

Land: An Empowerment Asset for Africa

The Human Factor Perspective



Edited by
Claude G. Mararike

Land: An Empowerment Asset for Africa
The Human Factor Perspective

Edited by
Claude G. Mararike



University of
Zimbabwe

UZE
Publications

© C. G. Mararike, 2014

ISBN 978-1-77920-110-2

First published in 2014 by
University of Zimbabwe Publications
P. O. Box MP 203
Mount Pleasant
Harare
Zimbabwe

Typeset by D. Masala, University of Zimbabwe Publications

Printed by Printforce Productions

Chapter Seven	
Land as the Nexus in Youth, Female Unemployment and Poverty Reduction	96
<i>Zororo Muranda, Rangarirai Frank and Fanny Saruchera</i>	
Chapter Eight	
Land as the Game-changer: Utilising Local Community Talent and Resources in Development Initiatives	118
<i>Mcdonald Matika</i>	
Chapter Nine	
Urban Land Development in Africa	127
<i>Innocent Chirisa, Elmond Bandaiko and Godfrey Chikowore</i>	
Chapter Ten	
Were It Not for the Land Revolution: Cases of Empowerment in Marondera District	150
<i>Charity Manyeruke and Ashton Murwira</i>	
Part Three	
Indigenous Knowledge and the Human Factor	
Chapter Eleven	
Language, Indigenous Knowledge and Survival Strategies	166
<i>J. Mapara and N. Mpofu-Hamadziripi</i>	
Chapter Twelve	
Climate Change and Indigenous Knowledge in Zimbabwe: A Human Factor Approach	182
<i>Sandra Bhatasara and Enock. J.R. Mandizadza</i>	
Chapter Thirteen	
Land Reform Programme and Rural Tourism in Zimbabwe	203
<i>E. J. R. Mandizadza, S. Bhatasara and O. Nyamwanza</i>	
Chapter Fourteen	
Land and Indigenous Knowledge Systems: Some Salient Issues	223
<i>Blessing Makunike</i>	
Part Four	
Land, Wildlife and Environment	
Chapter Fifteen	
Agro-forestry Resources Management, Transformation and Challenges in Southern Africa: The Case of Post-land Resettlement in Zimbabwe, 2000-2013	232
<i>Godfrey Chikowore, Innocent Chirisa, Harold Annegarn, Tafadzwa Makonese, Chihiro Ito, Verengai Mabika and Sam Ruturi</i>	

Chapter Thirteen

Land Reform and Rural Tourism in Zimbabwe

Enock J. R. Mandizadza, Sandra Bhatasara and Owen Nyamwanza

Introduction

Dynamics and implications of the land reform in Zimbabwe before the year 2000 have been variously examined elsewhere (Moyo, 1986, 1995, 1999, 2000; Alexander, 2003, Stoneman 2000, Cliffe, 2000, Mandaza, 1986, Palmer, 1990) and are not the focus of this chapter. It is the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) of the year 2000 which is our focus. According to Wolmer *et. al.* (2003: 1), “since 2000, Zimbabwe’s land reform initiatives have gained a high, and controversial profile internationally”. To Bernstein (2012: 170), “The Fast Track Land Reform Program in Zimbabwe is the world’s most comprehensive state-sponsored redistributive land reform of the twenty first century”. The land reform of 2000 was largely the compulsory acquisition and partitioning of large-scale white owned commercial farms and their redistribution to predominantly black small-holder locals. The salience of the land question in Zimbabwe is underlined by the colonial history of land alienation and the armed struggle to reclaim the land. It would seem the main protagonists in the land question are erstwhile colonisers on one end, who would have preferred a minimalist “willing-buyer willing-seller”, “market driven” land reform, eschewing radical change. On the other end is the ZANU PF government, with its nationalist appeal, adopting a Marxist socialist approach in the name of social justice. The contextualisation and rationale of the land reform in Zimbabwe has been variously debated and is not the subject matter of this chapter.

Following Ian Scoones *et. al.* (2010) publication titled *Zimbabwe’s Land Reform: Myths and Realities*, in a similar vein, we reiterate the imprudence of making generalisations on complex, dynamic social processes like the land reform. In view of the foregoing, it follows that in Zimbabwe, policy debates on land reform have tended to ignore or downplay the status and impact on rural tourism. Scholarship on how rural tourism has been reconfigured during the whole experience and its current and future status,

at best, has just been mentioned in passing in dominant discourses on land, and at worst, has been stereotyped and generalised. It is apparent that the fast track land reform of 2000 onwards, so far, is the crux of the land reform in Zimbabwe. According to Moyo (2011a), nearly 170 000 households have been formally allocated land across the country since 2000, a number which is even higher if we were to add informal land allocations. Scoones *et. al.* (2010) observe that the events since 2000 have heralded a radical shift in the agrarian structure with Sadomba (2011) being tempted to talk of a revolution spearheaded by war veterans (again the extent of the change is not subject of this chapter). Mamdani (2009: 8) concurs with Sadomba (2011) when the former observed that the land reform in Zimbabwe signaled the greatest transfer of property in Southern Africa since colonisation and that land redistribution revolutionised property, “adding more than 100 000 small land holding owners to the base of the property pyramid”.

It is imperative to note that autochthonous people were related to their land economically, socio-culturally, spiritually and politically. Thus, a human factor framework enables us to appreciate that the land reform of 2000 was not just about reclaiming land in the physical sense, but recovering intangible assets that come with land. To some scholars like Mamdani (2009) and Sadomba (2011), the exercise has led to an agrarian revolution, a reconfiguration of the colonial agricultural system and its juxtaposition with the African agricultural philosophy which had been emasculated and, in some cases, supplanted. From such a standpoint, as tourism is about people and celebrating culture, so does the nexus between rural/agro-tourism and land reform in Zimbabwe come into sharper focus. Failure to comprehend this connection, can be attributed to two main factors: a narrow understanding of the place/functions of land in the African cosmology and a Eurocentric conceptualisation of tourism as a search for the pristine African product which must be consumed and suit the tastes of the Westerner.

Defining the Human Factor, Rural Tourism and Agrotourism

According to Adjibolosoo (1993), cited in Chivaura and Mararike (1998: 11), the Human Factor entails:

the spectrum of personality characteristics and other dimensions of human performance that enable social, economic and political institutions to function and remain functional over time. Such dimensions sustain the workings and application of the rule of law, political harmony, a disciplined labour force, just legal systems, respect

for human dignity and the sanctity of life, social welfare, and so on. As is often the case, no social, economic or political institution can function effectively without being upheld by a network of committed persons who stand firm by them. Such persons must strongly believe and continually affirm the ideals of society.

In terms of tourism and development, what can be inferred from Adjibolosoo's (1993) sentiments are interventions which are people-oriented, which give primacy to local culture and which vaunt context specific and situation-based experiences.

The elusive nature of defining tourism (let alone rural tourism) has been underscored in various literature (Smith, 2007; Gilbert, 1990; Pearce, 1993; van Harssel, 1994). This chapter defines rural tourism to involve tourists (both domestic and foreign) travelling to non-urban, populated areas to witness or participate in activities that constitute the core of country life and rurality in general such as farming. Related concepts like *farm tourism*, *agrotourism* or *agritourism* are not uncommon in literature and are used interchangeably with rural tourism. Generally, rural tourism is seen as a "magic bullet" which is meant to halt rural-urban migration and a general loss of interest in rural life. According to the National Tourism Policy of Zimbabwe (2014: 10), for agro-tourism

...visitors experience agriculture life at first hand ... are afforded the opportunity to work in the fields along real farmers, wade knee deep in the waters with fishermen and experience the farming community for the purpose of enjoyment, education or active involvement in the activities.

If we are to follow a loose definition of tourism, rural tourism allows intersection of various forms/kinds of tourism, namely, sport tourism, academic tourism, farm tourism, media tourism, cultural tourism, eco-tourism and dark tourism.

Preponderance of Macroeconomic Thinking in Tourism Discourse and Practice

The pitfalls and implications of unconsciously and wholesomely adopting western development models to champion Africa's development, has been aptly highlighted by Mararike (1998) who calls for Africa to analyse critically the human factor content of development proposals offered by foreign development organisations. Mararike (1998) is eloquent in his elaboration of the ideological subjugation (*kudyiswa*, *kurutsiswa hypothesis*) that characterised the colonial experience and its enduring, mutating tendencies in development models exported to Africa today from the

Washington Consensus. Thus, for instance, many African countries today have missed the opportunities that come with rural tourism and land reform because of the preponderance of Keynesian classical economics which measure the economic contribution of tourism to the Gross Domestic Product. If rural tourism is recognised, it is often wrongly modelled, and thus neglects the intrinsic value and ideals of the autochthonous people. The human factor approach would emphasize cultural tourism, where local people celebrate their traditions, custom and lived realities and are ready to exchange this with visitors. In light of farm tourism, the emphasis of the human factor in the aftermath of the land reform is not on macro issues of productivity, mass production or mechanised “efficient farming”. The focus of the human factor is the smallish, subsistence, socio-cultural, spiritual, economic-political attachment to land, livelihoods and related activities.

In a similar vein, Cousins and Scoones (2010) discuss the contested nature of the notion of “viability” in relation to land reforms. Though they do not emphatically espouse a human factor approach which is people-centred, Cousins and Scoones (2010) indeed make important arguments which resonate well with the line of argument of the authors. The argument is that the notion of viability is defined from various conceptual frameworks. They (2010) identify neoclassical economics, the new institutional economics, the livelihoods approach, welfarism, the radical political economy approach as well as Marxist approach to land reform. It follows that these paradigms can be juxtaposed in land reform, yet the notion of “viability” is often applied and assumes a restrictive normative version, focusing on productivity and economic returns. Such reasoning is typical of hegemonic agricultural modernisation narratives which have hitherto dominated agricultural policy since the colonial era. Regrettably such modelling is applied uncritically to tourism.

Yet, it is an axiom that, in practice, neither land reforms nor tourist experiences espouse such narrow, unilinear goals. For instance, we argue that the land reform in Zimbabwe is informed by welfarist goals of addressing extreme poverty in rural areas, radical political economy approach of redistribution to deracialise land holding, as well as neoclassical economics emphasizing productivity. A human factor approach demands this interface analysis with the goal of initiating people-centred development. It is also apparent that land, as an asset, serves multiple purposes to multiple people. To some, it reunites them with the motherland, with ancestral heritage, for some, it is security which is passed from generation to generation, while for some, land is a platform for various livelihood strategies not limited to agriculture like mining,

hunting and leisure. We argue that it is only when we apply this holistic approach that we can realise the multiple dynamics of rural tourism and be able to harness its supposed benefits. This is the same kind of reasoning that Ian Scoones *et. al.* (2012) utilised to demystify the over-romanticised views on the FTLRP in Zimbabwe.

In line with most one-sided meta narratives on tourism dynamics in the aftermath of the 2000 FTLRP in Zimbabwe, Manwa (2007) writes in the classical economics tradition which emphasizes foreign currency inflows and is critical of the FTLRP for dampening tourist inflows. Manwa cites the Zimbabwe Tourism Authority (2000a) and the World Tourism Organisation (2005) which report a 40 per cent (1999 figures) and 17.8 per cent (2003 figures) decline into tourist arrivals, respectively. Manwa (2007) attributes this to "disruptions in conservancies and commercial farms" and the resultant negative perceptions amplified by the media. We do not dismiss observations by Manwa (2003, 2007) and related works. We argue that it is a one-sided and narrow view which is limited in terms of time-space analysis. The multifaceted, complex tourist dynamics cannot be reduced to simple macro economics. A phenomenological standpoint will emphasize the salience of individual tourism experiences, noting a nomenclature of tourists defined by their varying motivations. An emphasis of micro dynamics of tourism may point to the contrary that, in fact, the land reform was a boost for rural tourism (domestic tourism characterised by active rural-urban engagements).

The 2000 Land reform and the Reawakening of African Agricultural Philosophy: A Tale of 'Cultural Renaissance' and Agrotourism

Sadomba (2011) gives a detailed account of the impact of white settler colonisation on indigenous knowledge in agriculture. One of the major turning points in the history of agriculture of Zimbabwe was the introduction of Emery Desmond Alvord (1889-1959) to the scene. In his words, Alvord (1929), cited in Sadomba (1999a: 33), had this to say of the Shona people:

The people are essentially agriculturists. For many generations past they have lived almost entirely from the products of soil tillage. The economic structure of their social lives is closely linked up with this soil tillage and with the care of live stock. They are of the earth ... Agriculture, to the Native, is not a trade or an occupation. It is a mode of life.

When black Zimbabweans were forcibly removed from their ancestral land by the British colonial apparatus, it is not only land that was expropriated, but people were alienated from a whole array of cultural arrangements attached to land. For example, together with land, people lost their ancestral shrines, caves, paintings, household property and physical landscape of strategic importance. It also follows that the land reclamation of 2000 can be said to signal restoration of both tangible and “intangible” assets. The colonial era saw the disbanding of African agricultural philosophy embodied in spiritual attachment to land, cultivation of traditional crops, traditional methods of planting and tilling land as well as ceremonies asking for rain, among many others. Colonial rule saw the supplanting of this indigenous agricultural philosophy with a western agricultural system informed by the modernisation thinking of Alfordism. Thus, the indigenous land-holding and land-use systems were dislodged. A detailed analysis of the nature of land alienation has been described elsewhere and is not the subject of this chapter. (refer to Sadomba, 1999, 2010a).

In view of the foregoing, it suffices to say that during and in the aftermath of the 2000 land reform, there has been some “cultural renaissance” in newly resettled areas of indigenous knowledge and practices in agriculture that have either waned or halted before land redistribution. For instance, it is now common to see *mukwerera* ceremonies to ask for rain, beer brewing in *mabira*, in “new farms”, chiefs have regained their status (albeit supported by politics) and people are remaking family shrines, some have reverted to cultivating traditional crops like *zviyo*, using traditional ways. There is also pronounced multiple use of the landscape, including competing claims to mountains by followers of African Traditional Religion and those of African Independent Churches in mountains, *makomo anoera* and in caves, *mapako* or *ninga*. Stories of people in newly resettled farms who hunted down baboons in the Chiweshe area and the erratic rains of that year and that they had to seek restitution with a ceremony led by the Chief, were told! The point is not whether we believe this to be true or not, but what people believe to be true can actually be true in its consequences! If tourism is about cultural exchange and celebration of culture, if it is about people, then indeed the FTLRP has enriched rural tourism. All these rituals and cultural undertakings will be of great interest to cultural anthropologists, curators and cultural tourists.

Another important long-standing cultural tradition, which underpinned African agrarian philosophy, is the *Zunde raMambo* among the Shona. Loosely translated, this is a collective field under a chief. Mararike (2000: 94) elaborates that “Zunde is a Shona word which may mean ... or refer

to plenty of grain stored for future use by people in a particular community". The yield was stored in granaries (*Zunde raMambo*) at the Chief's compound (Mararike, 2000). The system involved organisation of inputs, labour and centralised storage and distribution (Sadomba, 2011: 141). *Zunde* was meant to be a "safety net" that guaranteed relief to the needy in the community during times of hardships and calamity and it was generally practised as a powerful ritual in rural community organisations, arousing cohesive emotions (Sadomba, 2011: 141, Mararike, 2000: 95). Working hand in glove with the *Zunde* system, is the production process designed along similar lines of work-feasts, known as *nhimbe*, where people enjoy traditional beer drinking, singing, eating and merrymaking intermittently, during planting and harvest time. All these activities are underpinned by a kind of Durkheimian *collective effervescence*, a *collective conscience*, a *gutsa ruzhinji* which signals de-individuation and collectivism. It is imperative to note that today in the newly resettled farms, the same *el spirit de corps* has been resurrected, albeit in "new forms" where new farmers assist each other with labour and formation of "neighborhood watches" when confronted with a common enemy. At a national level the government has as well attempted to "invoke" the same symbolic, socio-cultural capital in its *maguta* programme. We argue that the FTLRP has seen "cultural renaissance", a redeployment of African agricultural philosophies which had become dormant before the land reform, philosophies imbued in the human factor principles of selflessness, patriotism and *community*. The *Zunde raMambo* system is one such "tourist product" which is saleable to the cultural anthropologist and cultural tourist!

The Fast-track Land Reform and Study Tourism

Of late, Zimbabwe has become both the "field" and "laboratory" of learning experiences of how a land reform can be carried out in formerly colonised Africa or Americas, or Asia. Since around 2009, with the "cooling effect" of the government of national unity, there has been a huge influx of politicians, women, youths, academics, Pan African groups and civic society who were keen to learn from success and failure stories of the Zimbabwe land reform programme, including participants from our erstwhile colonisers, Britain.

It is a truism that many foreign visitors shunned to visit the country between the years 2000 and 2005, during the peak of the *jambanja* fast track land reform. But there is one group which may have been consistent in its visits and presence on the ground: economic anthropologists and sociologists. Social researchers interested in longitudinal studies were

keen to observe the fast track land reform as it unfolded. For instance, in the aftermath of the 2000 FTLRP, various study tourists, like Blair Rutherford (2003), Ian Scoones from the Institute of Poverty Development of Sussex, Ben Cousins together with a group of black Zimbabwean scholars, have been intrigued by the “livelihoods” of former farm workers. These are researchers to the bone marrow, who visited resettled A1 and A2 farmers at their farms and homes. Their scholarship tackled a wide range of issues which include the lived experiences of former farm workers, the relationship between the “new farmers” and largely white commercial farmers (co-existence), livelihood strategies, crop and animal productivity, among many other issues. It suffices to say a number of Phd and Msc holders owe their degrees to the “new farmers” and former farm workers! This trend has continued to date. Rural tourism receipts are obtained from the Research Council of Zimbabwe which registers and clears such research. Some rural people (respondents) may have benefited from some compensatory fees for affording interview time!

The argument of this chapter is that, instead of valourising the picture of the 2000 fast track land reform as disruptive and thus negative to tourism promotion, we rather see opportunities and prospects that it has created for rural tourism. It may be that the FTLRP had negatively impacted mainstream tourism, measured by the large influx of foreign visitors and hotel occupation. Nonetheless, that on its own may have sown seeds for the promotion of rural tourism as evidenced today! Implicit in dominant discourses and scholarship on tourism is a normative model of “conventional mass tourism”, in part, informed by neo-classical economics; a narrow focus indeed. The human factor approach which puts the human individual at the centre of analysis, offers a holistic, dynamic, nuanced understanding of the status of rural tourism in the aftermath of the FTLRP in Zimbabwe. A human factor framework would view tourism as an individual experience which coalesces with structural elements to produce a complex network of daily lived experiences of rural people.

It is pertinent to note how newly resettled farmers’ attempt at marrying “modern farming methods” with those they draw from their indigenous knowledge and from their lived experiences. During our fact-finding mission on the farms in Mazoe, we were fascinated by one “new” farmer, an ex-combatant and research fellow with Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, who has designated since 2000, his farm for research on indigenous farming techniques and “modern” ones. On the farm, they cultivate traditional crops like finger millet and *zviyo* using virgin land cultivation, where they do not remove trees, nor weeds. They only prune branches and “harass” weeds so that they do not cover

crops. Experiments are held to establish optimal distribution of crops on different planting methods as well as the favourable combination with tree types. Organic agriculture, where no chemical fertilizer is used, is put on trial. The same experiments can also be carried out in animal husbandry where different animal types are cross-bred to note outcomes. The point here is not to make much out of these “experiments” but to emphasize that “new farms” may become fertile “fields” and “laboratories” of research where new farmers harness both “old” and “new” farming methods. Such “research designated” farms become the rendezvous for researchers and cultural tourists interested in on-farm research.

“Hidden Treasures” on the Farms

Some “new farmers” have discovered “hidden treasures” in some parts of the farms. “It is not uncommon to find rock paintings, old pottery from presumably pre-colonial homesteads and caves with traditional war machinery known in Shona as *mapako* or *ninga*. In certain instances, archaeologists are called in to examine and collect certain historical artefacts. It has been reported at a farm near Mazoe that the deceased spirit medium of Mbuya Nehanda by the name Charwe had his home identified and preserved. In some instances, the “hidden treasure” included mineral deposits! We argue that there is rich material for cultural tourism on farms which local people can relate to.

In farm areas close to the Great Dyke, there are special types of rocks like verdite, Spring stone in Guruve, Mvurwi and Concession, Leopard Rock in Inyanga-stones used in sculptor. Zimbabwe is renowned for having some of the best sculptor pieces in the whole world, yet most of these have been exported for the exotic market at a far less value than the thousand United States dollars they fetch outside! All these are resources on farms which have potential to bring economic gain to rural farmers and people. That way, tourism would be more beneficial to local people. It is noteworthy though that with rural tourism, the number one goal is not financial gains, but cultural exchange, economic gain which can be realised in the long term on a more consistent basis.

Religious Tourism, Eco-tourism and Health Tourism on Farms

For religious pilgrimage and tourism, the land reform has provided unbridled access to certain mountains for religious thanksgiving in areas previously privatised by large-scale commercial farms. It is intriguing to note some competing claims between Christians and followers of African

Traditional Religion to some sacred places of worship like caves and mountains.

For eco-tourists, the natural landscape and the physical environment is the main attraction that has to be “consumed”. Former white owned farms and areas previously designated as “restricted” and where trespassers would be prosecuted became “liberated” zones after the FTLRP. Local people are now free to walk through. The mountains, the dense forests, waterfalls, the flora and fauna in resettled areas can be consumed by tourists. We argue that the land reform has boosted domestic tourism where locals from other communities and urban areas embark on some “rural tourism” to sometimes escape from urban life. The major challenge is that when local people embark on such adventures, they may not be considered as tourists (as it seems given)!

Closely linked to eco-tourism, we discern some elements on health tourism. In 2011, Zimbabwe’s climate alongside that of Malta were noted as the best on earth on the Quality of Life Index, according to Yale Universities Environmental Index published in the *International Living Magazine*. Though it may require scientific evidence to substantiate, we submit that it may be that there is now less damage to the atmosphere and physical environment as most resettled farmers practise safer agriculture which interferes minimally with biodiversity. In addition, it is now normal to see many urbanites scheduling to visit rural areas regularly for pure air, pure water, to enjoy traditional dishes and take some with them back to the city, a break from city life to be in “unity with the universe”. It is not uncommon to see some well-to-do resettled black large-scale commercial farmers, or those under the A2 model, preferring to reside at their farms and driving to and from the city for office work. Some water from ‘falls’ and hot springs is believed to be endowed with healing powers hence medical tourism. With stress being one prominent predisposing factor to illness nowadays; the countryside has somehow become a sanctuary.

Most of the times, in line with Chambers’ (1983) notion of “professional bias” and “urban-tarmac bias”, seminars, conferences and appraisal meetings on the land reforms are held in five-star hotels, away from the farms where activity takes place. Familiarisation tours are conducted on farms near cities, which are well-capitalised, which become “success stories” of the land reform. However, a full package of farm tourism would require touring of all areas, including small scale-farms as well as “failure stories”. One would imagine a land conference convened at a farm-land where all necessary facilities are provided, which will give a very go-

glimpse of the obtaining situation and allow “experts” to come into contact with rurarians. Such platforms will, in fact, promote rural tourism where rural people sell their crafts, souvenirs and exhibit their cultural traditions to visitors.

Wildlife Tourism and Land Reform

One conspicuous area of rural tourism brought to sharper focus by the 2000 land reform is wildlife tourism. Before colonisation, local people shared the habitat with wild animals, the latter not only providing the much needed protein and other end- use products like ivory and skin hides, but also cultural and symbolic significance in totemism. Among the Shona, totemic animals were sacred and could not be slaughtered for meat. Local communities would hunt game meat for food without any restrictions (which should not imply that it was not regulated). With the advent of British colonial rule, we saw the creation of “conservancies” and game parks meant to “protect” “engandered species” and displacement of local communities. Since then, these large-sized conservancies and associated safari hunting industries have largely been dominated by whites. Justification of large tracts of land is usually sought from “economies of scale” (foreign currency receipts), sustainable carrying capacities and conserving “endangered species” which face extinction, for foreign tourists (Wolmer *et. al.* 2003).

The 2000 land reform, by and large, is seen as disruptive and destructive of these “sound” agriculture economics type of explanations (emphasizing financial and economic profitability for “national interests”). New farmers were accused of “poaching” and destruction of infrastructure. The aftermath of the 2000 FTLRP may not have changed the status quo a lot, as whites and politically-connected new black land owners and entrepreneurs continue to control the wild-life sector. The government is faced with a herculean task of balancing among all interested parties. Literature is replete with cases of community-based natural resources management, for example, CAMPIRE, and what has come to be termed wild life-based land reform, meant to increase involvement of local communities in planning, monitoring and benefiting from such schemes (Read, Bond, 1999, 2001; Child, 1993, Murphree 1997, 2004). Though assessment of these initiatives have been discussed elsewhere (and is not subject of this chapter), we argue that a human factor approach, which puts local people as proponents and ultimate target of their development, would yield more positive results. Though the “benevolent” government is expected to play a balancing act to all and for national interests, it is a false start when huge national programmes are not designed for local

indigenous people for their development. Inherent in wild life tourism is the idea of local people and local natural resources to be 'exotic', meant to be packaged and consumed only by foreign tourists. Local custom, dreams and aspirations become secondary. Wolmer *et. al.* (2003) give an account of the Ndau Gudo people of Sangwe communal area who had their ancestral burial sites and ritual pools at the now Save Valley Conservancy and the Chitsa community displaced from Gonarezhou National Park with policy-makers disregarding their voices. This is inevitable in the "tourism industry" that is strongly rooted in European traditions and modelled along Eurocentric tastes. A human factor approach would put an emphasis on mutual trust, consensus, patriotism and commitment to a national ethos by government, business people and autochthonous people for the common good of all. It is not surprising that most tourist resort areas in the country are tailor-made to suit the tastes of foreigners. Hardly do most local Zimbabweans afford a holiday trip to see Victoria Falls, or afford a boat cruise or helicopter flight over conservancies. South Africa offers subsidies which ensure that locals, even those at the bottom rung, can have access to waters, beaches, a helicopter flight to Robben Island and Table Mountain in Cape Town! A human factor approach would emphasize a tourism industry which is designed with local people first in mind! Rural tourism should be locally designed, with local Zimbabweans being the tourists and the toured.

Rural-Urban Nexus and Farm Tourism

Any form of tourism that showcases the rural life, art, culture and heritage at rural locations, thereby benefiting the local community economically and socially as well as enabling interaction between the tourists and the locals for a more enriching tourism experience, can be termed as rural tourism. Rural tourism is essentially an activity which takes place in the countryside. It is multi-faceted and may entail farm/agricultural tourism, cultural tourism, nature tourism, adventure tourism and eco-tourism. As against conventional tourism, rural tourism has certain typical characteristics. It is experience-oriented. The locations are sparsely populated. It is predominantly in a natural environment. It meshes with seasonality and local events and is based on preservation of culture, heritage and traditions.

Instead of viewing the transactions between rural and urban as one-directional, we rather see opportunities for both rural and urban people that arise. There is a kind of "home euphoria" that has been created by "new homes" after the FTLRP in Zimbabwe, a boost for rural tourism on its own. Most black educated middle class people in Zimbabwe are

developing a keen interest in developing their new homes in largely resettled areas by constructing comfortable urban type homes, away from traditional homes where they are now exempt from land squabbles and strained relations from the extended family. This group is determined to invest in the home which will be the "ultimate" destination after death, retirement from city life or other eventualities from life. Traditionally, the Shona have a very strong sense of belonging, a sense of home. This "investment" has seen the capable bringing glitters of modern technology, small generators, invertors, solar equipment and satellite communication. Some are reviving closed retail shops left by their deceased or very old "broke" parents. Small businesses like poultry, piggery, nursery tree-marketing and makeshift markets specialising in electrical and communication gadgets, are now common features in some of the resettled areas. In a smaller way, employment has been created and new markets found. It is an oversimplification to dismiss the rural-urban connection as one characterised by a mercenary relationship. A common feature are well-to-do, party officials and successful black indigenous people allocated large-scale commercial farms who opt to reside at their farms while driving daily to the city for work and meetings.

Cultural Tourism and Similar Activities: The Case for Rural Tourism

There is now much talk about "alternative tourism", "culture tourism" and a new shift in tourist tastes, from mass/conventional tourism. These "new" forms of tourism are said to be eco-friendly and "sustainable". Cultural tourism (also termed heritage tourism) entails intense experiences with local people's customs, traditions, rituals and practices, the rich past and "cultural packs" which find expression in artefacts like crafts. Mkono (2010) attests that culture is the only product which is non substitutable, exclusive and which gives a competitive edge. Many scholars have observed a shift in tourist preferences and tastes from mass tourism to cultural tourist experiences and these tend to be high spenders (Manwa, 2007). It is imperative to note that a human factor perspective which is people centred, focuses attention on cultural tourism as the mainstream and not "alternative". The proverbial African hospitality makes many visitors feel welcome to the continent (Adu-Febiri 1998: 159). Adu-Febiri, reviews the status and trends of tourism in Africa using the HF approach, acknowledges the place of cultural tourism, but tended to emphasize an econometric, mass tourism and how Africa should position herself to derive maximum benefits from tourism. A related type of tourism is education tourism which focuses on researchers who are interested in

the qualitative study of local people's culture and agriculture tourism which enables farmers to diversify and enhance the value of their products (Cabrini, 2002). We reiterate that the major pitfall of dominant discourses of tourism is that they are Eurocentric and informed by neo-classical economics; a stance which negates any attempts at emic conceptualisations of tourism. A human factor approach accentuates tourism which enables and promotes cultural celebration and cultural exchange with outsiders and not tourism designed and geared for economic gains.

In Zimbabwe, in the new land settlements, there are a number of activities and initiatives which can be pigeonholed for rural tourism or which can express rural tourism. Rain ceremonies, traditional court sessions, installation of chiefs ceremonies, "field days" (green days), *Zunde raMambo* initiatives, traditional beer-making and drinking, rural funeral rituals are some of the activities which could be of interest to educational tourists and outsiders. The emphasis here is not necessarily the economic gains that accrue, but cultural exposition.

Possible Agro Tourism in Newly Resettled Areas

The A1 scheme was intended to expand the smallholder farming sector (commonly called the Communal Area sector), to cater for the landless, unemployed and disadvantaged peoples from communal, urban and other areas. On average, the A1 beneficiaries were allocated five to six hectares of arable land for farming and seven to fifteen hectares per household for grazing. There are two sub-schemes within the A1 model: the "villagised" and "self-contained". The villagised is a close replica of earlier Model A resettlement where the planners settle land beneficiaries in a closed village and are allocated household arable land and land units in grazing land that are outside the village.

The self-contained farms, on the other hand, are smaller versions of A2 models, whereby the resettled are given one piece of land in which they are expected to build the homestead, apportion some land for crop cultivation and also some to provide pasture for livestock production. The A2 model comprises individually held farm units ranging in size from the 50 hectares to large scale A2 units (of around 400 to 1 500 hectares). Their average size was about 330 hectares in 2003 (Utete Report, 2003). Farm sizes vary according to natural regions.

Taking a leaf from some of the "best practices" in planned rural tourism around the world, local government authorities, rural councils, farmers, business people and other local institutions can design rural tourism

packages which can have a positive impact on agriculture development, enhance farmers' incomes and improve the living standards in rural areas. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that agriculture should remain the number one priority. For farmers resettled under the A2 model, farmers can create recreational facilities with leisure programmes centred on agriculture products, arrange farm stays for visitors, create platforms for the selling of fresh farm produce as well as ecotourism from the natural landscape like hot springs, forests and waterfalls. Some A1 farms can practise crocodile and fish farming, themselves tourist products. Of late, in Zimbabwe, there has been a marked increase in the number of "new farmers" who are cultivating tobacco which has generated a lot of interests on issues such as environmental questions on deforestation and possible qualitative improvement of rural people's lives. Training seminars and conferences on "environmental best practices" and discussions on the tobacco auction systems, contract farming, among many other issues, can be held on farm sites.

Non-Farm Activities and the Philosophy of Money

Numerous studies, surveys and appraisals on the FTLRP in Zimbabwe have revealed a potpourri of on-farm, non-farm and natural resource based micro-level livelihoods adopted by rural people to earn a living. It suffices to say that proceeds from these endeavours are also shared and sold to urbanites who embark on some "rural tourism" and foreign visitors interested in cultural tourism.

Some of the livelihood strategies (we have avoided to refer to these as income generating activities as monetary gain is not always how rural people deal with non-rural dwellers) employed by beneficiaries are basketry, pottery, beer brewing, bricklaying, carpentry, wild-fruit gathering, vending, game meat marketing among many others. Foreign visitors may buy different crafts as souvenirs, middle men and women from urban areas may buy wild fruits (or get them for free), game meat and farm produce for resale in towns and cities. Quantities may not be strictly weighed in a rural setting as is the case in urban areas and most traders may enjoy surplus quantities on buying on farm.

Table 1 shows an outline of non-farm activities from a baseline survey of six districts by the African Institute of Agrarian Studies in the years 2005/6, on newly resettled farms. Though it is a truism that people in rural areas earn an income from the above activities, for activities like pottery, carvings, basketry and beer brewing, money is not always the goal. We rather view these activities as part cultural marketing, a kind of civic pride

of indigenous people who are keen to share their traditions and artistry. Similar arguments invoke some of the perennial debates that have characterised sociology and anthropology of tourism whether commoditisation removes authenticity of a product or enhances it. We argue that monetary exchange of cultural products/activities/ceremonies does not necessarily lead to loss of authenticity but, in fact, it enhances it. Monetary payment may be a way of showing value and appreciation to the artefact or souvenir. Instructive on monetary exchange are ideas of Simmel's (1907) *Philosophy of Money* and Giddens (1991) who highlight the depersonalising, disembedding nature of money, characteristic of the instrumentalisation and rationalisation of modern society. In other language, money in itself has no significant value, but a symbolic and abstract one that embodies exchange apparatus for the modern world signalling the waning of localism. We argue that from a human factor standpoint, with rural tourism, it is not the monetary gain that accrues to locals or the central government that matters because money is a medium of exchange, an enabler of exchange between locals and foreigners or outsiders. Money is not an end in itself, but a means to an end; celebration of local culture. Muzvidziwa (2000:58), in his discussion on eco-tourism, also makes the argument that "while profit is an important motivating factor for establishing (eco-) tourism projects, unlike mainstream tourism, there is a strong desire to offer rewarding, rich, participatory learning experiences involving the tourist and the host community".

Table 1 Non-farm livelihood strategies by land beneficiaries

Non-farm livelihood strategy	A1		A2		Chiplinge		Chiredzi		Goromonzi		Kwekwe		Mangwe		Zvimba		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Tailoring	75	4.5	14	3.2	8	2.4	12	5.1	29	4.2	25	6.7	4	2.8	11	3.6	89	4.3
Basketry	33	2	—	—	1	0.3	17	7.2	2	0.3	6	1.6	3	2.1	4	1.3	33	1.6
Bricklaying	88	5.3	7	1.6	5	1.5	6	2.6	21	3	42	11	11	7.6	10	3.2	95	4.5
Pottery	17	1	4	0.9	1	0.3	1	0.4	7	1	4	1.1	4	2.8	4	1.3	21	1
Vending of clothes	96	5.8	10	2.3	17	5.0	20	8.5	16	2.3	40	11	4	2.8	9	2.9	106	5.1
Beer-brewing	35	2.1	1	0.2	4	1.2	22	9.4	5	0.7	5	1.3	—	—	—	—	36	1.7
Carpentry	43	2.6	1	0.2	3	0.9	6	2.6	7	1	22	5.9	—	—	6	1.9	44	2.1
Repair work	46	2.8	9	2.1	9	2.6	4	1.7	11	1.6	18	4.8	2	1.4	11	3.6	55	2.6
Retail business	5	0.3	1	0.2	—	—	—	—	5	0.7	1	0.3	—	—	—	—	6	0.3

Source: African Institute Agrarian Studies Baseline Survey 2005/06, Household questionnaire, N=2089

Conclusions and Recommendations

A holistic approach is essential for gaining a comprehensive appreciation of rural tourism dynamics in the aftermath of the 2000 FTLRP in Zimbabwe.

A Human Factor Framework which is people-centred and Afro-centric is better placed to understand rural tourism dynamics in Zimbabwe.

It could be that the 2000 land reform in Zimbabwe has signalled a re-awakening of African agricultural philosophy, momentarily debased at the height of colonial rule and is now being re-enacted with modern farming methods.

The major limitations with current dominant discourses on tourism studies and policies in Africa are their western roots which, at worst, proffer a limited theoretical framework of analyzing the tourism phenomenon in Africa and, at best, offer narrow policy guidelines to rural tourism. A human factor approach to tourism encapsulates a humanisation of a hegemonic tourism discourse, hitherto dominated by modernisation meta narratives which focus on economic "trickle down" while divorcing the tourism phenomenon from people who are the major players.

Promotion of rural tourism transcends and inverts the picture of *tourists* as westerners and locals as the *toured*, to an arrangement where locals become tourists and tour their own.

There is great potential for rural tourism-related phenomena in Zimbabwe, in the aftermath of the 2000 land reform.

A more illuminating analysis of rural tourism should transcend a normative model of tourism which emphasizes economic gain to emphasize non-monetary, intangible aspects imbued in cultural exchange.

There is need for a deliberate action by the central government, local government, farmer associations, business, investors in tourism and other local institutions to create facilities and packages for farm tourism in newly resettled farm communities to optimise economic gain from rural tourism related transactions.

Contrary to widely held views that the FTLRP of 2000 and its aftermath was negative and led to the dwindling of tourism growth in Zimbabwe, there was a boost in certain types of tourist experiences like study tourism. There seems to be good prospects for rural/agriculture tourism in newly resettled farm areas.

References

- Adjibolosoo, S. (1998) "The Human Factor: Foundation for Development and Democracy". In Chivaura, V.G. and Mararike, C.G. (eds) *The Human Factor Approach to Development in Africa Vol 1*, Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.
- Adu-Febiri, Francis (1998) "The Human Factor: Tourism and Development". In Chivaura V.G and Mararike, C.G. *The Human Factor Approach to Development in Africa Vol 1*, Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.
- Alexander, J. (2003) *The Unsettled Land: State-making and the Politics of Land in Zimbabwe, 1893-2003*, Harare: Weaver Press.
- Bond, I., (1999) CAMPFIRE as a Vehicle for Sustainable Rural Development in the Semi-Arid Communal Lands of Zimbabwe: Incentives for Institutional Change. PhD thesis, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.
- Bond, I. (2001) "CAMPFIRE and the Incentives for Institutional Change". In Hulme, D., Murphree, M.W. (Eds.), *African Wildlife and Livelihoods. The Promise and Performance of Community Conservation*, Oxford: James Currey.
- Chambers, R. (1983) *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*, London: Longman.
- Child, B. (2000) *Making Wildlife Pay: Converting Wildlife's Comparative Advantage into Real Incentives for having Wildlife in African Savannas, Case Studies from Zimbabwe and Zambia*.
- Child, B.A. (1993) "Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Programme: Using the High Value of Wildlife Recreation to Revolutionise Natural Resource Management in Communal Areas" *Commonwealth Forestry Review* 72, 284–296.
- Cliffe, L. (2000) "The Politics of Land Reform in Zimbabwe". In Bowyer-Bower, T.A.S. and Stoneman, C. (eds), *Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Constraints and Prospects*, pp 47-57, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Cousins, B. and Scoones, I. (2010), "Contested Paradigms of 'Viability' in Redistributive Land Reform: Perspectives from Southern Africa", *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37; 1: 31-66.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self Identity*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Gilbert, D.C. (1990) "Conceptual Issues in the Meaning of Tourism". In C.P. Cooper (ed.) *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management Volume 2*. London: Belhaven.
- Mamdani, M. (2009) "Lessons of Zimbabwe. Mugabe in Context" *Concerned Africa Scholars*. Bulletin Number 82.
- Mandaza, I. (ed) (1986) *Zimbabwe: The Political Economy of Transition 1980-1986*, Dakar, CODESRIA.
- Manwa, H. (2007) "Is Zimbabwe Ready to Venture into Cultural Tourist Market?" *Development Southern Africa* 24: 3: 465-474, Routledge: Taylor and Francis.

- Mararike, C.G. "African Philosophy and the Human Factor Development". In Chivaura V.G and Mararike, C.G. (eds). *The Human Factor Approach to Development in Africa*, Vol 1, Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.
- Mararike, C.G.(2000) "Revival of Indigenous Food Security Strategies at the Village Level: The Human Factor Implications', *Review of Human Factor Studies* Vol 6 No.2 Dec 2000, International Institute for Human Factor Development.
- Moyo, S. (1995) *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*, Harare: Sapes Trust.
- (2000) *Land Reform under Structural Adjustment in Zimbabwe: Land Use Change in the Mashonaland Provinces*, Uppsala:Norkiska Afrika Institutet.
- (1986) "The Land Question". In Mandaza, I. (ed), *Zimbabwe: The Political Economy of Transition 1980-1986*, pp 165-201, Dakar: CODESRIA.
- (1999), "The Political Economy of Land Acquisition in Zimbabwe, 1990-1999", *JSAS*, vol. 26, No. 1, 5-28.
- (2011a) "Three Decades of Land Reform in Zimbabwe". *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 38, no. 3:493-571.
- Moyo, S. et. al. (2009), "Fast Track Land Reform Baseline Survey in Zimbabwe: Trends and Tendencies", 205/06". Institute for Agrarian Studies. Unpublished
- Murphree, M. (2004) "Communal Approaches to Natural Resource Management in Africa: From Whence to Where?," *Journal of International Wildlife Law and Policy* 7, 203–216.
- Murphree, M.W. (1997) "Congruent Objectives, Competing Interests and Strategic Compromise. Concept and Process in the Evolution of Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Programme". Community Conservation in Africa Working Paper, Vol. 2. Institute for Development Policy and Management (IDPM), University of Manchester, Manchester, U.K.
- Muzvidziwa, V. N. (2000) "Eco-Tourism and the Human Factor in Zimbabwe", *Review of Human Factor Studies* Vol 6 No.2 Dec 2000, International Institute for Human Factor Development.
- Palmer, R. (1990) "Land Reform in Zimbabwe", 1980-1990, *African Affairs*, London: Penguin.
- Pearce, D. G. (1993a) "Introduction". In D. G. Pearce & R. W. Butler, eds. *Tourism Research. Critiques and challenges*. Pp. 1-8. London: Routledge.
- Rutherford, B. (2003) "Belonging to the Farm(er): Farm Workers, Farmers and the Shifting Politics of Citizenship", in Hammar, A. (eds), *Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business: Rethinking Land, State and Nation in the Context of Crisis*, Harare: Weaver Press.
- Sadomba, W.Z. (1999a) "The Impact of Settler Colonialism on Indigenous Agricultural Knowledge in Zimbabwe: Fusion, Confusion or Negation?" Unpublished. *MSc Thesis*, Wageningen University.
- (2010a) 'Philosophical Conflicts in Zimbabwe's Land Occupations: Indigenous African Peasant vs European Capitalist Agrarian Jurisprudence', *Quest-Journal of African Philosophy*, Summer, 2010, 21, (2).

- (2011) *War Veterans in Zimbabwe's Revolution: Challenging Neo-colonial and Settler and International Capital*, London, Harare: James Curry and Weaver Press.
- Scoones, I. Marongwe, N. Mavedzenge, B. Murimbarimba, F. Mahenehene, J. and Sukume, C. (2010) *Zimbabwe's Land Reform: Myths and Realities*. Oxford: James Currey; Harare: Weaver Press.
- Simmel, G. (1990 [1907]) *Philosophy of Money*, London: Routledge.
- Smith, S. (2007) "Duelling Definitions: Challenges and Implications of Conflicting International Concepts of Tourism" In D.Airey and J.Tribe (eds) *Developments in Tourism Research*, Oxford: Elsevier. 123–138.
- Stoneman, C. (2000) "Zimbabwe Land Policy and the Land Reform Programme" In Bowyer-Bower, T.A.S. and Stoneman, C. (eds), *Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Constraints and Prospects*, pp 47-57, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van Harssel, J. (1994) *Tourism: An exploration*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Wolmer, W. Chaumba, J and Scoones, I. (2003) "Wildlife Management and Land Reform in Southeastern Zimbabwe: A Compatible Pairing or Contradiction in Terms. Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa" Research Paper 1. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>