

[https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2024.7\(3\).01](https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2024.7(3).01)
UDC 332.2:338.43(680+689.1)



LAND REFORM POLICY FORMULATION IN SOUTH AFRICA AND ZIMBABWE: IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Beauty Zindi*, ORCID: 0000-0003-4790-5379,
Emmanuel Ndhlovu, ORCID: 0000-0002-2339-3068

University of Johannesburg College of Business and Economics, P.O. Box 524, Auckland Park 2006

* Corresponding author: Beauty Zindi, letwinbee@gmail.com

Received: 06. 20. 2024

Accepted: 07. 24. 2024

Abstract. Intense ideological and political standoffs persist over land and agrarian reform in former settler countries where land access, ownership, and utilisation wield enormous socio-economic and political implications. Focusing on South Africa (SA) and Zimbabwe, this article contributes to the ongoing debate on land reform. Drawing on qualitative secondary literature review and abstraction, this article identifies land reform policy evolution in SA and Zimbabwe and explores the implications of land reform policy on socio-economic and political development. The article shows that since colonial times, asymmetrical land access, ownership, utilisation, and widespread land expropriation by settlers have been the major source of political instability, landlessness, rural poverty, high population densities, and poor land management in SA and Zimbabwe. The article argues for the need for theoretically and conceptually mature land reform debates located within the broad framework of trajectories of transformation, not only economic but also structural.

Keywords: *Agrarian reform, colonialism, development, land reform, imperialism, sovereignty.*

Rezumat. Confruntări ideologice și politice intense persistă cu privire la reforma funciară și agrară în fostele țări colonizate, unde accesul, proprietatea și utilizarea terenurilor au implicații socio-economice și politice enorme. Concentrându-se pe Africa de Sud (SA) și Zimbabwe, acest articol contribuie la dezbateră în curs privind reforma funciară. Bazându-se pe o analiză și o abstractizare calitativă a literaturii secundare, acest articol identifică evoluția politicii reformei funciare în Africa de Sud (AS) și Zimbabwe și explorează implicațiile politicii de reformă agrară asupra dezvoltării socio-economice și politice. Articolul arată că încă din epoca colonială, accesul asimetric al terenurilor, proprietatea, utilizarea și exproprierea pe scară largă a terenurilor de către coloniști au fost sursa majoră de instabilitate politică, lipsă de pământ, sărăcie rurală, densități mari de populație și management deficitar al terenurilor în AS și Zimbabwe. Articolul argumentează necesitatea unor dezbateri mature, teoretic și conceptual asupra reformei funciare situate în cadrul larg al traiectoriilor de transformare, nu doar economică, ci și structurală.

Cuvinte cheie: *Reforma agrară, colonialism, dezvoltare, reformă funciară, imperialism, suveranitate.*

1. Introduction

The land reform policy formulation of South Africa (SA) and Zimbabwe is tied to the history, nature, and result of their colonial encounter with Europe. To understand the source of the land conflicts and motivations for land reform in these countries, a thorough understanding of the multi-layered social and political inconsistencies emerging from pre- and post-independence land policies together with the continent's 'development' as well as white capital accumulation trajectories, regarding, especially land access, ownership, and utilisation, is required. For most of the pre-colonial African populace, land has been the major source of wealth and livelihood which defined and determined belonging [1,2]. It is a vital production asset that provides the basis for the socio-economic growth of nations. Today, in Zimbabwe where about 70% of the population engages in agricultural activities for income and livelihood [3], land is a basic asset for livelihood. There is also growing evidence that land is the most vital available asset which rural communities can easily and meaningfully utilise to meet a variety of livelihood needs [4, 5]. Poverty is also intimately linked to landlessness in most agrarian communities [6]. As a result, land reform has been one of the major mechanisms for socio-economic and political transformation.

Studies on land and agriculture as the engine for development in Africa have been increasing [7-9]. The land has been a subject of policy formulation in SA and Zimbabwe, and the increasing campaigns for land reform since independence are manifestations of the deep-rooted land dispossession. SA and Zimbabwe are former settler colonies. Europeans did not only colonise these countries to loot resources but also to settle due to favourable climatic conditions and other reasons best known to themselves. According to Moyo [10], land battles and agroecological conditions, together with the splendour of a land and its inhabitants, all brought about strong emotional ties between the settlers and their colonies. To appease the European gluttonous land-wrenching zeal, the colonial government, of necessity, adopted policies that instituted the enterprise. Studies that explore land policy formulation in SA and Zimbabwe are scant. In the case of Zimbabwe, available studies on colonial land policies focus mainly on the pre-independence period [11, 12].

In SA, there has not been a comprehensive study that traces land policy formulation. Land policies are simply touched on by scholars as they emphasise particular points. As a result, there are no references that provide detailed land reform policy formulation in the two countries from the colonial period until now. This is a gap that has policy and scholarly implications, particularly for emerging academics and land activists seeking to engage in the land reform debate. This article seeks to contribute towards narrowing this gap by providing a detailed outline of land reform formulation in SA and Zimbabwe since the advent of colonialism until now.

This article (i) identifies land reform policy evolution in SA and Zimbabwe and (ii) explores the implications of land reform policy on socio-economic and political development. The study has the potential to contribute to ongoing debates on land reform policy by providing details that may guide debate and policy formulation. It can also serve as the basis for further theorisation and conceptualisation by academics and land activists.

The article is organised as follows: After the current introduction, the following section presents the research methodology for the study. This is followed by a discussion of land reform policies and their implications in SA and Zimbabwe under two sub-sections. Thereafter, the article proposes a transformative social policy-based land reform trajectory. Lastly, conclusions and recommendations are drawn from the discussion.

2. Materials and Methods

This article is based on a qualitative secondary literature review. Both grey and academic literature identified using 'land reform' as the key word in SA and Zimbabwe were reviewed. Literature review was combined with abstraction since some of the issues raised in the article require in-depth analysis and not mere empirical evidence that is in the form of numbers as in quantitative studies or direct quotations of qualitative studies. The authors are widely published on land reform issues and therefore, believed that the article could benefit from their sectorial expertise. There was no rigid criterion used to identify the texts that were used in this article. Instead, the authors relied on texts that provided detailed information on particular land reform policies that are summarised in this study. This loose research approach, however, presents a particular limitation. It is the authors' conviction that future researchers will be motivated to problematise the debate made here and engage in more detailed analyses of land reform evolution in the two countries.

3. Land Reform Policy Formulation in South Africa

This section discusses key land reform policies in SA and Zimbabwe since the advent of colonial enterprise to the present. Since the advent of the colonial project, several land-related policies were adopted and implemented in SA as detailed below.

3.1 Natives Land Act of 1913

The Natives Land Act of 1913 was a pivotal piece of legislation that formalised and intensified racial segregation in land ownership [13]. It restricted blacks from owning land outside of specific areas known as reserves, which comprised only about 7% of the country's territory. The Act aimed to confine blacks to designated areas while reserving the majority of the land for white ownership and agricultural development. Socially, the Act reinforced racial divisions and entrenched inequalities by systematically dispossessing blacks of their ancestral land [14]. It led to widespread forced removals and the creation of overcrowded and impoverished rural reserves. The Act perpetuated social segregation and undermined the social fabric of South African society by limiting opportunities for interaction and integration between racial groups [15].

In addition, economically, the Natives Land Act severely restricted blacks' access to productive agricultural land, stifling their economic opportunities and perpetuating poverty and dependency [16]. It entrenched a dual economy characterised by racial disparities in land ownership, access to resources, and economic opportunities. The Act contributed to the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the white minority, exacerbating economic inequalities. Politically, the Act reinforced the apartheid government's agenda of white supremacy and control over land and resources [14]. Conradie [17] mentions that the Act disenfranchised blacks and limited their ability to participate in the political process by depriving them of land ownership and economic independence. The Act fueled resistance and opposition to apartheid policies, laying the groundwork for future political mobilization and activism among blacks.

3.2 Group Areas Act of 1950

The Group Areas Act of 1950 further institutionalised racial segregation by allocating specific areas for different racial groups [18]. It divided urban areas into racially segregated zones and forcibly removed black communities from areas designated for white settlements. The Act aimed to create racially homogeneous neighborhoods and reinforce the apartheid

government's policy of separate development. The Act deepened social segregation and fractured communities by forcibly relocating people based on their race. It led to the creation of racially segregated townships and urban areas characterized by unequal access to services, amenities, and opportunities. The Act exacerbated social tensions and contributed to the marginalisation and alienation of blacks from urban centers.

Economically, the Group Areas Act disrupted established economic networks and forced many blacks to live in overcrowded and underdeveloped townships with limited economic opportunities [17]. It reinforced racial inequalities in housing, employment, and access to services, perpetuating economic marginalisation and deprivation among black communities. More so, Mbatha and Tembe [19] argued that politically, the Act reinforced the apartheid government's control over urban spaces and resources while disenfranchising and disempowering blacks. For Sihobo and Kirsten [20] mentioned that the Act fueled resistance and protest against apartheid policies, particularly among urban black communities who faced the brunt of forced removals and social dislocation. The Act underscored the inherently oppressive and discriminatory nature of apartheid, galvanizing opposition and solidarity among anti-apartheid activists.

3.3 The Native Trust and Land Act 18 of 1936

This Act extended the apartheid government's control over land owned by blacks. It established Native Trusts through which the government could acquire and administer land on behalf of black communities, further entrenching segregation and dispossession [21]. Socially, the Act reinforced racial segregation and inequality by limiting blacks' access to land and confining them to designated reserves or "Bantustans" [20]. It perpetuated social divisions and undermined the dignity and autonomy of black communities. Additionally, in the economic context, the Act restricted blacks' access to productive land and resources, hindered their economic opportunities, and perpetuated poverty and dependency [15]. It contributed to the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the white minority, exacerbating economic inequalities. Politically, the Act served the political interests of the apartheid government by consolidating its control over land and resources while disenfranchising and disempowering blacks [22]. It fueled resistance and opposition to apartheid policies, laying the groundwork for future political mobilisation and activism among black communities.

3.4 Bantu Authorities Act 1951

The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 established a system of tribal and regional authorities for blacks, known as 'Bantustans' or 'homelands.' It sought to create separate and autonomous political entities for different ethnic groups within South Africa, effectively removing blacks from the political and economic mainstream [23]. Socially, the Act fragmented black communities along ethnic lines and undermined their sense of collective identity and solidarity. The Act facilitated the forced relocation of millions of blacks to designated homeland areas, disrupting social networks and traditional ways of life [14]. The Act contributed to the erosion of social cohesion and cultural heritage among black communities, as they were subjected to artificial divisions and political manipulation.

More importantly, economically, the Bantu Authorities Act further marginalized blacks by confining them to economically marginal and underdeveloped homeland areas. It deprived them of access to the resources and opportunities available in urban centers, causing poverty and dependency. The Act served the economic interests of the apartheid government by

maintaining a cheap and exploitable labor force in the urban areas while relegating blacks to subsistence agriculture and low-wage labor in the homelands [19].

Politically, the Act undermined blacks' aspirations for political equality and self-determination by relegating them to powerless and ineffectual tribal authorities. It reinforced the apartheid government's divide-and-rule strategy by co-opting and co-opting traditional leaders to administer the homelands on its behalf. According to Mukarati et al. [24] the Act contributed to the fragmentation and disempowerment of the anti-apartheid movement by isolating and weakening black communities' socio-economically, politically, and geographically.

3.5 The Group Areas Act 36 of 1966

This Act amended and strengthened previous legislation on racial segregation, further entrenching racial divisions and inequalities in urban areas. It expanded the scope of forced removals and demolition of homes in designated 'white' areas, leading to widespread displacement and dispossession [25]. The Act intensified social segregation and fragmentation by forcibly relocating black communities and destroying established social networks and community ties. It undermined the sense of belonging and identity among affected populations and perpetuated feelings of alienation and marginalisation.

By disrupting livelihoods and economic activities, the Act exacerbated economic hardships and poverty among displaced communities [20]. It deprived blacks of access to urban amenities, services, and employment opportunities, perpetuating cycles of deprivation and dependency. More importantly, the Act reinforced the apartheid government's agenda of racial segregation and control over land and resources [26]. It fueled discontent and resistance among affected communities, contributing to broader opposition to apartheid policies and demands for political change and justice.

3.6 Black Communities Development Act 1984

The Black Communities Development Act of 1984 aimed to promote separate development by conferring limited autonomy and self-governance on black local authorities and townships. It sought to create the illusion of progress and empowerment within segregated black communities while maintaining the overall structure of apartheid [27]. Socially, the Act perpetuated the illusion of empowerment and progress among black communities while reinforcing their subjugation and dependency within the apartheid system [20]. It marginalized alternative forms of political expression and resistance by co-opting and controlling local black authorities. The Act further entrenched racial divisions and inequalities by perpetuating the segregation and marginalisation of black communities [15].

Economically, the Act failed to address the underlying structural inequalities and disparities that characterized the apartheid economy. It perpetuated economic marginalisation and dependency among black communities by confining them to underdeveloped and resource-poor areas [28]. The Act reinforced the apartheid government's control over economic resources and opportunities while marginalising blacks from mainstream economic activities. Politically, the Act undermined the aspirations for genuine democracy and equality by maintaining the facade of black empowerment within the apartheid system [22]. It co-opted and neutralised potential sources of opposition and resistance by conferring limited powers and privileges on black local authorities. The Act contributed to the fragmentation and demobilization of the anti-apartheid movement by creating divisions and tensions within black communities.

3.7 The Abolition of Racially Based Land Measures Act 108 of 1991

This act repealed various apartheid-era laws that enforced racial discrimination in land ownership and allocation. It aimed to dismantle legal barriers to land ownership and promote non-racialism and equality in land rights [29]. Socially, The Act signaled a significant shift away from apartheid-era policies of racial segregation and discrimination, fostering greater social inclusion and cohesion [22]. It affirmed the principle of equality before the law and promoted the rights and dignity of all South Africans, regardless of race or ethnicity. More so, the Act removed legal barriers to land ownership and access, the act expanded economic opportunities and empowerment for previously disadvantaged individuals and communities [30]. It paved the way for more equitable distribution of land and resources, contributing to poverty reduction and economic development. Lastly, the Act represented a milestone in South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy, signaling a commitment to democratic governance, human rights, and social justice [26]. It bolstered the legitimacy of the post-apartheid government and laid the groundwork for subsequent land reform initiatives and policies.

3.8 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996)

Since gaining independence in 1994, South Africa has demonstrated a strong dedication to implementing a land reform process that is grounded in the constitution. This approach consists of three key elements: restitution, land redistribution, and tenure security. The concept of land restitution is enshrined in section 25(7) of the 1996 Constitution. This provision mandates that individuals or communities who have lost land due to historical racially discriminatory policies, such as the Native Land Act of 19 June 1913, are entitled to have their land returned to them or get fair compensation. According to Section 25(7) of the 1996 Constitution, individuals or communities whose land tenure is legally uncertain due to past racially discriminatory laws or practices have the right to either obtain legally secure tenure or receive comparable compensation, as determined by an Act of Parliament. Section 25(5) of the Constitution establishes land redistribution as a process in which the government is required to obtain land and distribute it to individuals who lack land or have insufficient access to it. Regarding this particular element, the state is legally obligated to: "...implement appropriate legislative and other actions, considering its existing resources, to create circumstances that allow citizens to obtain fair and equal access to land..."

Land tenure security is addressed by section 25(6) of the Constitution. This component aims to safeguard the rights of individuals who have resided on land held by white individuals for an extended period of time, but without legal protection. According to Section 25(6), if a person or community lost their property due to racially discriminatory legislation or practices before 19 June 1913, they have the right to either have their property back or get fair compensation, as determined by an Act of Parliament. The Constitution of South Africa has exerted influence on the country's land reform initiatives [31].

3.9 Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 1995

Land restitution has been a prominent and urgent matter in South Africa since gaining freedom. The Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 established a Commission on Restitution of Land Rights in 1995, headed by a Chief Land Claims Commissioner and seven Regional Land Claims Commissioners, each representing one of the country's nine provinces. The commissioners were tasked with providing assistance to individuals and groups seeking to

assert their ownership of property. They processed claims and provided applicants with updates on the progress of their claims. In 1997, the Restitution Act was revised to align it with the 1996 Constitution. This was done since it was found that the Act was inefficient in handling claims due to its focus on legal considerations rather than administrative concerns [32]. Claimants were granted direct access to the Land Claims Court, bypassing the lengthy process of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights. The Minister of Land Affairs was then granted the authority to resolve claims through negotiation.

The Land Claims Commission and the Land Claims Court were founded in 1995, in accordance with Section 4 of the Restitution Act and Section 123 of the Interim Constitution. The Land Claim Commission's objective is to address the administration of claims, including compensation for present owners and restitution for claimants. In contrast, the Land Claims Court specifically handles land-related conflicts that remain unresolved by the Land Claims Commission. The Land Claim Commission thoroughly evaluates all land claims, assesses the eligibility of individuals based on the Constitution and the Restitution Act, and endeavors to settle claims through negotiation.

3.10 White Paper on South African Land Policy of 1997

The White Paper on South African Land Policy of 1997 was based on a market approach whereby the 'willing buyer, willing seller' arrangement prevailed. Promoted by the Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG), this approach made the redistribution of land very slow and dismal [33]. In 2001, the SLAG was replaced by the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development which was meant to assist previously deprived groups (black, coloured, or Indian) to purchase land or agricultural inputs. Large amounts of up to R100.000 were granted to individuals in this programme [33].

Initially, the land redistribution programme sought to redistribute 30% of land from white farmers to black ownership. By March 2002, only 56 245 households had been settled on 427,337 hectares. By June 2009 only 5.5 million hectares (6.7%) had actually been redistributed [34]. In the same period, 75,400 land restitution claims had been processed with 1,551,249 beneficiaries while 4,296 claims were still outstanding [33]. By 2011, about 79,696 land claims had been lodged [34].

As with land restitution, by March 2002, 29,877 claims on about 427,337 hectares had been resolved to benefit about 56,245 families. Only R938 million was paid in monetary compensation. By 2019, the government had settled about 80,664 claims to benefit about 2.1 million people at the cost of R40 billion inclusive of compensation in the form of money. The state had also stored 3.5 million hectares of land which could be used for agricultural purposes or other economic development activities. These statistics are considered to be very slow as would be expected [15,20] The SA land reform, therefore, faces continued criticism from land activists and rural development practitioners for lack of satisfactory progress [34]. The Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development was also criticised for being biased towards resourced black South Africans who were more likely to succeed as commercial farmers instead of the rural poor whose livelihoods needed to be developed and strengthened [33].

4 Zimbabwe

Land access, utilisation, and ownership have always been a subject of policy formulation since the advent of white-settler colonialism in Zimbabwe as discussed below.

4.1 The Native Reserve Order in Council of 1898

The Native Reserve Order in Council was implemented with the purpose of establishing Native Reserves for Africans in order to facilitate the allocation of additional land for white immigrants. They ensured that Africans were resettled in low-potential economic areas to make them always available in the labour market [35]. The obvious intention was to underdevelop African communities and push them away from public goods and services required for social and economic development. The disintegration of communities also undermined the potential for political uprising as Africans from different tribes now suspected each other of cooperating with whites [34].

The colonial regime deliberately impoverished Africans to force them to offer labour in mines, farms, and factories. In addition to the above, Moyana [35] reports that pervasive land shortages were accompanied by pressing shortages of vital needs such as school fees, clothes, and food. The land-disenfranchised Africans were soon converted into commodities by the gluttonous land colonial project. The settler regime requested the British government (its headquarters) to adopt policies that prohibited Africans from purchasing land attached to farms owned by white settlers. White-settler officials also deployed many methods to force Africans to work on their farms and other projects without payment. This was at times achieved through African traditional leaders who were mandated to conscript their subjects to go and serve at white instruction. Labour was also needed in the construction of roads and rail lines. Violence was employed, such as the abduction of women until their husbands provided labor, or the capture of the chief until the necessary number of men stepped up. Unpaid labor was also extracted from individuals who did not pay their €10 hut tax. Africans residing on farms owned by white individuals were obligated to provide labor for these farmers without receiving any sort of remuneration, as a condition of their tenancy [36].

4.2 The Land Apportionment Act of 1930

The Land Apportionment Act emanated from the Morris Carter Commission which had been launched by the government in 1925 to make an urgent analysis and to provide a statement on the issues of biased land patterns in the Colony. Sir Morris Carter, the former Chief Justice of Uganda and Tanganyika, was the Chairman of the Commission which comprised three members including the Chief Native Commissioner -Sir Herbert Taylor -, and Mr. Atherson, Director of Lands, and former Surveyor General for the British South African Company [35]. The Commission commenced in 1925; and before the end of the year, it had completed its work. The Commission recommended the institutionalisation of a policy that would ensure that there were separate areas from which Africans and Europeans would purchase land [12,35]. Drawing from the recommendations of the commission, the Land Apportionment Act was meant to justify and cement the racial legislation that had been developed since the inauguration of the land dispossession scheme in the 1890s.

The Land Apportionment Act, similar to the SA Native Land Act of 1913, allowed white individuals to fully dispossess and separate Africans from their traditional lands, confining them to designated Purchase Areas (Pas) [37].

The Land Apportionment Act distributed land in the following manner: The allocation of land was as follows: 8.8 million hectares were designated for Native Reserves, 3 million hectares for Native Purchase districts, 19.9 million hectares for white farming and urban districts, and 7.2 million hectares remained unallocated [38]. Table 1 provides a detailed description of landholding after the inception of the Act.

Table 1

Classification of Land after the Land Apportionment Act (1930)		
Category of landholding	Size of landholding (Acres)	Percentage
Native Reserves	21.127.040	22
Native Purchase Area	7.464.566.	7.8
European Area	49.149.174	51.0
Unassigned Area	17.793.300	18.5
Forest Area	590.500	0.6
Undetermined Area	88.540	0.1
Total	96.213.120	100

The implementation of the Land Apportionment Act resulted in the communal areas becoming excessively crowded and overstocked [11]. Household livelihoods in the reserves became vulnerable and unable to be maintained in the long term. This was exacerbated by additional restrictions, such as the implementation of the Cattle Levy Act and Maize Control Act. The former imposed restrictions on Africans' access to marketing outlets, while the latter decreased the amount of cattle each individual could own by implementing higher taxes. The Land Apportionment Act served as the foundation for following laws that exhibited a preference for individuals of white ethnicity. By 1965, when the liberation struggle was at its peak, almost all the best lands were now in the hands of Europeans [38].

The Land Apportionment Act was an awful reality for Africans in many ways. Firstly, it disfigured the social formation of African life by disregarding native culture and religious systems which were tied to land ownership, access, and utilisation. It also disrupted the economic development trajectory by undermining, discouraging, and punishing traditional agricultural activities which were blamed for causing soil erosion [39]. The displacement of Africans and their subsequent abandonment into lowveld regions was accompanied by rapid livestock and flock loss and dismal crop production levels and thus fuelled resistant political activities [34].

Since Africans relied on land for social and economic development, the Act became the worst experience for Africans. For Chitiyo [37] reveals that before the Act, crop production stood at 3,483,650 bags of grain in 1923, whilst in 1939, the yield plunged to 3,160,999. The statistics of flocks (sheep and goats) also went on the negative. In 1923, there was a total of 262,432 sheep reared by indigenous households. However, after the Act, only about 234,748 sheep were recorded in the year 1939 - signifying a 10% difference over a period of 16 years. Despite the growing African population, their arid lands continued to endure significant strain, leading to the depletion of their cattle and flocks. The Land Commission was then established to regulate the permissible sizes of cattle and flocks that Africans were allowed to keep on the estates. By 1943, the majority of the 38 reserves had already become excessively inhabited, leading to significant soil erosion [37]. The scarcity of pasture and fodder resulting from excessive grazing significantly affected the African population's cattle, which consistently received the lowest rating in the market, greatly burdening their lives.

4.3 Land Husbandry Act of 1951

Due to the scarcity of land and insufficient pasture, the problem of soil erosion intensified. In response, the colonial government established the Land Husbandry Act of 1951 as an official policy. This legislation implemented land conservation protocols, recognized private land ownership, and implemented destocking measures in regions populated by

Africans whom the colonial government claimed were responsible for soil degradation due to their traditional farming methods [38]. The Land Husbandry Act transformed the ancient forms of land tenure into private landholding systems. Black farmers – whose agricultural practices were blamed for soil erosion - were now required to acquire a ‘farming permit’ to carry out their farming activities. Additionally, Black people had to obtain a "grazing permit" for their animals. Further steps were implemented to limit the maximum number of livestock that each farmer could own.

Land degradation, however, continued as Africans continued to prefer agricultural-based livelihoods over waged employment in white-owned businesses. The Act was later suspended in 1961 much to the chagrin of white farmers who then ensured the 1962 election victory of Ian Smith’s Rhodesia Front which promised them to revive the Act once it ascended power. Once in power, the Smith regime enacted the Tribal Trust Land Act of 1969 to cement the separation of land between whites and blacks. The Act resulted in the launch of Tribal Trust Lands where traditional leadership regained the power to administer land [11]. These tribal segregations worsened racial and political tensions centred on land and land-related nationalistic activities.

4.4 The Land Tenure Acts (1969-1980)

Several land policies were adopted and implemented since the ascendancy of the Rhodesian Front to power. In 1969, the Land Tenure Act was adopted to replace the Land Apportionment Act of 1930. This legislation classified lands into three categories: European, African, and National lands. Under this Act, both settlers and Africans were allocated 45,000 acres of land apiece, while National land was limited to 6,500 acres [12]. The Act distributed land evenly to white and black individuals, despite the fact that whites made up only 5% of the population, while blacks accounted for a significant 95% [11]. The Land Tenure Act was superseded by the Land Tenure Amendment Act of 1977, which subsequently led to the implementation of the 1978 Land Tenure Repeal Act. For the most part, these policies were meant to disenfranchise blacks socially, economically, and politically to drive them into the labour market where the colonial state would use their labour for primitive capital accumulation.

The enactment of racial land policies pushed blacks to the mountainous and peripheral lands where agricultural activities were unsustainable in the absence of irrigation systems while whites continued to secure more land in Regions I and II [34]. According to Moyo [7] notes that these colonial policies adversely affected African agriculture which markedly began to plummet with the launch of the Reserves in 1920, and further depreciated with the adoption of the 1930 Land Apportionment Act which culminated in over-crowding and overstocking, thus leading to waning agricultural returns [12].

4.5 Lancaster Constitution

The independence of Zimbabwe came in 1980 through the liberation struggle and negotiations chaired by the British government. The negotiations reached their climax with the signing of the Lancaster House Agreement, followed by the first democratic elections on 18 April 1980. Nevertheless, a number of factors, such as the provisions in the Lancaster House Agreement that safeguarded white citizens, limited the government during the first ten years. The provisions stated that the government would not forcibly seize land and that any transfer of land would be based on voluntary agreements between buyers and sellers. According to Chapter 3, Section 16 of the Constitution, it is necessary for the entity acquiring

land to promptly provide sufficient compensation for the acquisition. Additionally, if the acquisition is disputed, they must seek confirmation from the General Division or another court within thirty days of the acquisition. Consequently, the state was prohibited from confiscating any properties for redistribution, despite the fact that it had inherited a land ownership structure that was influenced by racial bias (34). During this time, the majority of the valuable land was inhabited by a limited number of individuals and groups, including 6,000 white farmers, a small number of agro-industrial estates, approximately 8,000 small-scale black commercial producers, and over 700,000 peasant households. Meanwhile, the remaining population resided on unproductive ground. Between 1980 and 1985, the government successfully relocated 60,000 homes. From 1985 to 1990, they resettled a total of 10,000 households [11].

The deficits of the Lancaster Constitution for land decolonisation ensured land disputes. The ban on compulsory land purchase resulted in inflated land prices and allowed whites to sell most of their unproductive lands to the state. Of all the land acquired between 1980 and 1992, hardly 19% of it was of prime agricultural value [11]. The market-based approach to land acquisition largely benefited whites who kept holding on to land knowing that their lands would not be expropriated [36]. For the first 10 years, the government acquired land totalling three million hectares at market value with the assistance of British funds (British Overseas Development Agency (ODA), including the 1981 Land Resettlement Grant which expired in 1996.

In 1992, the government reviewed the property rights part of the Constitution. The government implemented the Land Acquisition Act, which allowed for the forcible acquisition of land for the sake of redistribution. The Act also authorised the government to acquire land for settlement, subject to a fair payment reached by a designated committee of six persons deploying a set of procedures that included the limit to farm sizes. The Land Tenure Commission was also launched in 1994 as a way of improving the efficiency of land reform processes [40]. Yet still, land reform progressed at a very dismal pace much to the insult of household livelihoods which continued to deteriorate. Furthermore, according to [34], the government obtained fewer than one million hectares of land and successfully relocated no more than 20,000 residents during the 1990s. By 1999, almost 11 million hectares of valuable agricultural land remained under the ownership of a few 4,500 commercial farmers, predominantly white, due to the sluggish progress of land reform [41].

The Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF)-led government's land reform move from vote lobbying to radical policy ideas was significantly impacted by the consequences of the Economic Structural Adjustments Programme (ESAP) and opposition political activity in the 1990s. As a result, the 1998 Donor's Conference on Land was held, which then led to the creation of the Inception Phase Framework Plan (1998-1999) for the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme 2. The lack of effective resolutions and the conference, together with other contributing factors, led to the implementation of the Fast-Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) in the 2000s. The program was designed to be implemented efficiently, using local resources, to address the task of redistributing over 3,000 farms under the small-sized (A1) and commercial (A2) farming types [42]. As of October 2001, the state had obtained approximately 1,948 farms for redistribution. However, the number of individuals in need of land had significantly increased to 104,000, surpassing the predicted figure of 25,000 from the previous year [41]. At the conclusion of the program, there were significant changes in land ownership patterns. The land ownership in the large-scale

commercial sector decreased from 30% to 12%, while the small-scale agricultural sector expanded from 54% to 71% [43]. By 2010, the A1 program has allocated the land to almost 150,000 individuals living in urban areas, farm workers, rural peasants, and civil servants. In addition, 20,000 grantees were assigned A2 farms [7].

The FTLRP was widely recognized as a highly successful initiative in terms of property redistribution. It successfully finished the process of decolonization that was previously unfinished, bringing it into the sphere of economic liberation and achieving the much-awaited redistribution of justice. However, the claim made by what [44] refers to as the 'disaster school' was in disagreement with this. This perspective arises from the international community, particularly the influential countries in Europe and North America, who argue that the land reform has resulted in economic turmoil, leading to issues such as food insecurity, unemployment, environmental degradation, international boycotts, reduced agricultural output, and declining living standards. The school neglected to consider the economic embargo imposed on Zimbabwe as a result of the FTLRP. The sanctions imposed by the European Union on Zimbabwe involved halting financial assistance for all projects save those directly benefiting the public, as well as suspending fiscal support. Furthermore, government officials were subjected to a visa block, which prohibits them from traveling within the European Union. Additionally, the assets possessed by these officials abroad were frozen. The imposition of sanctions led to a decline in global trade, resulting in a lack of foreign money. This shortfall severely limited the ability to buy fuel, leading to the collapse of manufacturing and farming sectors. Zimbabwe Electricity Supply Authority (ZESA) stated on July 30, 2002, that the discontinuation of financial assistance from the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the European Investment Bank, and other organizations led to a loss of \$18 million [34]. As a result of limited international trade and the cessation of credit, the unemployment rate in Zimbabwe sharply rose to 70% in about 2002, while during the same year, 75% of the population was categorized as impoverished [34].

The land reform itself also contributed to the negative economic impact. The land transfers between 2000 and 2003 had a significant impact on commercial districts, resulting in a decline in production ranging from 7% to 30% [34]. The rapid pace of the Faster-Than-Light Resource Production (FTLRP) led to the displacement of previous producers. At the conclusion of 2001, some 250 farmers, which accounted for around 7% of the total number of farmers in the Commercial Farmers Union, had voluntarily left their farms during the preceding year [45]. The replacement farmers also encountered substantial output deficits and encountered obstacles in terms of accessing resources, such as a lack of tillage and harvesting machines, limitations in energy supplies (including coal, fuel, and electricity), and financial constraints. The production levels also decreased as a result of the new farmers' low technical capabilities in terms of skills (for tobacco, wheat, oilseeds) and insufficient resources (finance and irrigation resources). The production of wheat, tobacco, soya beans, and sunflower was significantly and directly impacted by the land transfers. However, plantation crops such as sugar cane, tea, and coffee, as well as certain major export horticultural crops like flowers, paprika, and some vegetables, experienced only minor declines of less than 15%. This can be attributed to their profitability, the resources they retained, and the limited land transfers that occurred on these estates [46]. The profitability and availability of inputs for most crops also experienced a general decrease as a result of the uncertain macroeconomic conditions and associated supply shortages. The production of key crops such as maize, wheat, and tobacco was adversely impacted by the scarcity and

rising expenses of inputs, as well as the lack of foreign currency to import these inputs. Groundnuts, primarily cultivated by small-scale farmers, were impacted by agricultural policies that decreased the profitability of farming.

In 2016, Zimbabwe implemented the Command Agriculture (CA) program, which is a government-led initiative designed to support farmers who grow cereals for local consumption. The program provides farmers with resources and a guaranteed market for their products. The facility placed a higher importance on ensuring the security, tenure, and livelihood rights of farmers and the state, rather than prioritizing the interests of neoliberal capital. This was done to prevent poor farmers from being enticed by joint ventures and contract farming arrangements. Zimbabwe had a significant surge of 321% in maize production during the 2016/2017 season, thanks to the CA facility. In Mashonaland West, the average maize production per family was 739.2 kg, whereas in Matabeleland South, it was only 174.5 kg. This has been verified as the initial significant maize production since the beginning of the Fast Track Land Reform Program (FTLRP) [47].

In post-Robert Mugabe Zimbabwe, the land reform policy formulation trajectory is, however, no longer clear as neoliberalism recuperates under the 'Zimbabwe is open for business' development approach. Since assuming office in 2017, the Emmerson Mnangagwa government has implemented or announced policies that impact land access, ownership, and utilization. The new government follows a neoliberal approach in which land access is governed by commercial principles [3]. The Agriculture and Food Systems Strategy aims to revolutionize the agricultural sector by prioritizing the commercialization of farming [48]. In order to promote production in all sectors, the government implements supply-side policies that are favorable to investors and promote sustainability [45]. Specifically, the regime encourages foreign investors to freely operate in the agricultural sector by utilizing contract farming arrangements [46]. The government has implemented measures to reduce the expenses associated with conducting business, such as trade and labor restrictions [45]. The Indigenisation and Economic Empowerment Act, which previously limited foreign investors to owning a maximum of 49% of enterprises in various sectors, has been abolished, with the exception of diamond and platinum mining [47]. Monopoly-finance capital has been drawn to the countryside, displacing rural households on the pretext of investments [48]. The new government has expressed a lack of interest in the development or upkeep of current agriculture policies. Instead, they have made it clear that their focus is on pursuing investment opportunities that will lead to self-sufficiency and an abundance of food. Their goal is for Zimbabwe to once again become a significant contributor to agricultural production and regional food security in Southern Africa and beyond.

5. Towards a Social Policy-based Land Reform Trajectory

SA and Zimbabwe have different demographic compositions that differently impact their land reform trajectories. For instance, in Zimbabwe, out of the 17,020,321 population, about 70% of the population resident in rural areas where they engage in agricultural activities [49]. In SA, out of the population of 61,020,221, only 30.5% live in rural areas [50]. However, being both former white-settler colonies, the two countries face similar land reform issues that can be addressed by implementing an inclusive land reform approach. One such approach is the transformative social policy. This approach offers a wide-ranging analysis that transcends economic focus but also considers crucial aspects such as production, reproduction, and social protection.

Transformative social policy involves public actions designed to ignite social protection and development by the state [51]. It includes "joint actions that directly impact changes in social well-being, social institutions, and social connections... as well as access to sufficient and stable means of living and income" [52]. It is also a tool for guaranteeing a feeling of belonging to a community and a necessary condition for long-term economic progress.[51]. Social policy consists of five tasks: production, protection, reproduction, and redistribution [53,54], as well as social cohesion or nation-building [55]. The transformative social policy commitment of the state is reflected in its implementation projects to help the most vulnerable and by ratifying by-laws, rules, and regulations that protect these people.

Being largely pro-poor, the transformative social policy approach resonates with land reform policy development particularly since agricultural land is required most by vulnerable categories who use it as a source of livelihood but also elites who use it as an income source [56]. Using this development approach could enable SA and Zimbabwe to implement land reform policies that can enable their populace to participate in farming and thus contribute to the broader economy. In applying the social policy approach, the two governments can focus on production, social protection, social reproduction, social cohesion, and redistribution tasks of the transformative social policy.

5.1 Production

Targeted interventions are needed to promote broad-based agricultural production, particularly in Zimbabwe where 70% already engage in farming. In SA, the government can focus on the emerging black middle class that is showing increasing interest in farming [56,57]. The aim should be to release land to indigenous people particularly those who can demonstrate capacity to utilise it productively. With most indigenous people being resource-poor, governments should invest in financial, educational, and infrastructural provision that supports maximum productivity. Many indigenous farmers possess traditional farming expertise [34]. This might not be adequate in the context of contemporary changing environmental conditions. Thus, farmers may need training but also resources such as new crop and animal varieties that can thrive in contemporary conditions. Such measures should be integrated into countries' overall land and agrarian reform programmes. Such measures could assist in sustaining agricultural production and, thus, justify land reform.

5.2 Social protection

Social protection is a vital necessity for indigenous residents in countries that have just transitioned from a century of white-settler colonialism. Social protection is a fundamental aspect of transformative social policy. To ensure social protection, land reform must go beyond its economic focus and consider social interactions and institutions [58]. To address the repercussions of flawed land reform policies, it is necessary to go beyond the implementation of social assistance programs and also incorporate social security elements like healthcare, sanitation, and education [59]. Infrastructure, including transportation networks, healthcare and educational facilities, marketplaces, and water supplies, plays a crucial role in improving the lives of individuals who depend on agricultural operations for their livelihoods and incomes. Without enough social support, individuals who have received land through land reform programs choose to leave their farms and instead participate in off-farm activities as a means of dealing with challenges [60]. The departure from agricultural areas reduces food production, leading to congestion in other locations and creating favorable conditions for the spread of diseases and conflicts. It is essential for governments,

at both the local and national levels, to collaborate and physically provide social infrastructure and services in areas that have undergone land reform. This is a crucial step in achieving transformative outcomes through land reform.

5.3 Social Reproduction

The transformative social policy framework can also be used to achieve social reproduction by households engaging in agricultural activities. Social reproduction refers to practices by which population classes in an unequal society tend to maintain their status from one generation to another [61]. To ensure the social reproduction of land reform beneficiaries, governments (at local and national levels) could focus on the provision of facilities such as irrigation systems and agricultural inputs so that farming can thrive. Financial inclusion is also another strategy that can be used to achieve social reproduction under land reform conditions. Financial inclusion should encompass not only providing inexpensive financial services to the impoverished, but also extending financial support to farmers to enable them to finance their production activities and maintain productivity [62]. This will enable sustained and sustainable social reproduction under land reform conditions.

5.4 Social cohesion

Land reform is a crucial component of the decolonization agenda in South Africa and Zimbabwe. Consequently, land reform is expected to guarantee social unity. Therefore, for the black community, land reform encompasses more than only the elements of production and protection. It also aims to revitalize and strengthen social cohesiveness and cooperation. Social cohesion is an integral part of the transformative social policy framework. According to [63], multi-faceted refers to various aspects of a concept. They describe it as the degree to which individuals cooperate with each other, both inside and across different groups, without any form of compulsion or simply self-interested motive. Social protection, within the context of land reform, refers to the ability of beneficiaries to develop a collective identity and a feeling of inclusion. Social cohesiveness and cooperation, manifested through networks (both political and communal), cultural norms (such as the establishment of cooperatives), and other social characteristics, play a crucial role in facilitating the sharing of knowledge, exchanging of experiences, and fostering cooperation. The networks and cooperatives of farmers play a crucial role in enhancing the likelihood of achieving high levels of productivity.

5.5 Redistribution

Land redistribution is a transformative social policy aspect that underpins the land reform programme [39]. In SA and Zimbabwe, this is being achieved through government-initiated land redistribution to blacks from whom it was expropriated by white-settler colonialism. With agriculture as the main source of livelihood and income particularly in Zimbabwe [1,3], land redistribution, wields much potential as a transformative social policy tool. Land redistribution allows the majority of people, particularly those whom the farm sector cannot absorb, to participate in the broader economy through agriculture and other related activities.

6. Conclusion

This article identified land reform policy evolution in two former white-settler colonies, namely, SA and Zimbabwe, and then explored the implications of land reform policy on socio-economic and political development. Underpinned by a qualitative secondary

literature review, the article discusses the major land reform policies of the two countries since the advent of colonialism to the present. It then demonstrates how racial policies during colonialism served to disenfranchise blacks socio-economic and politically. The article argues that the continuous displacements of blacks following particular colonial land reform policies were meant to suppress their collective voice for freedom: financially and politically. In the post-independence period, land reform is meant to reverse the racism of white-settler colonialism. The article, however, takes issues with encroaching tendencies of neoliberalism under the land reforms of the two countries. In South Africa, the 'willing buyer-willing seller' approach is criticised while in Zimbabwe, the 'Zimbabwe is open for business' approach is portrayed as regressive. The article then proposes the transformative social policy as having much potential to influence efficient and effective land reform policy in the two countries.

Acknowledgement: The authors acknowledge the University of Johannesburg for its affiliation support.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Moyo, S. Third World Legacies: Debating the African Land Question with Archie Mafeje. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 2018, 7(2), pp 1–23.
2. Ndhlovu, E. Decolonisation of Development: Samir Amin and the Struggle for an Alternative Development Approach in Africa. *The Saharan Journal* 2020, 1(1), pp. 87-111.
3. Ndhlovu, E. Resuscitation of Neoliberalism in Zimbabwe: Exploring Implications for Agriculture Policy Development. In: *Sustainable Agricultural Marketing and Agribusiness Development: An African Perspective*; Nyagadza, B.; Rukasha, T. Eds.; CAB International, São Paulo, Brazil, 2023, 4, pp. 23-37.
4. Moyo, C. S. Access to productive resources: the catalyst to rural women's poverty alleviation. A case of South Africa. *Gender and Behaviour* 2013, 11(1), pp. 5153- 5161, doi:10.1080/09709274.2005.11905835.
5. Rusenga, C.; Ndhlovu, E. Land Reform and Financial Inclusion Challenges in South Africa. In: *Financial Inclusion and Digital Transformation Regulatory Practices in Selected SADC Countries*; Chitimira, H.; Warikandwa, T.V., Eds., Springer Cham, Switzerland, 2023, 2, pp. 141-159.
6. Deininger, K., Hoogeveen, H.; Kinsey, B. *Benefits and costs of land reform in Zimbabwe with implications for Southern Africa* 2016, World Development. Available online: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=7146B001A4D79CF470C89F2CCC3164E1?doi=10.1.1.585.9486&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed on 30 May 2024).
7. Moyo, S. Land reform and redistribution in Zimbabwe since 1980. In: *Land and agrarian reform in Zimbabwe: Beyond white-settler capitalism*; Moyo, S.; Chambati, W. Eds., Dakar: Codesria, 2023, 1, pp. 45-67.
8. Rusenga, C. The Agribusiness Model in South African Land Reform? Land Use Implications for the Land Reform Beneficiaries. *Agrarian South* 2019, 8(3), pp. 440–461.
9. Scoones, I. Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 2009, 36(1), pp. 171-196.
10. Howman, R. Patriotism and pioneering problems. *Heritage of Zimbabwe* 1990, 9(1), pp. 75–102.
11. Moyo, S. *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*, Harar, SAPES Trust, 1995, pp. 1-28.
12. Palmer, R. *Land and Racial Domination in Rhodesia*. London: Heinemann 1997, pp. 80-102.
13. Republic of South Africa. *Natives Land Act (27 of 1913)*, South Africa, 1913.
14. Matseke, C. Land reform in South Africa. *The Thinker* 2021, 88(3), pp. 40–47.
15. Ngam, R.N. Government-driven land and agrarian reform programmes in post-apartheid South Africa – A brief history (1994-2021). *African Sociological Review* 2021, 25(1), pp. 131–152.
16. Mkhabela, T., Ntombela, S.; Mazibuko, S. An economy-wide impact assessment of agriculture land reform in South Africa. *Cogent Social Sciences* 2022, 2(4), pp. 80-102.
17. Conradie, B. Designing successful land reform for the extensive grazing sector. *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension* 2019, 47(2), pp. 1–12.
18. Republic of South Africa. *Group Areas Act 41 of 1950*, South Africa, 1950.

19. Mbatha, M.; Tembe S.S. Conflict and corruption: Land expropriation without compensation in South Africa. *African Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* 2020, 9(2), pp. 61–76.
20. Sihobo, W.; Kirsten, J. How to narrow the big divide between black and white farmers in South Africa. *The Conversation* 2021, 3 (30), pp. 1-12.
21. Republic of South Africa. *Native Trust and Land Act 18 of 1936*, South Africa, 1936.
22. Zantsi, S., Mulanda, S.; Hlakanyane, L. Small-scale agriculture, land reform, and government support in South Africa: Identifying moral hazard, opportunistic behaviour, and averse selection. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies Multi-Inter-and Transdisciplinarity* 2021, 1 (2), pp. 1–26.
23. Republic of South Africa. *Bantu Authorities Act 1951*, South Africa, 1951.
24. Mukarati, J., Mongale, J.P.; Makhomba, G. Land redistribution and the economy. *Agricultural Economics – Czech* 2020, 66(1), pp. 46–54.
25. Republic of South Africa. *Group Areas Act 36 of 1966*, South Africa. 1966.
26. Davis, R., Kosec, K., Nkonya, E.; Song, J. Global land reform experience: A review for South Africa. SA-TIED Working Paper 98, 2020.
27. Republic of South Africa. *Black Communities Development Act 1984*, South Africa, 1984.
28. Akinola, A.O., Kaseeram, I.; Jill, N.N. *The new political economy of land reform in South Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021, pp. 25-39.
29. Republic of South Africa. *The Abolition of Racially Based Land Measures Act 108 of 1991*, South Africa, 1991.
30. Greyling, J.C., Vink, N.; Mabaya, E. South Africa’s agricultural sector twenty years after democracy (1994 to 2013). *Professional Agricultural Workers Journal* 2015, 3(1), pp. 1–14.
31. Republic of South Africa. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Republic of South Africa, Pretoria, Government Printers, 1996.
32. Seger, S. Slow progress in land reform, from the Daily News, 08 February 2012. Available online: www.iol.co.za (accessed on 29 May 2024).
33. Boudreaux, C. Land reform as social justice: The case of South Africa. In: *Analysing contemporary development debates and issues: Reader for DVA4801*; Mazibuko, S. G., Ed.; Pretoria, South Africa, 2009, pp. 90-120.
34. Ndhlovu, E. Land, agrarian change discourse and practice in Zimbabwe: Examining the contribution of Sam Moyo, 2021. PhD thesis. University of South Africa, Pretoria.
35. Moyana, H.V. *The Political Economy of land in Zimbabwe*. Gweru, Mambo Press. 1975, pp 50-69.
36. Chambati, W. Changing Agrarian Labour Relations after Land Reform in Zimbabwe. In: *Land and agrarian reform in Zimbabwe: Beyond white-settler capitalism*; Moyo, S.; Chambati, W., Eds. Dakar, Codesria, 2013, pp. 157-194.
37. Chitiyo, T.K. *Land, Violence, and Compensation: Reconceptualising Zimbabwe’s Land and War Veterans Debate*. Harare, Academy Publishing (Pvt) Ltd, 2000, pp. 30-51.
38. Chiviya, E.M. *Land reform in Zimbabwe: Policy and Implementation*. Indiana University, SUA, 1982, pp. 100-121.
39. Ndhlovu, E. Socio-Economic Characterisation of Resettled Smallholder Farmers in Rural Zimbabwe. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 2022, 57(8), pp. 1495-1510.
40. Moyo, S. *Land Reform under Structural Adjustment in Zimbabwe: Land Use Change in the Mashonaland Provinces* 2000. Report commissioned and produced under the auspices of the Nordic Africa Institute’s programme on The Political and Social Context of Structural Adjustment in Sub-Saharan Africa. Available online: <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:271579/FULLTEXT01.pdf> (accessed on 9 March 2024).
41. Commercial Farmers ‘Union. *The Commercial Farmer’s Union Statement*. Harare. CFU, 2001. Available online <http://solidaritypeacetrust.org/897/the-commercial-farmers%E2%80%99-union-of-zimbabwe-cfu-and-its-politics-after-jambanja/> (accessed on 10 April 2024).
42. Moyo, S. *Three decades of land reform in Zimbabwe*. In: Land and Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe beyond White-Settler Capitalism; Moyo, S.; Chambati, W. Eds., Codesria, Dakar, 2011, pp. 29-79.
43. Government of Zimbabwe. *Report of the Presidential Land Review Committee on the Implementation of the Fast-Track Land Reform Programme ‘The Utete Report’*. Government Printers, Harare, 2003.
44. Government of Zimbabwe. *Joint Statement by the Minister of Lands, Agriculture, Water, and Rural Resettlement and the Minister of Finance and Economic Development in the wake of the conclusion of on 29 July 2020 of the*

- Global Compensation Deed between the Government of Zimbabwe and the former farm workers*. Government of Zimbabwe, 31 August 2020. Available online: <https://www.scienceopen.com/hosted-document?doi=10.1080/03056244.2020.1990033> (accessed on 2 April 2024).
45. ZANU-PF. *The People's Manifesto*. ZANU PF. Harare, Zimbabwe, 2018. Available online: <https://www.slideshare.net/povonews/zanu-pf-2018-elections-manifesto> (accessed on 13 April 2024).
46. Government of Zimbabwe. *Investment Guidelines and Opportunities in Zimbabwe*, p.3, sections 1.1 and 1.4, Government of Zimbabwe, January 2018. Available online: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Generic-Documents/Zimbabwe_Economic_Report_-_Building_a_new_Zimbabwe_Targeted_policies_for_growth_and_job_creation.pdf (accessed on 14 April 2024).
47. Government of Zimbabwe. *Amendments of Zimbabwe's Indigenization and Economic Empowerment Act*. Government of Zimbabwe. 14 March 2021. Available online: https://arocsa.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Fellows_Book_Chapters_Volume.pdf (available on 30 April 2024).
48. Ndhlovu, E. *Changing Agrarian Discourses and Practices and the Prospects for Food Sovereignty in Zimbabwe*. In: *The future of Zimbabwe's agrarian sector: Land Issues in a Time of Political Transition*, Mkodzongi, G., Ed., Routledge, 2022, pp. 34-53.
49. Government of Zimbabwe. *Transitional Stabilisation Programme: Reforms Agenda*, section 362, Zimbabwe. Government of Zimbabwe, 2018. Available online: https://www.veritaszim.net/sites/veritas_d/files/Transitional%20Stabilisation%20Programme%20-%20Oct%202018%20-%202020.pdf (accessed on 18 April 2024).
50. Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency. *Population and Housing Census: Preliminary Report on Population Figures*. Zimbabwe Statistics, 2022. Available online: https://zimbabwe.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/pub-pdf/2022_population_and_housing_census_preliminary_report_on_population_figures.pdf (accessed on 1 May 2024).
51. Worldometer. *South Africa Population, 2024*. Available online: <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/south-africa-population/> (accessed on 26 April 2024).
52. Adesina, J.O. *Why Development and Transformative Social Policy Matter: Lessons of COVID-19 in Africa*. *CODESRIA Bulletin Online* 2021, 2(10), pp. 1-9.
53. Mkandawire, T. *Social Policy and Development Programme*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva, Switzerland, 2001, 1, pp. 32-48.
54. Mkandawire, T. *Transformative Social Policy: Lessons from UNRISD Research*, UNRISD Research and Policy Brief 5, UNRISD, Geneva, Switzerland, 2006.
55. Adesina, J.O. *Social Policy in sub-Saharan African Context in Search of Inclusive Development*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, SUA, 2007, pp. 30-69.
56. Majova, N.B. A. *Proposed Framework on Women Empowerment in the South African Agri-business: A Case Study of the Gauteng Province*. PhD thesis. University of Johannesburg: Johannesburg, South Africa, 2023.
57. Ndhlovu, E.; Majova, B. *Women Empowerment in the South African Agri-Business: Opportunities and Constraints in the Gauteng Province*. In: *Economic Inclusion in Post-Independence Africa: An Inclusive Approach to Economic Inclusion*. Mhlanga, D.; Ndhlovu, E. Eds. Springer Cham, Switzerland, 2023.
58. Mhlanga, D.; Ndhlovu, E. *Assessing socio-economic factors affecting financial inclusion in South Africa*. In: *Promoting and Prioritising Financial Inclusion in Southern Africa: A Contemporary Law and Economics Perspective*. Chitimira, T.H.; Warikandwa, T.V., Eds. Juta and Company (Pty) Ltd, 2023, pp. 100-128.
59. Burns, J., Hull, G.; Lefko-Everett, K. *Defining social cohesion*. Saldru, Cape Town, Southern Africa, 2018, 216 p.
60. Ndhlovu, E. *An analysis of household livelihoods under the fast-track land reform programme in Chiredzi, Zimbabwe* (MA dissertation) University of South Africa, 2017.
61. Commercial Farmers' Union. *The Commercial Farmer's Union Statement*. Harare. Commercial Farmers' Union, 2001.
62. Moyo, S. 'Land concentration and accumulation after redistributive reform in post-settler Zimbabwe', *Review of African Political Economy* 2011, 38(128), pp. 257-276.
63. Mazwi, F.; Chemura, A.; Mudimu, G.; Chambati, W., *The Political Economy of Command Agriculture in Zimbabwe: A State-led Contract Farming Model*. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 2019, 8(1-2), pp. 1-26.

Citation: Zindi, B.; Ndhlovu E. Land reform policy formulation in South Africa and Zimbabwe: Implications for socio-economic and political development. *Journal of Social Sciences* 2024, 7 (3), pp. 6-24. [https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2024.7\(3\).01](https://doi.org/10.52326/jss.utm.2024.7(3).01).

Publisher's Note: JSS stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright:© 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Submission of manuscripts:

jes@meridian.utm.md