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ABSTRACT

In Independent Zimbabwe, control over land and resources in the rural areas is complex and divided. In spite of a multitude of forces that threaten local control, local management regimes maintain a degree of resilience that needs to be acknowledged. This thesis documents a local woodlands management regime and argues that there exists a firm basis for expanding local participation in and control over the "development process."

Defining woodland management broadly as the regulation of access to and use of trees, this study reveals a level of complexity and dynamism at times overlooked by planners and scholars alike. In this thesis the nature and coherence of the local woodlands management "regime" found in the study area (Gudyanga, south-eastern Zimbabwe), are discussed and implications for theory are explored.
The discussion of woodlands management in Gudyanga begins with a review of social history and present social undercurrents. The role of trees in daily life and the mechanisms that regulate household wood use are detailed. It is suggested that the management of local woodlands cannot be separated from the management of all other local resources. The forms of political control of land and people, and tenure relations in particular, are often contradictory yet woodlands are managed as a commons. Common interests are given expression in local land management although they are circumscribed by divisions within the local political arena and the influence of powerful external interests.

Significant opportunities exist for external intervention through ostensibly benign development activities carried out by state agencies. The threat to local control over resources posed by development activities is something that needs greater attention, particularly by the development agencies that design and fund projects that are carried out in Third World countries like Zimbabwe.
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"Mass starvation stalking Africans"

The headline on the article my mother had sent me prior to my leaving for Zimbabwe warned of impending doom. She had sent the article out of concern for my working in a region where a drought was wreaking havoc -- was I strong enough to face the human misery? Indeed, the article depicted a country in chaos: "The entire country is considered a write-off ... 'We're going to die' some were screaming (McCullum, 1992)."

The recent drought of 1991-1992 did have a tremendous impact on Zimbabwe, and especially the rural areas, but when I arrived in Zimbabwe I did not find the desperation and helplessness that the media had promised. In fact, my experience in Zimbabwe was for the most part quite positive. The people whom I met and lived with in Zimbabwe were both spirited and inventive, and found ways to survive in spite of their hardships. The experience reaffirmed for me the importance of coming to terms with, in a respectful manner, different forms of social intercourse. Finding this out was
in some ways the impetus for this thesis and remains central to the conclusions reached here.

Other people with whom I spoke about my thesis research, both before leaving and after returning, had expressed some confusion over whether the people of Africa managed their resources at all. As Anderson & Grove have suggested, "even the very name ‘Africa’, it might be argued, has come to be equated with notions of doom and despondency (1987:1)." What was there to study except destruction and wastefulness? At first I was a bit taken aback, but the question resurfaced on numerous occasions and reminded me of a very poignant comparison made elsewhere. Dove, in assessing the Indonesian government's attitude toward indigenous management systems, concluded:

> the government's view that peasants do not manage and utilize Imperata grasslands is, in a structural sense, far more fantastic than the peasant view that Imperata grasslands are created and utilized by volcanic spirits (Dove,1984:33 cited in Elliot,1989:12-3).

Many people here in Canada seem to believe that rural Africans are at the mercy of their environment and do not exert any positive influence over the resource base on which they depend.

In part, this thesis attempts to refute this belief by detailing the complexity of local knowledge and management practices with respect to woodland resources in Zimbabwe. However, dismissive and paternalistic attitudes towards
indigenous resource management are not simply rooted in a lack of information. As Redclift has noted,

one person's world of resource depletion is another person's world of resource abundance. Consequently divergent views are not necessarily correct or false and are unlikely to be consistent as long as people have different interests and different sources of knowledge and information (1987:202).

The assumption that the only influence peasant communities have on their environment is destructive has its roots in Imperialist expansion but especially in the era of colonialism. The expropriation of resources and reorientation of production for the global market (ie. commodification) was often justified on the grounds that indigenous peoples were "wasting" their resources. Although no longer part of polite, liberal discourse in Canada, Social Darwinism continues to be invoked to rationalize the denial of indigenous title to land.

For instance, in the Canadian land claim case between the Gitksan Wet'suwet'en and the Province of British Columbia (Delgamuukw v. Her Majesty the Queen), Justice McEachern ruled that aboriginal title was extinguished upon contact with European powers. In their defense of the Crown, the Province of British Columbia consistently argued that the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en were not sufficiently organized prior to contact with Europeans to have concepts of land ownership, and that social organization came hand in hand with the fur trade (Cruikshank,1992:28).

Citing Hobbes, Justice McEachern proclaimed in his decision that "Aboriginal life ... was far from stable and it stretches credulity to believe that remote ancestors considered
themselves bound to specific lands (Monet & Skanu'u, 1992:188)." It was the Justice's cultural belief that in the absence of private property there is no regulation of access to resources (res nullis), and hence the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en could not claim to be stewards over the lands they occupied prior to European encroachment. Perhaps also the decision was influenced by the powerful logging interests that were awaiting a rejection of the land claim so they could renew clear cutting in the old growth forests the Gitksan and Wet'suwet'en were claiming.¹ In any case, it was not for lack of information that Justice McEachern decided against recognizing indigenous claims to land; oral and written testimony as well as evidence presented by anthropologists was dismissed with Justice McEachern concluding, "I am able to make the required important findings about the history of these people, sufficient for this case, without this evidence (cited in Riddington, 1992:16)."

Throughout the world, peoples' relations to their land continue to be jeopardized by technical interventions made by powerful outsiders in the name of achieving greater productivity and a more rational system of land use. Ordinarily this process is referred to as "development" but how often have we paused before recommending intervention and considered the inherent value of indigenous management? Bell has asked the question in this way:

Can human nature be trusted to maintain equitable access to resources either between sectors of the community or
between generations in time? The case for strong central control rests on a negative answer, the belief that Africa is on the brink of man-induced ecological collapse (1987:96).

A guiding theme in this thesis is that local institutions and practices are indeed valuable and are worth supporting. Thus, while this dissertation is a case study of resource management practices in rural Zimbabwe it is not simply a description of practices and institutions but is necessarily political in its confrontation of (politically motivated) assumptions about local resource management systems.

In this thesis, the term "management" itself is used in a way that emphasises qualitative, political issues more than it does technical concerns that are more easily quantified (e.g., wood harvest rates, or tree regrowth rates after cutting). While the two aspects of management are not separable, I have emphasised social forces which structure control of resources. Thus, in this thesis the term "management" refers to the shared understandings and practices that structure the way in which people gain access to and make use of local resources. This emphasis leads me to examine the influences on people as resource users more than the influence of human use on the resource itself; in other words, my interest is not so much in how the ecology of woodland resources is manipulated but how human use is structured by social processes. As a study of human use of resources, rather than of the resources themselves (or some broader sense of ecology), this thesis tends to view resources in a fairly utilitarian and
anthropocentric light, although this is by no means the only way to approach the issue of resource management.

The Research Process

How I actually came to pursue the above issues through research in Zimbabwe is of course a long story, the closing chapters of which should be told here. Ultimately, I don't know why I "chose Zimbabwe", although I'm certain such actions are not simply "chosen". Initially I was drawn to Zimbabwe by some of the very interesting literature on the country (eg. Bourdillon, 1976; Lan, 1985; Schoffeleers, 1978; van Onselen, 1976). In 1992 I met Joe Matowanyika, a Zimbabwean working with the University of Zimbabwe, at the meetings of the International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP). Joe expressed an interest in my proposed research on indigenous woodlands management and eventually helped me to negotiate a research associate position with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature -- Regional Office for Southern Africa (IUCN-ROSA) for whom he now works.

It was my hope that I could work with an agency that was already doing field research, preferably in a multi-disciplinary context. I did not want to go in cold and do research independent of any already established process. It was important to me that my work and energy was of some practical significance to the people of Zimbabwe. Joe Matowanyika put me in touch with the Manicaland Development
Association (MDA), a Zimbabwean non-governmental organization based in Mutare that often took on expatriates for collaborative research and development activities. During the period of my field research I acted as a volunteer for the MDA while the MDA facilitated my stay in the study site where they were developing a project proposal for a small-holder irrigation scheme.

THE STUDY AREA

The site of my intensive field research was a small "village" called Gudyanga (pronounced roughly as "Goo-dlan'ga") some 110 kilometres south of Mutare (see Map 1). I arrived in Gudyanga in the middle of January, 1993 and stayed there almost continuously until mid-September, 1993. Located along the Mutare-Masvingo (or Mutare-Chipinge) road, Gudyanga was easily accessible by the numerous buses which plied up and down the road. As one travels south from Mutare you move downstream in the Save river catchment, gradually descending in elevation. Ecology changes more-or-less directly with elevation in Zimbabwe such that as you travel down-river along the Save catchment the land becomes increasingly hot and dry. Familiar trees of the central watershed, musasa (*Brachystegia speciformis*) and munhondo (*Julbernardia globiflora*), gradually give way to baobabs, mopane and other trees of the lowveld areas.

Gudyanga is located within the Muwushu Communal Land, one of the former Rhodesian Native Reserves which together
comprise some 42% of Zimbabwe's land area and bear the weight of roughly 57% of the total population (1982 figures, from Moyo, et al., 1991:50). When driving along Zimbabwe's roads it is often obvious when one is entering a Communal Area. The road at times gets more narrow and the soil often visibly changes -- most Communal Areas were sited on whitish sandy soils whereas European settlers occupied the more fertile red loams. The separation of largely European Commercial areas from African Communal areas has largely remained to this day. In addition to changes in the colour of the landscape, one can also notice changes in the habitation of lands. People appear and disappear along the roadside as you enter and exit Communal Areas; such changes in population density can be attributed to commercial farmers having on average more than 3,000 hectares of land per family while Communal Area holdings are on average three hectares, plus grazing and woodlands (Bratton, 1987:221). A travelogue of Zimbabwe would have to include in its record these signs of Zimbabwe's unequal distribution of human and natural resources.

Gudyanga was a fairly populous area with a population density of approximately 55 persons per square kilometre (for 1992). In 1982 the average population density for all Communal Areas was 25.2 people/sq.km ranging as high as 59.8 people/sq.km. (Moyo, et al., 1991:50). In 1980, the Whitsun Foundation, sponsored by the newly elected Zimbabwean government, reported that population pressure in Muwushu
Communal Land was "desperate" (cited in Elliot, 1989:33a). Houses in Gudyanga were scattered throughout the area but there were concentrations closer to the main road where services and infrastructure were most dense. Several shops, a clinic and primary school formed the basis of the "township", as it was called locally. Residential areas were roughly but not systematically separated from fields so that households were enmeshed in a common daily social life to some degree. Places of public social intercourse like paths, wells, and other areas in which no individualized (i.e. household) rights had been established, were the common property of all residents. This is in contrast to rural Canada and commercial farming areas in Zimbabwe where the household is placed within the borders of a privately owned estate. This difference in social geography has in my opinion a profound influence on local world view.

In addition to social geography, environmental conditions greatly influenced local activities in the study area and weighs heavily on the conclusions reached in this thesis. The study area (Gudyanga) falls within Natural Region V which is the lowest level classification of productive capacity in land in Zimbabwe. Lands designated Region V are found at low elevations (<900m) and characteristically receive a mean annual rainfall of less than 600 mm (Zimbabwe, 1980). The actual amount of rain which falls in any given year varies considerably and such areas are therefore prone to drought.
While drought was almost certainly the primary agent of famine (nzara) in pre-colonial times, famine mortality was kept low by a diverse economy which minimized risk (Ileffe, 1990:13-16). Ileffe suggests,

> there is little evidence in Zimbabwe (except in times of violence) that scarcity was attended by the epidemic diseases which often kills many of those who die in famine (Ibid:16).

In Gudyanga, the recent drought (1991-1992) put an enormous strain on the local economy; however people managed to avoid famine by a number of means including receiving government distributed drought relief which was crucial to survival for many households (cf. Scoones, et al., 1996:177-9). The appearance of drought and the specific responses that drought necessitates, at both local and national levels, makes the study period for this thesis rather unique. At the end of the drought, vegetation cover was reduced, agricultural production set back, livestock holdings were liquidated and people engaged in economic practices that they might not have in a period of more normal rainfall. Wherever appropriate I shall try to indicate when economic practices that I observed in Gudyanga were in part a response to drought. While not a study of local responses to drought, the woodland management practices outlined in this thesis do reflect the importance of commonly held woodland resources in periods of economic stress.

The economic diversity which has characterised production in the arid regions of Zimbabwe is unfortunately little
acknowledged by policy makers and development planners. Lands in Natural Region V are considered by central planners to be suitable only for extensive ranching (Zimbabwe, 1980). The assumption that in these low rainfall areas the only viable utilisation (ie. profitable commercial exploitation) is extensive ranching has led to at times absurd development practices. For instance, in the Zambezi valley, as in the Save valley, gardens along watercourses are vital for drought survival and a balanced diet in normal years. However, planners for the Mid-Zambezi Rural Development Project have attempted to re-designate riparian areas for cattle grazing only, a particularly upsetting intervention to residents when few of them even own cattle (Derman, 1991). Again, local management strategies have been poorly understood and neglected by policy makers. How then have I sought to improve our understanding of indigenous woodlands management in Zimbabwe through my own research?

MAIN RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This dissertation opened with a call of crisis that I have suggested has obscured the creative and adaptive capacities of rural people in Zimbabwe. Casey & Muir (1986) also use the call of crisis to frame their review of Zimbabwean forestry policy, as designed and implemented by the Forestry Commission of Zimbabwe (FCZ). The review begins by depicting "The Crisis", which is said to be particularly
pronounced in the heavily populated (upper) Save catchment (see Map 1):

The future for such areas is extremely bleak and if remedial action is not quickly taken, it is just a matter of time before the Sabi Catchment and similar areas are characterised by desertification and starvation (Ibid:2).

As I shall make clear in this thesis, the depiction of a widespread and immediate deforestation crisis is too generalized and therefore not always helpful; more specific socio-economic studies of particular areas are needed. The paper does go on in a more constructive vein by noting a number of revealing shortcomings in Forestry Commission planning. First, forestry programmes have generally not succeeded in large part due to a failure to seek popular participation. Second, the focus on fuelwood supplies has been misguided since this tends to be a low priority among the wood needs of people in the Communal Areas. Third, increasing the number of trees in the country is not enough in itself as policy should be directed at improving rural livelihoods. Lastly, general (agricultural) development programmes have failed to integrate a forestry component (Ibid:3-4). Zimbabwe is not alone in these shortcomings, as a review of FAO community forestry efforts reveals (Arnold,1991:3-5).

From the points above we can arrive at some important research priorities, perhaps the most important of which is methodological -- the need for greater local participation in research. As in the Mid-Zambezi Project, some of the
shortcomings in FCZ efforts could have been averted if people were simply asked what were their own priorities. In addition to the need for participatory research, there has been inadequate attention paid to indigenous woodlands management practices in the Communal Areas (Scoones & Matose, 1993:163). Specific attention needs to be directed at understanding the following (see Barnes, 1993:321-323 for further suggestions):

1. local knowledge systems and institutions;
2. local tree use patterns and priorities for desired tree species and products;
3. the relationship between various land uses within a holistic management context.

In approaching these issues I sought to address some key issues in the field which can be summarized as follows:

1. What woodland resources are being used, for what purpose, and where are they obtained?
2. What form of tenure relations govern rights of access to local woodland resources?
3. What is the nature of membership (or social identity, Berry, 1989) in resource holding groups, and what are the boundaries around such groups?
4. What are the rules about how woodland resources are used? Is there a sense of "reasonable use"?
5. What is the role of traditional authorities and land guardianship (Schoffeleers, 1978) in regulating access to and use of local woodland resources?
6. What are the roles of government agencies in shaping (local) control over resources?

While essentially a study of access to and use of local woodlands, this thesis tends to emphasise the issue of access, or the ways in which control over local woodlands was negotiated within the study area. Thus, there is an emphasis on what could be called "political economy," although it is perhaps more accurately "political ecology," insofar as I am concerned with the connections between social relations of power and the management of land-based resources (see Blaikie & Brookefield, 1987:17). My concern therefore is for both social and ecological issues, with the recognition that "anything other than a political treatment of the environment lacks credibility (Redclift, 1987 cited in Elliot, 1989:2)."

The pitfalls of viewing the use of resources without taking into account an understanding of political economy are well illustrated in the debate over deforestation in tropical rainforests. In his discussion of deforestation in Indonesia, Dove criticises what he calls the "Rainforest Crunch Thesis:" that poverty forces people to clear larger amounts of land for agriculture, but if alternative sources of income could be derived from the forest, they would be more inclined to preserve the forests. However, the evidence shows that deforestation is not occurring because of traditional agricultural practices but because of powerful outsiders who appropriate local resources. The Indonesian government grants
timber concessions to multinational logging companies which are then followed by slash and burn commercial farmers who penetrate the dense tropical forests via logging roads. Thus, forests are not degraded because forest peoples are impoverished; rather, forest peoples are impoverished by the degradation of their forests and other resources by external forces (Dove, 1993:20-1, emphasis in original).

In other words, it is the politically marginal nature of the forest dwellers themselves, and the forests in which they live, that has enabled powerful outside interests to degrade local livelihoods.

In this thesis then, I have sought to understand both the local and wider forces that shaped woodland use in Gudyanga. The specific lens through which I have viewed the dialectic between society and environment is the study of tenure. In a review of land and culture in Africa, Shipton asserts that recent research makes it clearer than ever that religion, ritual and cognition, on the one hand, and adaptation, sustenance, and production, on the other, cannot be kept pure of each other. Landholding is at the centre of the confluence (1994:347).

In this thesis I will explore the diverse sources of legitimacy for control over access to and use of land, but in particular, woodlands. In the Communal Lands of Zimbabwe, different resources, or even similar resources in different places or at different times, are subject to different forms of control. Resources are part of a diverse system of tenure niches, spaces "in which access to and use of a resource is
governed by a common set of rules, a particular tenure (Bruce, et al., 1993:627)."

Of particular importance in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe are the various forms of collective resource tenure that can be treated together as forms of common property. While the existence of collective holding and individual usufruct has long been known in Anthropology (eg. Bohannan, 1963; Gluckman, 1965; Richards, 1939; Schapera, 1943), the formal model of common property has made it easier to give a more consistent treatment of such tenure regimes.

**COMMON PROPERTY THEORY**

Berkes & Farvar have provided a very general definition of Common Property Resources (CPRs) which they describe as "a class of resources for which exclusion is difficult and joint use involves subtractability (1989:6)." This suggests that certain conditions of access to and use of resources characterise them as CPRs. A CPR is a resource to which access is not strictly regulated, or more likely is unrestricted only within a community of co-users. Rights to access are essentially usufructuary (ie. use) rights, not rights of possession or disposal. Such rights of usufruct are acquired by virtue of membership in a resource-holding group and cannot be transferred outside of the group. Expressions of social identity are therefore critical moments in the regulation of access to CPRs (Berry, 1989). The concept of
subtractability refers to a kind of "zero-sum" process whereby individual use of a CPR removes a portion of the overall benefit enjoyed by other co-users. Because of the potential for conflict between co-users of a CPR, mechanisms exist for the regulation of use such that individual users are not compelled to maximize individual gain at the expense of others (Feeney, et al., 1990:12-3).

The presence of a CPR therefore presumes the existence of an institutional framework regulating the use of that resource. Where there is no regulation of access to or use of a resource there are no property rights, only possession (Ibid:11). Resource degradation has at times been attributed to the alleged intrinsic weakness of management rules under Common Property regimes (Hardin, 1968). However, Common Property theorists have suggested it is in fact the breakdown of traditional commons systems, in the face of wider political and economic pressures, that has resulted in land degradation (Bromley & Cernea, 1989:7-8). The apparent stability of private tenure regimes derives not from their inherent adaptiveness but rather from the strong legal and institutional support they are given by the state, support which is rarely given to indigenous common property regimes (Ibid:12).

In sum, a Common Property management regime is a complex of social institutions regulating access to and use of resources that are jointly managed by some community of co-
users. Keeping in mind the notion of a tenure niche, some resources in any one setting may be managed jointly, while others are managed on a more exclusive ("individual") basis. Thus, for example, management of household fields may be the sole responsibility of the household while grazing lands are managed collectively by all graziers. We shall return to these questions towards the end of this thesis, when I will be in a better position to discuss the suitability of the Common Property model in describing the tenure and management of indigenous woodlands in Gudyanga.

FIELD METHODS

The research for this thesis was conducted with reference to the "traditional" political system organizing the occupation of land, not through the Zimbabwean government's administrative organization of land (a fuller discussion of the political organization of land follows in chapters 2, 3, and 5). The reasons for my taking this approach, as opposed to my working through state administrative structures, were entirely practical. Residents were themselves apparently not as concerned with state structures as they were with "traditional" authorities, a point to which I will return below. Though, residents were fully aware of government structures I saw no evidence for people linking their identity with state administrative bodies (ie. as members of such-and-such a ward) except when discussing matters of government
administration. I approached "traditional" leaders for permission to do work in their areas so that the study area itself became defined by the boundaries of the misha ("villages") in which I worked: Nhachi, Nhachi-Chisikaorayi, Toona, Gudyanga-Peukayi, Jira, Usongore, Murare, Mapandani, and Chinyamunyu (see Map 4). Each "village" falls under the jurisdiction of headman (or "sub-chief") Gudyanga.

My working through traditional political institutions was also in part encouraged by my principle contact person, Mr. Phibion Goo Gonoh, who was responsible for seeing that I "stayed well" (kugara zvakanaka, ie. in peace and without hardship) in the area. Mr. Gonoh was acting headman Gudyanga (the hereditary office was not formally filled during the time of my stay). Mr. Gonoh was also in communication with the Manicaland Development Association as the representative of the Gudyanga Irrigation Development Committee (GIDP), the local organization formed in anticipation of the proposed irrigation scheme in Gudyanga. During my stay, Mr. Gonoh introduced me to the traditional leaders of the area, as well as other influential locals, and took me to GIDP meetings. In my first few months in the area I travelled widely with Mr. Gonoh and was able to learn first hand much about daily life in Gudyanga; he also took me to a neighbouring irrigation scheme, Nyanyadzi, on a few occasions.

Mr. Gonoh rendered invaluable assistance in this research however his numerous responsibilities in the area left him
little time to act as a research assistant for me. To help me with my research I hired a local school-leaver, Mr. Lovemore Farai Kundhlande, to act as a translator and help arrange interviews with people in the area. Mr. Kundhlande was invaluable in helping establish contacts, draft survey questions and conduct interviews. In addition, Mr. Kundhlande carried the research forward in new directions, suggested novel solutions to problems and helped interpret data. As such, he was an integral and productive part of the research process. Mr. Kundhlande was also a friend and his family as a whole taught me much about daily life in Gudyanga. A great deal of my time in Gudyanga was spent with either Mr. Gonoh or Mr. Kundhlande and the two men did their best to make me "at home" in their area.

After settling in the area I began the more formal aspects of my research with a household survey which asked baseline questions about household composition and household access to and use of woodlands and other resources. A fuller description of the survey is given in Appendix III. Also in the early stages of research, I endeavoured to learn about local tree species by asking people to identify living trees, specimens that I had collected, as well as the woods that had been used in handicrafts and structures in the area. One of the first proper phrases I learned to use, after salutations of course, was zita remuti uyu renonzi chii? ("what is the name of that tree?"). Responses were checked against
published sources. However only a few more widespread species could be identified in published tree lists since local names were often different from the other dialects on the central watershed where most work has been done. Where possible, samples were identified using Coates-Palgrave (1983), an identification guide to the trees of southern Africa. Samples were also sent to the National Herbarium in Harare for identification. In addition to this early work I conducted a survey of trees in fields where I named and counted trees of three age classes (regrowth, young & mature) that were found in two area classes (within fields and along field borders).

The more formal and objective aspects of this research were used as starting points for more focused interviews. Interviews were fairly open-ended but were directed toward a particular topic (eg. local history, resource use, pre-colonial social history, agroforestry and household economy). For more detail on interviews please see Appendix III. In addition to semi-formal interviews I conducted casual interviews which were more like long conversations which developed according to the interests of people present, including myself. There were also specific questions on which I sought clarification from certain individuals locally regarded as knowledgeable on the issue; in such cases I often waited to meet the person under casual circumstances and asked them if they could spare a few minutes to talk with me (and my research assistant where necessary).
Much of time was filled with the fieldwork staple of very casual participant observation. While not fully a member of the community I was warmly greeted by most residents and I was able to observe and participate in many community and household activities. While in Gudyanga, I attended many meetings (especially those of the GIDP), participated in public events (eg. traditional leaders' dare ("court" or council), funerals, a wedding, and agricultural field-days where farmers celebrated and talked about someone’s successful crop), went to church (United Methodist), shared family meals, attended beer drinks, threshed grain, and the like. A large portion of my time was spent at the local clinic, where I lived, and at the "township" (where the few shops were concentrated), where people socialized and drank. Medical topics are not explored in this thesis although some comments on beer drinking are relevant and are discussed in chapter three. During my stay in Gudyanga I was fortunate to engage in a great number of daily activities which greatly enriched my appreciation of local routines and the vitality of peoples’ daily lives. Although I was immeasurably enriched by this aspect of fieldwork (ie. "participant observation") I was also made aware of how I was only able to scratch the surface of social and personal complexity in Gudyanga. By the time I had to leave the field, it felt as though I was only beginning to understand both local social life in Gudyanga and the directions in which my research needed to go.
In light of this last point I would like to close this section on the research process by emphasising that this thesis depicts life in a very particular time and place and as such is a fairly narrow case study. The people of Gudyanga have a unique social and political history that has shaped, and was shaped by, their interactions with larger social and political forces. In addition, the research was principally synchronic so I have used the past tense in describing Gudyanga for the period of this study (1993). There is virtually no written basis for historical comparison as no one has done any substantial research in the immediate area. Cautious use of oral history and comparisons with nearby areas are made. Limitations were therefore placed on this study by the breadth of sources employed. Archival sources were explored at the National Archives in Harare as well as District offices in Chimanimani. However, archival information on the Gudyanga area appears to be very limited and is probably spread around in more obscure and less accessible places. Gathering such information was well beyond the intentions of this research as my interest was to spend as much time as possible in the study site. Therefore, the main body of this thesis is based on original field research and as such the major limitations derive from the selective use of local sources. A discussion of sources is provided in Appendix III.
Outline of The Thesis

What follows in this thesis will be an exploration of the social context of local woodland management practices in one very small corner of Zimbabwe. In Chapter Two I set the wider regional context for the study area by providing a social history of the Shona-speaking peoples, the main ethnic group of Zimbabwe, focusing where needed on the southeastern highlands. This history will reach into the present with a discussion of administrative and legislative forces that have an impact on local tree management in the Communal Lands. In Chapter Three I provide a more detailed local sense of social context. Here I describe the local ecology, economy, political organization, and outline the social undercurrents that inform daily life and are the groudswell of personalised conflict and alliance. Chapter Four contains an overview of local tree use practices as well as some general comments on the availability of tree resources in the study area. Chapter Five is the main site of discussion, pulling together the various threads set out in Chapters Two, Three and Four. In Chapter Six I integrate the findings of this thesis with the broader theoretical and political issues raised earlier in this chapter, with special attention to the study of commons management. The final chapter will serve as a conclusion to this thesis, arguing for the importance of fostering greater local control over resources. A glossary of terms is provided on the last two pages of this thesis.
Endnotes


2. Even the prevention of some particular or potential use of a resource (ie. exclusion for the purposes of conservation) is necessarily an example of resource management.

3. It has been suggested that through large parts of what is now Shona-speaking Zimbabwe, African farmers preferred the better-drained sandy soils whereas European settlers preferred the more potentially fertile clay soils (see Palmer, 1970); this suggests there was not necessarily widespread expropriation of African farming land in the early colonial period, however in the Chimanimani highlands, settlers immediately displaced the African population from its areas of greatest concentration (see Rennie, 1973; Roder, 1965:73-4). Palmer has not suggested there was no conflict over land, simply that conflict and segregation was not structured on preference for soil types. He states "the soils controversy is an academic one ... With very few exceptions, Europeans were able ... to take up virtually all the land they required, regardless of African interests (1970:756)."

4. Based on observations noted on a drive from Harare to the Zambezi valley, through Mazoe and Guruwe (December 10, 1992).
5. The dates for the recent drought are perhaps more accurately 1990-1993 however here I am following Scoones, et al., 1996:164). Rainfall for the rainy season (running between November and May) of 1990-1991 was well below normal however the full effect was mostly felt in the following season (1991-1992) when rains almost failed altogether, causing deep disruptions in the economy. The 1992-1993 season was also in a rainfall deficit however the effects of the previous season, such as a lack of seed, grossly exaggerated the effects of drought. Experienced alone -- preceded and followed by better years -- the 1990-1991 and 1992-1993 seasons would have been bridged. The failure of the 1991-1992 drought therefore, depicted in the Zimbabwean press as the worst in living memory, had causes and consequences that stretched over a span of (at least) three years. As Scoones suggests, drought is as much an economic phenomena as it is an ecological one. Many residents of Gudyanga felt there were no serious droughts in the past however this may have reflected a declining ability to adapt to environmental crisis; indeed, people said they had never relied on government drought relief to the extent they did in the recent drought. Given that relief distribution has greatly improved it may have been the very effective distribution of relief during the recent drought (see Leys, 1986:269-270) that enabled people in Gudyanga to fall back on drought relief more than they ever had in the past.
6. A similar alarm is raised by a Zimbabwean encyclopedia:

Zimbabwe faces a major deforestation problem, particularly in the Communal Lands ... In some areas, notably the Save River Valley, virtually all tree cover has been removed (Tabex, 1987:146).

In some areas of the upper Save river valley, the expansion of arable land has cleared most of the indigenous woodlands however this is by no means generalized for the entire river valley.

7. Bruce, et al. (1993) suggest the term common property is too general due to the diverse and competing claims to resources grouped together as a commons. This issue will be explored later in chapter 6.

8. The only exception known to me being Roder (1965) who did some socio-economic survey work in the area as a point of comparison for his study of irrigation schemes in the region.
Chapter Two

Setting the Social and Historical Context

In this chapter I will establish the wider national and regional context in which social processes in the study area (Gudyanga) can be understood. Historical events and processes that have played a role in shaping local identity will be reviewed. While this chapter speaks to wider, regional processes, it will focus as much as possible on issues that influence southeastern Zimbabwe, where the study area is located. I will begin with the historical development of cultural and political relations in the region. Following this will be a discussion of the political and economic transformations engineered by settler colonial powers. Ending this chapter will be a general discussion of resource management issues in Independent Zimbabwe. It will be argued that the region has experienced centuries of political transformations although it was under colonial rule that the most far-reaching and lasting social changes were experienced.
Social History

The residents of Gudyanga identify themselves as Vandau (Ndau peoples). Speakers of Chindau (the dialect of the Vandau) are mostly found in what is now Mozambique, the remainder living in the Chimanimani highlands of Zimbabwe (see Map 2). The Vandau are a sub-division of Zimbabwe's largest ethnic group, the Shona-speaking peoples. The term "Shona" refers to a linguistic grouping which shares a distant but common ancestry with the Nguni, Sotho, Venda and Chapu to the south (Bourdillon, 1976:20). These groups are all descendants of the Eastern stream of Early Iron Age Bantu speaking peoples who entered the southern Africa region around the second century AD and are identified with the Bambata tradition (ie. of pottery styles) (Beach,1980:12; Lancaster,1981:8). Shona-speaking peoples represent the descendants of one branch of a secondary (Late Iron Age) Bantu expansion from south of the Limpopo river around 900 AD (Beach,1984:19-21; Oliver,1966:369-70). Non-Shona speaking groups, including non-Bantu speaking hunting and gathering peoples, continued to live on the plateau for centuries and in the Ndau areas into the seventeenth century (Beach,1984:16; Rennie,1973:55-6).

The Late Iron Age groups that arrived on the Zimbabwean plateau between 900 and 1000 AD were likely "Shona" speaking and probably called Karanga (Beach,1984:13; Bourdillon,1976:20). These early "Shona" developed the "Zimbabwe Culture" associated with a strong emphasis on
raising livestock, walled villages (the most famous being Great Zimbabwe, which reached its zenith between 1300 and 1450 AD), extensive gold mining, advanced metallurgical skills and vibrant trade networks, especially to the Indian Ocean (Lancaster, 1981: 8-9). Out of these early "Shona" developed the main Shona dialect clusters: Karanga, Zezuru, Korekore, Manyika, Ndau, Kalanga (Kuper, 1954:12). Both the terms "Shona" and "Ndau" are of fairly recent origin and were likely first used by Nguni speaking peoples in the mid-nineteenth century (Beach,1980:281; Earthy,1930:95; Mudenge,1988:21-2).

Prior to this point in history there seems to have been no term for the linguistically and culturally related peoples of the Zimbabwe plateau (Ranger,1989). Instead much more narrow terms were used, such as dzinza ("clan"), which denotes a loose political entity associated with a division of an ethnic group. The association between political/territorial entity and descent/consanguinity has led many observers to translate the term dzinza as "tribe" (see for eg. Hannan,1987). However, geography, culture, language, political affiliation and ethnicity were all significant in the formation of diverse local identities (Rennie,1973:85-92); each feature might be shared with neighbouring groups, such that they rarely coalesced into a distinct entity or identity as the term "tribe" might suggest.

Residents of Gudyanga, in naming themselves as Vandau, will say they are different from "the Shona" -- or the Manyika
and Karanga for instance, using the more regional identities of Shona sub-groups. Separating Vandau from Vamanyika, or any other neighbouring group, is however a much more complex matter for the outsider as ethnic identities blend into one another (Roder, 1965:44). The study area is in fact something of a "shatterzone" where Ndau features grade into other groups (Manyika to the north and Karanga across the Save). Not only is the cultural identity of Gudyanga somewhat composite but the upheavals of the last two centuries seem to have had, as I will argue, a powerful effect on local identities. In treating this history I will start with the origins of the royal lineages in the area and follow with the mfecane incursions of the nineteenth century.

THE MUUSHA CHIEFTAINCY

Gudyanga is found within the chieftaincy of Muusha', who represents the Nyamazha dzinza, which has common origins as well as political and linguistic ties with other dzinza in the Eastern highlands and Mozambique which would later be known as "Vandau". Muusha’s entry into the Chimanimani highlands of Zimbabwe was linked to the arrival of chief Mutema and other chieftaincies bearing the moyo (heart) totem (mutupo); that is, Chikukwa, Saurombe, Sahodi, Chikwanda, Makuyana as well as Mutambara of the bumphi, or sigauke (wild dog) totem (see figure 2.1). Chief Muusha says his "father" came to the eastern highlands under the leadership of Mutema ("airi
ndibaba" -- "it is he who is father"). Mutema is the most senior of the Ndau moyo chieftaincies (Beach, 1970:170-1) as well as paramount chief of the Sanga confederacy, dating from the late eighteenth to mid-nineteenth centuries (Rennie, 1973:71).

figure 2.1 Southeastern Dynasties

Muusha, as well as the other moyo dynasties, originate from Mbire, the centre of the Rozvi Changamire state (seventeenth to nineteenth century), in the vicinity of present-day Wedza (see Map 2)³ (Beach, 1984:24). According to Rennie (1973:72) there were likely three separate migrations from the Rozvi state with the Mutema led moyo clans
representing the most recent migration (somewhere in the late
seventeenth or early eighteenth century). Working from
genealogical information, Junod estimated the arrival of the
moyo dynasties in the south around 1785 (1934:36). Another
researcher, speaking more specifically about Muusha's
Nyamazha, reported that, "according to the history of the
chiefs, the VaNyamazha came to Muwushu, Biriwiri and Nyanyadzi
about 1800 (Sinclair, 1971:15);" however, Sinclair does not
cite any sources. Obtaining even a skeleton genealogy for
Muusha was a very difficult task in both my and others' experiences (see Rennie, 1973:569-70; Latham, 1965:15) and as a result there appears to be no clear record to date. A colonial report of 1965 on the delineation of Native reserves in the Melsetter (now Chimanimani) district suggests, "some deep mystery surrounds the whole Muusha chieftainship and may account for the reluctance of the chief or his son to reveal the names of the lineage (Ibid)."

What little genealogy I was able to obtain on the Gudyanga headmanship was also contradictory and incomplete but was clearly very shallow. Oral accounts of the "arrival" (which may be a metaphor for ascendancy rather than immigration) of Gudyanga in the study area suggest they became established in the area somewhere in the latter half of the nineteenth century. This would locate the arrival of Gudyanga in the Save valley roughly in the time of the Gaza state (see below) and shortly prior to the arrival of Europeans! One
informant offered a date of 1860-1880, which I was not able to corroborate with any other resident. The only firm date was set by the missionary Knight-Bruce who led an expedition through the area in 1892 and identified "Gundyanga’s village" roughly in its present location (Knight-Bruce, 1892); Gundyanga is referred to as a chief on the map, perhaps indicating a degree of autonomy from chief Muusha.

The gap between the arrival of chief Muusha in the highlands as early as the late seventeenth century and headman Gundyanga’s arrival in the lowlands in perhaps the late nineteenth century is explained in part by Beach. Beach (1980:171) points out that like the Mutema and Musikavanhu dynasties to the south, Muusha’s Nyamazha was divided between the more politically dominant eastern highlands and the less powerful groups of the arid Save lowlands (see figure 2.1). Thus, "those members of the dynasty who were unable to maintain themselves against the rest of their relatives in the highlands were forced to occupy the valley drylands (Ibid.)." It would seem then that Gundyanga never formed a strong political entity and may have had trouble establishing hegemonic control over the area in which they resided.

Scoones and Wilson (1988:36) suggest that this weak political influence of sub-chiefs was historically common throughout what is now Zimbabwe. In the period immediately preceding colonial expropriation and administration, people were concentrated on hilltops and farmed in wetlands at their
bases, while the vast wooded areas between hills were not regulated by any political authority (Ibid.). While Gudyanga was almost devoid of wetlands, people were nevertheless concentrated along the Save river at the turn of this century (Roder, 1965:50; English, 1914:5-6). Political authority may also have been concentrated in the control of a key resource, alluvial soils in this case, while the exercise of political authority over the more abundant wooded areas was likely more difficult (cf. Colson, 1960:78-85 on the Zambezi Valley).

Thus, clearly defined territories of political control which were later to be identified as wards (see below), and among which we can include the area of Gudyanga, were apparently the product of the colonial era.

More work needs to be done on the social and political dynamics which accompanied the arrival of Gudyanga in the Save valley. It seems hard to imagine that events of such a recent nature could be so hard to uncover; however, it may precisely be the shallow historical influence of the present leadership which is being disguised so as not to delegitimize local leadership and call into question their rights as "owners of the land", especially by autochthonous lineages (see ch.4 p.27) (cf. Rennie, 1973:160 n.21; Kopytoff, 1987:52-61).

THE MFECANE AND NGUNI RULE

It was in this very fluid period of Shona society, in which the majority of Shona polities were very recently
formed, that the Nguni migrations from the south occurred. The effect of the mfecane on Shona society may never be fully understood but it was clearly significant, especially for the Vandau. The first incursions into the Zimbabwean plateau were made by Nxaba, who led his followers out of Shaka's Zulu state and up the Save valley where he ruled out of Mutema's territory of Sanga (see figure 2.1) between 1827 and 1836 (Beach, 1980:177-8). Nxaba was forced out of the region by Soshangane, who established the Gaza state over the Vandau and Tsonga peoples. However, it was only between 1862 and 1889, when the Gaza capital was relocated from the Limpopo valley to the southern Chimanimani highlands (see Map 2), that the Ndwu moyo dynasties were subject to direct and sustained political pressure (Beach, 1984:54). It was most likely during this period that the practice of installing Nguni headmen directly in villages was found (Roder, 1965:45). Under Nguni suzerainty Vandau youth were recruited into age grades which formed military regiments (amabutho). These amabutho were the shocktroops — the buyandhlela, or "those who prepare the way" — who were mobilized against neighbouring groups (Rennie, 1973:144-6).

Residents of Gudyanga related stories to me about this time period which varied considerably; some said the Gudyangas fought for the madzviti (foreign invaders -- ie. Nguni raiders), some said they fought against them. Both resistance and accommodation to Nguni rule were common among
Ndau chieftaincies; however, it seems Muusha’s Nyamazha submitted "peacefully" after the chief of the time was killed by Gaza Nguni raiders (Ibid: 139; Latham, 1965:16). Thus, it seems very likely that the political order in the study area was in some ways a product of reorganizations which took place during the reign of Gaza, and most likely between 1862 and 1889. For instance, the title "Muusha", among other highland Ndau chieftaincies, originated in the time of the madzviti, indicating new "legitimate" authorities had been established (Rennie, 1973:140).8

In addition, there are indications that some of the political boundaries found today were created in this time. For example, residents said that the people of Gudyanga helped Chief Maranke to the north fight off Mutasa of the Manyika -- who were not subjects of Gaza (Bhila, 1982:190-1) -- and that is why one of the sons of Gudyanga, Chiadzwa, was given land and a title in Maranke’s area (see figure 2.1). At present, there is no persuasive evidence to confirm or deny the possibility that political control of the valley by Gudyanga was consolidated under Gaza rule, although this control was undoubtedly influenced to a some degree.

Nguni influence on local (Ndau) culture was also significant and was expressed in language, dress, ritual and identity. Demonstrations of allegiance to the Gaza Nguni state, and the right to enter military regiments, were centred on the adoption of the more visible elements of Nguni culture.
Thus, Ndau could become socially mobile by wearing the Nguni head ring and a skin apron in place of cloth, piercing their ears, speaking fluent Nguni and being familiar with Nguni oral traditions (Liesegang, 1981:185-6; Rennie, 1973:146). Liesegang (1981:186) cites an elderly man in Mozambique who recalled his life under Gaza rule: "when they pierced my ears with a knife, they said they were making me a Mubuyundhlela out of me."

Many older men in Gudyanga, especially those who originated further to the south, have pierced ears, indicating the practice continued into the twentieth century.

Nguni influence was also felt in the organization of ritual life among Vandau. Spirit possession is the main vehicle for religious expression among Shona-speaking peoples and all Shona ancestors (midzimu, sing. mudzimu) communicate with the living through a spirit medium of either sex (Gelfand, 1959:6). Possession by the spirit of a slain Zulu warrior (dzviti), referred to as njosi (pl. manjosi), is considered by Vandau to be particularly efficacious in divination (Rennie, 1973:157). Spiritual guidance at public functions in Gudyanga is generally provided by manjosi, whereas among other Shona-speaking peoples it is generally ancestors of the dominant lineages (mhondoro) who are at the centre of public ritual life (see Bourdillon, 1979; Fry, 1975; Garbett, 1966).

The use of Nguni words (or Zulu and Sindebele even) in everyday speech is fairly common in Gudyanga, though it has
been shown that it was the Gaza Nguni who lost their language to the Ndau and Tsonga amongst whom they lived (Roder, 1965:45). In addition to the use of Nguni speech, social mobility under Gaza rule was likely achieved through the adoption of Nguni totems (mitupo, sing. mutupo). Although Nguni mitupo have their Shona equivalents, Nguni forms are more commonly found in the study area. Residents of Gudyanga, largely descendent from clans bearing the Shona mwoyo mutupo, link all cattle related mitupo to a shared history, if not common ancestry, with the Zulu/Nguni totem Nkomo ("a head of cattle", but especially the heart) (cf. Earthy, 1931:79, 100-3; Junod, 1934:21-25; Rennie, 1973:157). Muusha’s mutupo is Ngombe ("a head of cattle", the Shona form for Nkomo), his chidao (the more precise sub-clan name) Sithole (Nguni for "heart" of cattle).10

In spite of these very noticeable changes among the Ndau, Beach has argued that the effect of Ndebele and Gaza raiding on Shona society more generally has been greatly exaggerated (1980:53, 57-8). He argued that many Shona-speaking peoples were not subject to raids until the later part of the nineteenth century, and then only briefly, there was very little depopulation, and in the end the basic structures of Shona economy and society remained intact. Rennie also suggests that the Ndau economy was not radically transformed, as the Gaza state did not attempt to direct production but only extract surplus through raiding and the superposition of

While it has been suggested that Zimbabwean historians have tried to minimize or even deny the impact of Gaza rule on Shona society (Liesegang, 1981:178), it would seem the greatest influence was felt by those people, especially "Tonga" and Chopi in southern Mozambique, where the density of Nguni settlement was greatest (Harries, 1981:320-1).

In sum, significant changes certainly took place in the political system as well as in cultural identity among the Vandau of Zimbabwe. However, in Gudyanga at least, the nature of social, political and economic life does not differ greatly from other Shona-speaking areas, including those beyond the reaches of Nguni rule. Perhaps the most lasting influences of Gaza rule were felt in the formation of local identities, which are expressed through linguistic and cultural differences with other Shona-speaking peoples. We will return to this point later in this chapter as well as in chapter 3.

Shona Society at the End of the Nineteenth Century

At this point I will give an overview of the principles which govern the political control of resources among Shona-speaking peoples prior to the arrival of Europeans in the early eighteen nineties. This chapter has shown already how Shona societies were in a continual state of flux up to the end of the nineteenth century. The disjunction between pre-
colonial and colonial periods, into which I am inserting this discussion on the "principles" of Shona social organization, is justified on the grounds that the establishment of the bourgeois state marks a major transformation in the political and economic lives of Shona-speaking peoples. For most of the Zimbabwean plateau, the social upheavals before the end of the nineteenth century that were caused by Shona tributary states as well as Nguni and European incursions, just as those changes that were brought by Independence in 1980, were less dramatic than the transformations effected in the early colonial period (1890-1910) (cf. Drinkwater,1989:288). This does not imply that there was some relatively undifferentiated "pre-colonial" period; I shall only refer to some apparently widespread features common to the peoples of the late nineteenth century that were later identified as Shona speaking.

The overview provided below is only tentative. For southeastern Zimbabwe as a whole there is relatively little recorded history prior to the nineteenth century (Roder,1965:53). Early Portugese documents focus more on areas to the north (eg. Manyika and Monomotapa) which were historically associated with the coastal trade, especially in gold (Beach,1980:88; Beach,1984:69, 75; Rennie,1973:65). Much of what we know about pre-colonial Shona society is in fact developed from studies done in the twentieth century, after many transformations had already taken place. In general
then, depictions of Shona society are primarily based on information gathered under one form or another of state suzerainty, whether Shona tributary, Nguni or colonial. The following discussion will be treated in two parts: political hierarchy, and control of resources.

POLITICAL HIERARCHY

The more recently formed polities of southern Zimbabwe that broke away from the Rozwi Changamire empire were organized along principles which resembled the structure of the larger statist polities, such as the Rozwi Changamire state, from which they originated; however, according to Beach (1984:50), these new chieftaincies bore greater resemblance to those smaller polities that coexisted with the tributary states and have their origins in the beginning of the Early Iron Age (ie. as early as the second century AD). From this perspective then, "the new settlers were reverting to the mainstream of Shona politics and society, from which the state-forming period had been a diversion (Ibid.)."

How representative these smaller less centralized chieftaincies were of "the mainstream of Shona politics and society" is however not uniformly agreed upon (Beach, 1984:69-70). In particular, there is no consensus on the authority that leaders exercised over people and land (see figure 2.2 for the nested levels of the political hierarchy in Shona-speaking societies). Holleman has described the Shona
chiefdom as "in effect little more than a fairly loose confederation of semi-autonomous tribal divisions" (matunhu) (1968:90). Speaking specifically about the Chimanimani highlands, Rennie suggests "the control of the chief over the affairs of the mutundu [ie. dunhu] was very limited, and they tended to be self-regulating units (Rennie, 1973:76)." As was mentioned earlier, Scoones and Wilson (1988:36) have suggested that the control of the sadunhu over the entire dunhu was likely very limited and concentrated on key economic resources (ie. wetlands). This is echoed by Bourdillon, who says "the authority of the headman [sadunhu] outside his own family group [was] limited (1976:79)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>position</th>
<th>Shona term</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chief</td>
<td>ishe</td>
<td>nyika (&quot;country&quot;, &quot;land&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headman/sub-chief</td>
<td>sadunhu</td>
<td>dunhu (&quot;ward&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>village leader</td>
<td>samusha</td>
<td>musha (&quot;village&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding class distinctions between members of chiefly and "commoner" lineages, Bourdillon has suggested that by the late nineteenth century class differences were minimal if not absent (1976:27). Lan is however more ambiguous as he says the only status distinction between chiefly lineages and others was that the former exercised control over land by virtue of their genealogical relation to the "owners of the land" (1985:20-1). Mudenge, on the other hand, is much more
emphatic about the degree of hierarchy in Shona polities. He suggests the *madzishe* were powerful rulers who could mobilize popular armies, exacted tribute for their fields and gold-digging operations and had the judicial power to impose capital punishment (1988:18-20). While the *sadunhu* may have made use of community ("tribute") labour on his fields (see Holleman, 1951:371), the *sadunhu* was at any rate expected to feed his followers in times of need.

Perhaps the safest and most realistic assumption should be that the degree of centralization and class differentiation varied from region to region. Mudenge's comments are perhaps based more on his research on the Mutapa (Munhumutapa) state and would understandably emphasize status differences. Nevertheless, Bhila argues that among the Manyika, who formed a large centralized polity since at least the sixteenth century (Beach, 1980:166-8, 173-177), a number of countervailing forces limited the ability of the central authority to wield power in an arbitrary manner (Bhila, 1982:13-5); thus, "in theory the king enjoyed absolute powers but in practice he could be autocratic only so long as he retained the consent of his people (Ibid:13)." The key point for us here is that it does appear that control of key resources was central to political dominance in Shona-speaking societies. This topic will be pursued further below, after giving a brief outline of the structure of Shona-speaking societies.
The chief (ishe) stood at the top of the political hierarchy and governed an area, nyika, which was defined by recognizable natural boundaries such as rivers and hills. The nyika was divided into a number of smaller units, matunhu (sing. dunhu, translated as "ward"), which were again clearly defined territories. The chief then, governed one of these matunhu (the most senior one). Matunhu are usually headed by minor houses of the chiefly lineage (vazvare, or macinda), however they were also led by "foreigners" or "strangers" (vatorwa), especially those who provided some form of service (eg. military) to the chiefly lineage. In addition, while the dunhu was primarily a kin-based political entity, led by a senior lineage head, there was often a significant number of residents who were not members of the dominant lineage but may be related as cognates or affines, or not at all (Bourdillon, 1976:77-80; Holleman, 1951:361).

The control of land by dominant or "chiefly" lineages, the patrilineages of the madzishe, flowed from their position as "owners of the land" (Lan, 1985:19); that is, as founding lineages which established a "communal right on the land for the benefit of future generations of their own kin" and any others who resided within the nyika (Holleman, 1969:17). "Founding" here can be loosely translated as "conquering", with royal traditions commonly stating that the area the dominant lineage occupied was originally uninhabited, or inhabited by wild people (Rennie, 1973:55). However,
"conquering" should not be interpreted as the decimation of earlier inhabitants, for which there was little evidence.

In fact, autochthonous mhondoro (ie. ancestors of dominant lineages) were often incorporated into the genealogies of settler populations as vazukuru (sing. muzukuru). A muzukuru is, in general, anyone born of a woman from one's own patrilineage, but in particular is a man's sister's (eldest) son. To be muzukuru was to hold a highly respected and ritually important position among Shona-speaking peoples; the muzukuru leads ceremonies for speaking with lineal ancestors (ie. kudira: "to pour" (libations) and therefore also translated as "to pray") and the muzukuru mukuru ("the important nephew") was responsible for installing a chief (Bourdillon, 1976:49-51; Garbett, 1966: 144; Gelfand, 1973:39-42). Thus, dominant lineages of autochthonous peoples were often given key ritual positions in the management of resources in order to ensure "peace with the land" (Rennie, 1973:63). Holleman (1951:371) notes that during harvest ceremonies, the sadunhu dedicated beer to his ancestors as well as to "the unknown spirits of the original 'owners of the country' (vasanyika)," that is, to the ancestors of autochthonous lineages who have been forgotten.

Equally, the presence of vatorwa (people not living with kin; "strangers"?) in a dunhu did not necessarily entail their subordination, beyond the recognition of the political supremacy of the chief (Holleman, 1951:372). This supremacy
could be applied in effect to all matunhu within a chiefdom, as the granting of an area (ie. dunhu) to any lineage precluded that lineage from any claim to the chieftaincy. It has been noted that this granting of land, and therefore a degree of autonomy, was an important mechanism for conflict resolution in Shona society. Political conflict within lineages (ie. within a given nyika or dunhu) was historically frequent in the region and was commonly resolved through territorial settlement, with new factions forming within the two separate polities (Rennie,1973:83-4, Holleman,1951:375). Again, it is possible that this was the origin of Gudyanga as a dunhu within the nyika Muusha.

The dunhu itself was composed of "villages" (misha, sing. musha) which were clusters of patrilineally related households centred around the leadership of a senior lineage representative, the samusha. The term musha is translated as "village" however the musha had a more fluid, and often dispersed, structure than the term "village" may suggest. Movement of the village site within a ward was common and the residents of a musha often dispersed to join relatives in other parts of the ward (Holleman,1951:4). The dunhu, therefore, was the more permanent political unit which united households and provided a focal point for local identity (Bourdillon,1976:123; Holleman,1968:88; Yudelman,1964:110). Holleman suggests it is the territorial ward (dunhu) that holds corporate rights to a clearly defined area and is the
focus for collective land-holding (1951:370, 1968:88, 1969:12-13). However, as will be seen below, the dunhu was probably constituted less by its territorial aspects than its central place functions as a focus for residence and political allegiance.

CONTROL OF RESOURCES

The Shona economy in the nineteenth century was agricultural, with extensive dryland and intensive wetland production being the main activities. Cultivation was done by hand, using a short handled iron hoe -- although hoes were also wooden (Beach, 1984:41). Dryland crops were drought resistant sorghums and millets which could be stored for several years (Beach, 1984:40). Finger millet (Eleusine coracana) and bullrush millet (Pennisetum typhoides) were most central to the economy and were the sole staples up to this century (Beach, 1977:41-2). Maize (corn) was grown in the late nineteenth century, possibly introduced from South Africa by the Gaza Nguni and returning labour migrants (cf. van den Berg, 1987:379); at the turn of the century maize was largely eaten as an early crop by roasting it on the cob while green (unripe) or cooking it as whole kernels (Roder, 1965:55; Wilson, 1986:2).

Sandy soils were generally preferred as the dryland crops required well drained soils and the sands were easier to work by hoe (Palmer, 1970). However, reliable water was presumably
the key determinant in locating fields and gardens. Reports from early European travellers along the Save indicate that people and their fields in the study area (Gudyanga) were concentrated on the alluvial clay soils of the river banks, the river being the only reliable source of water year-round (see English, 1914:5-6; Roder, 1965:51, 55). In other parts of the country where wetlands were found, rice and root crops, especially tsenza (Coleus esculentus), were grown year-round (Roder, 1965:55; Wilson, 1986:2).

Cattle were an important part of the economy, and were the major object of investment (Beach, 1977:45-6). In drier, hotter and especially tse tse infested areas such as the Save, Limpopo and Zambezi lowlands, goats were more prevalent as they are more tolerant of such conditions. Cattle were only traded or slaughtered in times of hunger (nzara) or when needed on ceremonial occasions. The non-meat value of cattle was paramount (cf. Harris, 1989) as they provided draught power, milk, transportation, manure (though not used by all groups as fertilizer), and bridewealth (roora). Cattle were not generally eaten for their meat as game was more abundant and hunting provided enough meat (Worby, 1989:15; Roder, 1965:71, Bhila, 1982:34).

Hunting, then, was a major economic activity and in Gudyanga at least, the bow (uta) was one of a man's personal possessions which symbolize his status as an independent adult male -- the corresponding item for women was the mortar
(duri). Hunting was conducted individually by men, using a bow, as well as in groups of both men and women using nets. Group hunting entailed lighting fire to the grass and underbrush to chase out game and then channelling game into a net where they were dispatched. In fields people dug pits (hunza), which could be lined with stakes (maronga), to catch game feeding on crops. Snares (zvingodo), deadfalls (mariya) and a variety of other traps were employed to catch medium-sized and smaller game. Oral evidence from Gudyanga supports MacKenzie's suggestion that hunting was a very important social activity, the full significance of which has been obscured by scholars (1991).  

Regional trade of commodities was not common except where ecological gradients were steep and distances between different ecological zones were therefore not great (Beach, 1984:41-2). Such conditions did exist in the Eastern Highlands where, for example, salt, dry fish and crafts (especially those made from bark fibres) were traded from the Save valley for agricultural produce from the uplands. There are sandy soils (bare) in the Gudyanga area where it seems one member of the Muusha dynasty, possibly a (classificatory?) brother to Gudyanga became a "proficient salt-maker" (Latham, 1965:21). This trade no doubt is the origin of the term gumbu (bark container) used to refer to the Gudyanga area (see figure 2.1), the bark containers being used to transport salt and dried fish. Together, the various branches of the
Shona economy provided sustenance in a region where drought was frequent.

Households gained access to productive resources by virtue of their residence in a dunhu (ward), residence being approved by the sadunhu. Thus, while control of resources was manifestly political and kin-based -- the ward being centred on agnatic kin -- membership in a dunhu was based solely on residence within that ward; therefore, access to resources was in theory a function of residence, not political or kin affiliation (Holleman, 1968:12). Misha were free to relocate anywhere within the ward and were only expected to notify the sadunhu. Only under specific circumstances -- i.e. when moving to a new dunhu, claiming land previously used by another musha, or where land was in short supply -- was the sadunhu called upon to allocate specific parcels of land (Holleman, 1968:7 n.2). Indeed, I was told by many residents in Gudyanga, including one traditional leader, that in the past there was nobody to tell you where to clear your fields and people just cleared what they needed. Speaking about land allocation in Africa more generally, Colson remarks,

> a closer inspection of the evidence suggests that the claim to allocate land was rare indeed, and occurred only when demand ran close upon supply and where a real clash of interests could arise (1971:201).

Scoones and Wilson have suggested that the control over land allocation as a basis for the political authority of dominant lineages probably developed only in the colonial era;
previously, dominant lineages maintained political control over other residents of a nyika or dunhu through their ability to mobilize labour and at times through force (1988:31-2). Since drought was a common occurrence and dominant lineages, by virtue of their place as "founding occupants", often monopolized control of wetland and alluvial soils which allowed for continuous production, many commoners were forced to rely on dominant lineages for sustenance in times of need (Wilson, 1989:371). There were, therefore, mechanisms for dominant lineages to potentially gain labour for intensive production in the wetlands, and perhaps extensive production in drylands, through tribute labour, polygamy and bride service (kugarira) (cf. Wilson, 1986:1-2).

Thus, while access to land was in theory a function of residence in a dunhu, many people might be bound to more wealthy households as followers or in-laws.15 Men whose families could not afford their bridewealth would perform brideservice which might include agricultural work on the fields of the father-in-law (tezvara). With the completion of brideservice, the husband was able to take up his own land and, in theory, establish himself as the head of an independent lineage segment which might contract dependent men through brideservice (Worby, 1989:14-5).

Access to woodland resources flowed from rights to reside in a dunhu and was therefore limited by political processes governing access to arable land, as outlined above. The only
direct control over woodland resources exercised by dominant lineages was through the creation of rampotemwa, or dambakurimwa, areas in which clearing trees was prohibited. Generally, such areas were grave sites of the dominant lineages or sacred grove in which the ancestors of the dominant lineages (mhondoro) were contacted. As such, these sites were a symbol of the authority of the ancestors of the dominant lineages (McGregor, 1991:291). It has also been suggested that the system of land guardianship -- in which ancestral guardian spirits (mhondoro) oversee the welfare of the land and its inhabitants -- reinforced the political and administrative unity of the chiefdom (Bourdillon, 1976:303,315-6). Through communication with these guardian spirits, chiefs ensured the well-being of the nyika; neglect for the mhondoro, then, would bring misfortune (Bourdillon, 1979:83-4; Holleman, 1968:89). Thus, it has been argued that the system of land guardianship existed for largely political reasons, for the aggrandizement of dominant lineages, although the practice clearly had positive ecological or land management consequences (McGregor, 1991:297; Matowanyika, 1991:126); this point is pursued further in chapter five. Speaking specifically about the Karanga (southern Shona), Wilson concludes that respect for guardian ancestral spirits was only part of the general ownership of the environment by the ancestral spirits, who thus pass rights to the ruling lineages enabling their ritual and political dominance of the area and the (mainly immigrant) peoples (1986:7).
However, this "ownership" was not uncontested so the ability of dominant lineages to use the sacredness of particular resources to reinforce their authority varied throughout the region. While the midzimu ("ancestors", sing. mudzimu) were said to establish a moral code (Gelfand, 1962:172), it might also have been the role of the spirit medium (svikiro) to articulate popular consensus and provide the chief, through the voice of the mhondoro, with the mandate to rule (Fry, 1976:119-20; Lan, 1985:59-67). Further, the political power of dominant lineages was in some measure based on the ecological function they performed in maintaining good relations with the guardian spirits of the area (Schoffeleers, 1978:18); that is, it was the most senior mhondoro in a region that were ultimately responsible for bringing the rains and this ability indicated that they are the true "owners of the land" (Lan, 1985:72-4).

Important guardian spirits, then, were often not from politically dominant lineages. For example, among the Tavara, autochthons in the lower Zambezi valley who were politically subordinated to the Korekore Mutapa dynasty, Dzivaguru was the most senior (ie. founding) mhondoro. The Mutapa dynasty and other distant peoples sent gifts to Dzivaguru in recognition of his superior rain bringing powers (Bourdillon, 1978:241-2). In addition, the territory over which a guardian spirit acts, the spirit province, very often did not correspond to any political unit like the nyika (Garbett, 1966:145). This
tension between invading and autochthonous lineages influenced political discourse in Shona society and was especially manifest in ritual life (Lan, 1985:74).

To summarize, it has been suggested that while ritual and political life was very often dominated by invading groups who were politically and militarily more powerful, by and large the social fabric of Shona society was very flexible and was likely in continual flux up to the period of colonial rule. Lineal conflict leading to migration and/or territorial settlements was apparently a common occurrence. Rennie sums up this process nicely, with specific reference to the Vandau:

the historical process of accretion of immigrant ruling and client groups resulted apparently in a series of layers of authority, with the earliest layers developing ritual responsibility for the relations between the new inhabitants and 'the earth' (which included earlier generations of inhabitants). Later layers of immigrants wielded political power based on military or economic supremacy (1973:73).

In a region marked by continuous social change the tendency has been toward assimilation of newcomers (Kuper, 1954:14). This may account for ethnic identity being derived primarily by locality rather than more inclusive clan or linguistic features. Spatially related social groups very often bear greater resemblance than those related "genealogically" (Holleman, 1951:355-6). With the advent of colonial rule, however, the processes of social and political differentiation were curtailed by the expropriation of land
and creation of "reserves" which froze demographic mobility and dispute settlement.

The Development of the Bourgeois State

COLONIAL PHASE - RHODESIA

Hoping to repeat the successes of the Witwatersrand mines, Cecil Rhodes secured a royal charter in 1890 granting his British South Africa Company (BSAC) administrative and commercial powers over the Zimbabwean plateau. The colonization of the Eastern Highlands was led by Dunbar Moodie, who arrived on the Chipinge plateau in 1893 with a trek of Boer farmers from the Transvaal. While land expropriation in general was most extensive in Matabeleland (Palmer, 1971:49), expropriation in Ndau country (Chimanimani highlands) was unequalled in other Shona-speaking areas (Rennie, 1973:5; Palmer, 1970:754; Phimister, 1974b:74-6). Those who came with Moodie quickly occupied the most fertile land in the area, indicated by tall grasses and abundant crops, making Africans squatters on their own land. The safeguards for Africans laid out in the BSAC Charter were firmly disregarded and many Africans who tried to leave the white farms were tracked down and forced to remain as agricultural labourers (Roder, 1965:73-4, 78-9). The majority of Africans were forced onto the hastily delimited Reserves which were located in areas deemed "useless for anything but natives (Palmer, 1977a:117)" -- i.e. fragile hilly and lowland areas.
which were not highly populated in the past. Between 1893 and 1900, the basis of land apportionment was established with little change to this day (Roder, 1965:77; Palmer, 1972:49).\textsuperscript{16}

Not only were the Reserve lands inadequate to support the African population, but various legislative and coercive devices were put in place to force Africans into wage labour. The Reserves, then, were in fact "labour reserves" which would supply the growing colony with cheap labour with the reproductive costs of the labour force itself being borne by the Reserves. However, Rhodesian mines and farms were competing against the better pay and conditions on the Rand as well as growing markets for agricultural products in the mines and urban centres (van Onselen, 1975). In fact, the very survival of the colony in its first few decades was ensured by African production, as European production was notoriously poor (Palmer, 1977a:73; Palmer, 1977b:227-30; Phimister, 1974a:217). In the 1903-1904 season, settler agriculture accounted for less than 10\% of marketed output in Rhodesia, and Africans, assisted by the adoption of the plow which allowed for an expansion of the area under cultivation (Barber, 1961:49-50), were able to derive 70\% of their total cash earnings from agricultural sales in the same period (Palmer, 1977a:73).

However, increasing restrictions were placed on African agricultural sales such that it became more and more difficult to obtain cash from agriculture; for example, many traders
refused to pay cash for grain and offered only trade goods (Phimister, 1977:260-1). In 1903 the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau (RNLB) was established to counteract the "free flow" of labour and supply contract workers to colonial enterprises which were otherwise unable to attract local labour (van Onselen, 1976:103-4). Recruitment was generally coercive and deceitful such that RNLB labour contracts were referred to as *chibaro* ("forced labour" or "slavery") (Ibid: 112-3).

With the expiration of the BSAC Charter in 1923 Rhodesian settlers gained full control of the state apparatus. Policy, previously dominated by international mining capital, was controlled by settler interests after 1923. The settler administration, then, sought explicitly to institutionalize segregation and the protection of European privilege. State policy in the nineteen twenties and thirties propped up European agriculture while at the same time prevented the emergence of viable African commercial production. Through stock taxes, dipping fees and strict limits on herd size, the ability of people in the Reserves to invest their earnings in livestock was greatly restricted. Similarly, investment in increased cultivation was discouraged through marketing restrictions on African-grown produce and limitations on African land holding, including through the enforced equalization of land-holding in the Reserves (see Ranger, 1985: 74-5). Thus, as Phimister has pointed out,

under various control and levy acts, African cattle-owners and maize-growers were manipulated and taxed
in order to subsidize the earnings of white ranchers and farmers (1983:227).

As a result of this legislative attack on the reserves, migrant labour increased markedly, especially to settler farms, even as wages steadily declined (Arrighi, 1970:199; Ranger, 1970:149). By 1933, labour supplies had increased to "embarrassing proportions", according to the Chief Native Commissioner, and the RNLB was disbanded (van Onselen, 1976:127). At the same time, the drive for racial segregation forced many Africans off of "European" lands and into the increasingly crowded and deteriorating reserves (Palmer, 1977a:148-9).

The Land Apportionment Act of 1930, sought to enact a final allocation of land, with 30.1% reserved for Africans and 50.8% for Europeans (Utete, 1979:15), and called for the eventual eviction of all Africans from "European lands" (Gray, 1960:55-6; Masser, 1964:216-7). However, the settler desire to see Africans on "European land" only for the duration of labour contracts was not economically feasible. Many settler farmers preferred to maintain a stable and dependent labour force on their farms as well as African tenant farmers provided rental income (Palmer, 1977a:205-6).

In addition, the full implementation of the Land Apportionment Act was not possible without the redistribution of vastly underutilized settler holdings to the crowded Reserves (Barber, 1961:137; Palmer, 1977a:230).

In an attempt to maintain agricultural production in the Reserves without a reallocation of land the settler regime
initiated a series of administrative interventions designed to reorganize social and economic life in the reserves (Phimister, 1986b). The two most notable devices were the Natural Resources Act of 1941 and the Native Land Husbandry Act (NLHA) of 1951. Both Acts gave the settler regime sweeping powers to direct cultivation methods, relocate people from crowded areas, and destock African herds (Scoones & Matose, 1992:158; Yudelman, 1964:18-20). It was in this period that many irrigation schemes, including Nyanyadzi and Devuli (now Devure) which neighbour Gudyanga, were established and expanded in Manicaland. Roder has shown that such schemes were in part established to resettle Africans from land designated for Europeans; on average, forty per cent of irrigators at schemes in Manicaland in 1964 were from distant European areas (Roder, 1965:125). Thus,

a many-sided programme was brought into operation which, it was hoped, would greatly increase the carrying capacity of the reserves, and hence allow them to absorb the many thousands of people who were due to be turned off European land under the terms of the Land Apportionment Act (Palmer, 1977a:204).

In the drive to increase productivity in the Reserves, the system of communal tenure was targeted as an obstacle.

Under the Land Apportionment Act provisions were made for private land holding in designated Native Purchase Areas while the NLHA attempted to institute private land tenure in the Reserves. It was held that communal tenure was insecure (Yudelman, 1964:14), it discouraged investment in improved conservation and productivity (Weinrich, 1975:297;
Yudelman, 1964:15,113) and prevented the development of full-
time commercial farming and proletarianization
(Allen, 1965:366; Weinrich, 1975:310). In other words, communal
tenure was blamed for the perpetuation of the migrant labour
system when it was the entire Reserve system itself which was
created for that purpose. Thus,

it was the intention of the Act [NLHA] that the
intricate network of social and tribal customs
regarding land use and land transfer would give way
to the marketplace (Yudelman, 1964:119).

However, the land available under the Land Apportionment
Act was insufficient to fully implement the NLHA, resistance
to state intervention in production was widespread and the
rise of African nationalism in the nineteen sixties forced the
settler regime to take new policy directions. By 1964 the
NLHA was suspended due to difficulties in implementing and
enforcing the Act (Drinkwater, 1989). The Tribal Trust Land
Act of 1967 reenacted communal tenure in the Reserves by
giving chiefs (ie. "Tribal Land Authorities") the power to
allocate land and supervise production (Cheater, 1990:201;
Ranger, 1982:22). The purpose of this exercise, as revealed in
the delineation report for Melsetter District (Chimanimani),
was to strengthen "re-identification" with traditional leaders
and minimize "Afro-Nationalist influence" (Latham, 1965:2; cf.
Ranger, 1982:21-2). At the same time, by granting to the
chiefs the powers of land allocation and conservation
enforcement, "central government was abdicating responsibility
over the most contentious political issue (Mutizwa-
Mangiza, 1985: 53) — the deterioration and shortage of land in the Reserves.

These attempts at reestablishing some form of indirect rule, however, were to fail as many traditional authorities had lost their legitimacy through their involvement with the colonial regime (Lan, 1985: 137-8); many of those traditional leaders that retained some legitimacy did so in large part because they refused to become puppets of the Rhodesian administration (Alexander, 1993: 375 et passim). Nationalist forces had begun military operations in Rhodesia by 1966 (Martin & Johnson, 1981: 9-10) and through the seventies popular resistance in the countryside made government intervention in the Reserves virtually impossible. Conservation works initiated under the Natural Resources Act and NLHA were destroyed as visible signs of colonial repression. In Gudyanga, the signs of state regulated production remain, fossilized, only in those fields that were abandoned before the war reached the area in the mid-nineteen seventies; in such fields, contours can still be detected as slight ridges across the slope while small piles of stones are all that is left of the beacons which marked the distance from the streambank beyond which the land was not to be cultivated.

With the displacement of colonial authority in the countryside and, in places, the delegitimization of many traditional authorities, there was a partial vacuum of power left behind. However, as Lan (1985) has shown, spirit
mediums, who were not coopted into the colonial system of indirect rule, were important in mobilizing popular consensus during the war and still retained popular support in many parts of the country. In addition, as ZANU(PF) (Zimbabwe African National Union - Patriotic Front, the ruling party) forces liberated portions of the country they set up a skeleton administration which would form the basis of local government after Independence. Notwithstanding these political institutions, control over access to new agricultural lands was limited and many new fields were opened up without any formal process, especially in those areas where cultivation was prohibited by colonial conservation legislation (see Ranger, 1985:299-300).

POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE - ZIMBABWE

The above account of the history of the Zimbabwean plateau outlines "Zimbabwe's Inheritance" (Stoneman, 1981) at Independence in 1980. Zimbabwe inherited not only the rich history of diverse peoples but the legacy of an economic and political system designed to exclude the majority from a productive and prosperous existence (Williams, 1982:114). In the century between Gaza rule and Independence, production, land holding and the system of political representation had been transformed. The long war of Independence deeply politicized the Zimbabwean countryside such that the newly formed ZANU(PF) government was under intense pressure to
redistribute resources, but especially land. However, the majority of the nation's productive resources continued to be controlled by foreign capital and Rhodesian settlers (Herbst, 1990: 37-40; Gordon, 1984: 122) -- Sibanda estimated, one decade after Independence, that 90% of the country's wealth was owned by only 4% of the population (1990: 10). The basic system of land tenure was inherited with few changes: the Reserves became Communal Areas (42% of all land in 1980) white farms became Large Scale Commercial Farming Areas (39% of all land in 1980), and Native Purchase Areas became Small Scale Commercial Farming Areas; state farms, resettlement areas, National parks and safari areas represent the other main categories of rural land use (Weiner, et al., 1991: 147-153).

Thus, the political economy of newly Independent Zimbabwe was riddled with strong yet opposing interests set against International influence through aid, trade and investment as well as the uncertain futures of its neighbours, Mozambique and South Africa. In this context, Mugabe's ZANU(PF) government opted to abide by the terms of the Lancaster House Agreement and pursue a policy of accommodation and reconciliation with the white population (Gordon, 1984: 126-31); however, reconciliation was directed not so much at easing racial antagonism as it was at ensuring "the reproduction of the dominant capitalist mode of production in Zimbabwe" (Sibanda, 1988: 261; see also Astrow, 1983: 136-142). The Zimbabwean government's first development plan was entitled
"Growth with Equity" (Zimbabwe, 1981), revealing the dual commitment to the government's political basis among rural Africans and its economic basis in settler and multinational commercial production. This policy of reconciliation greatly reduced the ability of the ZANU(PF) government to effect a radical transformation of the Zimbabwean economy and in many respects, the political and economic basis of Rhodesian society was inherited relatively intact. Thus, as Carol Thompson suggests,

the struggle for Zimbabwe was not a revolution in that class relations have not been transformed. The armed struggle delimited the hegemony of the dominant class of white settlers and international capital; it did not defeat them (cited in Shaw, 1989:156 q.v.).

Among the most immediate tasks for the newly Independent Zimbabwean government was in the provision of services such schools, clinics and wells where there were no such facilities or where they were destroyed in the war. Accomplishing this was however dependent on the effective development of local administration. Immediately after Independence the government passed the District Councils Act (1980) which was to revive local government in the countryside. Under the Act, District Councils were given jurisdiction over resource allocation and disposal (Mutizwa-Mangiza, 1990:426-7; Wekwete, 1988:22). Traditional authorities, who came to dominate local government during the later days of colonialism, were excused of all official powers, however, by Independence "any 'customary' control of land was already a dead duck
Under the Communal Land Act (1982), successor to the Tribal Trust Land Act (1967), ownership of land in the Communal Areas is vested in the President and is administered by District Councils, not traditional leaders.

The framework for implementing policy decisions and expanding the hegemony of the ruling party was based in the local committees set up by ZANU(PF) forces during the war which after Independence were to become the Village Development Committees (Vidcos). Vidcos are elected bodies made up of residents within a given village (as defined by often arbitrary boundaries which were estimated to contain 100 households) and are responsible for drafting local (village) development plans which are taken up and considered for funding by the District Council. As such, the Vidcos were to be the basis for democratic representation, however, they have generally functioned as a vehicle for communicating and, in theory, upholding government policy (Wekwete, 1988:22; Nhira, n.d.:7). Conflicts between these new forms of administration and "traditional" forms of organization have been frequent (Wekwete, 1988:23; Mutizwa-Mangiza, 1990:429-30) and in some cases the former is largely dependent on the latter (Lan, 1985:209-12) -- this will be expanded upon in the next chapter.

Considerable funds have been channelled into the Communal Areas via the District Councils (Mutizwa-Mangiza, 1990:431); however, the legal and financial autonomy of the Councils has
placed them in an unusually powerful position. Nhira & Fortmann (1992:60) have suggested that District Councils operate like "mini-states" with near absolute control over the sources of political and economic power. In general though, the creation of viable local administration has enabled the Zimbabwean government to vastly improve health care, education, water works, agricultural infrastructure and social services in the rural areas (Gordon, 1984:134-5; Faruggee, 1981:4-10). Of particular importance at the time of this study, recovering from a major drought (1991-1992), was the provision of drought relief. Leys (1986:269-270) remarks that drought relief was distributed in a very fair and democratic manner as recipients were registered through local Vidco chairs who had an intimate knowledge of their peoples' needs; this is corroborated by my observations in Gudyanga as well as in Dande (Zambezi Valley). At the national level, very visible changes have taken place such as, for example, in the "Africanisation" of the civil service, opening up of economic opportunities for Africans and in the creation of a common voting role.

However, what interests us here is resource management and in this sphere there has been far less change than was anticipated by the populace on the eve of Independence. Legislation and technical views on resource use continue to stress top-down, rationalized planning, characteristic of the interventionist colonial period, generally seeing Communal
Area dwellers as backward and inefficient (cf. Drinkwater, 1991) Here I will try to give a brief introduction to the following policy issues affecting resource management in the early nineteen nineties: macro-economic policy, land holding and conservation legislation.

Zimbabwean economic policy, in spite of the socialist rhetoric, has been described as "state capitalist" (Schatzberg, 1984:3-4) and has evolved from an emphasis on import substitution industrialization to one of export-led growth within a liberalised trade regime (Dashwood, 1994:3; Sibanda, 1990:17-18). This shift has taken place in the context of a wider global economic recession (Lawrence, 1986) and a shift in donor priorities from poverty alleviation (or basic needs) to export led growth as a means of repaying loans. Zimbabwe announced its commitment to trade liberalisation in its 1990 budget (Zimbabwe, 1990) and adopted a World Bank Economic Structural Adjustment Plan the following year. During the early nineteen nineties there was a considerable decline in formal employment with many government employees being "retrenched" (ie. laid off), prices on basic commodities rose with the removal of subsidies, and primary school fees were introduced for the first time since Independence. In addition, the shift in economic policy to a more "trickle-down" approach (Astrow, 1983:174-5) has been accompanied by a weakening of the redistributive nature of the resettlement programme.
Given that the commercial export sector remains central to the national economy, it is hardly surprising that the colonial pattern of extensive underutilized holdings continues to characterize the country (Cliffe, 1988:309). In spite of the constraints of the inherited political economy, significant amounts of land were redistributed (2,713,725 hectares with 52,000 households settled as of 1989 (Palmer, 1990:169); however, since those with jobs and land are generally not eligible for resettlement, the majority of Communal Area dwellers (i.e. "worker-peasants") were excluded and only widows with dependents were granted land as female headed households (Bush & Cliffe, 1984:86; Jacobs, 1984:40; Herbst, 1990:65-6). In 1992, with the expiration of the Lancaster House Agreement, the government amended the Land Acquisition Act (1985) to allow for expropriation of (largely white owned commercial) land, with compensation at state determined prices, for the purposes of resettlement.

The rhetorical flourish which has accompanied this process is perhaps a timely appeal to continued popular concern over land shortages in the Communal Areas, in the context of growing concern for the effects of structural adjustment and an upcoming multiparty election in 1995 (Deve, 1993; Stiles, 1994). Nevertheless, the government’s suggestion that only those with "proven farming ability" will be resettled, raises the concern that farmers who have already benefitted from integration into the market economy will be
the only ones to gain under resettlement. This would mirror those colonial policies, like the Native Land Husbandry Act, which sought to effect a division between full time commercial farmers and full time wage earners (ie. class differentiation).

NATIONAL LAND MANAGEMENT POLICY

It is clear then that many of the structural dynamics which limited the range of livelihood options under the colonial political economy continued to operate in the Communal Areas after Independence. Land redistribution has helped many who were without access to productive resources but has thus far not dismantled the inherited economic dualism which forces most Communal Area dwellers to depend on access to both arable land and cash incomes. At Independence, some 50-60% of Communal Area households (which account for some 60% of the population) were dependent, to varying degrees, on migrant labour (Farugee,1981:2-3). Drinkwater notes that the Zimbabwean government has begun to retreat from a redistributive solution to underdevelopment in the Communal Areas (ie. through resettlement) which formed the focus of agrarian policy in the first five years of Independence; in the latter half of the nineteen eighties, government began speaking about "improving" land husbandry practices and reorganizing settlement patterns within the Communal Areas as

In 1986, the Government of Zimbabwe produced its First Five Year Plan in which agrarian reform will be effected both through "translocation resettlement" and "internal resettlement", the latter referring to the reorganization of land use within the Communal Areas. This process is expected to entail relocating people into "consolidated villages," reallocating arable and grazing blocks, and developing irrigation (Alexander, 1993:199). This emerging discourse of internal resettlement reveals the continuity from colonial times of a desire to see poverty in the Communal Areas as the product of ineffective land use practices, rather than of the unequal distribution of productive resources. Tenure issues are brought to the fore in the Communal Land Development Plan:

The present land tenure system in the Communal Areas cannot cater for land pressure and a fair land distribution in general and the development needs of the individual holding in particular. Instead, the present land tenure system is hampering to a large extent rural development (MLRRD, Feb 1985, p.18 cited by Ranger, 1993:360).

The emergence of policy that argues for a reorganization of production in the Communal Lands reflects a growing assumption in planning circles that Rhodesian-style land-use interventions are the real solution to the "Land Question." That is, the very land use interventions that piqued rural resistance are being considered as solutions to structural
problems imposed by the creation of the Reserve system (i.e. Communal Lands) itself.

The disdain for indigenous resource management strategies is further reflected in national legislation affecting resource use. Here I will focus specifically on legislation directly affecting tree use and management, legislation which remains largely unchanged from the colonial era. While many legislative controls affect woodland use, the principle Acts which directly regulate woodland use are the Natural Resource Act (1941, amended 1981), the Forest Act (1948, amended 1982) and the Communal Lands Forest Products Act (1987, previously the Native Reserves Forest Products Act of 1929).

The Natural Resources Act has been described by Scoones and Matose as "a highly interventionist piece of legislation, particularly as it applies to the communal areas (1993:178)." This Act provides for the prohibition or enforcement of any land use practice, with all costs borne by the land user. The Forest Act established the Forestry Commission of Zimbabwe (FCZ) which manages state forests and plantations. This Act allows for any tree species or forested area to be expropriated and managed by the FCZ, with allowances for compensation to the land owner; in addition, the Act empowers the Minister of Agriculture to direct cutting, removal and planting practices (Ibid:179-80). Revenues earned from FCZ plantations, including those established in Communal Areas, accrue to the FCZ (Ibid). The Communal Lands Forest Products
Act applies more specifically to the Communal Areas than the Forest Act, which has state and private lands as its primary but not sole object; according to Fortmann and Bruce (1993:203), the two Acts are currently being revised and may be combined under a single piece of legislation. The Communal Lands Forest Products Act, among other things, restricts harvesting to "own use", prohibits the cutting of reserved trees, the sale or use of forest products by non-residents and cutting of any tree within 100m of a watercourse" (McGregor,1991:43-4; Nhira & Fortmann,1992:15-6).

This latter Act in particular, puts much of current woodlands management in the Communal Areas in a compromised position; the Act "makes much current forest product management in the communal areas effectively illegal (Scoones & Matose,1993:180; see also Bradley,1993:122-3)." The legislative framework for woodland management in the Communal Areas, then, is largely prohibitive and authoritarian. At the same time, conservation legislation is in many respects unenforced due to its internal contradictions, lack of funding and personnel to enforce it and perhaps most importantly, rural communities would be unlikely to tolerate the levels of state intervention envisioned by the above Acts as such intervention was a major focus for resistance in the liberation war.

Implementation and enforcement of forestry policy rests with the state; however considerable confusion exists among
the various levels of government as well as with the role of
traditional leaders who have no legal role in land use
regulations but who nevertheless are active players in
woodlands management (Hofstad, 1992:5-6; Nhira, n.d.:2; Scoones
& Matose, 1993:165). At the local level, VIDCOs have no
statutory powers over resources or resource use; they can
merely advise village residents and report infractions to
District Council. District Administrators, and their
respective District Councils, then, are the immediate
authorities with legal powers to expropriate land, grant
commercial timber concessions and enact by-laws governing land
use in the Communal Areas (Ibid). The District Council is by
law intended to be the sole beneficiary of any revenues earned
by commercial sale of Communal Lands forest produce
(McNamara, 1993:3). The Natural Resource Board (NRB) is an
appointed body responsible only to the President and
administers the Natural Resource Act with sweeping powers to
intervene in local resource use (Scoones & Matose, 1993:178).
The NRB is the only body capable of charging individuals for
infractions of national conservation legislation.

Concluding Remarks

Together, the above Acts and their responsible
authorities (ie. NRB, FC, District Council), which date from
the colonial era and emphasize strict controls on African
population with voluntary controls for white Rhodesians, form
the basis of forestry legislation in the Independence period (Scoones & Matose, 1993:158). In the colonial period these Acts served to uphold settler privilege and racial segregation in two respects: 1) preserving woodland resources in the Reserves postponed the need to redistribute land; 2) the restriction of commercial benefit from communal woodlands limited "unfair" (i.e., African) competition with European enterprises (McGregor, 1991:46-7). Thus, although these controls were couched in conservationist terms their object was equally to repress the African population, which is precisely how Africans in the Reserves understood the issue (see Drinkwater, 1989:293-5; Wilson, 1986:380-1). That the technical basis, or scientific justification, for conservation legislation is faulty and informed by non-conservationist ideologies has been adequately demonstrated (see Beinart, 1984; Drinkwater, 1989; Elliot, 1989; Grove, 1989; McGregor, 1991:26-69, 103-18; Phimister, 1986a; Scoones & Matose, 1993:161-2).

Any discussion of rural institutions with a role in resource management cannot escape the significance of colonial "indirect rule" in directly reshaping the political economy of the Zimbabwean plateau. While the political control of land was in constant flux for centuries prior to European encroachment, the colonial era established a radically transformed basis for the control and management of landed resources and the people those resources support. Colonial administrators had hoped that the Reserves would play their
role in guaranteeing white privilege through segregation. However, the Reserves, with all the new institutions that grew in response to the colonial political economy, were to prove them wrong, as the history of rural resistance attests (see for example: Alexander, 1993; Lan, 1985; Ranger, 1970, 1982, 1986). Colonial planners, in failing to come to terms with local management practices, sought to tamper with something they did not understand. Although there were colonial officials who recognized the vitality of local management strategies, such opinions did not seem to have filtered up the various hierarchies of the colonial land management bureaucracy.

Unfortunately, much of the same top-down approach to land use interventions continues in Independent Zimbabwe. Local Village Development Committees (Vidcos) draft development plans which are passed on to the District Council for consideration, with the Provincial Development Committee stamping final approval and providing funding. However, District Councils are expected to meet much of their own recurrent budget expenses and do not have the financial basis generally to fund development projects. Hence, development plans with funding are generally only initiated and then only by provincial or national government as well as by external development agencies. My own observations of development plans compiled by Mabvazuva (Chimanimani) District Council suggest that such plans passed on to District Council by

The top-down approach to government land use interventions continues due to financial constraints on local government but also from an inherited technocratic worldview held by government employees responsible for drafting and implementing land use plans (Drinkwater, 1991). In talking with technocratic staff in Zimbabwe I found them to be generally dismissive of local people's knowledge and in the habit of using colonial phraseology; for example, the phrase "scratching at the earth" was often used to refer to the use of hoes for cultivation. In this way, Communal Areas dwellers were blamed for the resource problems that endanger their survival yet which have their origins in the colonial period and were not resolved by the National war of Independence. By way of illustration, a provincial circular (circa 1992) listed the main causes for land degradation as follows: "squatting; cultivation on river beds; stream bank cultivation; indiscriminate destruction of trees and other vegetation as well as overgrazing." The moral tone of the colonial period is recalled in the conclusion to this circular: "These are all social ills which must be stopped (Office of the Provincial Governor, Manicaland, circa 1992).

Government planners apparently are not interested to know how it is that people in the Communal Areas have survived when the Reserve system (ie. today's Communal Areas) was created in
an attempt to suppress African economic independence (Mafeje, 1988:102). In part, Communal Area dwellers have made use of numerous strategies frowned upon by the bourgeois state, whether in its colonial or post-colonial phase: they have reoccupied lands expropriated by Europeans and been labeled "squatters" (see Alexander, 1993:251-61); they have cultivated winter gardens in the only reliably moist soils during the cool but dry winter months (April to September), along watercourses (see Bell & Hotchkiss, 1991); in spite of pressures to keep Communal Area herd numbers down (herds were destocked in the colonial period), they have invested considerable energy and capital in livestock production so as to guard against the vagaries of the Zimbabwean climate; and of importance to us here, they have made extensive use of local woodlands as a source of fuel, raw materials, foodstuffs, fresh fields and modest incomes -- the role of woodlands in maintaining livelihood security being particularly important in economically marginal areas (Scoones & Matose, 1993:189). Deemed "wasteful" by planners, such resource use practices have continued, with or without official blessing, as they play an important role in the survival of Communal Area dwellers.

In sum, while the ideological, technical and legal basis continues to exist for massive intervention into land use practices in the Communal Areas, the ability of the Zimbabwean government to mount an all-out attack on local management
practices is more circumscribed. Rural resistance to
government intervention has to some degree frustrated attempts
by the bourgeois state to reorient land use patterns in the
countryside. In its review of the World Bank-sponsored Rural
Afforestation Programme, the Zimbabwe Forestry Commission
listed the failure to understand local resource use patterns
as contributing to their failure to implement afforestation
schemes (1987, cited in McGregor, 1991:67-8). Furthermore,
conflicts between administrative (i.e. local government) and
technical planning priorities, as well as conflict between
agencies responsible for implementing land use reform, have
continued to hamper effective implementation of central
policy. For instance, responsibility for resettlement and
Communal Area planning has been split between two powerful
Ministries: the Ministry of Local Government (incorporating
the Department of Rural and Urban Development: DERUDE) and the
Ministry of Land, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement

Thus, while the potential powers of state agencies for
intervention are virtually unlimited, the ability of any one
agency or actor to invoke these powers is much more limited in
practice. Elections, inter-ministerial conflicts,
adминистative priorities, shortages in funding and personnel,
technical difficulties in implementation and popular
resistance all work to frustrate any simple exercise of what
might otherwise be near-absolute powers.
The remainder of this thesis is devoted to a more detailed and nuanced understanding of the people and resources of Gudyanga; in particular, we will see how access to communal woodlands is a fundamental factor in livelihood security. In the next chapter we will see the vitality and diversity of local life which shapes day-to-day resource use and management, at times in spite of the wider forces described in this chapter.
Endnotes

1. It is suggested that the distinction between Early and Late Iron Age cultures is not fully justified as the latter was an extension and elaboration of the former (Huffman, 1982:147; Beach, 1984:16). Both traditions practised a mixed economy with agriculture, herding and hunting, and worked metals; what demarcates the so-called Late Iron Age is their greater emphasis on cattle rearing (Huffman, 1982:142-3; Bourdillon, 1976:20).

2. Other forms of Muusha are also used: Muwushu (the name used in the creation of the original Reserve and still in place today), Muushu, Muwusha, Murwusha.

3. Beach points out however that the southern moyo Ndau reference to Mbire indicates a general area to the north more than a precise point of origin (1980:286-7). Chief Muusha himself claims his people were originally from what is now Tanzania, a not uncommon explanation for the origins of ruling lineages among Shona-speaking peoples (Ibid:56-7; Bullock, 1928:21).

4. Certainly the inability to obtain a genealogy can in part be attributed to the shortcomings of the researcher. However, "some deep mystery" still surrounds the matter when the recitation of chiefly genealogy has been, since the nineteen-sixties when administrators attempted to legitimize "traditional
leaders", an important part of establishing local authority (cf. Alexander, 1993:74-110).

5. At the same time however, control of salt production in the valley did apparently provide the basis for the building of local political dominance prior to this century (see p.50).

6. This settlement pattern may have been a product of so-called "Pax Britannica." Some residents suggested people once lived in the hills I did not investigate further. There was evidence of a small settlement made up of stone houses in the Makura Hills (see Map 5) which almost certainly predates the arrival of European observers.

7. It is interesting that in the colonial period the District Administrator was also addressed (respectfully!) as mudzviti, the singular pronominal form of madzviti.

8. Previous to this time the chiefly title was Newushoma (Beach, 1980:171). Interestingly, Newushoma shows up in one government report as a possible "brother" to the "founder" of the Muusha chieftaincy who moved to the Save valley and became a proficient saltmaker (Latham, 1965:20-1).

9. It is likely that SeZulu and Sindebele are also learned by men who seek work in South Africa and Ndebele dominated areas, especially Bulawayo.

10. Sithole may also refer to a calf (Earthy, 1930:101).
11. Although, as Scoones & Wilson (1988:36-7) point out, ward boundaries may not have been well understood or agreed upon.

12. Hence the term is very often translated as "nephew" (e.g. Gelfand, 1973:39) when there is no necessary relation to gender. Hannan (1984) defines the term as "grandchild; nephew; niece", illustrating the very common use of the term to affectionately refer to people related through women. With a muzukuru one has a joking relationship (Ukama hwakutamba, "playful relationship"). Thus, it is said, muzukuru anokunda mwana ("a muzukuru is better than a son").

13. Roora was not always paid in cattle however. Payment with hoes was common (oral evidence in Gudyanga; Worby, 1989:14) and it has been suggested by oral evidence in Gudyanga that in some cases no payment was necessary whatsoever. Where cattle were scarce, such as in tse tse infested areas, or where individual households had none, the practice of bride service (kugarira) was found (Bourdillon, 1976:61; Worby, 1989:14-15).

14. Beach disagrees: "In early Shona settlements, hunting was not as prominent as cattle-keeping as a source of meat (1977:40)." Beach is the only researcher cited who works with archaeological evidence although this evidence is based in relatively wealthy settlements such as centres of large polities.
15. Bourdillon notes that in a *dunhu* most people are related somehow (1976:80), a fact my own research confirmed and which made the distinction between "ruling" lineages and "commoner" lineages somewhat arbitrary in Gudyanga.

16. Two major changes in land-holding have occurred. The first took place under colonial rule and amounted to a redrawning of Reserve boundaries. For example, in 1914 the Native Reserves Commission recommended a reorganization of land holding that resulted in a net loss of one million acres from the Reserves and amounted to an exchange of productive land proximate to potential markets, in return for remote, barren land (Ranger, 1970:66). The second change took place with the post-Independence resettlement programme whereby, as of 1989, 2.71 million hectares of former (white) commercial farmland, amounting to 6.8% of all lands, has been reassigned for African use (Palmer, 1990).

17. Ranger has made much of the way in which communal tenure in the Reserves was recast by colonial administration so as to suppress peasant entrepreneurialism; that is, to protect white farmers from competition with the African extensive plough farmers of the early colonial period who capitalized on the flexibility of traditional tenure in the Reserves to cultivate huge fields for commercial production (see Ranger, 1985 & 1993).

19. The Lancaster Agreement, signed by Mugabe and ex-Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith, guaranteed the following for ten years after Independence: 20% white representation in Parliament, maintenance of the structure and personnel of the civil service, protection of private property (any state acquisition of land was to be on a "willing-seller willing-buyer" basis) and the creation of a national army composed of all the forces which fought in the war of Independence (Gordon, 1984:130).

20. This is in contrast to Mozambique. While in Dande, a Dutch researcher (Marja Spierenburg) and her research assistant walked me across the border with Mozambique, marked by a block of cement in the ground. There we met so-called "local administrators" and "relief workers" who controlled the sale of relief supplies. Canadian tinned sardines that were donated to Mozambique were widely available for purchase in Zimbabwe during my stay there.

21. This is presumably a mistaken conversion of the 100 foot restriction in the earlier, non-metric version of the Natural Resources Act (Scoones & Matose, 1993:181).
22. Following are some examples: Native Commissioner for Marendellas in 1930: "the best tilled fields are the small gardens of the old women using the hoes" (cited by Elliot, 1989:58); Rhodesia’s first Director of Agriculture: "native methods of cultivation were frequently of a high order" (Palmer, 1977:23, note 58); Posselt, a Native Commissioner: "as far as their own crops are concerned, I do not think we can teach the natives anything" (Ibid.).

23. An exception could be made, for instance, where Council has been able to profit from rights to cull game under a CAMPFIRE (Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resource Management) arrangement (see for example, Peterson, 1991).

24. Local peoples do contribute significant resources (land, labour and capital) to such projects. For example, the Gudyanga clinic, which was rated second in the District for 1992, was built almost entirely with local labour and with a large amount of local capital. The donor (EEC) paid for approximately 60% of all costs, primarily materials (save bricks which residents provided); the Council is estimated to have contributed roughly 10% of costs, or about a third of their expected contribution (this was a controversy that served to create local hostility towards Council).

25. There is plenty of evidence to suggest that colonial interventions in local management in the Reserves increased
resource degradation in the Reserves. For example, the reorganization of land use patterns in the Reserves led to massive woodland clearance through the crowding of people on limited and fragile lands and the centralization of residences which required the clearance of new (destumped) fields and the cutting of more trees to build new structures (including massive amounts of fuelwood to fire bricks). Further, destumping fields, encouraging monocultures and the concentration of water flows along contour bunds contributed to erosion in the colonial Reserves (Elliot, 1989:67-8; McGregor, 1991:110-111; Showers, 1993 cited in Bruce, et.al., 1993:627).
Chapter Three

Putting Gudyanga on the Map

In this chapter I will present a more detailed picture of the study site itself. As a case study of community resource management in Zimbabwe, this discussion of community life in Gudyanga deals with issues that were in some respects fairly typical in Zimbabwe. At the same time, the social-historical experience of peoples in the study area was unique. Here we will see in greater detail where Gudyanga fits within the broader social context outlined in the previous chapter. This specificity will then enable us to better understand the nature of resource management practices and institutions, the subject of the next chapter.

This chapter will begin with a description of the resource base and economic practices in the study area. It will be shown that local woodlands were vital to the viability of the local economy. This chapter will also outline the position of Gudyanga with respect to the wider political economy; relations between local peoples and state agencies overseeing local administration and development activities are
particularly important to elaborate on. Following this will be a discussion of local political processes and the degree to which dominant lineages can be glossed as "ruling lineages". The chapter will conclude with a discussion of social undercurrents in Gudyanga which inform public discourse and, ultimately, resource use and management.

Bases of Production in Gudyanga

RESOURCE BASE

Gudyanga is located at an altitude of roughly 600 metres above sea level and at these altitudes local climates in Zimbabwe are very hot and dry. Annual rainfall in the area was on average 427 millimetres per annum, but varied considerably from year to year. Temperatures also varied widely in any given year with average temperatures in the hottest month (November) being 26.2°C and in the coolest month (July) 16.5°C (Roder, 1965:16-7). As mentioned in the introduction, Gudyanga is located in Agro-ecological Region V which indicates the area was among those of the lowest potential for intensive commercial production in the country. However, the ecological gradient changes very rapidly in the Eastern Highlands such that as one moves East (ie. upland), temperature and rainfall regimes improved dramatically. Thus, it was even said that the upper areas of the study area, eight to ten kilometres East of the Save river, received slightly more rain and were at times covered in a mist when the lower
areas were dry. Crop yields were slightly higher in the hills but proximity to the road, school, clinic and stores was perhaps the strongest consideration when residents choose where to live; ground water was also less reliable in the upland areas and women generally had to walk farther to obtain water.

Map 5 gives a cross-section view of the study area. The area has been divided by myself into 5 Zones that reflect different ecological and land use classes (a vertical view of the zones as well as the transect used to make the cross-section is found in Map 3). Zone 5 includes the upland hilly parts of the area that were covered by open mopane woodland with the higher reaches dominated by different species. This area is similar to the Makura hills just to the north of the study area that were in fact the main source of fuelwood and building materials (about which more is said later). Zone 4 consists primarily of regenerating woodland on abandoned fields and homesites and was often quite different in composition than the original mopane woodlands out of which the fields were cut. In this area, fast-growing Acacia species were abundant, especially in the fields that were abandoned more recently, say in the later 1960’s. Zone 3 was mostly dryland fields with scattered trees within and around the fields. Soils were mostly granite-derived sands with some patches of sandy loam. Zone 2 is characterised by "mixed use," but was primarily residential, and on the whole was
thinly wooded. The "township" (i.e. concentration of stores and public buildings) was found in this zone, as was an area (Chinyamunyu) where no development was allowed to take place due to the area being sacred. Zone 1 covers those lowland fields found on fertile alluvial soils along the Save, as well as the heavily wooded riparian areas below the escarpment.

Woodland cover in Gudyanga was predominately mopane woodland in which Colophospermum mopane dominated in association with Diospyros guiloensis, Adansonia digitata, Terminalia spp., Combretum spp., Acacia nilotica, Commiphora spp. and Lonchocarpus capassa. Vegetation changed somewhat in the more upland and hilly portions of the study area with Combretum apiculatum, Commiphora mossambicensis, Ziziphus mucronata and Flacourtia indica becoming the more prevalent species. On heavily disturbed lands, where trees had been removed, Acacia spp. were more dominant.

While there were many areas of mature or climax forest in Gudyanga, particularly in the hills, much of the area was cleared and heavily thinned. Residents indicated that much of the woodland clearance in the area had been carried out in living memory. A map produced by Dunbar Moodie in 1893 described the Gudyanga area as "very dense bush" (Burrows, 1954: between pp.126-7). In the past the mopane forest covering the study area was referred to by residents as Mutambanebota ("you are playing with [hot] porridge"). It was said that one would never venture out alone or unarmed as
lions and leopards were a problem. In interviews it was suggested that the forest that was Mutambanebota was thinned more heavily in the late nineteen sixties and nineteen seventies. From that time until shortly after Independence, the woods were progressively pushed away from the main areas of settlement and into the hills. In part, these changes were a result of people abandoning their upland fields and reestablishing residence closer to the main road where services and more reliable wells were found. Patterns of woodland clearance, and woodland management more generally, at times reflected regional demographic changes as much as they did local tree use practices. This issue will be explored more thoroughly in the next chapter.

As in other river valleys in the region, people along the Save have had to adapt to the constant threat of drought and hunger (nzara). While drought may have occurred on an average of one in five years, people had many means to combat crop failure and prevent famine mortality (Illife, 1990:13). The people of Gudyanga described the most recent drought (1991-1992) as the most devastating known to them in history. For the first time the Save was said to have stopped flowing and one resident said he saw ants crossing the river, one of the region’s largest. In fact, water was flowing but only below the surface of the silt which filled the river. In the second year of the drought people were resorting to eating their seed so that by the 1992-3 season there was very little basis for
production; some seed was supplied by the government although there were few wild foods to gather, browse was sparse and few had any livestock left.

Under the constant threat of drought, the local economy in Gudyanga was characterised by a diversity of productive activities to ensure residents of economic output in one form or another. Agriculture was staggered through time and space, and encouraged diversity and micro-climate adaptation. To compliment agricultural production, people gathered wild foods, hunted small game, reared livestock, engaged in manufacture (craftwork), and traded with more productive regions; since the end of the last century, we can also include wage labour. A more complete discussion of the local economy is given below. Here we can note that in all branches of the local economy in Gudyanga, with the exception of wage labour, there was a marked reliance on local woodland resources.

ECONOMIC PRACTICES

The people of Gudyanga, like other Shona-speaking peoples, subsisted primarily on rain-fed (ie. dryland) agriculture. In parts of the country, agriculture in the nineteenth century was concentrated in wetlands (matoro) at the base of hills, with people living in fortified hilltop settlements (Wilson, 1986). However, nineteenth century settlement in Gudyanga was apparently concentrated along the
Save, the only major year-round source of water (oral sources; see also Roder, 1965:60; Knight-Bruce, 1892:345). Springs and pools in perennial streams were found in the past but were few and far between. Thus, the pre-colonial economy in Gudyanga appeared to conform to the more general pre-colonial (Iron Age) pattern based on drought tolerant millets and sorghums with little reliance on exotic crops such as rice, potatoes or maize (see Beach, 1980:28).

Maize was probably introduced into the Zimbabwean region in the nineteenth century, possibly from the Gaza Nguni and labour migrants returning from South Africa (see van den Berg, 1987:379). The adoption of maize became widespread in the region and is now the staple for most Zimbabweans. In Gudyanga, however, the staple crop was not maize but bullrush millet. Although people did plant maize on a regular basis, few took the risk of relying on maize which very often produced poor crops in this low rainfall region. Chemical fertilizer (ammonium nitrate) was only very rarely used in Gudyanga; among all Communal Land farmers in Natural Region V (see p.9), it has been estimated that only 10% use chemical fertilizers (Bradley & Dewees, 1993:88). People recognized that soluble fertilizers did not respond properly in low moisture conditions -- "inopisa zviyo" (they burn the crops). In fact, there were almost no purchased inputs in agricultural production in Gudyanga and crop sales were negligible.
One agricultural input purchased by many farmers in Gudyanga was hybrid maize seed, which was obtained from a government office in Nyanyadzi, a nearby irrigation scheme. Apart from maize, virtually all seed was produced on the farm (ie. retained for the next season). Labour was only rarely hired. Men and women generally worked together on the same field, although in some larger polygynous households men and women had separate fields. Even in the latter case, chores like weeding were often done collectively. Only one quarter of households surveyed claimed to perform all tasks cooperatively as a household. Generally, clearing and plowing was done by men, while hoeing and weeding was done by women. Plowing was primarily limited to the heavy clay soils in Zone 1. Thus, the majority of agricultural land (some 75-80%) was cultivated by hand (maoko), by women using hoes, in the 1992-1993 season. Similarly, most of the processing of millets and sorghums was done by hand, by women, although threshing (kupura) was generally a more collective activity even involving people from other households. Maize was generally taken to the nearby irrigation schemes to be milled mechanically for a fee (Zim$ 2.00 on average).

In the midland fields (Zone 3) bullrush millet (mhunga, *Pennisetum typhoides*) was the most common crop with only some maize (magwere) planted, while maize predominated in the lowland fields (Zone 1). Several varieties of sorghum (mapfunde, *Sorghum vulgare*) were commonly grown in both
locations, but especially in the fields of Zone 4. Finger millet (rukweza, *Eleusine coracana*) was somewhat rare in the area and most of those farmers who planted rukweza in the 1992-3 season used seed distributed by the government. Cereal crops were usually interplanted with watermelon (*makebe*), "cattle melon" (*shamba, Citrullus lanatus*), cucurbits (eg. *magaka, Cucumis metuliferus*), peanuts (*nzungu*) and along the Save with pumpkin (*nhanga*), cow peas (*nyemba*), groundnuts (*nyimo*) and okra (*gusha*) as well. In the lowland fields, sweet sorghum (*ipwa*) was planted in stands, or intercropped with cereal crops, and eaten early in the season like sugarcane. In addition to intercropping, a number of techniques were employed to diversify investments over time and space. Transplanting was a particularly important means of responding to changes in micro-climates.

Winter gardens were found close to reliable water sources such as along the Save River and at wells, and were an important source of vegetables for the community. Many residents also gathered wild vegetables from riverine areas and fields. Commonly gathered green leafy plants include *bangara*, or *nyeve* (*Gynandropsis gynandra*), *mbowa* (*Amaranthus spp.*), *ndakupuka* (*Brassica juncea*), *derere* (*Corchorus olitorius*), *mhuu?* (*Bidens pilosa*, "black jack"), *furanondo* (*Aerva leucara*), *derdy* (*Hermbstaedtia odorata*) and *ngaka* (*Momordica balsamina*). Wild 'vine fruits such as *magaka*, or *muchacha* (*Cucumis metuliferus*), and *mukaka sango* (*Coccina
adoensis) were commonly gathered as well numerous tree fruit which are mentioned in the next chapter. Gathered vegetables, insects and small game (especially birds) made up an important, if small, component of the local diet however it was clear from interviews with older residents that a much wider variety of foods were consumed in the past (see also Gomez, 1988; Alvord, 1929; Gelfand, 1971).'

Hunting of small and large game was a central component of the local economy in the past, however few adults engaged in hunting by the time of this study (1993). Children, but especially boys, supplemented their diets with small birds and rodents which they often roasted on the spot while tending livestock. On occasion, including once during my research, small game such as the rabbit-like mbira (rock dassie) were flushed out of the bush using fire and trapped in nets. Most game is now virtually absent and, together with the outlawing of most hunting activities since the early colonial period, this accounts for the small role hunting played in Gudyanga at the time of this study; trapping of birds and rodents by children, especially using deadfalls (mariya), was however a very significant element of many children’s subsistence.

The virtual absence of game in the study area itself was likely the result of habitat changes -- as Europeans forced Africans onto the Reserves, so Africans inevitably pushed out large game animals. Riverine animals were also scarce and this can be partly linked to the siltation of the Save River
which prevented deep pools from forming. Similarly, fish had become more scarce although people did trap them when waters in the Save were deep enough, especially prior to the drought. The historical importance of fish to the inhabitants of the Save lowlands was revealed by the report of an early Anglican missionary who passed through the area: "They are fishermen; they get salt from their salt pans and rivers; in places their customs seem affected by the coast people (Knight-Bruce, 1892:345)." The same report speaks of "very large herds of cattle", indicating livestock were at the same time very important and that perhaps stocks were not decimated by Gaza raids. At the time of this study, livestock was still a fundamental component of the local economy, providing draught power, milk and if sold or traded, some insurance against drought; the recent drought left the community with very few head of cattle. Many households had no cattle, and most who did have cattle had very few, which placed a serious limitation on agriculture in the lowland fields. Historically, goats were for many in the drier regions as important as cattle and probably more numerous (Beach, 1980:29). Goat herds in Gudyanga were increasing in size again after herds were cut back to provide food and income during the drought.

In the past it appears trade between the Save valley and the highland areas was also an important component of the local economy. Salt, dry fish, palm wine, tobacco, cotton and
bark fibre crafts were traded with the higher rainfall areas for food (Rennie, 1973:48; Roder, 1965:69-70). With the penetration of industrial commodities into the region and expropriation of the highlands, there was little trading of these items, with the exception of crafts made from bark fibre and palm leaves (e.g., bags, rugs and hats) which are still widely made. Today, most of the trade in Gudyanga takes place with neighbouring irrigation schemes and the capital, Harare.

The majority of household cash incomes in Gudyanga derived from craft production and wage remittances as figure 3.1 shows. Please note that the percentages in figure 3.1 indicate sources for all incomes regardless of specific amounts. In my survey I consciously avoided asking for details on the amounts of household income as this was a sensitive issue and not central to my study (see Appendix III). Nevertheless, the data still indicate the relative significance of various sources of income to livelihood security in Gudyanga. Virtually all income defined as "trade" was derived from the sale of woodland products, especially baobab tree fruits (mauyu), as well as the sale of goods purchased elsewhere. Several enterprising women regularly travelled to Tongogara refugee camp in the south east to buy crafts, as well as to South Africa to buy consumer goods, which were resold in Zimbabwe. Incomes from crop and livestock sales were negligible which was the result of
farmers having low and erratic surpluses as well as their weak integration into the marketing system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Percentage contribution to all cash incomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local salaries</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casual labour</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remittances</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crop sales</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>livestock sales</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craft production</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1984 and 1985 the Zimbabwean government sponsored a detailed household Income, Consumption and Expenditure Survey (Zimbabwe, 1988) providing a national perspective on household sources of income. According to the report, the average household in Zimbabwe’s Communal Areas derived 33.5% of its income from wages and salaries, 18.8% from agricultural sales (crops and stock), 4.3% from non-agricultural enterprise (including crafts, trade and shops) and 42.9% from remittances and gifts (Ibid: 4-5). While the figures for Gudyanga are not absolute accounts of amounts they nevertheless indicate a relatively different economic trend from the more general picture for all Communal Areas.

According to a World Bank report (Farugee, 1981:2), at Independence 50-60% of rural households were dependent in some form on migrant labour. In spite of residents citing
remittances as contributing only one quarter of local incomes, Gudyanga did appear to follow the general pattern of significant reliance on migrant labour. Sixty percent of all households had at least one migrant labourer with migrant labourers making up 17% of people cited as being part of local households. Most men over the age of twenty had experience as migrant labourers (68.3%) with 52.4% of these men away working at the time of the survey (1993). Just over 15% of migrant labourers were women. World recession and structural adjustment have generally reduced levels of formal employment in Zimbabwe making migrant labour more insecure.

GUDYANGA AS A MARGINAL AREA

In many respects then, Gudyanga was a fairly marginal area. As we will see in greater detail in the next chapter, access to local woodlands was a central component of the local economy. Virtually all households were dependent, although to varying degrees, on local woodlands and therefore woodland clearance was a major concern. In addition to shortages of tree products, woodland clearance has led to environmental degradation in Gudyanga. The removal of tree cover generally and widespread cropping in Zone 3 contributed to much of the (sheet) erosion in the area. However, soils in Gudyanga were naturally prone to erosion due to a number of factors inherent in the local ecology: soils were sandy and therefore poor in structure; the arid climate supported less ground cover which
might protect the soil; the sloping terrain and numerous hills and kopjes increased runoff speed. The lack of ground cover following the drought left the inherently fragile earth particularly vulnerable. Residents spoke of a similar problem in the past when a severe drought in 1947 was followed by heavy rains the following year; some feel that serious erosion in the area and problems of siltation in the Save date from this time. In addition, woodland regeneration has proven less successful on the heavy and often compacted clay soils of Zones 1 & 2 such that some areas developed into hard pans, some of which were subject to severe gulley erosion during the rainy season.

The national government has expressed alarm at the siltation of the Save river and has suggested the Save valley be a priority area in the search for sustainable resource management solutions. The Save Area Rehabilitation Action Committee (SARAC), a congress of government, non-government and international development agencies, was established to seek participatory and sustainable solutions to environmental degradation in the 32 Districts in the Save watershed, or catchment area. In 1992, plans were initiated by the Manicaland Development Authority and the United Nations Development Programme sponsored Africa-2000 (both members of SARAC) to initiate a small-holder irrigation scheme. To date, construction is still under way and the outcome of the scheme
is unclear, more on which will be discussed later in this chapter as well as in the conclusions to this thesis.

Notwithstanding these concerns, there was in fact very little "development" in the immediate study area. In the areas centred around the Gudyanga township (see Map 3) there were the following public institutions at the time of my research: one clinic, one primary school, one secondary school with only 42 students in 1992-1993, one church building with two under construction, five general stores, three "bottle stores" where beer was sold and consumed and one livestock dipping station. Wells were widespread and generally reliable; the average distance of households from the nearest well was 375 metres, according to a survey I conducted. There was no electricity, telephones or running water.

In addition to teachers and clinic staff, the only other government employees were an agricultural extension officer and a District councillor who did not live in the study area itself. While Village Development Committee (VIDCO) members were in theory representatives of local government they were not paid for their positions. Local police were based at Nyanyadzi and were not often seen in Gudyanga. With the planning of the proposed irrigation scheme there was an increased presence of state employees and government representatives; however, their presence, and to a degree their influence in day to day life, was ephemeral.
The penetration of state and capital into the Zimbabwean countryside has been more strongly felt in neighbouring areas. Some ten kilometres in either direction of Gudyanga, along the main road, were two irrigation schemes. To the north was Nyanyadzi, initiated in 1934 and to the South was Devuli, located at Birchenough Bridge and initiated in 1942. Many households in the Gudyanga area left for these schemes so that to this day there are strong ties between Gudyanga and these schemes, but especially Nyanyadzi. Some residents in Gudyanga had relatives with irrigated plots that in some instances were even jointly worked, although titles were vested only with residents of the schemes. In the early sixties, Roder conducted a wealth ranking of households in Nyanyadzi, Devuli (now Devure), and the area between the two schemes (which includes the study area). Based on house construction, possession of agricultural implements and livestock holdings, Roder found the average household wealth ranking at the irrigation schemes to be more than double that of households in the dryland farming area (1965:164-7). Thus, maintaining kin ties with residents of the irrigation schemes, and therefore resource sharing between irrigated and dryland areas, was an important element of the local economy in Gudyanga.

To sum up the position of Gudyanga in the regional picture, the study area can be described as marginal but not remote. It was distant from the centres of power -- the
National, Provincial and District capitals as well as the commercial farming areas in the Chipinge Highlands and the Middle Save. Nevertheless, these nodes of commercial and government activity were easily accessible by bus and exerted a measure of influence over political and economic activities in Gudyanga. The local economy maintained a diverse mixture of commodified and relatively uncommodified practices which together enabled residents to survive. The development of commodity markets altered but did not transform the basis of woodland use and agricultural production. However, access to cash has become a key ingredient in the successful adaptation to drought and hunger, as well as a primary determinant of rural economic differentiation (cf. Leys, 1986:261-2). The state has played an important role in economic stability in Gudyanga by providing wells, price controls on basic commodities, seeds and drought relief. After the most recent drought (1991-1992) many residents in Gudyanga suggested that they could not have survived without government distributed drought relief.

Residents of Gudyanga were understandably eager to receive development assistance which could improve livelihood security. In particular, the proposed irrigation scheme underway in Gudyanga was welcomed, although by no means unanimously, for its promise of two scarce resources in the area: water and cash income. However residents were at the same time concerned that development be "appropriate"; that
is, many felt changes in production should not reduce local control over the resources which have guaranteed survival. Given the history of government intervention there remains a widespread suspicion in Zimbabwe of any government attempt to regulate productive activities. Roder’s comments on local perceptions of irrigation schemes under colonialism can equally apply to Gudyanga in Independent Zimbabwe:

the extreme case of insecurity is a fear that the government is having them clear and prepare the land only so that it can be handed over to white settlers (Roder, 1965:175)."  

While no one suggested that white Zimbabweans would settle in the area, it was feared that the benefits of the irrigation scheme would accrue to government or other "outsiders", including those who might be resettled from other areas. It was precisely such suspicions which hampered the implementation of development activities in Gudyanga, including the proposed irrigation scheme, as we will see below.

**Putting Gudyanga on the Map**

If you look at a map of Chimanimani District you will not find Gudyanga as a place name. You will see the Gudyanga Primary School but no other reference to the dominant patrilineage which was said to control the area. For those who represent Gudyanga, the descendants of chief Muusha, this was a disturbing problem which illustrated the nature of relations between the community and government. Two incidents
in Gudyanga reveal the somewhat haphazard process of statecraft in both the colonial and post-colonial periods.

The first incident was related to me as a story about the naming of the livestock dipping tank and veterinary station in the area. In the early colonial period, colonial authorities arrived in the area to set up the dip station with the purpose of controlling livestock diseases and numbers, as well as enforcing a livestock head tax. When residents were asked who was in charge of the area the colonial authorities received little assistance -- it was said people ran in fear. One brave man, among others attending a beer drink, stepped forward to proclaim he was a man of importance to whom the authorities should address themselves and it was his name (Chimhete) which was given to the dip station. Oral accounts of the Chimhete family in Gudyanga do suggest the family was influential in the last century, but not in the immediate area of the diptank. Family names that were attached to public places created by the state were almost exclusively from lineages represented in the traditional political system yet no Chimhete has ever acted as a representative of any traditional title or office. There were other stories related to me in which dominant lineages, unsure of the intentions of colonial authorities, pushed forward a "dispensable" person (ie. not a full member of the dominant patrilineages) to do the work of colonial officials. Thus it was that a "book"
(bhuku, ie. tax register) was given to Masasi, mupwambo (son-in-law) to Gudyanga.

The second incident which speaks to the nature of relations between locality and the state occurred during my stay in Gudyanga. At that time, the Zimbabwean government passed the Amalgamation of Urban and Rural Councils Act (1993) whereby administratively separate white farmers and communal area dwellers were to be represented by the same division of local government, the District Council. Under the amalgamation, the number of administrative wards in Chimanimani District was reduced so that two previously distinct wards, Gudyanga and Changazi, were combined to create a single ward. People had no dispute with the new ward itself as the area was in the past a single ward (Gudyanga-Changazi) and the division was, at any rate, entirely artificial. Conflict arose, however, over the naming of the ward. People of Gudyanga had expected the ward to be named Gudyanga as the ward encompassed the largest portion of the Gudyanga dunhu, the traditional "ward". Mabvazuwa (Chimanimani) District Council planners, who were almost exclusively Africans, wanted to use the name of a river, Changazi, precisely as a way of not aggrandizing local lineages. Representatives of the Gudyanga lineage claimed that if the ward was not named after them they would prevent any development from taking place in the area by mobilizing people against the government.
This was not the first time local traditional leaders have threatened to oppose government sponsored activities in the area. The traditional leadership was initially opposed to the introduction of the proposed irrigation scheme in the area given the history, well-known to Gudyanga residents, of other schemes in the province whereby local lineage control of land was subordinated to state irrigation management (cf. Roder, 1965:173-5). Reference was also made to the possibility that the government might expropriate outright the land once they had invested in a costly irrigation scheme. There are residents in Gudyanga whose presence attests to this very possibility: those registered in the bhuku (tax register) of Mwandiambira were resettled in Gudyanga from the Chipinge area to the south in 1955, as part of the implementation of the Land Apportionment Act (see chapter two); more recently, people were resettled from immediately across the Save in 1989 when the government sold a large tract of Communal land to a private landholder.  

Needless to say then, there were reasonable grounds upon which traditional leaders could object to the introduction of an irrigation scheme which almost certainly would bring an increased degree of government control in the area. The traditional leadership was brought around to supporting the irrigation scheme however because the vast majority of residents were in favour of the immediate economic benefits the scheme promised. Elsewhere it has been noted that where
the judgements of traditional authorities contradict general community opinion, the very legitimacy of the leader can be called into question (Bourdillon, 1978:250; Bourdillon, 1979:90; Fry, 1976:33,42-4; Garbett, 1969:118; Lan, 1985:66; Spierenburg, 1995).

The two stories related above reveal some of the contradictions inherent in the creation of state administration during both the early colonial period and the post-Independence period. The ability of local institutions to mediate institutional changes necessitated by the political economy of colonial occupation as well as changes promoted by central government, both before and after Independence, has been mixed. However, the political terrain in Gudyanga belonged as much to local interests as it did to wider interests and this is revealed in the nature of traditional political institutions.

THE POLITICAL ARENA

Traditional is not put in quotation marks in this thesis because residents of Gudyanga referred to their leaders as such, and they valued that characteristic of their leaders. The suspicion attached to tradition by means of quotation marks seems to suggest that local perception is somehow illusory, the "real tradition," if it exists at all, lying hidden behind at least a century of obfuscation. As was suggested in the previous chapter, the knowledge of people's
lives in the region prior to the arrival of literate Europeans is almost entirely oral; that is, it resides in the memories and perceptions of predominantly rural Africans. What we do know about the past reveals no unitary or stable social matrix that can be held up to deny today's traditions the mantle of authenticity.

Thus, while it is clear that the traditional political system in Gudyanga took on its current form during the colonial period it was not a creation of colonial administrators. As was suggested in the previous chapter, the institutional environment in which resource management was negotiated in Gudyanga was a particular mix of local/historical precedents and government sponsored structures, creating a system which was neither strictly "traditional" nor simply a government creation. For instance, Village Development Committee (VIDCO) leaders were tied to the traditional leadership through kinship, but in no instance were traditional leaders also VIDCO members. The two political frameworks were able to operate in greater harmony and there were no major conflicts over land or resource allocation.

Similarly, the Gudyanga Irrigation Development Committee (GIDP), established in 1992 to represent local interests in the proposed irrigation scheme, recognized the role of traditional authorities in matters concerning the land. GIDP representatives were drawn from a broad base of influential
community members such as close relatives to traditional leaders, VIDCO personnel, teachers and church leaders. Traditional leaders were explicitly excluded from acting in the committee _ex officio_ as it was said they would hinder development by pursuing their personal and political agendas. Nevertheless, the symbolic importance of traditional authorities in land management was recognized by the GIDP's constitution which details clearly how traditional leaders were to be part and parcel of any land allocation and dispute settlement processes in the irrigation scheme.16

In general then, the system of traditional authority which had undergone significant transformations since the nineteenth century, was nevertheless respected by most residents even if not all leaders were themselves entirely respected. In both interviews and casual conversation people regarded the legitimate representatives of political leadership to be their traditional leaders, not the administrative institutions representing the Independent state of Zimbabwe. Following the right channel or protocol (_murandu_, lit. "due") was stated by residents to be an essential element of social and political life in Gudyanga. However, what was the "due" that local traditional authorities deserve was not itself always agreed upon.

Contrary to the tendency of more recently established chiefdoms to drop the highly honorific terms for chiefs (Beach, 1984:50), these terms seem to enjoy a renewed life in
Gudyanga. Traditional leaders were referred to by many as the madzimambo (great chiefs, even kings), and it was not unusual to greet a samusha as you would a chief or sadunhu -- ie. by clapping as a group, in unison. Although I recorded no cases of alternative claims to leadership in the area, say by autochthonous lineages, there were nevertheless a number of people, including descendants of autochthonous lineages, who suggested that traditional leaders were not due any particular respect or service. Even among those who held respect for the traditional political system, there were some residents who felt there were too many people seeking respect as traditional leaders; in effect, the multiplication of positions in the traditional political system was said to lessen the respect any one leader should deserve. One disapproving resident protested that if every samusha was going to be treated like a chief then clearly the title was worthless. The same was said of sons of Gudyanga who hold the title of samusha across the Save and were "acting like chiefs". A number of historical circumstances seem to have led to the masamusha assuming at least the air of greater authority than in the past, two of which seemed particularly significant in Gudyanga and are relevant to this thesis.
First, there has not been a sadunhu in Gudyanga since 1981 when the previous one died. During the interregnum the position was filled by an atete, a female lineage member ("aunt"), to the Gudyanga patrilineage. This acting sadunhu was referred to as samarinda (lit. "keeper of the graves") and was assisted by a senior muzukuru (descendent through the female line) to the Gudyanga patrilineage. People said they could not recall a time when the position of sadunhu was left vacant for such a length of time. Perhaps this institutional vacuum enabled the masamusha to enjoy greater freedom than they would have had under a sadunhu. This vacuum may also account for there being three rivals for the position of sadunhu Gudyanga, only one of which was eligible under customary rules of collateral succession (cf. Garbett, 1966:152; Rennie, 1973:74-5). The delay in installing a sadunhu was surely linked to the administrative tinkering of the colonial period whereby the processes of legitimation of leadership were taken away from the people and assumed by the government. When asked about the issue, some residents said there was little they could do since it was for the government and the traditional authorities to work out -- "who are we to say".

INSTITUTIONAL INTENSIFICATION

The second explanation for traditional leaders appearing to hold greater authority than they had in the last century
relates to what I call institutional intensification; that is, the structures of political representation of land and people have become more elaborate in this century -- please see chapter two (pp.40-8) for a fuller description of the model of political hierarchy among Shona-speaking peoples in the late nineteenth century. Prior to colonial rule the smallest administrative unit of the nyika ("chiefdom") was the dunhu ("ward"). Within the dunhu, households were free to move around and generally formed loose clusters (misha, sing. musha, guta in ChiNdau) centred around an influential household head (samusha). The musha had rights of first refusal to land its members had previously cultivated or resided on but did not control specified portions of land in perpetuity; its location shifted and control over land flowed only from use. Thus, while the term musha is translated as "village," the musha of the past was not as centralised or permanent as the term "village" can often suggest to us.

The limits of a nyika or a dunhu were not likely clear territorial boundaries but roughly agreed upon perimeters (cf. Scoones & Wilson, 1988:36). It is quite possible that the authority of traditional leaders centred not so much on their control over territorial polities but on their roles in dispute resolution (ie. at dare) and their association with influential ancestral spirits (mhondoro). Indeed, in the Musikavanhu chieftaincy to the south (see figure 2.1) political authority was largely vested in the religious
functions of the Musikavanhu cult center and was only fully secularized under colonialism (Rennie, 1978).

In the colonial period, the musha is transformed from a residential aggregation to a formal political and territorial entity. At the time of this study, the musha in Gudyanga functioned much like a scaled-down version of the dunhu itself. That is, they were bounded resource-holding units associated with and named after an influential lineage in the area which controlled the hereditary title of samusha. I refer to these administrative divisions of the dunhu as misha, and to their leaders as masamusha, mindful of the fact that these misha bore little resemblance to their distant predecessors. These so-called "villages" clearly arose in the colonial era and were associated with bhuku, the tax registers. In fact, leaders of these modern "villages" were often referred to in other places as sabhuku ("keeper of the book"), since the samusha was said to have adopted the new duties of tax collecting (Gelfand, 1971:8-9; Holleman, 1968:86). The term sabhuku is of African origin, and has its origins in the early colonial period whereby membership in a "village", and therefore access to land, was demonstrated by having one's name entered into the tax register of a sabhuku.

However, where the ethnography suggests the samusha was retitled as the sabhuku, in Gudyanga at least, the samusha was in all cases a separate person from the sabhuku, with the
samusha held to be the formal guardian of the land. The two leaders were related through kinship and performed complimentary tasks but were nevertheless distinct; both the sabhuku and samusha were approached for approval when a household needed to gain access to arable and residential land. That the samusha passed requests for land to the sabhuku, who then passed requests on to the sadunhu, seems to suggest that the sabhuku was somehow senior to the samusha in the political administration of land in Gudyanga. However, the relative authority of the samusha and sabhuku over land varied from leader to leader in Gudyanga. While the sabhuku was likely more influential in colonial times on account of his role in colonial administration, like the samusha he had no legally recognized powers since Independence. In fact, the sabhuku was in most cases a close relative or ally of dominant local lineages. As such, the role of the sabhuku generally complimented rather than conflicted with the traditional political system as a whole. The samusha was seen as the political representative of the land while it was the sabhuku who was said to hold the proof of a person's place in their respective musha. Thus, while the sabhuku did not control land outright, the position was nevertheless an influential one, partly due its previous role in the colonial administration.

There was no simple correspondence between the jurisdiction of the samusha and the sabhuku as one bhuku
(register of occupants) often encompassed more than one musha ("village"). In other words, the sabhuku in Gudyanga often maintained a tax register for more than one samusha. Oral testament suggests that larger misha were subdivided into smaller units, which I continue to refer to as misha since they were locally held to be autonomous units of the dunhu Gudyanga with their own hereditary leadership. The subdivision of misha took place both in the colonial period and continued into Independence with petitions for the recognition of new traditional authorities by District Council being made up to the time of this research. This process of territorial and administrative fission may reflect the pre-colonial dispute settlement process outlined in the previous chapter.

In sum, both the samusha and the sabhuku were influential figures with slightly different sources of authority over the same land and its inhabitants; the relative strength of either leader depended on circumstances, more than any powers inherent in their respective offices. While the misha of the early nineteen nineties clearly arose in the colonial era they do not appear to be simply creations of the colonial administration. The office of sabhuku was meant to replace that of the samusha whereas in Gudyanga the samusha has, if anything, become a more significant leader than in the past. In the past, the samusha was a leader of people but his authority was vested more in personal
influence than control over resources; now the *samusha* has become like a *sadunhu*, a leader of people through control over land.

**LINES OF CONFLICT AND ALLIANCE**

All in all then, the political environment in Gudyanga was hierarchically structured but the control of traditional leaders over the affairs of residents was actually quite nominal. Traditional leaders, like any older person active in community affairs, were accorded respect by virtue of their achievements and their history in the area. At the same time, traditional authorities were no longer providers and could not be called upon in times of need. The chief in particular was a distant authority who played very little active role in the affairs of Gudyanga. The more localized leaders who were in contact with people everyday, especially the *samusha* and *sabhuku*, were given the most respect and attention in Gudyanga during the time of this study (cf. Matowanyika, 1991:121-2). Traditional leaders, however, were no more than first among equals and those with little influence were treated with no more respect than another person of similar accomplishments.

No one was required to pay any form of tribute or work in the *sadunhu’s* or *sabhuku’s* fields. Residents were expected to brew beer (*mushosho*) at the time of requests for rain (September) and present a token portion of their harvest
at harvest celebrations (kutenda) in May. Traditional leaders, including the masamusha, did levy fees and fines at their meeting places (matare, sing. dare) although the amounts were quite small. For example, a traditional leader announced at his dare that a fine of ZIM$5 (approximately CAN$1) should be imposed on those people who had plowed during the day in which no work was to be done (chisi); most people present felt the fine would be unreasonable and that such rules should not interfere with farming, especially after the drought. To my knowledge, the matter was dropped and no fines were collected. In the past, the imposition of fines was apparently the prerogative of the sadunhu (see Holleman, 1951:363,370). The material gains of leadership in Gudyanga were apparently quite small although not necessarily insignificant. In other parts of the country, influential traditional leaders have been able to use their position to capitalize on development activities intended to benefit the entire community (Cousins, 1990). In Gudyanga, people actively resisted the authority of leaders who were seen to be undignified or arbitrary. One particular traditional leader, for instance, was accused privately of being greedy for power and money and was unable to use his position to any significant advantage because people refused to abide by his unpopular judgements. Residents would avoid his dare when they knew the meeting was being called simply to pursue some private agenda.
Arbitrary exercises of power by traditional leaders were also limited by the role of other senior (male) residents at dare. In order to assert his authority at his dare, the samusha depended on the support of his assistants, his mapurisi (lit. "police") and especially the makosi (roughly, "important person"). The makosi was not a member of the resident dominant patrilineage but someone who had been in the area a long time and who demonstrated good character as a leader. In the past, the makosi was said to be responsible for protecting resources, especially springs and permanent pools in rivers, but today this role has virtually disappeared. Perhaps the most important role retained by the makosi was his place in the dare of the acting sadunhu, where the makosi lead discussions on behalf of the acting sadunhu. Thus, the makosi was an important figure in the study area as he influenced to some extent the boundaries of formalised public discourse at the dare of the most influential traditional leader. Although spirit mediums (masvikiro) were not a significant part of the traditional political system in Gudyanga, other local institutions and precedents circumscribed the "judicial function" of traditional leaders.

In addition to the complexity of struggles within the local political system, political divisions existed in terms of affiliation to National political parties. The study area falls within the general pattern for Manicaland in that there
was a significant degree of support for Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole and his ZANU-Ndonga party. Support for Sithole was justified on the basis of three key points: 1) his role in the liberation struggle; 2) his promises of economic development to those regions that supporters say have been "neglected" by the ruling party (largely Ndau and Ndebele-speaking areas); 3) his general call for a more openly "free market" approach to the economy, with the ruling party adhering to socialist ideology.

Sithole was the first president of the Zimbabwean African National Union (ZANU), formed in 1962 and the forerunner to the current ruling party (ZANU(PF)), however by 1969 Sithole's leadership was called into question because of his refusal to support the armed struggle (Martin & Johnston,1981:147-9). In the 1980 Independence elections, Sithole failed to win a single seat (Ibid:331). In the 1995 parliamentary elections, Sithole’s ZANU-Ndonga won two seats in Chipinge District, the only two seats not taken by Mugabe’s ZANU(PF) (FBIS,1995). Thus, support for Sithole was largely regional with most of his following in Ndau-dominated Chipinge District, his home area, immediately south of Chimanimani District (Sithole,1993:4).

I was fortunate enough to be in the study area when District by-elections were held, as part of the implementation of the Amalgamation of Urban and Rural Councils Act (1993). Factions were mobilized along party
lines and in the days leading to the by-elections there was regular discussion about the relative merits of the various parties. In some cases party faithfuls were brought in from neighbouring Nyanyadzi to present the case of their parties. In the final tally for the Ward as a whole, which roughly corresponds to the dunhu Gudyanga, the ruling party, ZANU(PF), won 70% of valid votes with ZANU-Ndonga trailing at 28% and the Zimbabwe Unity Movement (ZUM) at 2%.

During the 1993 council by-elections in Gudyanga there was a movement by followers of ZANU-Ndonga and some local supporters of ZANU(PF) to have a particular candidate nominated for the ZANU(PF) leadership in the Ward. The basis of this support which cross-cut party affiliation resided in the two groups' similar interests. The candidate favoured by ZANU-Ndonga supporters in Gudyanga was resident near the Gudyanga township and an active community member whereas his rival, the incumbent Councillor, was resident closer to Changazi township (see Map 3) and was not popular in the study area. However, the incumbent ZANU(PF) Councillor was nominated to lead his party and was later re-elected as Councillor. In spite of the outcome, the negotiations leading up to the by-elections showed ties of locality were in this case cutting across political affiliation.

While the impression of residents was that the majority of non-Christian traditionalists voted for ZANU(PF), there was no easy correspondence between party and religious
affiliation. The only congregation I was able to know in any
detail was the United Methodist Church (UMC), the members of
which voted for all three parties with many of the more
active members voting for ZANU-Ndonga and ZUM. Members of
the UMC described themselves as hard working and keen on
development and complained that the policies of the ruling
party limited the expression of their entrepreneurial spirit.
Such an entrepreneurial spirit has long been a central pillar
in the Methodist church with its early emphasis on making
good Christians through the adoption of "modern" farming
methods -- hence, the "gospel of the plow" promoted by the
Methodist E.D. Alvord -- as well as other outward signs of
"modernity" (see Rennie,1973:548). While I cannot comment on
the numbers of agricultural implements owned by UMC members,
many did state explicitly that they would favour a more
"free-market" economy on the assumption that it was political
favouritism that prevented the benefits of development from
trickling down into the region.

Lines of conflict and support developing around
religious affiliations were also significant in the area but
in general cross-cut all other forms of group formation. The
main Christian denominations in the area were Methodist
(UMC), Baptist (UBC), Roman Catholic, Zionist and Apostolic,
the latter two being Independent prophetic movements rooted
in charismatic leadership (see Daneel,1971:285-6). A rough
estimate of the Christian population, determined by survey,
would put the Christian faith at some 50-60% of the population with no particular denomination being visibly predominant. Any estimation of the Christian population was very hard to make however as households were commonly made up of diverse faiths, including, if less commonly, mixtures of both Christian and non-Christian adults. Some of the traditional people felt a sense of helplessness over the fact that their children were becoming Christians by virtue of their attending the primary school which was state-run but taught the Christian faith; peer pressure also encouraged adoption of Christianity by children from traditional homes since often many of their friends at school were Christians. However, there was in the end no easy way to separate Christians from non-Christians as people seemed able to combine African and European faiths in novel and non-contradictory ways.

Gatherings organized by Christian denominations were commonplace and provided an important context for people with similar interests, including common political visions, to share ideas and reinforce ties with one another. Friendships and alliances were made between families within the same denomination, however people mixed freely regardless of affiliation and Christians did not openly disparage non-Christians. In all, adherence to any particular faith was more a source of positive reinforcement in social
relations, an avenue along which people organized, and not generally a source of conflict in itself.

SOCIAL UNDERCURRENTS

The lines along which alliances formed and tensions erupted were, not surprisingly, manifold in Gudyanga. Traditional authority, government office, kinship, lineage, family, locality, religious or political affiliation and workplace were all potentially a part of any one person's identity. It was difficult to characterize any single source of identity as dominant; people held multiple sources of identity which tied them to a diverse and at times conflicting network of friends and colleagues. There was a social atmosphere in Gudyanga in which people were divided on many bases and yet were not openly judgemental or intolerant; people were not disparaging of anyone on the basis of their beliefs, background or even (within limits) behaviour. Overbearing drunks or prostitutes, for example, were not ridiculed or shamed, although they were often actively ignored by many people. Many Christian abstainers claimed "true" Christians did not drink but most Christian men did drink. There was apparently no attempt to resolve such contradictions at the pulpit in Gudyanga. Daneel notes that the stringent application of church laws has long been a source of resentment and dissent among church members in Zimbabwe (1971:35).
On the whole, there was very little intervention in the personal lives of others, even where it appeared to me to be warranted (as in the case of an alcoholic who risked losing his job). Equally, people expected others, even kin, not to intervene in their personal lives. Each household was expected to subsist from its own fields although seeking assistance from close kin was possible. However, one resident suggested that a person could not go to their relatives in times of hunger for they would also be in need. Colson's remarks on Tonga practices in the Zambezi valley seem to express this contradictory relationship nicely. She notes that demands for sharing, expressed in kinship terms, were not uncommon but "people do not share their possessions gladly;" to refuse however could lead to misfortune (1960:53-5). In Gudyanga, people did not refuse outright but merely made up excuses and tried to avoid making any commitments.

Mistrust of others' intentions was prevalent. The interconnectedness of sharing among friends, expectations of personal independence and suspicion of other people who were not close friends or relatives was perhaps best expressed for men by how (male) residents shared their beer (doro). Bottle stores were primarily part of the men's world although older women did make occasional visits. Again, many Christians abstained but the matter was more one of personal decision. Those who chose not to drink were probably the majority of converts overall but most abstainers were evidently women.
In the township, only close friends would share beer; others could not enjoy what they had not been called on to share. When it became apparent to residents that I too enjoyed my beer I was told not to drink with one person or another by so many people that if I was to follow all of the advice I was given I was going to be rather alone at the beer hall. Finally it was suggested by one man that I take my beer home to drink privately. Being somewhat more social than that I took it upon myself to judge who to share beer with. Needless to say, the bottle stores were an important context for "participant observation".

Beer was traditionally consumed by a group sharing the same pot (*hari*), although with larger gatherings men and women had their own pots which were shared separately. Seven-day beer, *doro proper*, was still brewed in Gudyanga although primarily for sale and for spiritual offerings. The most widely consumed beer was a commercially produced concoction, *Chibuku*, which resembled traditional brews. *Chibuku* was consumed in bulk (i.e. by the litre) and shared communally much like traditional beer. Bulk beer was never consumed by one individual alone. European style bottled beers were also consumed by residents with good wages and single bottles were never shared. For the less recreational drinker, two unpleasant but potent and inexpensive brews were purchased from enterprising local women: *chikokiana*, a quick one-day brew of malt flour, maize meal, sugar and yeast; and
ni-ripe, a liquor distilled in other areas, including neighbouring townships. Traditionally, the server of communally shared beer, often a junior male selected by the one responsible for brewing the beer, was to "taste" the beer first to assure others that it had not been poisoned. The server would then pass beer in a hollowed-out gourd (mukombe) to other drinkers on the basis of seniority. Reports of poisoning (ie. uroyi, or "sorcery") were extremely rare at traditional beer-drinks. However, as we shall see, life in the beer halls was far more dangerous.

Although the term uroyi is a single linguistic category, referring broadly to any anti-social action which takes places secretly or mysteriously, the agent being a muroyi, a distinction is made between the "witch" and the "sorcerer" (Crawford,1967:107). The former is almost always a women possessed by a spirit inherited from a maternal ancestor and who operates at night beyond her own volition. The "sorcerer" is a man who uses medicinal substances (muti) during the day to harm others. While both were considered a threat to society, the latter is less serious in so far as his medicines can be counteracted and he can be persuaded to cease or reverse his poisoning (Gelfand,1967:45-6). During my stay in Gudyanga I encountered no discussions of (female) witches although the topic of sorcery did come up often, as Gelfand has noted for the "day witch" (muroyi wemasikati) in other parts of the country (Ibid.).
The threat of being poisoned was part and parcel of social discourse in Gudyanga, but particularly so in the beer halls where poison (ie. uroyi) could be skilfully slipped into your pail of beer. To be effective, it was said, most poisons must be injected. However, given that "witchcraft is the worst accusation that can be made against anyone (Gelfand, 1967:81)", allegations were whispered in the beer halls as mere innuendo and slander. Never was I told that so-and-so was known to practice uroyi so don't share beer with him. Rather, it was only suggested that I shouldn't drink with that person because "one can never be too sure -- if you know what I mean." As such, allegations of uroyi were rarely expressed as open accusations requiring evidence but continually flowed with the undercurrent of social tension between individuals. In this sense, the innuendo of uroyi continued to perform its political functions of bringing disfavour to others and promoting one's own standing in the community (Daneel, 1971:160; Bourdillon, 1976:219). Thus, "the allegation of witchcraft [was] primarily a device used to involve the whole community emotionally in what would otherwise be merely a private quarrel (Bucher, 1980:112)."

The Anthropological explanation for witchcraft allegations -- ie. that they are a means of making social tensions more manifest -- was well understood by residents in Gudyanga, as was illustrated by an accusation made against two youths by an influential elder man. A crocodile (goko)
was found butchered along the Save river and its spleen, a well known poison used in uroyi, was missing. The youths were alleged by the man to have taken the spleen although there was no indication the two had any knowledge of uroyi. The two young men, and several of their acquaintances, told me that the goko (ie. the parts of the crocodile used for uroyi) was taken by certain known individuals, older men, who did have such knowledge. The accusor failed to rally support for the case privately and never publically accused the youths or brought the case to a dare (public meeting). Many residents recognized the covert accusations as a campaign of slander against the youths by an elder man with a personal vendetta against them. Although an influential leader, the man who initiated the private accusation was seen by many to be "jealous", a term often used to describe persons whose actions were selfish and disruptive.

It was doubtful that there was in Gudyanga any unified community opinion which could have given such personally motivated accusations of uroyi the force of some community sanction. As Gudyanga was integrated into wider social networks, especially through labour migration and increased transportation, the community became more heterogeneous and probably less able to control the expression of uroyi wemasikati (ie. sorcery; lit. "witch of the daytime"). The anti-social potential of uroyi is treated in the ethnography of Shona-speaking peoples as the conceptual opposite of the
protecting role played by ancestral spirits, but especially mhondoro, the ancestors of dominant lineages (see for eg. Bourdillon, 1979 & Gelfand, 1967); perhaps the lack of any central public role for local mhondoro in the organization of community life in Gudyanga, may have provided more space for the expression of uroyi (ie. sorcery) as an idiom for social conflict. Sorcery was seen by residents in Gudyanga to be more common and more openly practiced, however this was not apparently a cause for undue alarm, only caution. The following case reveals the ambiguous place of uroyi in Gudyanga. One night, two men quarrelled at the beer hall and were making verbal threats to use uroyi against one another. I was told that one of the men was known to have a reputation for possessing very potent powers of uroyi and that the other man was being foolish to taunt him. Although both men were known to possess knowledge about uroyi, and openly threatened to use that knowledge, neither man was apparently labelled as muroyi and shunned.

Traditionally, one had nothing to fear from a muroyi (ie. a sorcerer) as long as he had no grudge against you (Crawford, 1967:76). However, given that material success was widely regarded to result from the use of special medicines (Ibid:159), new sources of wealth and economic differentiation which were not mediated by community institutions have likely led to an increased expression of uroyi. In sum, uroyi was both a cause and expression of
social tensions among men in Gudyanga; uroyi, either in its expression through men as sorcery or its expression through women as witches, did not appear to be an idiom for conflict among women or between men and women however my research into the general topic of uroyi was extremely preliminary. Fry's general comments on sorcery serve nicely to summarize the significance of uroyi in the undercurrents which shaped social discourse in Gudyanga:

the harm that it causes is the price that society has to pay for jealousy, for if it were not for jealousy (shanje), the laws of the ancestors would be obeyed, rights would be enjoyed and obligations met to the mutual happiness of all (Fry, 1976:25).

THE MULTIPLE DIMENSIONS OF "COMMUNITY" IN GUDYANGA

Like any community, Gudyanga was rife with overlapping loyalties and personal and political tensions. Like any community, Gudyanga did not comprise any single "community of interest". What then was the "community" which I have been calling Gudyanga, recalling that there is no such place located on any government maps? A community is at some level a fictitious entity which only requires clear definition when being mobilised to achieve some desired end. The multiple dimensions of the term "community" reflect the variety of purposes or intentions that underpin any invocation of notions of community. 31

The first invocation of "community" was suggested in the anthropological literature. According to Holleman, the dunhu
"traditional ward") was the focus for group identity and the area in which most of a person's life was spent (1968:87-90; see also Colson, 1960:57). Recall however that the administrative function of the dunhu and musha ("village", pl. misha) was likely very weak prior to colonial "indirect rule" -- please see figure 3.2. It was colonial administrators who introduced the idea of the village as an administrative unit and appointed headmen (Colson, 1960:31). In Gudyanga, both the dunhu and musha were referred to as residential areas in which people expressed a sense of being "at home" (kumusha). People expressed a sense of belonging to both musha and dunhu although by themselves these territorial divisions of the "Chiefdom" (ie. Muusha Communal Land) rarely formed a social unit which came together to achieve some end. While most people tended to spend their days within the boundaries of the dunhu Gudyanga, misha were in no practical sense social or economic units. Collective activities such as rain and harvest ceremonies or meetings at a dare mobilised people within a particular musha however such events filled only a few days in a year and did not exclude residents from other misha. Similarly, while membership in a particular bhuku (ie. tax register) was invoked as proof of "community membership", the members of a bhuku engaged in virtually no activities as a collectivity and were in many cases divided into different misha. Thus, the territorial divisions of the traditional political system
were not effective "communities" in the way a voting district in a Canadian city is not, even if the former was probably characterised by a far greater sense of solidarity than the latter would ordinarily be. For residents who were tied to the traditional political system, the association of the area with the name Gudyanga was something they would like to see expressed more fully, as was seen in the struggle over the naming of the administrative ward. Thus, the corporateness of traditional political divisions in Gudyanga centred more exclusively on the roles dominant lineages played in controlling hereditary titles and access to land, as well as in exercising certain judicial functions through their dare.

A second focal point for community formation was the administrative system established after Independence; that is, the "villages" represented through the Village Development Committees (Vidcos), the Wards comprising several Vidcos and the Districts which formed the legal organ of local government. The District of Chimanimani was too large an area (approx. 2750 sq. km.) to be called a community as such and at any rate Mabvazuwa (Chimanimani) District Council was not trusted by residents of the study area to represent local interests. Administrative Wards existed solely as an intermediate layer between Vidcos and Council however Wadcos, which were to coordinate Ward-based activities, were essentially non-functioning (see Alexander, 1993:174).
That administrative Ward and Village boundaries did not correspond to traditional political boundaries (see Map 4), something probably common in Zimbabwe (Holleman, 1968:91), tended to divide any sense of belonging that might have been engendered by participating in activities initiated by either traditional leaders or local government. The somewhat arbitrary units of state administration represented by Vidcos were not frequently referred to by residents in day-to-day life except in people's relations with the clinic and school, as well as other government agencies; drought relief, for instance, was channelled through Vidco leaders. Thus, as with the traditional territorial divisions, the role of Vidcos centered on their specific political functions, and were not the focal point for some deeper conception of social identity. Although government agencies, including those planning the proposed irrigation scheme, referred strictly to the administrative units of local government, Vidcos were rarely if ever evoked to express any sense of "community" in the proposed irrigation scheme. The Block Committees of the general Irrigation Committee (GIDP) were based on membership in misha which contradicts the government planning process that was itself based on Vidco boundaries. In sum, the use of the term "village" to denote the area associated with either a samusha (or sabhuku) or a Vidco is misleading in that neither referred in any significant sense to a discrete social body.
The most important invocation of "community" was centred on locality and it was this sense which seemed to be the most practical and resonant, even if also the most vaguely defined. Localities were often centred on concentrations of public buildings such as shops, markets, schools, clinics and the like. Those living more distantly from such centres described their place of residence in different terms, but often in terms of some more specific locality. There were people in the more upland portions of the area (Zone 4 on Map 5) that said they were not going to apply for land in the proposed irrigation scheme. These residents said they wanted to bring "development" to their area. In general, it was the locality sense of "community" that was invoked by people when situating themselves in a larger spatial context, although many people did not express a commitment to any single locality.

The boundaries of these locality-based "communities" were the most vague of all however the larger centres had a strong gravitational pull, attracting people for socializing and conducting business. The area where public buildings were concentrated in Gudyanga was not large enough to term a "township" or "business centre", and people only occasionally referred to this area as a single public domain. People said they were going to mashops (lit. "the shops"), or the clinic, for instance. Still, the concentration of infrastructure and services strongly influenced settlement and daily routines.
Proximity to the shops, clinic, main road, and the more reliable wells found in that area (ie Zone 2 on Map 5), was a central consideration in choosing a residential site for many residents. In this thesis I use the term Gudyanga to refer to the area centred on the "township" unless the term is qualified in some other way, such as in dunhu Gudyanga. While it is the former sense that is used in this thesis, as that sense incorporates the largest portion of the study area for this research, the name Gudyanga was rarely applied to this restricted area by residents themselves.

There were signs of an emerging common interest among those who lived around the Gudyanga "township" and especially among those who depended on it -- ie. teachers, clinic staff and merchants. There was a sense among some residents that a critical mass of people and activity was needed to attract development assistance, especially from the District Council. The history of the secondary school in the area illustrates well the common interest of Gudyanga residents (ie. those living in close proximity to the "township". The school was built in 1987 and was located in a thinly populated area roughly midway between Gudyanga and another (smaller) centre of demographic concentration that I shall refer to as Changazi (see Map 3). The site was presumably chosen to accommodate the needs of both "townships" (ie. Gudyanga and Changazi) although it was convenient for neither. In 1993 there were 29 pupils in Forms 1 through 4, and no one had
passed by that date. Even people who lived near the school did not send their children there "to die" (ie. to fail). Residents of Gudyanga felt strongly the school should be relocated to the main road, that is, the Gudyanga "township", where people were most numerous and access would be easier. Thus, the concentration of people in Gudyanga tended to favour a stronger expression of local interest; a local interest that clearly cross-cut the division of people into separate political domains, both traditional and statist.

In general then, there was in Gudyanga no clearly defined "community" which operated as a social or economic entity -- there is no adequate translation of the term "community" in Shona dialects nor was the term used in English by residents of Gudyanga. Residential mobility was far more restricted than it was before colonial expropriation and "Indirect Rule", however people still travelled and socialized freely both within the larger area (ie. the Ward) as well as in neighbouring areas. Many people regularly visited relatives in other Districts and went to nearby towns, especially Nyanyadzi and Birchenough Bridge to conduct business. While the daily activities of those in the study area were generally concentrated around Gudyanga "township", social networks were expansive and multi-centric. Wider senses of belonging, such as to the nyika Muusha (or Muwushu Communal Land), region, or nation were very diffuse and rarely mobilised in day-to-day life. The Ndau ethnic
identity was perhaps the only significant larger identity expressed by people but conflict with other "ethnic groups" was non-existent except at the level of national politics. People were in constant contact with other Shona-speaking peoples and many non-local people were brought into the area through employment and marriage.

**Concluding Remarks**

The purpose of this chapter has been to present a more detailed picture of local life in the study area, focussing on those features which are relevant to the remainder of this thesis. Within this local social context we can better situate a discussion of woodland use (chapter five) and management institutions (chapter six). In the regional context, Gudyanga was very marginal to the centres of political and economic power, although the area was tied closely to neighbouring irrigation schemes that were themselves more deeply embedded in a wider political economy. From an institutional perspective there appeared to be no dominant social structures in Gudyanga which regulated the daily cycles of social and economic life. Traditional authorities gathered people at certain key times but not often and not always with total "community" participation. Traditional authorities were accorded respect but there was very little evidence of them exercising much power over other residents. Government was relatively remote and apparently
uninvolved in the area, although with the development of irrigation there will presumably be a stronger government presence.

Differences in material wealth were almost exclusively traced to households' access to wages (cf. Leys, 1986) and differences were manifest in the style of homes, the possession of agricultural implements and other consumer goods, as well as the volume and diversity of foods eaten by a household. Class differentiation was however fairly low even with marked differences in access to cash. The vast majority of residents had access to cash but then only small sums; those with high incomes and those with no income and inadequate land to feed themselves made up a very small, but not necessarily insignificant, proportion of residents in the study area. People of the lowest socio-economic standing were primarily destitute single mothers, persons with mental disabilities and Mozambican refugees who were hired as housekeepers and herders.

Household land holdings varied however there was no propertied elite as such. Wealthy households and traditional leaders did not necessarily control more land or labour than any other resident; many households employed housekeepers year-round who were also put to work in the fields but there was no standing reserve of labour to be hired on a seasonal basis. The most potentially productive land, the alluvial soils in Zone 1, were divided up on a one acre (0.4 hectares)
per household basis by colonial authorities (cf. Ranger, 1985: 74-5). Some of the largest and most productive fields in the 1992-1993 season were cultivated by hand by households with only modest access to incomes. Hence, within the context of existing farming system in Gudyanga the key limiting factor (apart from rain!) in agricultural productivity seemed to be labour, not capital. Regulations preventing the concentration and privatization of irrigated land in the proposed irrigation scheme might also militate against control of valuable resources by a narrow group of interests. While loyalties were divided along a number of lines, there was a fairly widespread interest in seeing the irrigation scheme succeed to the benefit of all.

This interest was understandable in an area where crop failure was a constant threat and opportunities for cash income very limited. Under these conditions, access to woodland resources continued to be a fundamental component of local livelihoods. Rights of common access to woodland resources reduced the likelihood of monopolization by some smaller segment of the local population. How important woodlands were to residents in Gudyanga, and how they made use of trees and tree products, is the subject of the next chapter.
Endnotes

1. Figures were recorded at Birchenough Bridge which is twelve kilometres to the south at an elevation of 500 metres.

2. People's commitment to millet may have been most pronounced at the time of this study (1993) due to the drought of 1991-1992.

3. In part, the low levels of plowing can be linked to very low livestock numbers as a result of the drought. However, oral evidence suggested that even with higher average livestock holdings most land was cultivated by hand.

4. Approximately Can$0.40 at the time.

5. Common varieties grown were: chidoriana (short white), mutode (tall red), chindindindi (short reddish-brown), and mhondo (short pale).

6. This was part of the government's drought recovery efforts which included the promotion of small-seed grains that are more drought tolerant. Government distribution of seed and food during droughts should in fact be considered part of the local economy (ie. a source of "income").

7. In Gudyanga, wild plants with the mucilaginous properties of okra are often referred to as derere, whereas in most Shona-speaking areas it is the cultivated forms that are referred to as derere and the wild ones gusha.
8. Few people had fields in more than one ecological zone. Those who did, often found the labour demands of more than one field too great; most fields in Zone 1 were about one-half of a hectare (usually one acre) in size while those in Zone 3 were generally more than one hectare (some were up to six hectares).

9. This decline in gathering is likely the result of greater reliance on agriculture (and drought relief?). The expansion of land under cultivation in this century cleared large areas of woodland habitat for plants and animals that were part of the local diet. Most gathered vegetables today, and certainly those listed for Gudyanga, are found in open and disturbed places, but especially fields (ie. as "weeds"). As such, their role in the local diet is closely tied to agriculture; however, during dry periods these vegetables were mostly found in moist areas associated with drainage and partial woodland cover.

10. Roder (1965:70), who is familiar with Knight-Bruce’s reports, states that Nguni raids left few cattle in the area however he cites no sources.

11. The five store owners in Gudyanga were not included in my survey although not for any particular reason. Two were visibly more wealthy than the average person and their inclusion in the survey would affect survey results.
12. J. Made, personal communication. Made is a senior administrator at the Agricultural Development Authority (ADA), a parastatal which plays a major role in organizing national development activities.

13. This was exactly the way Europeans saw things; see English (1914) on the possibility of expropriating the river frontage along the Save, between the Nyanyadzi and Changazi rivers. It was even suggested to me that one traditional leader refused to speak to me claiming I was like Rhodes, surveying resources in preparation for extinguishing local control.

14. The land is owned by the Manicaland Development Association and is the site of the Devure Training Centre which, at the time of this study, was principally engaged in training young women in garment making skills.

15. My own presence in Gudyanga was an indication that (relatively more powerful) outsiders will accompany the irrigation project. At the time of writing, two Americans are staying in the area and working with the Manicaland Development Association. Prior to my fieldwork, there had at no time been a European living in the immediate study area.

16. Although the donor (UNDP-UNEP) has specified the scheme be left in the hands of local organization it is still unclear what the status of the GIDP and traditional authorities will be once the scheme is fully operating.
17. The sadunhu Gudyanga was installed in 1995.

18. The Chindau term guta is perhaps better translated in other Shona dialects as mana ("a large family unit of a village community"). Thus, it is said in other parts of the country, wakaita zvimana zvimana (lit. "they did things by the family cluster"), which is how people in Gudyanga described residential patterns of the past; numerous household clusters lived in fairly close proximity to one another.

19. As such, it may be more accurate to define the limits of a traditional leader's area in the nineteenth century with reference to the households that claim an association to that leader. This association could be verified, for instance, by seeing what dare ("court") people take their cases to or by following where requests for rain are taken to.

20. I have seen no evidence of any other researcher referring to the presence of both positions at the same time. It is uncertain if the Gudyanga case is unique or if this feature of local political organization represents a level of complexity overlooked by ethnographers. I suspect the latter to be true if only because most researchers simply use blanket terms like "traditional leaders" or "chiefs".

21. Or the samarinda, the acting sadunhu, as was the case during my stay (see p.113).
22. The sadunhu is also respected although the expectant sadunhu was not treated any differently than any other elder as he had not yet been installed.

23. The only "tributary labour" I witnessed was at the primary school where children were expected to work in the school's field and were even enlisted by teachers to do chores such as washing dishes.

24. This local term taken from English reflects perhaps the colonial framing of "traditional authority" more than the role of such assistants prior to this century. In anthropological accounts such assistants are more often referred to as "councillors" (makota).

25. I was not able to get verification of such a title anywhere else. It is quite possible that the term derives from the Zulu nkosi ("senior counsellor") and dates to the time of the Gaza state installing its Nguni headmen directly in villages (see chapter two).

26. Since Independence, water has been controlled by borehole committees.

27. This figure is based on adult respondents and would probably be higher if all children were asked separately. Rennie (1973:439-443) has indicated how church expansion in the south east has followed closely the establishment of mission schools. Primary schools in the area were
established by missions and continue to teach "Bible Studies."

28. The greater time spent discussing sorcery may be explained by: 1) gender (women may have talked more about female witches however I spent much more social time with men and was, by definition, always in mixed company when women spoke); 2) the topic of hereditary witchcraft may have been a more sensitive issue and was therefore avoided more often, or kept much more privately.

29. It is interesting to note that those most likely to be the subject of envy, migrants with good wages who returned on weekends or other occasions, often drank bottled beer exclusively. At once a sign of status, drinking bottled beer also prevented one from being poisoned by others.

30. So-called witchcraft, the malevolent powers inherited by women, were not as widely spoken about in Gudyanga, although judging from the Zimbabwean press, witchcraft was quite prevalent in other parts of the country.

31. A proper study of local perceptions of community would require detailed linguistic evidence from formal and informal sources. This discussion is based only on casual observation and survey responses.

32. There is a Changazi Business Centre across the Changazi River in Mutema Communal Land, Chipinge District. The place
I call Changazi is at times referred to as Changazi as well but was quite separate from the larger Business Centre on the road to Chipinge.
Chapter Four

Woodland Use and Management Practices in Gudyanga

In this chapter I present an overview of tree use practices in Gudyanga. The first objective of this chapter is to detail the very important role trees play in the daily lives of people who reside in Gudyanga. As will be seen, much can be learned about everyday life through an examination of tree use. The second objective of this chapter is to discuss the nature of management practices and institutions that regulated access to and use of trees in Gudyanga. Here I will be largely descriptive; discussion of how local management processes can be situated within a political economy of control over resources is reserved for chapter five.

Before detailing the many uses to which trees and tree products were put it will be useful to review some of the basic terms in this chapter which would otherwise be taken for granted. Both western scientific as well as local Shona/Ndau systems of classification are to some degree arbitrary in designating what is and what is not a "tree". For our
purposes, a tree can be defined as a perennial woody plant with a single bole (trunk) which supports a crown. All such plants are referred to in Shona-speaking Zimbabwe as *miti* (sing. *muti*). Some species more closely resembled what we might call a shrub but were often referred to as *miti* in Gudyanga -- eg. *chitataunga*, *muchecheni*, *muminu* and *mupangara*; such species are included in the discussion here. In short, I have tried to follow everyday local usage in defining what was a tree, even though when pressed to be definitive there was some disagreement over whether some intermediate species were actually *miti*. No generic equivalent to the English "plant" exists in Shona dialects so species that were not referred to as *miti* were designated as *bundu* ("bush", ie. smaller woody plants that have no significant value to people), *sora* ("weed"), *muriwo* ("vegetable", ie. edible plant), or other more specific terms.

General vegetation types in Zimbabwe can be grouped, for convenience, into three broad classes (adapted from Gondo & Kwesha, 1993):

1) forest, including plantations, with trees over 10 metres in height;
2) woodlands, with trees between 6 and 10 metres in height and with canopy closure between 5% and 70%;
3) bushland, savanna and grassland in which vegetation on average is either less than 6 metres in height or has a canopy cover of less than 5%.
Following the above classification, forests occupy 0.5% of all land in Zimbabwe, woodlands 30.5%, and the remaining natural vegetation types 38.5% of all lands; agricultural lands account for 29.2% of Zimbabwe's land area (Gondo & Kwesha, 1993). Much of woodland cover in Zimbabwe generally falls into two broad types classified by the dominant species: 1) Miombo or Brachystegia, with *Brachystegia speciformis* and *Julbernardia globifora* the co-dominant species, which is found in mid-altitude regions where rainfall is more regular; 2) Mopane, dominated by *Collophosphermum mopane*, which is found in the hotter, drier regions of low altitudes -- especially the larger river valleys such as the Zambezi, Save and Limpopo.

Tree cover in Gudyanga could not be classified as forest in any significantly large areas; certain riverine areas near the Save River were dominated by the very tall mucha tree but these areas of riverine forest were only a small proportion of the study area. Similarly, in no significantly large areas did brush or grasses dominate; areas that were cleared of tree cover were either fields or built-up areas (Zone 2 on Map 5). In fact, given the broad definition of woodland above (ie. 5-70% tree cover), the term might be applied to cleared areas near homesteads and between fields, abandoned fields (*makura*), and even fields themselves. These areas often held many trees but were not referred to as wooded areas (*sango*, *gasha*, or *dondo*) by residents of Gudyanga. However, in practice it is very difficult to separate the management of woodlands *per se*
from the use of trees on other lands being managed for agricultural production (including silviculture), occupation or grazing. For this reason I examined the use of all indigenous trees in the study area.

The centrality of trees in the lives of those who live in Gudyanga was perhaps not entirely evident at first glance and needs to be emphasised here. From the morning fires to daily work in the fields or at home, and in the houses in which people retire at the end of the day, local wood played a vital role. Trees were not only important for the products they provide (eg. wood, materials and food) but they were integral to the organization of social, ritual and agricultural activities. In the discussion of wood use that follows there are some terms used that need to be distinguished and are given in figure 4.1 below.

**figure 4.1 Tree management practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coppice</td>
<td>cutting of main stem close to ground, up to a height of 50cm from the ground level. Can also apply to any tree cut in this way that sends out new shoots from the stump.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pollard</td>
<td>cutting of main stem or leader at any height from the ground above 50cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lop</td>
<td>cutting of branches, whole or part; prune</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Role of Trees in Community Life

**TREE PRODUCTS**

The harvesting of wood was an activity which nearly all household members were involved in, although to differing
degrees. Cutting of live trees, say for poles or materials for craft production, was largely something men did while the gathering of dead wood for fuel was largely a woman’s responsibility. However, it was only men who gathered dry wood with a scotchcart for sale locally (cf. McGregor, 1991:205). Men generally gathered wood for very specific reasons, such as to build a particular structure, and then largely on a seasonal basis; that is, it was especially in the dry season (June to September), when there was more free time, that greater attention was directed at building, repair work and craft-work. When men required wood for these tasks they generally sought wood from a specific species and even had specific locations, if not individual trees, in mind when they went out to cut trees.

Women, on the other hand, were engaged on a far more regular basis in the gathering of (dry) wood. It was not uncommon for at least one woman in a household to gather wood on a daily basis. McGregor notes for Shurugwi (Masvingo Province) that the gathering of fuelwood was commonly done to provide fuel for that day’s needs only (Ibid:201-2) and in Gudyanga the gathering of wood by women was similarly opportunistic. Wood was often collected by women as they conducted other daily chores. For example, on their way to or from their fields, women would pass through wooded areas to gather fuelwood. Stockpiles of wood (mapakwa, sing. bakwa) were occasionally made over the winter for use in the rainy
season when women were preoccupied with their work in the field. However, the size of a bakwa varied greatly between households, depending on available labour, and most households did not build a store on an annual basis.

On the whole, there was no entrenched or strict division of labour in woodland use, as has been observed elsewhere in Zimbabwe (eg. Chidari, et.al.,1992:93; Matowanyika,1991:262). Available labour most strongly determined how and by whom woodland products were gathered, although women clearly gathered the vast majority of fuel wood. Below is a brief discussion of some of the uses to which tree products were put in Gudyanga, after which I will return to the role of whole trees, living trees, in organizing social and economic life in Gudyanga. The following outline will serve as an introduction to many of the main tree species found in Gudyanga (Appendix I lists the local and Latin names for trees mentioned in this thesis).

The greatest single use of woody biomass in Gudyanga was for fuel. While almost any type of dry (ie. dead) wood was used for fuel, with the dominant species being the most important sources, the specific needs of the user often dictated which species were used. For example, when high and even temperatures were needed (eg. for cooking sadza, roasting meat or burning bricks) or when the fire was to be kept burning for some time, woods such as musharu, mukukuti, muhweti, mutsingidzi or mucha were used. These woods burn
with an intense heat for long periods and produce few ashes. Coals from these woods were also used for ironing, but especially musharu. On the other hand, when brewing beer, heat was only required to make the beer boil and then the fire should subside. In this case, quick burning species such as mugwatikwati, or mupanda were preferred. Furthermore, the size of wood was also important to consider; when cooking in large drums, burning bricks or heating visitors who had to sleep outside, people burned larger pieces of wood, such as trunks, than they would have in their everyday use of fuelwood. As far as I was able to determine there was no charcoal production in Gudyanga, likely because there was adequate fuelwood.

The use of trees in construction accounted for the second largest volume of wood consumed and certainly the largest volume of live wood. A wide variety of species were used for very specific purposes although dominant species were most frequently cut. A number of households had brick homes however most had at least one structure such as a kitchen which was made from mud and poles. Poles (mapango) accounted for the greatest use of wood in construction. Particularly large amounts were cut when a new homestead was established or when fences were constructed. When cutting poles, the species of tree chosen was clearly crucial to the quality of the poles. Mijuru ("white ants", ie. termites) were found in abundance throughout the study area and hence termite
resistant species (e.g. musharu, mutsingidzi, mubvumira and muhweti) were almost exclusively used for structures of any permanence although other species (e.g. guvhunga, mukukuti and mushanje) were also used. Mukukuti saplings and young branches provided hasha or laths, strong straight poles spaced between larger roofing poles. Important sources of rope used in building included musharu, gunjaru and muuyu. Muunga branches were used to fence gardens and fields; branches from other trees felled in clearing the field were also used to provide a barrier to livestock although such branches were more often used as fuelwood.

When asked what trees were most important in their lives, the majority of Gudyanga residents mentioned fruit trees (56.8% of all trees cited were fruit trees). Indigenous fruits clearly played a vital role in the local diet and especially in times of crisis such as during the past drought. While exotic fruits (e.g. mangoes, papayas, guavas, bananas, citrus, granadillas) were available in stores, there has been virtually no success in establishing productive exotic fruit trees in the area. The most widely eaten fruits were those from the muuyu, munyii, mushumha and mupfura trees. Other fruits which were eaten, but less widely, were those from the following trees: dyaukuru, mukute, muonde, mutsamvu, munduduhwe, mukwakwa, mutohwe, munderera, munhengeni, mubhururu and munhedederwa. While not common, beer was made
from local fruits, especially those of *mupfura*, and from the sap of palms (*murara*) along the Save.

*Icha*, the fruit from the *mucha* tree, was said by many to be an important famine food. Eaten fresh, the *icha* is very bitter and acidic however when roasted underground it becomes a sweet and nutritious food. As was said to me, "*Icha dzaiponesa vanhu kare kana baye*" (*Icha* have been sustaining people from long back, as has grass -- the seeds of certain species being used as a substitute for grain). Also important in periods of drought was the drought-resistant *muuyu*, the seeds of its fruit being stamped and boiled to make porridge (*bota*). In the last few years the fruit of the baobab (*mauyu*) have been gathered in large numbers and transported to Harare for sale, providing some needed income to a few households. Others complained that they were no longer able to freely gather the fruit from better tasting trees as they were now collected regularly and hoarded by individual households. *Nyii*, the fruit of the *munyii*, were sold in other nearby areas but were not at the time of this research gathered in Gudyanga for sale elsewhere.

There was also a bounty of medicines (*mushonga*, pl. *mishonga*) obtained from trees. Alternate terms for medicine were *muti* ("tree") and *mudzi* ("root"). The specific details of which tree species were used for what ailments is largely unknown to scholars, or at least unpublished. While very many people in Gudyanga had knowledge of more generic
medicinal trees, the bulk of traditional knowledge of medicines was guarded by a few specialist practitioners. In Gudyanga, the resident gatherer of medicines was not himself a healer (n’anga) but sold medicinal substances to local healers and traditional midwives. The study of local medicinal plants was a subject which could stand by itself however I choose not to explore this topic given the difficulty of conducting this research, the knowledge being somewhat "secret" (sacred). In addition, I did not see any practical end use for the results of such research which would at the same time be ethical.

Tree leaves, bark and seeds were an important component of the diet of local livestock. Both goats and cattle ate a very complex array of trees according to a seasonal schedule. The most important browse species were muunga, guvhunga, musharu, mucha and munyii. Musharu (or mopane) is well known in Southern Africa as a valuable, if under-utilised, cattle fodder which is very high in protein (Campbell, et al., 1991:105). Branches of these trees were generally only lopped for animals being kept in a pen for some reason (eg. a new animal that might have run away); otherwise, livestock were not fed directly by people. Acacia species (esp. muunga and guvhunga) were a favoured food for goats, the seed pods (manjokota) being particularly relished by both goats and cattle, and were an important food source in the winter when other sources of browse were more scarce.
Trees also provided materials for a wide range of items in daily life and for handicrafts which were sold both locally and in other areas. *Maturi* (mortars) were mostly made from mukamba, as were stools, although other trees were used (eg. guvhunga). Handles (*mupinyi*) for axes and hoes were carved from mukukuti and at times musharu, mutsingidzi and muhweti. *Migoti* (stirring sticks for cooking sadza) were generally carved from mutezwa and mukukuti. Softer woods like mugwatikwati and mupepe were used to carve bowls, spoons and decorative handicrafts. Fibre for making strings to be used in crafts can be taken from many trees, as was reportedly done in the past, but was mostly taken from the *muuyu* at the time of this study. Hats, bags and rugs made from this string were very common in the area, as were items made from murara (palm) leaves. Good murara was quite scarce in the immediate area and was therefore mostly purchased from areas to the south (Chipinge District). Dye (*mukato*) used in craftwork was generally obtained from tree bark with *munyii* being the favoured source.

Craft production has been an important source of cash income for people in the area for some time. The people living in the lowland areas stretching along the Save were known for their skill in weaving cloth, hats, and other items from bark fibre, and to a lesser degree, palm fronds. Many of these items now make their way to Harare to be sold at Mbare market. Carving of functional goods, as opposed to decorative
objects, was more common in past however the lively market for
decorative crafts shapes local production. At the time of my
research (1993), traditional "necessities" such as *nhekwe*
(snuff containers) and *mbira* (thumb pianos) were not made in
the area but only to the south, such as in Changazi but
especially Chipinge, areas that were considered more
"traditional Ndau" by residents of Gudyanga.

WHOLE LIVING TREES

As suggested by the IDRC-funded "Value of Trees" project
in Zimbabwe, the market value of local tree resources (ie. the
cost of such goods if were they obtained on the market) is in
itself considerable (see Campbell, Vermeulen & Lynam,1991;
Campbell,et.al.,1994). However, trees were not only valued as
a source of products and materials. Trees were valued at
times for the innate qualities associated with them as well as
for the benefits whole, living trees provided for people.
Trees cast their cooling and moderating influence through
their shade and many trees were conserved for this reason.
Trees provided shade for people, the ancestors and crops. In
providing this shade, trees became integral to the dynamics of
social, ritual and agricultural activities in Gudyanga. In
addition, trees were managed as bearers of innate spiritual
and aesthetic qualities.

The *mucha* and *muuyu* in particular were respected for
their association with water, both trees being very drought
tolerant. The mucha was said to be a sign of ground water and judging from the flow rates of wells in the area this association seems correct, although these trees were largely found near larger rivers. The muuyu was found on drier and better drained locations but was itself a source of water in the past (its roots being dug up and stamped). Longevity was another characteristic of many important tree species in the region which earned respect for trees. In Chindau the term musharuka was used as a respectful term of address for an elder person and connoted a sense of strength and vitality in weathering a long life. The term derives from the Ndau musharu (mupane in other Shona dialects), a tree which was otherwise not accorded any special spiritual significance.

Trees were clearly associated with the spirit realm and large trees, especially the mucha, were said to be the dwelling place of ancestral spirits (mudzimu, pl. midzimu). Spirits were attracted to trees for the same reason living people were; they prefer the coolness of the shade. It was for this reason that trees in grave sites (magambiro) were not to be cut, but especially near the graves of leading lineages. The area referred to as Chinyamunyu (see Map 4) was the main site for the graves of the dominant lineages (ie. Gudyanga and his more influential "sons"). Cutting of any trees was forbidden in Chinyamunyu and as such this was the area's only functioning rambotemwa (a sacred area in which cutting was prohibited -- see Matowanyika, 1991).
Trees were important therefore in the spatial organization of social life in Gudyanga. Boundaries of political domains were at times marked by large trees, generally mucha and muuyu. It is interesting to note that the Shona term for "boundary" (mugano, pl. migano) falls within the same noun class (or gender) as "tree" (muti, pl. miti).

Meetings in Gudyanga almost always took place under trees, but especially micha, a huge tree with a broad and very dense canopy found year-round. Meetings were also held under miuyu, which provided less shade because of its brief period in foliation, but possessed roots that often extended above ground and made fairly comfortable benches. As community meetings were held under large trees these trees were central places around which community life was organized. Every dare, which was the main forum for public political discourse, was associated with a particular mucha or muuyu. In addition, there was only one church building by the time of my study and most congregations met under a mucha, just as their non-Christian neighbours did and their ancestors would have done for generations before them. Rain ceremonies at the start of the agricultural season and harvest celebrations (kutenda, "to thank") took place under specific trees each year, again generally miuyu and micha.
STANDING WOODLANDS

Thus far we have spoken of the role of tree products and single living trees; taken as a source of values, individual trees were clearly vital to local social and economic life in Gudyanga. However, trees exist not only in relation to human needs but in relation to other trees, plants, animals and microorganisms. In other words, trees exist in the context of a diverse biotic system, an ecosystem. As such, woodlands are an important habitat for other life forms, many of which were important to the survival of people in the area. Numerous insects were eaten but only the mopane worm ( mushorwa, or madora, Gonimbrasia belina) and termites (ishwa) were widely harvested. Honey (uchi) was harvested from locally constructed beehives (mikoko), wild hives as well as from a species of a stingless bee (dendende) which makes its hive in the ground. Mushrooms, vegetables and plant medicines were also found in local woodlands. Grasses for thatching and crafts were found in the wooded hills, as was the better pasture (mafuro). Finally, woodlands were home to a multitude of birds, reptiles and mammals, although large game is now very scarce. As a habitat for other plant and animal species then, woodlands as a whole were an important source of value for people in Gudyanga. Equally important, woodlands were an important source of rich soils that lay beneath their tree cover.
The relationship between arable land and wooded land was that of two sides of a length of cloth. Forest and field have been continuously converted into one another through alternating processes of clearing and fallow. In general, agriculture disrupts ecological processes in a climax ecology, through a reduction in structural and functional diversity and the removal of stored energy and nutrients (Gliessman, 1990). However, these disturbances can be minimized where agricultural practices seek to preserve characteristics of indigenous plant and animal communities.¹⁰ Such practices include, for example, minimal tillage (eg. hand hoeing and ridge planting), incorporating organic matter in the soil (eg. turning under weeds, crop residues and leaf litter), increasing biotic diversity (eg. intercropping, using open-pollinated locally-adapted crop varieties, working with microenvironments, and retaining trees in fields) and by allowing succession to re-occur (ie. "bush fallow"¹¹); in addition, ash from fields cleared through slash and burn techniques returns valuable minerals and micro-nutrients to the soil in a form which is available to crops (see Dommene, 1988; Lal, 1987). Such practices were common in Zimbabwe at the onset of colonial rule and continued much later in some places (see for example Bell & Hotchkiss, 1991; Nyamapfene, 1989; Scudder, 1962; Wilson, 1986).

To a large extent, traditional agricultural practices which incorporate trees (ie. agroforestry) were disrupted by
the colonial partitioning of land and undermined by land use policies and extension practices in Zimbabwe. For example, during the colonial period, state policy held that trees were not to be maintained in fields in spite of the fact that trees were an essential part of traditional agroforestry practices (Campbell, Clarke & Gumbo, 1991). Wilson (1989) has indicated that fields were not de-stumped as this required huge amounts of labour which would only be wasted if the field was later to be abandoned (i.e. left to fallow). Woodlands recovered more rapidly if heavily coppiced as opposed to being cleared completely of trees and Wilson suggests this was a major reason for opposing colonial de-stumping programs; that is, under colonial de-stumping programs "abandoned field areas did not revert to useful woodland as re-establishment of woodland on properly de-stumped sandveld was notoriously bad (Ibid:373 -- my emphasis)." Thus, people throughout Zimbabwe resisted clearing trees out of fields, especially where valuable or sacred trees were concerned (Ibid:381; Campbell, Clarke & Gumbo, 1991:102).

These observations apply well to Gudyanga. Where fields in Gudyanga were de-stumped and abandoned in the nineteen fifties and sixties, thick stands of pioneering Acacia species had developed which provided very few useful wood products. On the whole however, Gudyanga was not the object of much colonial intervention in production and de-stumping was not extensive. More recently, some people renewed de-stumping in
lowland fields (Zone 1) in anticipation of receiving ploughing assistance (ie. by tractor) from the District Council. This assistance was initiated in response to the devastating drought of 1991-1992 which left few households with any livestock. In fields where the original mopane woodland had been only partially disturbed, or cleared, original dominant species were returning although not likely to their previous stature. It was said by residents that in the past there were very few Acacia species in the area and that they were not found in association with musharu (mopane), suggesting that climax mopane woodland was not heavily disturbed as it is in the present.

TREES IN FIELDS

Trees were protected and managed within fields in Gudyanga, for a number of reasons, including for the agronomic benefits trees provide. Trees which do not produce a wide and dense shade (muunga, guvhunga, muuyu, and mushumha for instance) were not generally seen as deleterious to crops and their shade was said to protect crops from periods of intense heat and dryness. If the lower branches of trees kept in fields were disruptive they were lopped. Further, it was understood that large trees attract rain and moist air, or at least slow down winds that might otherwise have carried moisture away (cf. Matose,1990:174; Matowanyika,1993:222). Large trees may also bring water and nutrients from deep
underground during the day, releasing them during the night when the tree is transpiring less actively (Yoon, 1993). Trees that interfered with the light and moisture requirements of crops were cleared or left on the margins of fields.

In addition to providing shade to crops -- and to people resting while working in the fields -- trees can enhance the nutritional qualities of soil. Decaying leaf litter provides organic matter which improves both soil nutrition and structure (Campbell, et al., 1995). Although goats and termites in Gudyanga consumed very large amounts of leaf litter, goats do in turn provide manure while termites bring mineral rich sub-soils to the surface as well as aerate the soil and improve water infiltration. While in other parts of the country people did gather leaf litter from communal woodlands to spread on fields (see Grundy, et al., 1991:22; McGregor, 1991:281-284), this was not done in Gudyanga. Residents argued that the practice would not repay their labour as termites would consume the litter. In addition, there was a more general hesitation to fertilize fields, using any form of amendment, whether leaf litter, manure, soils from termitaria, or chemical fertilisers. As stated in chapter three, the very hot and dry conditions of the area do not allow soluble nutrients in fertility amendments to be dispersed evenly through the soil thereby "burning" crop roots that come in contact with nutrient rich fertilizers. It was said however that when a muuyu had fallen and was rotting it
was spread on fields to improve yields. In addition, weeds and bush regrowth in fields were burned regularly, providing some amendments in the form of ash.

Perhaps the most important reason trees were kept in fields was for their value as sources of food, primarily fruit. Thus, fruit trees add to the diversity and output of production in fields. With some trees, especially mupfura, the kernel (shomu) of the fruit can be eaten as is or ground into a nutritious and very tasty nut butter (dovi). No trees were planted in fields in Gudyanga, however in other parts of Zimbabwe fruit trees were often planted in fields (Campbell et al., 1993:62). In Nyanyadzi, a nearby irrigation scheme, many plotholders planted mango trees in their one hectare irrigated plots. Government irrigation management banned the practice stating that one must grow either crops or trees, but not both. Some residents of the scheme said this was justified because trees reduce yields in both the plot-holder’s fields and the neighbour’s; nevertheless, one can still find mature mango trees in some plots and many on the margins of irrigated areas, indicating the value attached to fruit.13

Campbell (1987) has indicated that the extent of preservation of fruit trees in fields is shown by the correspondence between the number of fruit trees found in fields and the number found in equivalent areas of uncleared forest. While Campbell’s study was not replicated by myself
in Gudyanga, I was able to conduct a survey of trees in fields, the results of which are summarized in figure 4.2. The area sampled for Zone 1 was comprised of 22 hectares of contiguous fields while the area representing Zone 3 was made up of three separate areas located in different portions of Zone 3. An attempt was made to select areas which together would be representative of fields in Zone 3. Trees were classified as being in a field if there was cropping on three sides of the tree; there were very many fruit trees on the margins of fields which were not included in the figure 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zone 1 (22ha)</th>
<th>Zone 3 (7ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total # trees</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit trees as %</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees/ha</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fruit trees were clearly being preserved in fields in Gudyanga. As can be seen in figure 4.2, the number of trees per hectare found on the sandy soils of Zone 3 was far greater than on the clay soils of Zone 1. Similar differences by soil type have been observed elsewhere and Campbell (1991) suggests this discrepancy may be due to the greater abundance of fruit trees in the original woodlands found on dystrophic soils (here the sands); this conclusion assumes that one of the primary reasons for preserving trees is to eat their fruit and
the data from Gudyanga would support this assumption. However, the discrepancy by soil type does not appear to reflect the original composition of woodlands. Nowhere have I seen other researchers specify what they define as a fruit tree. Here I have treated three trees, mucha, mubvee and mutsikiri as fruit trees although their fruit is not eaten raw, and in the case of the first two, the fruit was eaten primarily in times of famine. The fruit of the mutsikiri contains an oily milk which was boiled out and used to cook mutikiti (pumpkin leaves). In a recent report on research done in a nearby area with similar woodlands, Campbell et.al. (1994) did not report mubvee or mutsikiri as fruit trees; not treating these two trees, and mucha, as fruit trees would leave fruit trees as 11.4% of all trees in Zone 1 fields. Perhaps if such trees were not treated as fruit trees, the proportion of fruit trees assumed to exist in woodlands on eutrophic soils (here the alluvial clays of Zone 1) would be lower in comparison to woodlands on the sandy soils of Zone 3.

Nevertheless, figure 4.2 does reveal a much higher density of trees in fields in Zone 3, on the sandy soils, than found in Zone 1. Campbell (1991) has also suggested this difference may result from eutrophic soils (here the clays) being more intensively cultivated and hence subject to more clearance. The lowland fields of Zone 1 were subject to greater colonial intervention and continue to be the focus of virtually all ploughing in the area. Further, Wilson
(1989:376) argues that the positive effects of leaf litter on soil nutrition were more noticeable on sandy soils and hence trees on these soils were subject to less cutting; on heavier clay soils, water, and not nutrients, was the limiting factor in agricultural production.

Figure 4.3 below lists the four main species for each zone. The majority of trees left in Zone 1 were not locally important fruit trees as such but were either under protection for their association with the ancestors (ie. mupanda and mutsikiri) or were very large but not too disruptive to cropping (ie. guvhunga). Both mupanda and mubvee are said to have a positive effect on soil fertility, primarily through their leaf litter (see McGregor, 1991:285; Wilson, 1987:2; Wilson, 1989:377), however this was not offered as an explanation by residents of Gudyanga for retaining these trees in their fields. In Zone 3 fields, locally valued fruit trees were maintained although with the muuyu in particular, multiple benefits were derived (see Appendix II) and as such their preservation was presumably not related solely to their fruit; further, the muuyu was not very disruptive to cropping as its leaves appear before the rains, and removing a mature muuyu would have been a truly enormous effort. 15 The presence of musharu and mukukuti in Zone 3 fields, both trees being dominant in local woodlands and prized for their wood, suggests the fields in Zone 3 were not fully cleared and the original woodlands has been able to reassert itself to some
degree. On the whole, it would seem then that there were two key principles governing the active preservation of trees in fields by residents of Gudyanga: 1) a certain proportion of valuable species were maintained for the benefits (material and non-material) they provided; 2) trees that were very difficult to remove but did not have a significant negative impact on yields were left alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone 1</th>
<th>Zone 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guvhunga</td>
<td>Muuyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupanda</td>
<td>Musharu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsikiri</td>
<td>Mukukuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukukuti</td>
<td>Munyii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubvee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up this discussion on the role of trees in community life, it was seen that trees are an important source of products and value16, and as an ecosystem are central to the local economy in Gudyanga. While numerous benefits were derived from woodland clearance, the preservation of particular trees and woodlands as a whole was an equally important aspect of woodlands management. As well shall see more fully in the next chapter, local institutions play a critical role in balancing the need for household agricultural lands with the need for community woodlands. To some degree, current agroforestry practices illustrate that the two needs can be combined within fields by capitalizing on the multiple
values provided by trees in the form of additional (tree) products and agronomic benefits for both crops and livestock. In addition, nutrients are transferred from woodlands to fields in the form of leaf litter, soils from termitaria, and dung from cattle browsed in woodlands (Campbell et al., 1993:31-2; Bradley & Dewees, 1993:82-88).

Overview of Management Issues

The above discussion of trees in fields revealed that trees were conserved when their value while standing outweighed the value realized from felling such trees. Where greater value was derived from felling, such as in clearing a field, there were no absolute prohibitions on clearing even protected trees. Although it was more common to prune favoured or protected species which might interfere with cropping they were removed at times. One local traditional leader suggested it was not necessarily prohibited to cut down any fruit trees in clearing a field, only that some must be kept for all to enjoy. This is an important point which speaks volumes about the use and management of trees in Gudyanga.

TREE TENURE

Trees, even those in fields, were held in common by the entire community. Trees were for all residents to enjoy and were managed with the common interest in mind. In other
words, woodlands were held as a commons in Gudyanga. Only
trees that had been planted by individual households could be
claimed as private possessions. However, there were very few
trees successfully planted in the area, as will be discussed
later in this chapter. There were no observed instances of
households annexing woodlands (as standing woodlands) next to
fields or homesites (cf. Matose,1990:177). Thus, the private
or individual management of trees was a minor occurrence in
Gudyanga.

As a commonly held resource, woodlands were not, in
theory, subject to the exclusive possession by any one segment
of the community. However, there was a somewhat contradictory
movement in the other direction which was based in the rights
of households as members of the community. Every household
exercised full control over all improvements they made on the
land and its resources (Colson,1960:39,85; Gelfand,1971:13;
Holleman,1968:62; Holleman,1969:7). While this right to hold
and dispose of improvements did not in theory refer to the
land itself, in practice the right did ultimately apply to
land. Once cleared and worked no one could effectively take
away land from a household. Shifting cultivation is no longer
practised and hence fields were generally passed on to elder
married sons. In the past the chief was said to hold the
power to withdraw usufruct rights even if this right was
rarely exercised. Since Independence, the Zimbabwean
government is the ultimate holder of all land in the Communal
Areas and can withdraw usufruct rights but has not ordinarily exercised this right for practical and political considerations. Thus, land was in effect held in permanent "private" possession.

However, land in Gudyanga was not held as private property in that it could only be controlled by a household through their use of the land. In other words, the "perpetual" right to land referred to usufruct in that it was only held as long as the land was being used for cultivation or residence and was difficult to permanently transfer. Once a homesite was abandoned or a field reverted to bush the land returned to the common pool. The previous user had a preferential right to make use of such land (cf. Holleman, 1969b:12-3) but only if such use was realistic and imminent. Thus, to prevent land reverting to the commons it was not uncommon for households who experienced a downsize in their demographic cycle, or who experienced outmigration, to keep a field cleared with no immediate intention of planting in it. A more common strategy was for households to lend out their land to other households which could make more productive use of the land. In such cases, the "rentee" generally gave a small portion of their harvest, or was in some other way indebted, to the household that controlled the land; renting outright, by the paying of cash for the use of land, was not observed although may have been kept secret. Thus, by a number of (unofficial) means arable land was kept
under the control of a household holding land but not able to effectively use it.

This discussion of arable and residential land is very relevant to woodland management in that trees were not generally owned outright but their tenure was tied to the land on which they were found. Thus, the use of specific trees on homesites and fields was loosely regarded as being the prerogative of the occupant of the land (i.e. the household which held control over the land by virtue of their using that land and/or keeping that land cleared). At the same time, the underlying communal nature of land holding in Gudyanga was expressed by the right of all residents to pick fruit from trees in fields; during the agricultural season one was expected to seek permission from the household using the field, if only to make one's intentions clear (one might otherwise be accused of damaging or stealing crops). After crops were harvested and the dry season set in, fields were opened up. Cattle browsed on crop residues (mashanga) and people were free to walk through fields and gather tree fruits, although cutting and gathering wood was considered inappropriate.

In contrast, the privately held lands in Zimbabwe were generally vast tracts of under-utilized land from which non-owners were excluded by legally authorized force. It was a bit of an enigma to residents of Gudyanga, and a sore spot for some, that the lands immediately across the Save river (i.e.
the Devure Training Centre -- see Map 4) were converted to private property and yet not fully utilized." This was seen as a needless waste of resources which could only be justified if the Training Centre provided valuable skills to youths from the surrounding areas.

The above can serve as an introduction to tree tenure in Gudyanga. A fuller discussion of the formal regulation of access to tree resources, and land more broadly, is pursued in the next chapter. Stated briefly here, access to trees in unimproved areas such as woodlands and abandoned (not simply fallow) fields was open to all community members; trees on improved lands such as fields and homesites were under the care of the occupying household and were subject to greater restriction although fruits were available for all to consume personally. By far, the greatest proportion of trees was found on community land, not individually occupied land. Thus, trees were a valuable community resource and their management was structured by a complex of community dynamics. Ambiguities and conflicts in the institutional framework of community management will be discussed in next chapter. Here I would like to look more closely at the regulation of the use of local woodland resources.

Other researchers have pointed to a variety of controls which regulate the use of indigenous woodlands in Zimbabwe (see Nhira & Fortmann, 1992; Gumbo, 1992; Matowanyika, 1991). Nhira & Fortmann (1992:9-10) group these controls into four
types: 1) formal rules established by new (although possibly "traditionalist") institutions; 2) sacred; 3) informal "civil-contract" (eg. restraints on excess); and 4) pragmatic (eg. preservation of fruit trees). Each type of control will be discussed in turn, with the latter two being grouped together. Discussing these controls will provide an opportunity to examine the main dynamics which guide overall woodland use in Gudyanga as well as what institutions were responsible both in theory and practice for the management of local trees.

NEW INSTITUTIONS REGULATING WOODLAND USE

Formal regulations were those drafted by newly founded local organizations or by government agencies. For example, under the Communal Lands Forest Products Act (1987) trees were to be felled only for "own use" and scheduled hardwoods (eg. mukamba, mubvamaropa) which have a high commercial value were not to be cut without a licence from District Council (McGregor, 1991:43-4). In addition, the Natural Resources Act (1941), together with the Forest Act (1948), prohibited the cutting of vegetation along the banks of any watercourse. Few regulations originated from independent community institutions such as the Gudyanga Irrigation Development Project committee (GIDP) which was formed to oversee the introduction of a proposed irrigation scheme in the area. The GIDP was the only new institution with a role in wider resource management in Gudyanga however the GIDP was established solely to manage the
development of the proposed irrigation project; by the time of
this study the GIDP had not claimed any jurisdiction over
woodlands resources. The two rules about tree use that were
most commonly cited by residents of Gudyanga were that entire
trees, except for those in fields, were not to be felled, only
their branches were to be cut, and green wood (nyoro) was not
to be cut for fuelwood. These regulations were articulated in
the Natural Resources Act and may have had their origins
there. However, residents did not link those regulations with
state policy but rather said the rules were pragmatic in that
they prevented the wasteful use of trees. As such they may be
counted as semi-formal pragmatic regulations just as much as
they are formal rules initiated by new institutions.

Numerous institutions were responsible for ensuring state
regulations (ie. natural resource laws) were followed. At the
community level, Village Development Committee (VIDCO)
leaders, the local ZANU(PF) representative and the local
agricultural extension worker were expected to represent
government interests and were therefore at some level expected
to uphold the law. Among those who were tied to the
administration, it was only the above leaders who had any
daily contact with people in Gudyanga and arguably it was only
they who had any measurable influence over the extent to which
people observed conservation legislation. However, as
residents of Gudyanga, these community leaders were in my
observation no different from the other residents in their use
of wood. One VIDCO chair deplored the waste of wood to burn bricks, claiming not to use wood to burn bricks, even though I conducted the interview some fifteen feet from a neatly stacked pile of bricks in his yard." Further, it was difficult for local leaders to stop people from violating state regulations when those leaders have no legal authority to enforce regulations."

Government employees who had a more formal, but less immediate, role in resource management included agricultural extension workers from Nyanyadzi, District Council members (especially members of the Conservation Committee) and representatives of the Natural Resource Board (NRB). District Council could uphold model land use by-laws applying to the District while the authority to enforce national environmental legislation (ie. to arrest and prosecute) rested solely with the NRB. The NRB is an independent body created in 1941 to implement the Natural Resources Act and answers only to the President. NRB representatives, like District Council Conservation Committee members, were not frequently in the area and were very unlikely to hear of any but the grossest violations of the law. In fact, from my investigations, there were no widespread or flagrant violations of conservationist legislation. Thus, it could be said that government, at all levels, was not significantly involved with the day-to-day management of trees in Gudyanga. As of the time of study there were no government-initiated or funded woodlots in
Gudyanga, nor any other land use plans which impacted directly on woodlands use. Equally, there were no other new, non-governmental organizations which played a significant role in local woodlands management.

**SACRED REGULATION OF WOODLAND USE**

While day-to-day tree use was not greatly affected by new institutions, the traditional political system was seen by residents of Gudyanga to be important in woodlands management. Here I shall treat any regulation on tree use that is associated with respect for the ancestors, and in particular the ancestors of dominant lineages, as a sacred regulation. Such regulations on tree use were upheld by, or at least associated with, traditional leaders. Sacred regulations were frequently cited by residents of Gudyanga as restricting the area where trees were cut and what types of trees were used. Any tree in a sacred place, on grave sites and especially on the grave sites of the ruling lineages (*magambiro*), was not to be cut. The only significant area in which any cutting was prohibited was in *Chinyamunyu* (see Map 4), where the graves of the dominant lineages were found. There were no other protected areas (*rambotemwa*) such as sacred groves, which are fairly common throughout Zimbabwe (see Bourdillon, 1978:244; Gata, 1991; Matowanyika, 1991:193-5; McGregor, 1991:291). There were apparently no supernatural sanctions and a person could cut trees in a protected area without punishment if the person
did not know the area was sacred. However, people had been fined by the sadunhu and samusha for violating such sacred regulations.

Figure 4.4 lists the reasons cited for trees that were not supposed to be used for any particular reason, in response to a survey administered in Gudyanga. As can be seen, no one made mention of any trees protected by law and almost all respondents cited sacred regulations as restricting tree use. Some of the trees said to be protected for their connections with ancestors were also fruit trees and therefore subject to the general restriction on cutting fruit trees. The larger fruit trees, muuyu, mushumha, and mucha, were very central to the ancestors and were not allowed to be cut for this reason. It was under these trees that offerings to ancestors were made (kudira). As one resident explained, munopira mudirwa yevakuru ("it is the place where we offer libations for the great ones").

Figure 4.4 Trees with restricted uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reason cited</th>
<th>number of spp cited</th>
<th>number of citations</th>
<th>% of all spp. cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sacred</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor fuel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fruit tree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none restricted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In other parts of the country, numerous sacred regulations dictate how to gather tree products, especially fruits (see Gata, 1991; Gumbo, 1992:2; Matowanyika, 1991:220) however such regulations were not very significant in Gudyanga. Any means of felling fruit from a tree was permissible as long as it did not destroy the tree. There were specific rules about cutting trees which were associated with the ancestors (eg. mucha, muuyu and mushumha) and those used in burials. Certain trees (eg. chigaramariya, mupangara, mutarara and nyamakuwa) produced a profusion of small leaves and were used to sweep grave sites; other trees that were easy to cut and produced fast growing straight branches (eg. mugwatikwati) were used to measure the size of the corpse as well as the grave. These trees were not to be cut although only the prohibition on using nyamakuwa was strictly observed. Both mugwatikwati and mutezwa, for instance, were widely used in crafts although their use was in theory prohibited.

The conflict between religious interdiction and economic necessity was a possible source of tension between household and community which was generally resolved in favour of the household. For example, there was an allegedly traditional rule that miuyu (baobabs) were not to be barked around an entire tree (even in stages). However the bark was very widely used for crafts and the trees with the best bark were more heavily barked. To enforce a prohibition on ring barking would mean interfering with an important source of income. As
one resident commented bluntly, "who is to say?". Even Chief Muusha deferred on this issue. When asked about the widespread barking of miuyu in his area, Chief Muusha said if he were to enforce the protection of miuyu people would come to him for blankets, implying he would then have to provide necessities for those without incomes.

In general then, woodland management practices were articulated with sacred practices, and especially where large fruit trees were concerned, but the overall structure of tree management was not expressed in spiritual terms. Traditional leaders were seen as the formal representative of the relation between people and the land yet they played a fairly small role in regulating everyday household woodland use. When sacred prohibitions were ignored the violator could be taken to dare (translated as "court", but is more accurately a public meeting) and fined by the samusha (cf. Wilson, 1989:372). Fines were generally affordable although perhaps significant for a household with no regular wages or remittances. For example, one man who had used nyamakuwa as firewood was fined a cock. Roughly a year before my arrival in Gudyanga a man who had felled a mucha without consulting the samusha (or sabhuku) was brought in front of the dare and fined some Zim$25 (roughly CAN$5 at the time). In contrast, during my stay in Gudyanga branches had been cut from a mucha and in response to my questions no one said that cutting of a sacred tree warranted any action.
INFORMAL AND PRAGMATIC REGULATION OF WOODLAND USE

By and large, the nature of daily household wood use was shaped not by formal regulations and restrictions but from practical considerations and informal processes. When cutting trees, permission only needed to be sought from traditional authorities if cutting large, protected species that were not in fields. There was little need for most households to do so however a few resident carvers did occasionally make mortars (maturi) from mukamba which was said to be protected as a sacred tree. Many of the restrictions on cutting that are articulated in conservation legislation were expressed by residents of Gudyanga as locally derived common sense, not as legal devices of the state. That is, although certain restrictions may have had their origins in colonial conservation policy, people were not openly aware of this. The value attached to these formal restrictions was not seen as deriving from their legal status but from their conservationist implications. Thus, whereas there was very little formal regulation of woodland use in Gudyanga there was a clear sense among residents of what was an appropriate way to harvest local wood resources.

Day-to-day management of woodlands in Gudyanga was characterised by a sense of reasonable use. Residents were asked in a survey what restrictions applied to the way in which people were allowed to harvest wood in Gudyanga; the replies are tabulated in figure 4.5. The four of the
restrictions cited by residents were generally justified on the grounds that they prevented the wasteful use of trees. Cutting live wood for fuel was said to be unnecessary as there was sufficient dry wood to be collected, especially following the drought. Felling of trees, and especially the permanent removal of trees through stumping and burning, was considered wasteful in that the practice prevented regrowth (ie. renewal of the resource base). It was said by many residents that people should cut branches for their poles and should not fell an entire tree simply to get at desirable branches. Neither should one coppice a young tree to use its trunk as a small pole. Burning of trees to fell them was also criticized for its wastefulness and the danger it posed in starting brush fires (kuambura mapundo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Practice</th>
<th>No. times cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burning trees to fell (kupisira)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting green wood (nyoro) for fuel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felling live trees (kutema munyoro wese)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stumping out trees (kugobora)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No restrictions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use care</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these informal restrictions on wood harvesting there is the general restriction on cutting fruit
trees, especially those associated with the ancestors. Fruit trees were pruned in areas where they were more numerous -- i.e. the higher areas of Zones 4 & 5 -- and dead branches were removed for fuel. This explains why those trees listed as sacred in Appendix II are also said to be good sources of wood for fuel and carving. In interviews, many people stated that trees in residential areas or along paths between fields were not to be cut as they were important for shade, windbreak, natural fencing and fodder. Such restrictions were clearly not always adhered to, especially in the annual re-clearing of fields, as there were few trees in these areas and most of the more desired species had been heavily pollarded. The trees that remained in cleared areas could not have sustained even a small proportion of local wood needs and so were generally left alone.

During my stay in Gudyanga the practices suggested above were generally observed. Although the above restrictions are treated here as "informal regulations" they are perhaps more accurately guidelines, not rules. In the areas where trees were scarce, tree use was fairly public and therefore subject to the scrutiny of other residents. In a small community most cutting could be attributed to specific households who might be, for instance, building a new structure in their yard. Although everyone held their own secrets, public cutting of community trees was not a private affair and was therefore regulated to a degree by the expectations of other
residents. People said that when a fellow resident was seen cutting trees wastefully that person was told as much. Thus, while residents didn’t always stop others from using trees wastefully, especially in fields, public pressure was no doubt important in checking wastefulness. Furthermore, although there were accepted guidelines about how to manage trees, there were few unambiguous and enforceable rules, even when local "common sense" was given expression in conservation legislation. However, to say that the preservation of woodland resources in Gudyanga could simply be the result of people observing certain prohibitions would be naive. A discussion of woodlands management covering only rules and regulations would be wholly inadequate. What people are not supposed to do is not the sum of management dynamics any more than being an active member of Canadian society means simply not breaking the law.

PROACTIVE MANAGEMENT

Proactive management practices would involve any contribution to increasing future wood supplies (both quality and quantity) and as such is more developmental than conservationist. Matowanyika suggests there is little active management of trees in communal woodlands to ensure greater productivity and that management is primarily conservationist (1991:268-9). Campbell, et.al. have noted that there is little evidence for the conscious management of coppices or
pollarding for increased wood production in the Communal Lands (1993:36). It should be mentioned however that local cutting practices (lopping, pollarding and coppicing) to meet specific needs may to some degree *indirectly* lead to greater productivity of standing woody biomass (but principally among more mature trees) (cf. Mushove & Makoni, 1993). The clearest signs of proactive management are found within the confines of individual homesites where people were more likely to plant and water trees (Campbell, et al., 1993:36-7). These observations were confirmed by my research in Gudyanga. Although many people (66.4%) said planting was an important way to improve wood availability, fewer had actually planted trees (35.8%) and many of those trees planted were not very successful. The long dry season and lack of surface water in the area makes transplanting seedlings very difficult and given that this study followed the worst drought in living memory it was not an especially good time to judge planting success. Goats and termites also discouraged many from the task. Campbell, et al. (1993:49) have also suggested that people in the Communal Lands are less likely to plant trees where critical shortages of wood and fruit have not yet arisen, as they had not in Gudyanga.

Trees that were successfully established were mostly indigenous species (see figure 4.6), with *mugwatikwati* being the most commonly planted (for live fencing). These results vary somewhat from other findings in Zimbabwe which point to a
very strong preference for exotic fruit trees
(Campbell, et al., 1993:47). Exotic fruits and flowering
trees were planted but few were well-established and healthy
during the time of this study due to the inhospitable climate;
I was able to verify only one exotic fruit tree that was
planted by a household and produced edible fruit during the
time of this study. At the primary school there were a number
of successfully established exotic fruit trees and ornamentals
however they were not part of this study; proximity to a well
with very soft water and command of an enormous army of
captive labour made the primary school a somewhat unique
management enterprise. The school did not operate a woodlot
nor were there were any woodlots elsewhere in Gudyanga.

figure 4.6 Trees planted in Gudyanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type</th>
<th># species planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local fruit</td>
<td>2 (1 munyii; 1 mudyandararama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic fruit</td>
<td>7 (4 papaya; 2 mango; 1 lemon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exotic flowering</td>
<td>8 (7 Jacaranda; 1 Flamboyant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local other</td>
<td>15 (10 mugwatikwati, 2 mukamba, 2 mukumbangu, 1 mukina)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARDS OF "REASONABLE USE"

Somewhere between proactive management and simply obeying
rules lies the largest field of activity in day-to-day
woodlands use. Woodlands management in Gudyanga then was
primarily centred on the understanding of informal principles,
or guidelines, which are not always well articulated as rules or regulations. Culturally and situationally appropriate management decisions were therefore largely "understood" or learned practices that children acquired when they accompanied adults. Households were free to take what they needed but were expected to consider the needs of the future and not preempt the claims of the rest of the community which had an equivalent right to the same resources. People argued for the need to use care in cutting trees so as to prevent waste. Common interest was recognized by the standards of "reasonable use" which guided individual woodland use.

Thus, while there were few formal restrictions on where or how people gathered wood, wood cutting practices were in many respects conservationist. The cutting of green wood was done in such a way to ensure that the tree remained in good health to continue producing valuable wood for other residents and future needs. Lopping of branches was preferred over cutting whole trees, and not all branches were taken from any one tree. In this way the stress of cutting was spread around, preserving the diversity of tree parts (tree form) and ages. This practice has lead to a reduction in woodland stature and density without greatly reducing the actual number of trees (cf. McGregor,1991:143). Valuable and more scarce species such as mukamba and munyii that remained in the area were evidently not cut back; during my stay I saw mostly mature specimens from which branches were not taken. This can
be contrasted with musharu of which there were few untouched specimens except far in the hills. Most musharu had branches and often the leader cut at one time leaving the tree shortened and not very straight. In areas with fewer trees, such as residential areas, many if not most people respected the remaining trees and walked to more heavily wooded but distant areas to cut trees. Although it could be argued that species specific cutting, to meet specific needs, leads to a reduction in species diversity, people were willing to substitute a more available species for one which would otherwise be more desirable. Whole trees were cut for large house poles and maturi (mortars) however many of the trees in the area coppiced very well, including the dominant species. People did not burn down trees except to clear areas more permanently.

These management practices helped local woodlands to remain productive and continue to provide useful products to residents. Mature trees, but especially fruit trees, were preserved for the multiple long-term benefits they provided. Trees were not harboured as a household’s property and there was little reason to enter someone’s yard to gather fruit; in the more densely populated areas (Zone 3, Map 5) the only fruit tree (muuyu) that was predominantly found in fields (Zone 4) ripened in the winter when crops were cleared and access to the trees was open. With the recent marketing of mauyu, the fruit of the baobab (muuyu), there was some
complaint that it was harder to find good fruit. However, *mauyu*, like other fruits were not yet scarce and I had no trouble getting adequate good fruit for myself. During my stay in Zimbabwe there were reports in the press of people with flat-bed trucks cutting down *muzhanje* trees (*Uapaca kirkiana*) in communal areas outside of Harare to harvest the highly valued fruit for sale in Harare. I spoke to several residents of Gudyanga about these reports and they said they had never heard of such a practice and clearly were confused about how such a thing could be allowed -- *muzhanje* are generally protected by traditional restrictions where the trees are found (cf. Gumbo, 1992:2; Matowanyika, 1991:220). One woman simply asked me in return, "what about next year?" Fortunately such depredations by commercial interests were not found in Gudyanga.

By limiting their harvesting to what they needed and by cutting selectively, residents of Gudyanga were able to minimize waste. Generally there was no waste when a tree was cut because branches were used for house or fences poles, bark for string (on certain species such as *musharu*) and the remainder for fuel; even the smallest branches were picked up for kindling. Perhaps because of this resourcefulness there was no perceived need in Gudyanga for restricting the amount of wood households extracted from local woodlands. Among survey respondents there were few who reported any restrictions on the amounts of wood people could harvest (see
Those respondents who suggested residents were free to take "reasonable amounts" used expressions such as *dzaunokwanisa kutakura* ("as much as you can carry" -- i.e. by oneself). This apparent lack of concern for amounts taken reflected the fact that no segment of the community was threatening the supply of wood in the area. Although larger and more wealthy households may have used more wood, particularly in construction, on the whole there were no households in Gudyanga which used a grossly disproportionate amount of wood. There were no commercial operations taking wood away in trucks, and there was only one or two individuals who gathered wood with a scotch cart to sell locally to a few households with regular wages. The extra-local sale of timber or fuelwood without a licence from the District Council was prohibited under the Communal Lands Forest Products Act; this Act also specifies that wood is to be harvested for "own use." Thus, the limitations cited in figure 4.7 were in theory legal restrictions. However, they carried little weight as legal restrictions in part because they were observed simply by virtue of the low level of harvesting by households in the area. In practice, nobody was breaking the supposed legal restrictions on amounts harvested even though the vast majority of people claimed there were no restrictions. The responses given in figure 4.7 presumably reflect a local perception that there were no critical shortages of wood in the area.
figure 4.7 Restrictions on amounts collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restriction</th>
<th>No. times cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Scotchcart load</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Lorry load</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not to sell wood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No restrictions</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable amounts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it should be clear from chapter three that life in Gudyanga was far from being free of conflict and hardship, there did appear to be a sense of "fair-play" in gathering tree products. Households were free to take what they needed but individual use was structured by the expectations of other community members (ie. other woodland users). Woodland management in Gudyanga was guided above all by a sense of practicality. It was especially those trees that provided multiple benefits (eg. dietary, agronomic, spiritual, and wood products) that were subject to the most intensive management, but in particular, protection. Knowledge of trees and their uses was detailed, although somewhat unevenly held among residents of Gudyanga. It would seem that the main factor differentiating people in terms of knowledge of trees was the amount of time a person spent in the area. Those people who spent more time away, especially working or at school, were less likely to have detailed knowledge of trees in the area. In addition, those people who used local woodlands more intensively, especially women, had more detailed knowledge.24
This case study supports others which have revealed a high level of Indigenous Technical Knowledge (ITK), or Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), with respect to indigenous trees in the Communal Lands (see Campbell, Clarke & Gumbo, 1991; Campbell et al., 1993:41; Chidari et al., 1992:96; Clarke, 1990:4-5; Matowanyika, 1991:132-5; McGregor, 1991:460-4; Wilson, 1989:380, 382).

**Concluding Remarks**

To sum up the use of trees in Gudyanga then, trees were preserved for the many important roles they played in social and economic life. Trees provided useful products such as fruit, construction and craft supplies, fuel, medicines and animal fodder. Trees also formed part of the social landscape by providing shelter from the sun and wind, by acting as centres for social gatherings and communication with the ancestors, and were integral to agricultural production. It can also be said that woodlands, as an entire biotic community, were central to life in Gudyanga; that is, as a habitat for a wide array of foods such as fungi, plants, invertebrates and game. Lastly, the regenerative potential of indigenous woodlands allowed for the transformation of field to woodland, renewing to a degree the agricultural potential of the area.

Thus, it has been shown that trees in Gudyanga were an extremely valuable community resource subject to largely
informal management characterised by a sense of reasonable use. There was a detailed knowledge of trees among residents of the study area who actively managed local woodlands by adopting conservationist practices. While woodland cover has been significantly reduced in this century there was no apparent reason to anticipate a "tragedy of the commons" (Hardin, 1968). There was however some scope for abuse of this management system, especially with increased population, commercialization of woodland use and even reckless use by individuals. The principle of taking only what was needed, leaving the rest for others, worked fine when "needs" were in rough equity; that is, within a fairly narrow range, as was the case in the study area.

However, in an overtly accumulative (capitalist) economy there is more scope for inequality of "need" and equally important, more incentive to take more than one "needs" in order to maximize gain. For example, if one were seeking poles to sell one could cut much more timber than was realized in poles, the rest being left behind. This is exactly what happens on commercial timber plantations where all undergrowth, branches and low-value trunks are burnt after harvesting the prime timber. An employee of the Forestry Commission, who must remain anonymous, estimated that at least half of the woody biomass on forest plantations is burned off after harvest. Similarly, timber companies that mine state forestry concessions are required only to pay for the wood
they extract, not for the amount they actually cut down (Bradley & Dewees, 1993:106).

There were certain measures in Gudyanga which discouraged such wastefulness, such as sacred regulations and community pressure. Few such measures exist on private property where even the relevant legislation is different from that in the Communal Areas. That the Communal Areas are generally located on land with the lowest productive potential adds to the burden of careful resource management. In spite of this inherited racist division of resources, reports of impending doom -- "The Fuelwood Crisis" -- are somewhat unjustified (cf. Grundy, et al., 1991:30; Leach & Mearns, 1988; McGregor, 1991:322). Thus, existing local knowledge and practices which shape resource management need to be better understood and wherever possible used as a basis for developing new management regimes. Replacement of existing institutions is not justified on the grounds of helping Communal Area dwellers (cf. Shiva, 1989).
Endnotes

1. The remaining lands are classified as built-up areas and "waste".

2. The precise term used to refer to wooded areas depends on ecology, density and at times dominant species. The term dondo refers to an extensive woodland area which has not been cleared; sango is also used the same way but suggests the area is somehow "wild", or is not routinely used by people. The term gwasha refers to a thickly wooded ravine. Woodlands dominated by mopane might be referred to as jaru; in other parts of the country, woodlands dominated by *Uapaca kirkiana* (*muzhanje*), a tree that does not occur in the study area, are referred to as jiri.

3. This contradicts what others have noted in brewing beer which is reportedly done using hardwoods, including fruit trees, for fuel (see for eg. McGregor, 1991:208). My own findings on the use of quick burning trees to get the beer to boiling point for a short time are based primarily on my experience of hiring someone to brew beer for a farewell gathering. The women, Mbuya Kitchini, who brewed the beer was a key informant and considered very skilled in brewing. Mbuya Kitchini arranged to have the wood of her choosing to be gathered and delivered by a local man with a scotchcart, and I paid the expenses; she specified specific species of soft wood and the resulting beer was first-rate!
4. Charcoal production was essentially illegal since it almost certainly assumes a market for the finished product whereas the Communal Lands Forest Produce Act specifies wood must be used for "own use". A government circular notes that charcoal production was "rampant" at Nyanyadzi, a fairly denuded irrigation scheme nearby (Provincial Forestry Officer, Manicaland).

5. This is much like our choke cherry (Prunus virginiana) although perhaps not quite as astringent.

6. For some details see Gelfand, et al., 1985, Scudder, 1971 and at a more general level (ie. less culturally-specific), Coates-Palgrave, 1983. For a full treatment on traditional medicine in Zimbabwe see Chavunduka, 1994.

7. Zimbabwe is well-known for its stone carvings and an active "tourist" market maintains a thriving local industry. There was no stone carving in Gudyanga owing to a lack of suitable materials.

8. Vadzimu is another, more honorific, plural form for mudzimu however midzimu was more commonly used as a simple plural form of "ancestors".

9. As noted in chapter two, a much wider variety of foods was harvested from local woodlands in the past.

10. Although it could be argued that predators and agricultural pests are thereby sustained, any agroecological system has its
characteristic "pests". Thus, two of the most damaging species to crops in Gudyanga, mice and the graniverous bird *Quelea quelea*, have only become a major problem with the more modern practice of extensive and permanent (mono)cropping.

11. Agriculture in Gudyanga was not shifting but effectively permanent (cf. Campbell, et al., 1993:32). Hence, there was no general practice like "bush fallow" although some fields were left to partially regenerate until their marginal utility, and/or the availability of labour, was sufficient to justify clearing and cultivating the land.

12. Field observations revealed numerous cases where crops adjacent to trees in fields were taller than those more in the open. However, no simple conclusions can be made because it was also clear that microenvironments of all sorts had a very strong influence and produced as much variation without the immediate presence of trees as with trees in fields.

13. After *Eucalyptus* spp., mango trees (*Mangifera indica*) are perhaps the most widely planted tree in rural Zimbabwe. The place of mango trees in Zimbabwean agroforestry has finally been given due treatment with the publication of Musvoto & Campbell (1995) who reveal that Communal Land farmers plant these trees in their fields for their fruit, shade and leaf litter. Farmers recognize that the dense shade from the trees inhibits crop growth and therefore pruned the trees to reduce competition for
light; the additional benefits (esp. fruit) are seen to justify crop losses.

In addition to the opposition to agroforestry at Nyanyadzi irrigation scheme, the growing of sweet potatoes (madima) along irrigation canals was also discouraged. This attempt to diversify production and maximize the use of available land continues in spite of irrigation by-laws against the practice.

14. Only young to mature trees which were not cut back prior to planting in the 1992-1993 agricultural season were counted in the survey. Regrowth of numerous species in fields was widespread.

15. Moodie, in his journals describing his journey through the area just to the south of Gudyanga, says they had to dynamite their way through "Hells Wood", the baobab forests along the Save river (cited in Burrows, 1954:140).

16. Campbell, Vermeulen & Lynam (1991) have attempted to quantify this value as part of the IDRC-funded "Value of Trees" Project.

17. The owner, the Manicaland Development Association, did not, and perhaps could not, enforce exclusion of cattle which often found their way or were driven across the Save.

18. Colonial government encouraged the building of houses from bricks as a way of demonstrating one's commitment to "modernity" and also to save trees. It is highly questionable in my mind
that firing bricks uses significantly fewer trees than a pole and mud hut. A brick house may last longer, if it is free of termites, but poles in huts are generally recycled, even if only for fuelwood.

19. Only the extension worker was paid and even then, his pay was very small.

20. Reasons cited referred mostly to certain trees bringing misfortune when burned. It was also said that muunga was not burned because the smoke produces chest pains, which I can personally verify. Being less industrious than the local women I resorted to taking home a small muunga stump that was close to home and passed up by other residents; for two days I suffered minor pains in my chest when cooking until I recalled that piece of local wisdom and abandoned the wood.

21. Given the small size of the sample (see Appendix III) and the larger number of trees required for live fencing these figures are probably well within the norm for Communal Areas. Chidari, et. al. (1992:8) have also noted that Commiphora mossambicensis (mugwatikwati in Gudyanga) was an important source of live fencing in Mhondoro District (central Zimbabwe).

22. The most economically important species, such as musharu, tended also to be the dominant species in the area.

23. This represents in effect a sustained harvest from local woodlands with little return of organic matter and as such
diminishes the productive potential of woodlands over the very long term.

24. However, given that local ecologies and indigenous knowledge systems are very geographically specific, and that women were often married into the area from other parts of the country, many women often held slightly different names for local flora or had incomplete knowledge of local trees.
Chapter Five

The Political Control of Land and Resources in Gudyanga

In this chapter I will return to the issues raised in chapter one and which have subsequently branched in many directions. The broad purpose of this dissertation has been to understand an indigenous resource management regime. The outlines of local management of indigenous woodlands in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe are only recently emerging (see Campbell, Clarke & Gumbo, 1991:99; Katerere, 1993; Scoones & Matose, 1992:163; Wilson, 1989:382-3 on the lack of research prior to Independence). In fact, much of the basic research on the ecology of indigenous woodlands has only been done in the last five years (Barnes, 1993). Through much of the colonial era, indigenous woodlands were seen as unproductive and indigenous use as wasteful. This false picture served to justify European expulsion of Africans from the land and the liquidation of woodlands and forest to meet the needs of settler agriculture, herding, exotic timber plantations and mines. History has proved the colonial view of indigenous woodlands management wrong. In spite of the attacks on
African land use patterns, people have survived in the rural areas. Some observers are now taking note and a new crop of Zimbabwean scholars has emerged with an interest in social forestry (for eg. Makuku, Matose, Mukamuri and Nhira).

Even with the recent scholarship on indigenous woodlands management, only the broad outlines are known about local management systems, the complexity of which defies easy explanation. Much work has been done to demonstrate the wealth of technical knowledge Communal Area dwellers possess about indigenous woodlands (see for example, Campbell, Clarke & Gumbo, 1991; Campbell, et al., 1993:41; Chidari et al., 1992:96; Clarke, 1991, 1990; Matowanyika, 1991:132-5; McGregor, 1991:460-4; Wilson, 1989:380,382). I have only given an introduction to technical practices employed in woodland utilization in Gudyanga; the focus of this thesis is more narrowly concerned with the social forces and institutions that regulate the way in which people gain access to and make use of local woodland resources. The present study then is only a first step towards understanding woodlands management in one very small part of Zimbabwe and in one unique historical instance. The interpretations made here are not likely to be identical to those made for other parts of the country (I hope they are not, if only for the sake of diversity!). Before entering a more detailed discussion of the woodland management regime in Gudyanga, a quick summary of my findings is in order.
Summary of Key Features of Woodlands Management Regime

In trying to characterize woodlands management it is difficult to give a straightforward depiction of how the system operated in Gudyanga given that much of what happened on a day-to-day basis was informal. There was no single linchpin that kept the management system together. However, there were some key features that are summarized below. The four points below will serve as the basis for more detailed discussion on each of these features of the woodlands management regime in Gudyanga.

1) An informal sense of reasonable use ("common sense") was central in structuring household use of trees and tended to limit wasteful practices. Woodlands management was more fully part of an entire social system than just a set of rules; it was assumed that people would act in their own interest in using common resources (i.e. take what they needed) but not at the expense of everyone else. If people failed to act responsibly in their use of common resources, mechanisms such as shame were used to uphold common interest. Thus, collective pressure checked individual (household) abuse of the woodland commons in Gudyanga as much as state legislation or traditional authority.

2) An absence of clear tenure boundaries was found with respect to the daily gathering of household wood and
other woodland products. Standing woodlands in the area were used by anyone who would reasonably walk to them and carry their needs home. As long as a person was not violating any regulations enforced by a traditional leader in the immediate area then that person was free to cut what they needed. In fact, the vast majority of dead wood collected and live wood cut by residents of Gudyanga was taken from hills under the authority of a different sadunhu (NeChiora) and part of a separate government ward. Access to arable and residential lands was subject to fairly strict regulation however, and as a result, specific trees (in fields and in home yards) were held as semi-private property insofar as access to them needed at times to be obtained from the holder of the field or homesite where the tree was found. The more intensively the land on which the tree was found was managed (ie. the more it is "improved") the more likely the tree was to be subject to exclusionary practices.

3) Control over access to and the use of land was diffuse. Vested interests in land were in a vague and uneasy balance whereby individual households, traditional leaders and state agencies all exerted a measure of control over how local woodlands were used. No single interest (whether individual, collective, traditional or statist) was able to exert its influence at the expense of the other in the general use of local woodlands.
Under these circumstances, daily household use of woodlands was relatively immune to formal political authority. While this may have been in part the result of there being no sadunhu ("sub-chief") for twelve years, it would appear that households have enjoyed a fair degree of autonomy since at least the end of the nineteenth century.

4) Woodlands were managed as a commons. Woodlands were an integral part of a larger land management system centred on arable land in which users were in theory not permitted to transfer use rights to outsiders. Although land tenure relations were often ambiguous and contradictory, lands were in theory held jointly by some collectivity. More individualised rights were held over improved resources such as fields and homesites and as such these lands were managed within a different (but not altogether separate) "tenure niche" (Bruce, et al., 1993). However access to the remaining (standing) woodlands was not effectively restricted by prior claims of any household or group of households.

These four points sum up the main features of woodlands management in Gudyanga. Woodlands were an integral part of a commons system in which peoples' relation to the land was expressed in part through the traditional political system yet households were fairly free to meet their wood needs as they
saw fit. We can now turn to a more detailed discussion of these findings.

Resource Management as a Cultural Process

As suggested in the previous chapter, specific restrictions on woodlands use were not central to woodlands management in Gudyanga. The harvesting of tree products in community woodlands, and in abandoned fields in which vested interests in cultivation had effectively lapsed, was generally not restricted in any formal way. Restrictions under national conservation legislation, such as the Natural Resource Act which prohibits the cutting of trees along watercourses, were not a strong deterrent in themselves. Rather, woodland use was shaped by far more informal and diffuse influences. In Gudyanga, much of what we can refer to as woodlands management -- ie. the way in which decisions are made about who is to gain access to trees and how they are to use those trees -- was guided by what I will call "common sense". In using this term I am not suggesting that management decisions in Gudyanga reflected what to anybody was self-evidently the most sensible approach in economic and conservationist terms. Opinions on what constitutes the most "sensible" approach to management differed, reflecting the diversity of interests in woodlands use. Management decisions in Gudyanga did not simply reflect some pragmatic logic readily appreciable to an outsider. Rather, common sense decisions reflected cultural attitudes
about the intrinsic value of trees and their role in society. Thus, as Geertz has indicated: "Common sense is not what the mind cleared of cant apprehends; it is what the mind filled with presuppositions ... concludes (1975:16)."

The sense of "reasonable use" which was integral to woodland management in Gudyanga suggests there was a value placed on the future supply of tree benefits for all residents who might have a stake in local woodlands. At the same time, the lack of formal restrictions on daily household woodland use reflected the value placed on non-interference and independence (see p.127). These values were given support by a common sense view of: 1) the regenerative potential of local woodlands and, 2) the ability of people to survive when not interfered with. Values can only be achieved through purposive action. In other words, common sense is not simply about values or ideology, a way of viewing the world, but about achieving those values, about being.⁴ Thus, residents of Gudyanga were not fatalistic about woodlands management; they did not simply assume resource renewal and household reproduction would continue to function without decisions being made. In other words, they did in fact manage their woodlands.⁵

In Gudyanga, common sense forms of management were expressed, for example, not simply in the belief that trees would grow back but in the practice of letting them grow back. Through selective cutting, spreading cutting among trees and
limiting felling, deforestation was reduced. Hence, management decisions entailed an understanding of rights and obligations held by all who made use of local woodland resources. Woodlands were seen to regenerate so long as people didn’t cut wastefully and households were able to meet their wood needs so long as they were not prevented from harvesting what they needed from community woodlands. That the two might be at odds, that is, household needs might outstrip wood supplies, did not figure in local "common sense" as far as I was able to observe, except insofar as wasteful use was discouraged for its negative effect it had on all households. In part, this may have been the case because critical shortages had not yet emerged. Identifying a management ethic of "reasonable use" may be difficult enough; assessing its effectiveness is probably much harder.

Nhira and Fortmann suggest that a "civil contract" is an important part of local management strategies in Guruve and Kenyati (north western Zimbabwe); in both places government has assumed a leading role in the control of resources through its development initiatives there and traditional controls have therefore been subject to severe erosion. In spite of the difficulties in regulating the use of common woodlands, especially with the influx of new immigrants, people have not altogether abandoned the notion of collective responsibility (Nhira & Fortmann, 1992:39-40, 47-8). In other words, there has been no "tragedy of the commons". Matowanyika has observed a
similar dynamic in Nyanga, whereby people have an "inbuilt sense of equity and fairness;" that is, they do not take tree resources without consideration for the needs of other residents (1991:275). Campbell, et al. have also noted that in Mutambara Communal Land (some 25 km north of Gudyanga) people emphasised that the cutting of trees was not to be done wastefully; all tree parts were to be used and live trees were not to be cut for fuel (1994:44-5,47; cf. Nhira & Fortmann,1993:146).

McGregor has noted the influence "modern conservation ideology" (1991:316) has had on local management, but especially on the use of arable land which has been subject to close scrutiny since colonial times (see Elliot,1989:202). Woodland use has largely not been subject to perhaps the same degree of state intervention through much of the Communal Lands but it was noted earlier that some of the commonly held views about how to use trees wisely (ie. not wastefully) were mirrored in colonial conservation legislation. 7 In Mutambara Communal Land (Campbell,et al.,1994:44-5,47), just as in Gudyanga, prohibitions against wastefulness, such as the ban on cutting live wood for fuel (prohibited under the Natural Resource Act as well as the Communal Lands Forest Products Act), were not expressed as formal regulations but rather as "common sense." It is instructive to note as well that in some places people are seeking to revive traditional regulations, not necessarily to simply revive traditional
authorities, but rather for the conservationist influence of such regulations (Campbell, et al., 1994:43; Matowanyika, 1991:243-4). This speaks to the adaptability of local peoples in modelling a woodlands management regime that makes sense to themselves, that they can feel committed to. Perhaps where Communal Areas dwellers are able to weave together the threads of tradition, state management and locally inspired innovations, management regimes may have a wider and more organic appeal.

Makuku has suggested that where traditional leaders have been effectively replaced by state administration (Vidcos) the management of woodlands (like grazing & water resources) has faltered due to neglect. After undermining traditional management structures, state administration has failed to provide a viable alternative (1993:94-5). This expresses an assumption that seems implicit in much of the literature on resource management in the Communal Areas; namely, that management is only effective where there are formal, institutional controls regulating the way in which individuals use woodlands. However, I would argue that the invocation of statist and traditional regulations in the absence of effective power to fully enforce such regulations is not a sign of slavish obedience to authority but of adaptiveness. This dissertation has shown that collective management in Gudyanga did not simply depend on the presence of formal authority. Thus, woodlands management in Gudyanga was
characterised not so much by a lack of controls as it was by informal and diffuse mechanisms. These more subtle, self-regulating forms of management may be more widely relevant in the Communal Areas, playing an important role in woodlands management in the face of weakening traditional regulations. Unfortunately, few researchers have addressed the issue directly, except Nhira & Fortmann (1992).

Woodland Tenure Boundaries

Equally important as the way in which people used trees in Gudyanga was the way in which people gained access to trees (ie. tree tenure). People generally avoided cutting trees in areas where there were few trees, such as in built-up areas and fields. Apart from this tendency to avoid cutting in areas already heavily cleared, the area in which any given household’s tree use took place was bounded by convenience not demarcated and exclusive management zones. Households obtained wood and other tree products from trees in their vicinity and travelled only as far as they needed to meet their specific needs. As the most heavily wooded areas were those in the hills, most people went into the hills (Zone 5 of Map 5) but especially the Makura hills (see Map 4) for their wood needs. The partially closed woodlands of these areas were almost the only reliable place to obtain specific wood products to meet specialized needs. For instance, housing poles were almost entirely harvested in the Makura hills.
People did not restrict themselves to, or even favour, the *musha* ("traditional village") or *Vidco* (administrative village) in which they lived. Given that most of the Makura hills was part of another *dunhu* (NeChiora), a large portion of Gudyanga’s wood needs were supplied by a theoretically separate communal pool (as per Holleman, 1968:88). This lack of exclusion on the basis of membership in traditional areas can be explained in three ways.

First, the need for exclusion was not significant. Although tree products were becoming more difficult to obtain, there was no struggle over what remained. Encroachment from Nyanyadzi, a heavily populated and largely denuded irrigation scheme 10km up the road, was not significant as there was a large, well-wooded area between the two communities. Second, the surrounding areas were related to the Gudyanga headmanship, even if more distantly across the Save. The Makura hills were largely within the headmanship of Chiora, the (classificatory) "older brother" of Gudyanga. One traditional leader in Gudyanga suggested that even if shortages were greater, exclusion on the basis of *dunhu* boundaries would be impolitic. Lastly, there were certain resources available in neighbouring areas which were not found locally, and vice versa.

Tenure relations based on mutual exclusion were not valued socially or economically in Gudyanga. This point was well illustrated, by way of example, in a public discussion (a
GIDP meeting) of who would be allocated plots in the proposed irrigation scheme. It was suggested by some residents that those people who lived in the hills and were therefore distant from the scheme, should be excluded on the grounds that they did not at the time have fields where the scheme was to be implemented (Zone 1). Most dismissed this suggestion pointing out that everyone should have a chance to gain access to this new resource, regardless of who was to lose their lowland fields. Those who had fields in the areas to be irrigated were to have first priority only. It was said that those who wanted to exclude people from the hills were not thinking clearly, for where do they send their cattle to eat? -- to the hill areas where better grazing and foraging resources were found. At the same time, people living in the hill areas very often led their cattle to the Save river for water.

In sum, there were no well-defined ideas of socially and geographically bounded "estates" (of management), with a sense of who does and does not have rights to local woodland resources. There was in fact no need for a rigid system of exclusion with respect to woodland resources, and the topic of exclusionary access was on the whole a non-issue. Only where access to woodlands was restricted by law, as it was across the Save in the Devure Training Centre, did people speak of any reasons for limiting where they harvested tree products. Apart from this exception, residents went wherever they needed to get tree products, and then only as far as they needed.
Boundaries around administrative wards and Village Development Committees (Vidcos), as well as around misha and matunhu were not perceived in the use of local woodlands. This is in marked distinction with arable land, the regulation of access to which has become more elaborate and formalised in the last century (see pp.114-18).

It has been noted that so-called tenure boundaries in Communal Area woodlands are often not enforced (Campbell, et al., 1989:38; Matowanyika, 1991:275, 287; McGregor, 1991:312-3) and some researchers have suggested that more effective woodlands management could be achieved through clarifying and strengthening tenure boundaries (see for eg. Campbell, et al., 1989:107-9; Fortmann & Bruce, 1993:204; Hofstad, 1993:54). However, a lack of emphasis on exclusivity of access to trees does not necessarily diminish the strength of collective management but may expand the scope of a (woodlands) commons. That people adapt flexible means to ensure access to woodland resources is a sign of capacity, not failure. In Gudyanga, exclusivity of use of local woodlands was rejected as unnecessary and undesirable. I know of only one other researcher, Makuku (1993), that gives a concrete example of why people choose not to maintain tenure boundaries in local woodlands.

Makuku documents the indigenous management of a riverine forest that is home to a highly prized edible insect (harurwa) that is a an important source of income in Bikita. The
insect lives in this muzhanje (*Uapaca kirkiana*) forest (*jiri*), only 50 hectares in size yet the largest known source of the *harurwa*, and is harvested between March and November. The forest is an important source of income, among other benefits such as medicine and wood, and as such is preserved for its value as standing woodland (ie. not cleared for agriculture). The traditional political structures of the area are said to be associated with the origins of the *harurwa* and are therefore central in the management of the forest and set the wholesale price for the insect. All 24 kraalheads (*masabhuku*) in the area are equally involved and each distributes gifts ("tribute") of the insect "to other local chiefs as well as important government leadership in the district such as the District Administrator and the police."

This ensures the recognition of traditional leaders who have no legal authority in woodlands management. The physical management of the forest is directly regulated by a team made up of a representative from each of the 24 villages in the area, with members rotating each year. Any person who seeks to pick the *harurwa* must report to the management team although no one who reports to the team and follows the stated rules is excluded. Members of the team first allocate best lands exclusively to themselves in return for their efforts to manage the year’s harvest (Makuku, 1993).

Here is an interesting example of institutional control over resources becoming more elaborate but without developing
exclusivity of access. In Gudyanga, the institutions of woodlands management had also undergone an intensification without developing exclusivity of access (ie. rigid tenure boundaries); the difference clearly lies in the far greater degree of formalization found in Bikita. The lack of exclusivity in access to local woodlands may reflect an absence of serious shortages in woodland resources (cf. Little & Brokensha, 1987:204), but may also suggest that resource management institutions have been developed to reflect common interest rather than to protect more limited, vested interests. As Makuku suggests, the

tribute paid to the other surrounding chiefs and the fact that outsiders are allowed to collect harurwa means that they also appreciate the continued existence of the forest (1993:94).

Thus, a wider network of people are given a stake in the management of local woodlands.

Woodland Commons and the Wider Land Management System

The importance of inclusivity in woodlands use suggests that collective interests are a central feature of woodlands management in Gudyanga. However, collective interest in local woodlands needs to be put in context, both locally and nationally. First, we need to look beyond the woods to the entire system of local land use practices. Matowanyika, in his thesis on resource management in Nyanga (north-eastern Zimbabwe), suggests that resources and rights to use them are held as a mosaic such that the study of a single resource in
isolation is misleading. Thus, in Gudyanga, household harvesting from local woodlands was generally not subject to any significant intervention, however the picture was more complex with regard to other land uses. Given that woodlands were also potentially fields and built-up areas, as well as being grazing lands, the long-term management of woodlands must be treated as part of a wider land management system in Gudyanga that regulates access to and use of these other types of land. The regulation of access to arable land especially mobilised local interests and institutions to a far greater degree than was the case with trees themselves. Numerous people had a stake, even if indirectly, in the long-term management of wooded areas in which more restricted individual (or household) rights had not yet been established.

Among those who might feel the need to reduce woodland cover in Gudyanga (ie. convert woodlands to fields and homesites) we can include the following: young families looking for new fields and homesites, households returning from other areas but especially from the cities, potential immigrants (especially relatives), and any other land hungry households in the area. With the decline in formal employment opportunities for young people and widespread retrenchment occasioned by structural adjustment, the pressure to clear land has continued to grow. On the other hand, livestock holders and those households that already had fields, even though their stock and arable land holdings may be
insufficient, may feel a greater need to preserve the benefits they enjoy from communal woodlands.

In considering the management of local woodlands then, we need to look beyond the level of household wood use and understand the long-term impact of other land uses on local woodlands. To speak of a woodlands management system in itself is therefore misleading. There were woodlands management practices but these do not constitute a separate management system set apart from the management of other resources. Agriculture and housing, in particular, have the greatest potential impact on local woodlands in so far as they may require large areas to be cleared and with houses, additional trees may be cut (and coppiced) for materials. Thus, making use of the more fertile soils found under woodland cover has been the one value derived from woodlands that has led to the greatest proportion of woodland clearance in Gudyanga; indeed, for the country as a whole, woodland clearance for agriculture has been the single greatest factor in deforestation (Whitlow, 1988). Thus, as Nhira and Fortmann have suggested, "what may be at stake is the land under the trees rather than the trees themselves (1993:147)."

Perhaps as a consequence of the greater potential for competing interests in arable land, the clearing of woodland for agricultural purposes was more strictly controlled. Rights to cultivate fields and occupy a residential "stand" (ie. homesite) were exercised solely within the boundaries of
a musha or bhuku (ie. "village") in which such rights had been granted. At the time of this research there was said to be a hold on acquiring uncleared lands in the study area. One resident suggested traditional leaders had taken in new residents without assigning them fields in order to collect fees from the new residents. However, the role of traditional leaders in allocating land was not given legal sanction; the authority traditional leaders was also based in large part on some form of local consensus. Hence, it would be difficult for traditional leaders to allocate valuable (wood)lands in return for exaggerated fees ("gifts") when many residents, including the sons of influential families, were in need of arable land.

Thus, a key feature of woodlands management in Gudyanga was the importance of regulating the relative proportions of land held communally, principally woodlands, and land effectively held by households, principally fields and homesites. In spite of (growing) pressure from agricultural needs to diminish (wood)lands in which collective interests were spread throughout the entire local population, a certain balance had been reached. Whether this balance could be sustained, or whether the "balance" was itself sustainable, is difficult to answer in the confines of this thesis. Here I have tried to remain content with demonstrating that institutional capacity, the ability to adapt to changing
political and economic contexts, does exist with respect to the management of woodland resources in Gudyanga.

The second way in which collective interest in woodlands needs to be contextualized is with respect to the legal framework of Communal Tenure, the Communal Lands Act of 1982, which explicitly sets out to uphold collective interest. Cheater has suggested however that the legal model of collective land holding is a fiction for two reasons. First, title to all Communal Lands is vested in the President of Zimbabwe and Communal Area dwellers have no proprietary rights; thus, communal tenure is in fact a sham (Cheater, 1989:201-3). Second, the occurrence of land inheritance, sale and other forms of transfer by individual households puts the strength of the communal right in question (Ibid:191-5; Cousins, 1990:18). For the most part these comments are directed at arable land however as was noted above, the processes of arable land allocation are key to woodlands preservation. Other researchers have made note of ways in which restricted claims are made on trees. For example, houses can claim more exclusive use of trees by annexing, without permission, portions of woodland that are adjacent to fields and homesites; restricted claims to trees may also be made by fencing home yards and effectively excluding others from access to fruit trees (Matose, 1990:177; McGregor, 1991:314, note 69). In addition, the practices of tying strings on trees with edible insects and keeping
beehives in trees, mark individual trees for exclusive household use even if only for a limited time (Matowanyika, 1991:225).

Concluding Remarks

These are all important issues to come to terms with. Together they suggest that woodlands were not simply held as a commons but that more individualised forms of tree tenure were also potentially significant. All manner of vested interests exerted their influence across what was a highly fragmentary and indeterminate political terrain; no single interest was able to ensure its voice was dominant at all times. The role of traditional authorities in the management of woodland resources in the Communal Areas was highly variable and likely depended on the particular historical experience of an area. As Wilson has suggested, whilst a hierarchy of 'chiefs', 'wardheads' and 'kraalheads' was codified by the government, in fact there is no clear distinction of roles and in practice very local politics tends to control which old men of leading lineages actually have influence (1989:375).

In addition, traditional leaders were limited in the control they exercised over resources by virtue of their lacking legal status and their sharing power with other local leaders, including those working through the Vidcos.

At the same time, while all land and resources were ultimately held by the state (as per the Communal Lands Act), state agencies have largely been unable to effectively
exercise their authority in resource management on the ground (cf. Alexander, 1993:377). In part this was due to there being no significant commercial potential in Gudyanga and therefore less incentive to regulate commodity production; in part, the lack of state presence in woodlands management also reflected a history of popular resistance to state intervention in production. The fragmentary political terrain across which government agencies attempted to exert their influence presented numerous obstacles to any easy exercise of power. Thus, as Alexander has suggested,

although the legislation regarding natural resource use in Independent Zimbabwe has changed very little since Independence, the interpretation of the legislation at the local level varies substantially (1989:138).

The lack of consistency among state agencies and the political difficulties of enforcing resource legislation, has led to a situation where "current legislation is in fact irrelevant (Hofstad, 1993:54)." Taken together, these contradictory forces have perhaps in part allowed households to exercise a fair degree of autonomy in their use of local resources, but especially local woodlands.

Hofstad has suggested that the combined effect of the decline in traditional authority, conflict between traditional leaders and Vidcos, as well as the inability of the state to make decisive interventions (in part due to a laissez-faire approach) has led to woodlands being treated as an "open access" resource (ie. no regulation of access or use)
This dissertation has suggested, on the contrary, that there may be more subtle, and perhaps more populist, forces at play in local woodlands management in Gudyanga. It may be that these more subtle forces are too weak to be effective in some cases. However, there has been very little research done on more diffuse and informal ethics of "reasonable use" which shape woodland exploitation in very subtle ways; only more formal traditional regulations have been clearly documented.

Woodlands management in Gudyanga was best understood within the total context of resource management institutions that shaped access to and use of trees. The role of woodlands in guaranteeing local livelihoods was maintained through inclusivity and self-regulation among users. More destructive uses were discouraged or, with woodland clearance for agriculture, were more strictly controlled. Thus, while trees in woodlands were held in a very inclusive manner, the (potentially arable) soils underneath them were held by smaller, more exclusive divisions of the traditional political system.

Rather than there being a single commons encompassing all resources, or a series of separate commons for different resources (ie. woodland, arable, grazing, water), tenure relations were more fluid and situational. Access to trees was structured by the way in which the land was being used, the way in which trees were used (including the intended
destination of tree products), and by seasonality. Varying levels of collective holding, as well as changing forms of more "individualised" control of land, interacted to form a complex but coherent land management regime. The subtle and at times contradictory way in which collective interest in local woodlands is expressed in Gudyanga raises some interesting questions for the study of common property, the subject of our next chapter.
Endnotes

1. An exception should be made for the highly valuable hardwoods (especially *Baikiaea plurijuga*) of the Kalahari sands in the western part of the country.

2. Piearce notes that many observers in the colonial era remarked on the productivity of indigenous trees. However, management and policy decisions stressed exotic trees (especially those of the genera *Pinus* and *Eucalyptus*). Thus, the management of indigenous trees has largely been neglected by commercial interests:

   commercial foresters appear reticent about ... developing the existing indigenous timber resource, and are continuing to treat ('mine') it as non-renewable in many areas (Piearce, 1993:109).

3. S. Makuku works with the Department of Natural Resources (Harare); F. Matose is completing his dissertation at the University of Saskatchewan? and works for the Zimbabwean Forestry Commission’s Forest Research Centre; Mukamuri is writing a dissertation with the Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS), University of Zimbabwe; Nhira has recently defended his dissertation at CASS.

4. Common sense, in the way it is used above, might also be referred to as hegemony.

5. As an analogy, it is not common sense to know that rain
makes you wet, but to know to stay out of the rain, or take your umbrella (Geertz, 1975:7-8).

6. Guruve is a growth point (ie. a central place, or node, for the provision of services and the growth of the commercial sector) in the mid-Zambesi development scheme while Kenyati has been sprayed for tse tse eradication and settled since 1980.

7. From my experience in Gudyanga, people generally assume that foreign researchers are there in part to instill and test for a conservation ethic among rural Zimbabweans. The experience of Communal Land residents would clearly support this assumption. Thus, the espousing of a "modern conservation ethic" by Communal Area dwellers may have been largely for the benefit of foreign researchers, however the more common (practised) response was to deride fellow Zimbabweans for their "wasteful" practices.

8. However, trees in these areas evidently were cut in the past as there were few remaining except very large trees (eg. mucha) and trees with little economic value (eg. muunga). This was generally the case throughout Zone 2.

9. I have been unable to determine what sort of insect this is. It is migratory, plant-eating and lives specifically on the Uapaca kirkiana.

10. Up to $300 Zimbabwe (approx. $60 Canadian) a season for a household.
11. However, my findings diverge from Matowanyika (1991:277,315) who suggests that woodland commons are part of a series of nested institutions; that is, woodland tenure is ordered hierarchically following the orthodox model of arable land tenure. This model suggests land is held by the chief who distributes allocating rights to his subordinates (the masadunhu), who distribute allocating rights to the masamusha (or masabhuku), who then allocate land to (male) household heads, who then allocate portions of their land to wives, sons and other so-called "dependents" (see Holleman, 1969:6-17; cf. Gluckman, 1965). Clearing woodland was subject to the control of the traditional hierarchy but rights to gather woodland products were not structured by a person's relation to political hierarchy.
Chapter Six
Contributions to the Study of Commons Management

In this chapter I would like to expand upon the implications of this research in Zimbabwe for the study of commons management more generally. In doing so, I approach the subject from two directions. First, of more immediate significance to Zimbabwe, I review the apparently contradictory sources of legitimacy for communal resource holding in the Communal Lands. Second, of more general interest, I assess the ability of Common Property theory to explain the nature of woodland tenure in Gudyanga.

The Commons in the Communal Lands

An examination of woodlands management in Gudyanga revealed that effective control over resources was highly localized and that traditional leaders were integral to this control. The recognition that traditional leaders play key roles in the control of resources in post-Independence Zimbabwe has stimulated continued debate as to their legitimacy (see below). While traditional leaders are not
legally recognized in the administrative structures of Zimbabwean government, the legal basis for land-holding in the Communal Lands (i.e. the Communal Lands Act), clearly rests on Rhodesian precedents of "indirect rule."

INVENTION OF TRADITION?

Several authors have shown that the legal model of Communal Tenure does not fully reflect the range and flexibility of tenure patterns since at least the turn of the century (see Cheater, 1990; Ranger, 1985, 1993; Scoones & Wilson, 1988, Wilson, 1986). However, a common feature of such discussions is a failure to clearly separate the legal definition of Communal Tenure from local traditional political institutions; in other words, it is assumed that the jural model of Communal Tenure is based on the traditional political system and that both share common roots in colonial attempts to impose "indirect rule" (see for eg., Ranger, 1993:357). Both Communal Tenure and the contemporary traditional political system are in part alloys forged in the colonial era however they were not exactly cast in the same die. Colonial indirect rule sought to construct a rational, official political order out of the African political orders they encountered at the end of the nineteenth century; Communal Tenure traces its roots to this process. However, colonial officials did not create, and probably could not have created, an entirely new political order (Berry, 1992).
Many of the political struggles among Shona-speaking peoples of the nineteenth century were carried forward into the colonial era and continue to have relevance to rural Zimbabweans. Thus, it is misleading for Ranger to dismiss traditional leaders (but especially chiefs) as "the fossilized and inutile structures of tradition built by the Rhodesian Front (1982:39)." It needs to be stressed that if present-day traditional leaders are exercising responsibilities quite different from their pre-colonial predecessors, they do so not simply because the colonial government gave them those powers. In Gudyanga, and perhaps many parts of the country, the elaboration of local political control over land was shaped in part by local interest and to some degree compromises with government may have enabled local leaders to carve out their own spheres of influence (cf. Alexander, 1993). The crystallization of misha ("villages") as discrete corporate entities (see pp.114-18) reveals the multiple historical forces at play in the development of land tenure and management in Gudyanga.

OR INDIGENOUS RESPONSE TO COLONIALISM?

The intensification of corporate control over land was in part a result of the colonial administration's attempt to formalise control over people for tax purposes. However, the elaboration of the traditional political system and the current strength of traditional leaders derived principally
from their role in regulating access to arable land. The importance of securing rights to reside and cultivate fields cannot be overestimated in a region where productive land is scarce and most adult men, and increasingly more women, experience some period of absence to seek waged labour. Vail (1989) has suggested that the crystallization of territorial units and the formalization of authority over those territories was initiated through the process of indirect rule and missionary teaching of "tribal" language and history; together, missionaries and colonial administrators, in concert with African and European intellectuals (including Anthropologists), attempted to codify and formalize what had been quite flexible and informal (Berry, 1992:329-30; cf. Ranger, 1989; Rennie, 1973:84,92). Traditional leaders were ready to embrace the opportunity for regained authority following the colonial military occupation of the region which had undermined indigenous political systems.

Decisive support was given to the reconstituted political system by migrant labourers who relied on the ability of political leaders in the countryside to preserve the land rights of absentee migrants (Bourdillon, 1976:108; Mafeje, 1988:115-6). This must have been particularly important during the early colonial period, when the Reserve system was being established and massive disruptions of people made access to land insecure. This crucial role played by the traditional political system in ensuring household survival
may account for the widespread support for the traditional political system I observed in Gudyanga. The traditional political system was an important focus for people’s identification with the land, and as such was a valued cultural institution. For Vail this crystallization of traditional authority vested in land marked the emergence of "tribalism" in Southern Africa whereby new ideologies of ethnicity stressed historical integrity of the tribe and its land and, especially, the sanctity of the family and its right to land (1989:14).

With respect to woodland resources in Gudyanga, this "historical integrity," the underlying assumption behind associating traditional leaders with clearly demarcated and exclusive blocks of commonly-held land (Berry, 1992:336), does not seem to pertain. This suggests tenure relations were not entirely shaped by the political ambitions of either colonial officials or traditional leaders. In addition, the active role that rural Africans played in re-shaping tenure relations suggests that the current institutional framework of the traditional political system is not simply a creation of colonial missionary and administrative forces. In Gudyanga at least, the creation of parallel offices of the sabhuku and samusha, as well as the emergence of the musha as the smallest territorial division of the chieftaincy (nyika) can be seen as an indigenous response to land alienation in the early colonial period. While in part fostered by colonial
administrators, this local elaboration of political control over land enabled people to maintain access to land in a way that many continued to see as traditional. Although by law, since the turn of the century, no new authorities over land were to be created without state approval, traditional leaders have been created in Gudyanga with the full approval of sadunhu ("ward headman") Gudyanga and chief Muusha. In Gudyanga at least there has been a proliferation of madzimambo (traditional leaders, lit. "kings"), each giving itself "room to rule" (Gumbo, 1992); that is, an area or jurisdiction in which to exercise authority. Thus, territorial fission may have continued to be a part of conflict resolution and social adjustment in the colonial political economy (cf. Scoones & Wilson, 1988:36).

This locally-centred process confirms Alexander's contention (1993:104-8) that traditional leaders were not everywhere passive government functionaries during the colonial era, nor were they delegitimized for their role in colonial administration as has been argued for other parts of Zimbabwe (cf. Lan, 1985:167; Ranger, 1982:24-5; 1985:202). Thus, colonial "indirect rule" was not simply the creation of traditions handed down to unwitting rural Africans; rather, it consisted of the forging of a substantially transformed political economy in which colonial authority was paramount however African interests continued to be expressed and contested. As Berry has suggested,
Colonial 'inventions' of African tradition (Ranger, 1983) served not so much to define the shape of the colonial order as to provoke a series of debates over the meaning and application of tradition which in turn shaped struggles over authority and access to resources (1992:328).

It is not especially helpful to say the traditional system is bogus and/or illegitimate because it does not adequately reflect "the heroic tradition of the past (Ranger, 1982:39)." The traditional political system in Gudyanga is an "invention of tradition" (Hobsbawn & Ranger, 1983) just as much as any tradition is continually reinvented as it is reproduced. Should social scientists use the term "traditional" only when a cultural practice has deep historical roots; or should the term be used where people themselves perceive cultural practices to be traditional? Any social science that expects traditions to be only those cultural practices that are old and established will cease to be able to explain the creation of new cultural expressions. Without a dynamic theory of culture that allows for novel expressions of tradition one is forced to conclude that a people have abandoned their culture, or have been stripped of it, simply because they have changed aspects of that tradition. On the contrary, "culture is dynamic, constantly changing to fit in with the current needs of people (Bourdillon, 1993:7)."  

Understanding may not be best served when powerful outsiders define what is legitimately "traditional" for local peoples. Thus, although Ranger dismisses traditional
political systems as "bogus 'traditionalism'" (1993:382),"
local political savvy is probably more developed than Ranger
cares to acknowledge. Evidence from Gudyanga suggests that
the legal formulation of Communal Tenure does not define the
nature of what is the traditional political system in Gudyanga
nor does it define the shape of local resource commons. Under
the Communal Lands Act (1982) the President of Zimbabwe is the
ultimate owner of all lands in the Communal Areas. District
Councils, but especially the Land Allocation Committee of each
Council, is the smallest level, legal manager of land. Chiefs
have in places been included on District Land Allocation
Committees as ex officio members (Ranger, 1993:366) however
traditional leaders are not legally recognized agents of
Communal Tenure. Neither the sabhuku or Vidcos, recognized by
the government as part of rural administration, exist to
administer control over land as such; they are associated with
demarcated territories but their roles relate to people within
those areas, not to the land itself. The role of these local
representatives in resource management, as with other
traditional leaders, is not given legal expression in some
form of proprietorship or stewardship; their role is purely
educational and facilitative. This is the jural model of
Communal Tenure.

The de facto operation of tenure (i.e. the way in which
people express their relation to the land and gain access to
productive resources) in Gudyanga clearly involved local
leaders in more active roles. Local leaders, but especially traditional leaders, were integral to the control of access to and use of resources (esp. fields and homesites) in the study area. In particular, that the samusha was an important figure suggests people in the study area did not readily see the land as "belonging to" central government. Perhaps the samusha expressed the relation of people to the land in a way that neither the sabhuku or Vidco was able to. This may account for residents of Gudyanga making a close association between the samusha and specific portions of land (ie. misha).

In Gudyanga, Communal Tenure did not guarantee government control over land nor did it allow traditional leaders to develop exclusive privilege through control of landed resources. The limits of traditional authority were perhaps best expressed by the way traditional leaders were given a role in the irrigation scheme but were prevented from monopolizing control of a valuable resource (see p.111-12). The very inconsistencies and ambiguities inherent in Communal Tenure may in fact have enabled residents of Gudyanga to exercise greater control over local resources. Cousins has noted a similar process with respect to grazing schemes whereby,

the tension between 'commoditisation' of land rights and community control is being expressed [through] ... the insistence by the community that transactions involving land rights are ratified and approved by kraalheads [masamusha], who retain the broad support of community members as land allocating authorities (1990:29).
Common Property Theory

The coexistence of (de jure) formal authority over arable land and relatively unrestricted access to woodland resources raises some interesting questions for the study of common property. In the introduction I defined a common property resource as one in which access and use is regulated by some institutional framework representing the interests of a community of co-users. Individual users are not free, in theory, to dispose of such resources without the prior consent of the group or some steward representing the group. Common property theorists have emphasised the regulation of usufruct by two means: 1) exclusion of non-owners, or in this case non-members; and 2) regulation of the economic activities of its users (Feeney, et.al., 1990:6-11). This regime is contrasted with "open access" resources in which there is no exclusion or regulation of use; "there are no rights, only possession (Ibid:11)."

Common property theorists make an important contribution in pointing out that access to and use of commonly-held resources are ordinarily subject to institutional regulation; that is, the absence of private ownership does not mean that resources are part of an "open-access" (ie. unmanaged) situation. However, in depicting commonly-held resources as subject to formal control, the common property model of Fenney, et.al. has effectively excluded its more subtle and informal incarnations leaving them to be glossed as "open
McGranahan (1991) has criticized the fairly specific and formal model of common property for erring in the other direction of Hardin's neo-classical version by offering a too restrictive definition. McGranahan points out that not all commons systems are associated with clear rights about access to and use of resources. The formal model given above is in fact only one variant of a more general model of common property which McGranahan defines broadly as, "any property regime which ensures that more than one user has some non-exclusive access to the same resource (Ibid.:1276)."

McGranahan's definition is useful in that it points to an underlying principle of multiple rights of access while rejecting the notion that this leads to some "free-for-all".

The obverse position, that with multiple rights of access lead inevitably to resource degradation, is most pointedly represented by Hardin's "Tragedy of the Commons" model (1968). Hardin assumes that without formal mechanisms for exclusion at the level of the individual user (ie. private property) people are not forced to recognize the inherent limitations of their resource base. Thus, it is argued that with private property, individual users have to make do with what they have; in a commons, the user can take advantage of the common good by maximizing individual gain and preempting others' claims thereby leading to a crisis in management. Hardin has somewhat qualified his initial stance (1968) to suggest that the "tragedy of the commons" is in fact a "tragedy of the
unmanaged commons (Hardin, 1991)." Hardin is willing to admit that in situations of resource abundance, a commons system may function effectively. However, his commitment to Malthus leads Hardin to conclude that the commons is of limited utility and should be a thing of the past, since population growth places pressures on the resource base that a commons system cannot manage effectively (1977:32-3, 37-41; 1991:178-9). Common Property theorists have reversed this proposition by observing that where needs begin to outstrip available resources, institutional mechanisms are developed to regulate access and use; the greater the pressure on resources, the more formal the regulation (see for eg. Gibbs & Bromley, 1989:25-6; McCay & Acheson, 1987:6-7, 18-22).

More than simply an argument for privatisation of commonly held resources, the "Tragedy of the Commons" thesis is a call for greater external (state) control. There is an implicit Hobbesian assumption in the "Tragedy" thesis that suggests in the absence of the alleged security and stability provided by some sovereign authority, people will neglect to invest in the institutional regulation of resource use. Numerous case studies have shown that this is not necessarily the case (see Berkes & Farvar, 1989; Bromley, et.al., 1992; McCay & Acheson, 1987 for collections of such cases). Rudel depicts what he terms the "legal centrist" position in which it is assumed that where a weak state fails to guarantee exclusionary mechanisms it cannot forestall the emergence of a
"tragedy of the commons;" in other words, the legal centrists assume that the absence of legal rights to land creates open access conditions that are conducive to deforestation (Ibid:188)." Rudel goes on to show how small farmers in Ecuador are quite capable of devising even informal mechanisms for sorting out rights to gain access to and make use of local forest resources (Ibid.).

COMMON PROPERTY THEORY AND WOODLANDS IN GUDYANGA

How does the highly formalized model of common property given by Feeney, et.al., and the "tragedy of the Commons" thesis, apply to woodlands management in Gudyanga? Apparently it neatly fits neither the model of a formalised commons nor that of the unregulated "open access" resource. Given that there was virtually no obvious formal regulation of daily household wood harvesting it is easy to see how woodland use could be seen as a case of "open access" (see for eg. Hofstad,1993:54; Campbell,et.al.,1993:42). However, the land management system in Gudyanga was more complex than this simple dichotomy can convey. Woodland commons were an integral part of a larger commons system and were not subject to some exclusive form of land use. Although, different resources had different forms of management and tenure, there were no permanently exclusive spaces, or zones, of management. Woodlands were also grazing areas and, potentially, fields and homesites. Thus, in discussing woodlands management we need
to understand the impact of the management of other resources (or land uses). The wider land management system in Gudyanga, centred on arable land, fits the more formalized common property model better with its clear exclusivity of access within areas associated with traditional leaders.

The case of arable land management in Gudyanga, and through much of the Communal Lands, supports the formal definition with the proviso that there are many reported instances of "private" holding and transfer (see pp.225-26). However, my research reveals there can be a contradiction in the term "common property" which is not apparent in the more formal definition given by Feeney, et.al. (1990). The contradiction lies between the words "common" and "property;" the former implies an inclusive sense of interest and the latter exclusive interest. The formal definition of common property suggests a common interest in preventing encroachment from others. In Gudyanga woodlands were managed in the common interest by restricting clearance for the expansion of arable holdings while leaving virtually no restriction on the use of woodland products. Households met their daily wood needs from a commons that had no boundaries, except those imposed by labour time (or effort), and that they shared with neighbouring peoples freely. Similarly, the case of harurwa management given by Makuku (see pp.217-19) suggests that collective interest was being served best by inclusiveness.
WHO OWNS THE LAND?

If a commons is a form of property (ie. common property) it must presumably be "owned" by somebody or some group. The debate over who "owns" the land on which woodlands are found has probably in some form or another dominated political discourse in the region for centuries; indeed, the debate has engaged anthropologists for some time as well (see Shipton, 1994). It has been suggested throughout this thesis that woodlands in Gudyanga were held collectively. However, to say that "the community" owned the woodlands would be misleading for a number of reasons. Perhaps the most obvious reason is that under the Communal Lands Act of 1982 title to all land in the Communal Areas is vested in the office of the President of Zimbabwe. However, the ability of central government to exercise its legal prerogatives, as a land owner, to direct land use practices in the Communal Areas has been extremely uneven. Given that few development interventions have been made in Gudyanga, land is fairly effectively controlled by local interests.

However, the people in Gudyanga who used local woodlands in common did not effectively form a bounded residential or land use group with a common identity. In other words, as was discussed in chapter three, there was in effect no clear sense in Gudyanga of a closed, corporate "community." Corporate control of land was only exercised with respect to arable and residential land within a musha ("village") or bhuku ("book")
and even this control of land was not "ownership" as such. The *samusha* and *sabhuku* were clearly associated with stewardship over fairly well-defined tracts of land, however they were more representatives of common interest whose duties were to minimize conflict; traditional leaders were not, as far as I could tell, treated as "owners of the land (Lan, 1985:72-4)," or the living representatives of a patrilineage that exercised corporate control of land.

The prefix *sa-* that was applied to units of land management (eg. *musha*, *bhuku*, *dunhu*) is conventionally translated as "owner of ..." however this is inaccurate and is more properly "holder of ..." (or "keeper of ..."). Thus, for example, when two people have the same name (*zita*), the more senior may be called *sazita* ("namesake," or "the holder of our common name"). *Sa-* implies connection and relatedness more than mastery over something (ie. dominion or ownership). The *masamusha* in Gudyanga were not generally referred to as *masamusha* but were addressed using some honorific title or term of address. Furthermore, the manner in which the broad-based Gudyanga Irrigation Development Project Committee sought to prevent traditional leaders from directly controlling access to irrigated land in the proposed irrigation scheme suggests traditional leaders were not seen to hold title to the land on behalf of their ancestors or the people more generally.
It could be said that field-holders were effectively "land-owners" as they held the land in perpetuity, theoretically -- or at least as long as they are able to keep their land under cultivation. Thus, field-holders were effectively holding "privately" what had been communal woodlands before it was cleared. The ability of field-holders to encroach on surrounding woodlands and effectively "privatise" woodlands was an important process to note however I did not investigate the matter fully. Expansion of household fields into common woodlands was limited by the expectation that traditional leaders be notified. In addition, most fields in the study area formed large contiguous blocks in Zones 1 and 3 (see Map 5) and therefore the majority of fields were bordered by other fields, paths, or areas where cultivation was difficult such as rivers or hills. Clearing of new fields without formal approval had taken place however, especially after war, and fields were expanded into paths, river banks and hills. The "private" enclosure of standing woodlands by fencing parts off into fields or home yards had not occurred to my knowledge.

Thus, the answer to the question "Who owns the land?" is far more complex than it first appears. It was only with land for building and cultivation that the dynamics of neo-classical scarcity had led to greater regulation of access and use, and ultimately, possession as property (whether common or more individualised). With respect to the land on which the
remaining standing woodlands were found, it appears that in some sense nobody actually "owned" the land. Put differently, common interest was more fully expressed in the management of woodlands than it was, say, with arable land. At the same time, the institutional mechanisms that regulated access to arable land were relevant to woodlands management insofar as in the common interest they served to protect woodlands from being cleared to meet more narrow, individual needs for fields and homesites. Thus, in the management of common woodlands, every interest in the land had to account for the vested interests of other persons, groups and agencies. The land and its resources were there for all to enjoy.

In other parts of Zimbabwe, Bruce, et al. found that trees that were found in common woodlands could not be claimed by individuals as it was said they "belong to the forest (1993:636)." This confirms Gluckman's observations of Rotse law that specifies "not so much the rights of persons over things as the duties between persons in respect of things (cited in Shipton, 1994:349; see also Colson, 1971:199)." With this in mind then, I must conclude that while woodlands in Gudyanga were clearly managed as a commons, they were not held as property. The terms muboo ("something free") or jakafiri ("communal property") might be translated as "common property" (Hannan, 1984), however the terms were not used as such in Gudyanga. I was unable to find an alternative term for those resources that were held collectively; communal woodlands were
not referred to as "things" to be held (collectively) but as places where trees were found (eg. makomo, "mountains", dondo, "forest", or mapundo, "bush").

A "Tragedy of the Commons" in the Making?

I would like to close this chapter by expanding on the implications of treating the management of woodlands in Gudyanga as a process that was not necessarily dependent on their ownership as a form of property. Here we can return to Hardin's notion of the "unmanaged commons (1991)" which suggests that without formal boundaries for ownership (individual of collective), and hence exclusion of non-owners, resources cease to be managed; in effect, they become subject to an "open-access" "free-for-all." In a similar vein, a World Bank "Strategy for the Forest Sector in Sub-Saharan Africa" suggests that "common property regimes without clearly defined rules for use and management are ... subject to degradation ('the tragedy of the commons') (Sharma, et.al., 1994:21)."

To the contrary, this thesis has shown that although woodlands in Gudyanga were not "owned", strictly speaking, this did not mean they were not managed. Neither state agencies or local collective organization effectively held woodlands as a form of property, however there was no sense that people were rushing to capitalize on woodland resources before others preempted their own claims. It is a mistake to
assume, as Hardin seems to, that community held resources are always at risk of being squandered by rapacious self interest, or even that pursuing self-interest will necessarily lead to over-exploitation. The problem with the view that effective management is dependent on political hierarchy and clear exclusionary rights is that management is then seen simply as a negative or restrictive process. In Gudyanga there appeared to be a common (but not necessarily unanimous) sense that self-interest should not rule out the claims of other residents or of future generations. There were few clearly formalised regulations about how resources were to be used, and by whom, yet one could say there were management practices and cultural conventions that acted to preserve the commons. Such flexible and informal institutions may have been important in making available a wide variety of livelihood options in what was an environmentally insecure area.

The clearest case of an "open access" situation can be found during the early colonial period in the Zimbabwean plateau when landed resources were individualised as quickly as possible to preempt the claims of Africans as well as other European settlers (see pp.56-9). The resource "free-for-all" is, I would argue, a product of exceptional circumstances associated with frontier conditions. The colonial frontier was not an institutional vacuum however as European settlers brought with them the institutions of their home country, especially those of the bourgeois state and private property.
The notion that land needed to be held in clearly demarcated parcels associated with exclusive control by some "owner" justified the land grab by claiming the land was unoccupied, or at the very least, "wasted." Through the application of their knowledge, institutions and military power, Rhodesian settlers attempted to extinguish African control of land. In the process, settlers cleared huge tracts of indigenous forest and woodland to meet European demands for timber and agricultural land. To establish the forest plantations of the Eastern highlands, for example, rich indigenous forests -- not simply stands of trees but entire ecosystems rich in plant and animal life -- were liquidated and replaced with exotic timber species. Put simply, the true "tragedy of the commons" in Zimbabwe was the rapid and brutal land grab of settler colonialism which expropriated and privatised the most productive pieces of African commons and relegated Africans to the least productive lands where they were expected to reformulate a new commons. The study of local woodland commons in the Communal Lands of Zimbabwe cannot ignore this historical dimension.
Endnotes

1. Vail also suggests that the emergence of this new authority was essentially a conservative process, particular in so far as it increased control over women (1989:15).

2. This is another rehashing of the emic versus etic debate, and as such the conclusions reached here have implications for much of Anthropological research.

3. Perhaps Bourdillon’s assertion in his recent publication (1993) is overly functionalist however his emphasis on the adaptive tendencies of culture is instructive in this context.

4. Cousins does warn, however, of the possibility that "in the absence of decisive interventions the ambiguities inherent in the current property regime may be increasingly manipulated by elites and emergent rural accumulators to their own advantage (1990:30)."

5. There were only vague boundaries between the portions of misha that were in the hilly woodland regions (ie. Zone 5) where there was less likely to be allocations for homesites or fields. Borders became more distinct, as do the rivers that often mark borders, in the areas more densely settled and cultivated (ie. Zones 3 - 1).

6. The most common term was mutape however I am not sure how to translate this. If the term is a variation of mutapi it could be literally translated as "captor" and may have its roots in
the turmoil of the Gaza Nguni period. Lan (1985:59-66) notes that in Dande (Zambezi Valley) the term mutapi refers to an influential local person who serves as an assistant to a spirit medium (svikiro).
Chapter Seven

Resource Management Planning and the Need for Greater
Local Control of Resources

Calling the Crisis

With the expropriation of African common lands in the
early colonial period, and the crowding of Africans into
resource-poor Reserves, the spectre of ecological crisis
emerged. Although much of the early conservation legislation
was in fact directed at the wasteful practices of European
settlers (see for eg. Judge,1993), conservation legislation
became an important tool for the colonial government to
intervene in the organization of production in the Reserves.
McGregor (1991:312) suggests that the so-called "woodfuel
crisis" of Independent Zimbabwe, like the alarm over erosion
in the colonial era, is the latest misunderstanding of the
environment used to intervene in local production. Both the
cause of and the solution to land degradation have not being
effectively linked to the (inherited) colonial political
economy but are still seen in policy circles as being internal
to the Communal Lands themselves (Elliot,1989:211). Thus, the
alarm over land degradation in the Communal Lands continues to
be a basis for crisis management (i.e. short term, interventionist solutions). Sweeping generalizations like that of Casey and Muir cited in chapter one (p.11) do not do justice to the diversity of local conditions nor to the ingenuity and determination of people in the Communal Lands.

Regrettably, long term solutions rooted in the organizational capacities of local peoples have not yet been formulated by government planners. Centralized land use planning threatens the viability of local resource management systems in the Communal Lands. This can be demonstrated with reference to two key elements of resource management models: 1) the assumption that each resource type (woodland, woodlot, arable, irrigated, grazing, residential) be spatially segregated and subject to only one land use; 2) national planning priorities are rooted in, and justified by, the static, macro-ecological model of Natural Regions.

EXCLUSIVE ZONES OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Land use plans are drafted and implemented by the state agricultural extension agency, Agritex, and are based on the assumption that specific classes of land are best suited for one specific type of land use -- a form of comparative advantage on a smaller scale. Land use plans drafted by Agritex begin with land capability (or carrying capacity) maps which clearly demarcate areas as potential arable, non-arable, grazing areas, woodlots and built-up areas. The difficulty of
working with the concept of carrying capacity is too large an issue to be treated here (see for example Homewood & Rodgers, 1987). Agritex land use plans for Gudyanga specify clearly demarcated, and ideally fenced, blocks of land for dryland agriculture, irrigated agriculture, grazing, and woodlots. Such plans ignore the complex relations people have with the land and may effectively reduce the general community benefit derived from multiple use of resources.

This thesis has demonstrated that the management of woodland resources in Gudyanga was intimately tied to the management of all lands in Gudyanga. Multiple uses of land, such as the keeping of trees in fields and the winter grazing by cattle on crop residues and trees in fields, were particularly important in diversifying benefits and reducing the risks posed by unpredictable weather patterns. Therefore, creating and enforcing exclusive zones of land use would effectively undermine local land management strategies. It would almost certainly be unwise to separate the management of woodland resources from the management of arable and grazing resources.

As much of daily woodland use in Gudyanga was opportunistic, informal management enabled households to meet their daily needs. In this way, flexibility in patterns of tree use was strengthened by maintaining flexibility of access to collectively held resources. Land management in Gudyanga was characterised in part by flexible and adaptive
relationships between use practices and (access to) the resource base. Although perhaps more fragmented than in the nineteenth century (cf. Matowanyika, 1991:253), it was as an organic system in which different land use practices were not mechanically segregated that land management in Gudyanga has survived the legislative and economic pressures of the last century; in other words, cultivated land, woodland and cattle are, therefore, inseparable and have remained so for decades, despite the imposition of a wide range of central directives to the contrary (Bradley, 1993:97).

We can illustrate this point with reference to the relationship between the harvesting of wood for fuel and diversity of woodland resources. People in Gudyanga said that certain woods were best for gathering fuel although people made use of almost any species for fuel. Daily fuel needs were met by dry wood gathered at one’s convenience and thus the burning of wood for fuel had little impact on woodlands diversity except on the floor (i.e. where decaying branches serve as habitat and nutrients for other species). Although people were beginning to walk farther for good poles, the diversity of tree species and ages provided a renewed source for the diverse and changing needs for tree products in Gudyanga.

The proposed long-term outcome of segregated land use is to reduce pressure on parcels of land considered optimally suited to one particular use. However, this can only succeed where inputs to each sector are provided to replace those
provided by multiple-use. For example, dryland agriculture will require fertility amendments in the absence of bush fallow and steadily deposited leaf litter from trees in fields; this is in fact already the case through much of Gudyanga, especially Zones 1 & 3 where fields are almost permanently cultivated, and points to the importance of agroforestry. If livestock are to be kept in paddocks, fodder will have to be grown to replace those foraged from woodlands and fields, a particularly untenable suggestion when there is virtually no grazing land to begin with in Gudyanga. Given the importance of livestock to Communal Area production in low rainfall areas, Scoones and Wilson have suggested that overall productivity is more constrained by lack of commonage for pasture than it is by lack of access to arable land (1988:35; see also Arnold, 1991:11). This applies well to Gudyanga where a larger commons would reduce livestock pressures on woodlands regeneration.

It is highly questionable that Gudyanga has the resources to make the above needed investments in fertility amendments and fencing on an on-going basis. The potential for a shortage of irrigated land, not to mention unstable producer prices and marketing costs, means the future rewards of the proposed irrigation scheme are far from certain and cannot be expected to transform local land management. Current tenure patterns in Gudyanga enabled all households, even the materially poor, to make use of community woodlands (including
grazing) resources and therefore allowed for the possibility of material improvement. In addition, collective access to woodlands within a flexible and informal management regime was especially important for women in Gudyanga. Fortmann and Nabane have shown that women are generally most immediately affected by restrictions on access to woodlands (1992:32-5). Formal political institutions, the traditional system and the state bureaucracy, tended to exclude women from arable lands by giving land only to more established older women (especially widows) who had the ability to maintain their access to land; however, access to common woodland for gathering products was largely unrestricted. Women were the most active users of local woodlands as they gathered food, fuel, and incomes from the wooded areas -- most gathering and sale of mauyu (baobab fruit) was done by women, who generally controlled that income on behalf of their family. Flexible access to woodland resources enabled women to provide for their families in such a way that did not interfere greatly with their other daily activities. In addition, restrictions on the way in which woodlands were used applied principally to the cutting of trees, something that was largely done by men. In the interests of protecting less wealthy residents of the area, as well as women in general, existing land use and tenure patterns need to be better evaluated for their contribution to rural livelihood security. Radical
transformations of local management strategies in Gudyanga should therefore be viewed with caution.

NATURAL REGIONS AND CENTRAL PLANNING

As has been shown for Gudyanga, the lack of boundedness and exclusivity was integral to land management and has enabled flexible adaptations to changing environmental, economic and political conditions. Thus, indigenous resource management strategies in the Communal Lands of Zimbabwe can often be quite flexible and adaptive, and should be considered as part of the solution, not an obstacle, to developing sustainable management approaches. However, land use planning in the Communal Lands is guided by very broad conceptions of land capability as defined primarily by rainfall quantity, frequency and reliability. It is standard fare in any discussion of arable land management to trot out the tidy classification of productive potential, and therefore "most suitable" land use, represented by the Natural Regions model. While agro-ecological potential is evidently more complex than the amount and form of rainfall, "for general purposes ... the Zimbabwe Natural Regions and Farming Areas map at 1:1m, second edition, 1984, remains the main policy document for strategic and regional planning (Moyo, et.al., 1991:33)." Although rainfall has historically been critical in shaping the boundaries of economic activity in the Communal Areas, the priorities drawn from this general and simplistic observation
are potentially tragic. As Derman (1991) has noted for the Mid-Zambezi Valley Rural Development Project, located in an area classed as suitable for livestock production, an land use planning emphasis on livestock has led to the absurdity of designating wetlands used for critical winter gardens as grazing areas, yet few people even own livestock.

The Natural Region model is based on putative potential for commercial production and as such has as its focus the market and GDP, not the lives of Communal Area dwellers themselves. The characterization of Natural Region V, in which Gudyanga is located, seems out of place when viewed next to the depiction of the diverse production system described in this thesis:

The rainfall in this region is too low and erratic for the reliable production of even drought-resistant fodder and grain crops, and farming has to be based on the utilization of the veld alone. The extensive form of cattle ranching or game ranching is the only sound farming system for this region (Zimbabwe, 1980).

Natural Regions IV and V are described as not suitable for crop production and yet 73.5% of the land in Communal Areas, and 62% of the Communal Area population, is located in these regions (Moyo, et al., 1991:57; Weiner, et al., 1991:147-8). This glaring, and still largely racial, inequity in landholding points to the difficulties Africans have faced in maintaining secure livelihoods. However, Africans evidently have survived under these conditions and it is incumbent upon policy makers to give credit to the tenacity of indigenous
resource management systems. Thus, as Moyo, et al., have suggested,

"Planning, which is negatively based on agro-ecological constraints, needs to be challenged by imaginative planning based on actual resource potential, including human and technological resources (Moyo, et al., 1993:334)."

The belief that land management would be better served by radically redefining people's relations to resources has its origins in the colonial period, but especially in policy of centralization initiated in the nineteen thirties by E.D. Alvord and in the Native Land Husbandry Act (NLHA) of 1951. As McGregor notes for the colonial policy of centralization, "control [by the state over rural Africans] seems to have been the primary effect of the whole program, whether or not it was explicitly part of its original intent (1991:104)." It is not surprising then that the "most significant impact [of the NLHA] was to create insecurity and disaffection which contributed to a hostile attitude to later government interventions (Alexander, 1993:59)." Today, the assumptions and goals of the highly interventionist NLHA can be found in virtually all important policy documents affecting land use in the Communal Areas (Ibid:215). Thus, as shown in the First Five Year Development Plan (see p.70), central planners tend to view indigenous resource management systems in the Communal Areas as unviable. Rather than finding ways to better facilitate those management systems that have enabled Communal Area dwellers to survive, technical planners appear to be
preparing to dismantle local land management in the Communal Areas.

**Participation and Local Control**

In 1988 the director of the powerful Department of Rural and Urban Development (Derude), which is largely responsible for overseeing resettlement schemes, expressed clearly the sentiment held by government planners and technical staff that I observed in Chimanimani District: "Government has the resources and the people take the back seat. We tell people what we are doing and they tell us their fears (Interview conducted by Alexander, 1993:210)." If a more participatory development practice is to be achieved, those people who shape policy in the development agencies of the west will need to ensure that their intended beneficiaries are able to exercise effective control over the sources of their livelihood. To do this, existing local institutions need to be better understood and given a stronger role in the management of local (woodland) resources. In other words, the very people who make use of and depend on local resources must also be the ones who are responsible for regulating access to and use of those resources. Defining what will be "local" need necessarily be flexible and drafted in full consultation with all stakeholders (ie. traditional leaders, Vidcos, and popular organizations); arbitrary units of administration such as Vidcos or areas associated with traditional leaders are
appropriate only if there is popular consensus. The content of this dissertation has suggested that people in Gudyanga have demonstrated the ability to regulate resource use and to adapt to a changing political economy by developing new management institutions. Residents in Gudyanga clearly conveyed the desire to achieve greater economic security but not as virtual employees of a state-run irrigation scheme. Commitment to sustainable and equitable resource management will not be secured simply by the aspiration for material improvement or by nationalism.

Although a marginal area, the material conditions of residents in Gudyanga are not desperate enough, nor is their faith in the ruling party strong enough, for people to relinquish control over resources. Fears of government intervention in daily life, and resistance to that intervention, have been a feature of local politics since the end of the last century. The proposed introduction of an irrigation scheme in Gudyanga was a welcome relief in this arid area, however one that was also viewed with some caution while the benefits remained so intangible. Invested with the diverse and often contradictory interests of international and Zimbabwean NGOs, government planning departments (esp. Agritex), local government (ie. District Council) and Gudyanga residents themselves, the outcome of land use changes in Gudyanga was far from certain.
The assertion that rural people have no management strategies to protect the resources on which they depend serves as a justification for colonial (and post-colonial) destruction of indigenous management institutions and the exploitation of human and natural resources that ensures the continued levels of consumption by urban elites as well as the rest of us in wealthy industrialized countries. The wealthy of the world enjoy cheap commodities like the sugar and wheat grown in the multinational and state irrigation schemes of southern Zimbabwe that were founded on the expropriation of African land and forced African labour. Communal Area dwellers like the residents of Gudyanga, many of whose forbears came from and/or worked on those very lands expropriated for the Middle-Save estates, see few benefits. However, the linkages between industrial agriculture and the Communal Area run deeper than those of land, labour and capital; they trace themselves out through the ecology. For example, the erosion that occurs in Communal Areas along the Save river threatens the viability of irrigation downstream and is almost certainly a factor behind government concerns for siltation in the Save River (i.e. erosion). Again, conservation concerns are not merely technical issues but are direct reflections of the (largely inherited) political economy in Zimbabwe. More insidious connections between arid Communal Lands and irrigated private estates run through the food chain.
In Gudyanga, the ngozha (Quelea quelea) is a small but very numerous and tasty bird that is highly esteemed and an important source of protein, especially for young children who trap them in fields with deadfalls (mariya). The ngozha is viewed by the industrial irrigators as a "pest." By day the birds descend in vast clouds to feed on the extensive acreages of monocropped wheat; by nights they roost along the wooded parts of the Save River in the Communal Areas. The tragic and shameless expression of the power of multinational and state interests is revealed in the spraying campaigns mounted against the ngozha. To protect the wheat an important seasonal source of meat for Communal Area residents is sprayed with toxic chemicals (an organophosphate) right along the Save river. The next morning a bounty of deadly birds can be gathered by residents to eat or sell to other rural dwellers farther afield.6

This is truly the "tragedy of the commons." A tragedy that is rooted in rapacious self-interest but beyond the control of those who fully depend on the commons for survival. The "tragedy of the commons" is created by powerful outsiders who, more likely, are dependent on the destruction of the multitude of resource commons on which rural Africans depend. The dismantling of the commons thereby "frees" both human and natural resources from their social constraints so that they may enter commodity exchange networks in which profits accrue to powerful commercial interests. History repeats itself --
or perhaps the historical forces that spurred the expropriation and exploitation of African land and people have never ceased to dominate the Zimbabwean political economy.
1. Three aspects of the concept of carrying capacity make its application in development planning potentially detrimental to local management systems in Zimbabwe. First, while quite capable of being dynamic, the concept of carrying capacity tends to be used in a static manner insofar as planners work with formal and relatively fixed categories of resource capability (resource areas can be reclassed of course). Second, calculations are generally made with reference to conditions suitable for commercial production, and then largely under experimental conditions. Third, following from the above two, existing land use practices in the Communal Lands are rarely taken into account; thus, assessing land capability becomes a strictly technical issues divorced from an understanding of local social dynamics and their political-economic context. Assessing what is the "ideal" use of land is mapped out only according to topography, soil type, soil depth and other natural (ie. "inherent") features of the area.

However, the capacity of rural farmers in Zimbabwe to adapt to very marginal resources is quite remarkable (see Nyamapfene, 1989). For instance, in the hilly upland and often badly eroded parts of Gudyanga farmers manage to wrest harvests from coarse sandy "soils" that are virtually devoid of clay or humus. While not in any way a model for arable land management, this example nevertheless points to the ability of marginalized
farmers to extract value from what would otherwise be deemed an area where cultivation was not possible.

In addition, the relationship between a society and its resource base is not simple and linear, but complex and characterised by two-way feedback processes. For example, a heavily cut woodlands is more productive (i.e. produces more woody biomass in the form of branches per unit of time) than mature "virgin" woodlands even though the latter may contain more woody biomass at any one moment in time. Agriculture is the more apparent case where human energies are directed at reducing the diversity and stability of a mature ecosystem to take advantage of the productive capacity of structurally transformed (i.e. disturbed) ecosystem. In an agroecosystem, then, plant succession is constantly held back in order to maintain plant communities more desirable to people (see Gliessman, 1990). Selective cutting maintains the rough proportions of tree species while preventing the formation of a mature canopy and its associated understorey; in other words, succession is prevented from reaching a climax. Whether or not people in Gudyanga cut trees selectively for this reason (i.e. to increase woodland productivity) is unknown.

2. Transporting leaf litter would require additional labour; I am not aware of any studies that compare the decomposition and consumption (by termites) of leaf litter applied in bulk by farmers with the litter deposited more gradually by trees.
3. The Natural Regions model consists of the following classes and their associated farming systems (Zimbabwe, 1980):

I Specialized and Diversified Farming Region (restricted to the Chimanimani highlands);

IIa & IIb Intensive Farming Regions;

III & IV Semi-Intensive Farming Regions;

V Extensive Farming Region (Zambezi and Save-Limpopo Valleys).

4. Both the state and large scale commercial farmers have extensive holdings in the dry regions of Zimbabwe but primarily for game reserves and extensive livestock and/or game ranching, respectively.

5. A further illustration of institutional capacity is provided by the history of the medical clinic in Gudyanga. The clinic was the only health service in the area with the nearest hospital being in Nyanyadzi, ten kilometres up the road. The clinic consisted of one main building with limited solar electricity and no plumbing, as well as two staff buildings. The donor, the EEC, apparently pledged to pay for materials while Mabvazuwa District Council was to pay contractors, and the residents of Gudyanga to supply labour. Council rerouted materials for a third staff house to another clinic and failed to pay contractors. When the contractors saw they were not going to be paid they stopped working. Local leaders (traditional, Vidco and others in Gudyanga) organized the
completion of construction by having people contribute extra labour, materials (bricks) and a building fee; most of the clinic was built by local labour. Those who did not contribute to the clinic were treated as "non-members" (or visitors) and were charged a $1 per visit fee for using the clinic.

Some residents felt the fee was a violation of the government's promise of free health care and complained to District Council. Council then informed clinic staff in person that they were not to charge for treatment, directly contradicting the regulations put into place by the clinic committee. The clinic committee requested a meeting with the District Council at which they asked the Council, in essence, "whose clinic is this?" After taking a recess to discuss the matter, Council returned to state clearly that the clinic was under the jurisdiction of Mabvazuwa District Council. A representative of the contractors, who was called to the meeting, was informed that all outstanding bills are to be presented to Mabvazuwa District Council. Meeting adjourned.

At a subsequent meeting called by District Council this time, Council informs the Clinic Committee that the Gudyanga clinic belongs to both the Council and the community; the head nurse was to take her instructions from the Clinic Committee and thereafter the status quo ante was reinstated. By the time of this research the Gudyanga Clinic Committee had paid off most of the contractor's bills with their own contributions. The Gudyanga clinic was rated second in the District for 1992 and
played an important role in the lives of the residents. While the construction of the clinic revealed the District Council could neglect its responsibilities to local communities like Gudyanga, that the clinic was built at all is a sign of the determination and organizational skills of the people of Gudyanga.

6. Although residents of Gudyanga were apparently aware of the dangers, it is questionable that all people, especially children, observed warnings issued by government. Residents of Gudyanga told me of how people from Birchenough Bridge gathered the sprayed birds by the sackful to be sold at the market in that town.
MAP 4  Study Area (showing territorial divisions)
Map 5  Cross-Section View of Study Area (Transect A-B on Map 4)

Zone 1
Resource Base
Alluvial soils; parts very wet and poorly drained; elev 485-520m

Woodland Cover
Mainly riparian; esp. Guvhunga, Mucha, Munvee; many trees in fields & on edges of fields

Land-Use
Plowed fields; main crop: maize.

Zone 2
Resource Base
Severe compaction and, in places, gulley erosion; elev 520-535m

Woodland Cover
Many colonizing spp. in disturbed areas (esp. Muunga); Mucha dominant; some deeply cut mopane woodland remains

Land-Use
Main residential and built-up area; Chinyamunyu (sacred area)

Zone 3
Resource Base
Heavy sheet erosion; soils mostly sandy; elev 535-640m avg. slope 2°

Woodland Cover
Mostly cleared; some regenerating mopane woods; Muuyu common in fields

Land-Use
Hand-hoed fields; main crop: millet

Zone 4
Resource Base
Many eroded surfaces and rocky outcrops; elev 640-825m avg. slope 2.5°

Woodland Cover
Very mixed; much in regeneration; Muunga in abandoned fields; some stunted mopane woodland remains

Land-Use
Older fields, many abandoned; main crops: millet, sorghum, maize

Zone 5
Resource Base
Agro-ecological Region IV; cooler and moister; elev 825-1250m

Woodland Cover
Wooded hills of mixed species; mutsisingidzi, mugwataigwati dominant (not mopane)

Land-Use
Generally not used; some wood gathered but most from more nearby hills
## Appendix I: A List of Local and Latin Names for Tree Species Observed in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Species Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bushepuhe</td>
<td>Burseraceae</td>
<td>Commiphora merkeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chigaramariya</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Grewia flavescens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flavescens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chigwendere</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Bauhineae galpinii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikonde</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Euphorbia cooperi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitataunga</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Acacia schweinfurthii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyaukururu</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Grewia flavescens (subsp?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowakowa</td>
<td>Liliaceae</td>
<td>Aloe app.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunjaro</td>
<td>Sterculiaceae</td>
<td>Sterculia rogersii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guvhunga</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Acacia albida, A. galpinii, A. polyantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. robusta clavigera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwenanguruwe</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Acacia polyantha campylacantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubhururu</td>
<td>Verbenaceae</td>
<td>Vitex payos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubvamaropa</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Pterocarpus angolensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubvee</td>
<td>Bigoniaceae</td>
<td>Kigelia africana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mubvumira</td>
<td>Simaroubaceae</td>
<td>Kirkia acuminata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucha</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Xanthocercis zambesiaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muchecheni</td>
<td>Rhamnaceae</td>
<td>Ziziphus mucronata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudyandararama</td>
<td></td>
<td>? (unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugwatikwati</td>
<td>Burseraceae</td>
<td>Commiphora mossambicensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhedgi</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Euphorbia tirucalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhweti</td>
<td>Combretaceae</td>
<td>Combretum imberbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukamba</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Afzelia quanzensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukonde</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Euphorbia ingens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukukuti</td>
<td>Ebenaceae</td>
<td>Diospyros guiloensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukute</td>
<td>Myrtaceae</td>
<td>Syzygium cordatum, S. guineense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukwakwa</td>
<td>Loganaceae</td>
<td>Strychnos madagascariensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muminu</td>
<td>Ochnaceae</td>
<td>Ochna pulchra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munanga</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Pericopsis angolensis (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munduduhwe</td>
<td>Flacourtiaceae</td>
<td>Flacourtia indica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munhengeni</td>
<td>Olacaceae</td>
<td>Ximenia caffra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munyi</td>
<td>Rhamnaceae</td>
<td>Berchemia discolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munonde</td>
<td>Moraceae</td>
<td>Ficus capensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupapangoma</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Albizia gumifera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupanda</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Lonchocarpus capassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupangara</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Dichrostachys cinerea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupepe</td>
<td>Burseraceae</td>
<td>Commiphora martoithii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mupfura</td>
<td>Anacardaceae</td>
<td>Sclerocarya birrea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murara</td>
<td>Areaceae</td>
<td>Hyphaene benguellensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murwiti</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Dalbergia melanoxin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushanje</td>
<td>Combretaceae</td>
<td>Terminalia prunoides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Name</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Species Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Musharu</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Colophosphermum mopane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushumha</td>
<td>Ebenaceae</td>
<td>Diospyros mespiliformis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musosoti</td>
<td>Euphorbiaceae</td>
<td>Securinega virosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musototo</td>
<td>Anacardaceae</td>
<td>Lannea stuhlmannii (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutarara</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Grewia volkensii (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutezwa</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Grewia inequilatera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutohwe</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Azanza garkeana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutongoro</td>
<td>Tiliaceae</td>
<td>Grewia bicolor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsikiri</td>
<td>Meliaceae</td>
<td>Trichilia emetica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsingidzi</td>
<td>Combretaceae</td>
<td>Combretum apiculatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutsvikiri</td>
<td>Anacardaceae</td>
<td>Rhus spp. (eg. lancea?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muunga</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Acacia robusta robusta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muuyu</td>
<td>Bombaceae</td>
<td>Adansonia digitata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muvheneka</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Cassia abreviata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzeze</td>
<td>Leguminosae</td>
<td>Peltophorum africanum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix II: Ecology and Use of Trees in Gudyanga

#### Key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDER</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Genus species</th>
<th>(Local Name)</th>
<th>Ecology</th>
<th>fuel</th>
<th>fodder</th>
<th>other uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>agrofor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOCOTYLEDONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arecaceae / Palmae (Palm)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hyphaene benquellensis</em></td>
<td>(Murara)</td>
<td>Few Along Save R. regrowth in fields (esp. Zone 1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>fronds used for weaving &amp; plaiting; palm wine made in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliaceae (Lily)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aloe spp.</em></td>
<td>(Gowakowa)</td>
<td>Throughout Zone 2, esp. Chinyamunyu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DICOTYLEDONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraceae (Mulberry &amp; Fig)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ficus capensis</em></td>
<td>(Muonde)</td>
<td>Scattered in Zone 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>kudira (prayer); medicine; wine in past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olacaceae (Sour Plum)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ximenia caffra</em></td>
<td>(Munhengeni)</td>
<td>Zone 4 (rocky outcrops)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leguminosae (pod bearing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mimosoideae (Mimosa)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Albizzia gummifera</em></td>
<td>(Mupapangoma)</td>
<td>Scattered in Zones 2 &amp; 3; much regrowth in Zone 3 fields Common in Zone 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia albida</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Guvhunga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia galpinii</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Guvhunga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acacia polyacantha subsp. campylacantha</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Gwenanguruwe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus species</th>
<th>Ecology</th>
<th>fuel</th>
<th>fodder</th>
<th>other uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acacia robusta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsp. clavigera (Guvhunga)</td>
<td>Lowland valleys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>poles, mortars; medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsp. robusta (Mununga)</td>
<td>Throughout area</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>branches cut for brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fence; glue from sap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly in Zone 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>poles, some mortars;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acacia polyacantha</strong></td>
<td>Climber frequent in Zone 1 watercourses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsp. ? (Guvhunga)</td>
<td>Throughout area; dominates heavily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disturbed areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently found in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disturbed areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dichrostachys cinerea</strong> (Mupanga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Caesalpinioideae (Cassia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colophospermum mopane</strong> (Musharu)</td>
<td>Dominant species in study area as whole</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(esp. Zones 2 &amp; 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afzelia guanzzenzis</strong> (Mukamba)</td>
<td>Thinly scattered in upland areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>poles, tool handles;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bauhinia galpinii</strong> (Chigwendere)</td>
<td>Scattered in upland areas (Zone 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mashorwa (mopane worms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cassia abreviata</strong> (Muvheneka)</td>
<td>Scattered in upland areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>poles, planks, mortars;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peltophorum africanum</strong> (Muzese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crafts; predict weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poles, medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Genus</td>
<td>species</td>
<td>(Local Name)</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Papilionoideae</td>
<td>Xanthocercia zambesiaca</td>
<td>(Mucha)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widespread in Zones 1 &amp; 2 on drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pericopsis angolensis</em></td>
<td>(Munanga)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered in Zones 3 &amp; 4 along drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dalbergia melanoxin</em></td>
<td>(Murwiti)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered in uplands along drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pterocarpus angolensis</em></td>
<td>(Mubvamaropa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common throughout mopane woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lonchocarpus capassa</em></td>
<td>(Mupanda)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Infrequent; Zones 4 &amp; 5 and rocky outcrops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simaroubaceae</td>
<td><em>Kirkia acuminata</em></td>
<td>(Mubvumira)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common throughout mopane woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burseraceae (Myrrh)</td>
<td><em>Commiphora marlothi</em></td>
<td>(Mupepe)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered throughout Zones 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Commiphora merkeri</em></td>
<td>(Bushepushe)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widespread, in close association with mopane woodland; dominant in toplands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Commiphora mossambicensis</em></td>
<td>(Mugwatikwati)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scattered in Zone 1, including fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliaceae (Mahogany)</td>
<td><em>Trichelia emetica</em></td>
<td>(Mutsikiri)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family | Genus species (Local Name) | Ecology | fuel | fodder | other uses | fruit | agrofor
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Euphorbiaceae (Euphorbia) | **Euphorbia cooperi** (Chikonde) | Widespread in Zone 2 on rocky outcrops |  |  | fish poison |  |  
| **Euphorbia ingens** (Mukonde) | Widespread in Zone 2 on rocky outcrops |  | X |  | sticky latex used to make bird traps |  | 
| **Euphorbia tirucalli** (Muhedgi) | Commonly planted as a hedge in Zone 2 Zone 4 & 5 outcrops other open areas |  |  |  | live fencing |  | 
| **Securinega virosa** (Mukonde) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 
| Anacardaceae (Mango) | **Lannea stuhlmannii** (Musototo?) | Throughout area but esp. on waterways and in fields | X | X |  |  |  
| **Rhus sp. (lancea?)** (Mutsvikiri) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  
| **Sclerocarya birrea** (Mupfura) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  
| Rhamnaceae (Buffalo Thorn) | **Berchemia discolor** (Munyili) | Scattered throughout area, incl. fields | X | X |  |  |  
| **Ziziphus mucronata** (Muchecheni) | Widespread in Zone 1 fields & on Save R. |  |  |  |  |  |  
| Tiliaceae (Jute & Linden) | **Azanza garkeana** (Mutohwe) | Only few scattered in mopane woodland |  | X |  |  |  
| **Grewia bicolor** (Mutongoro) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  

- fish poison
- sticky latex used to make bird traps
- live fencing
- timber, dye
- tool handles
- sacred tree; kernel eaten whole or ground (dovi); wine (doro remapfura); medicine
- dye from bark; medicine
- tool handles; medicine
- rope
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Genus species</th>
<th>Ecology</th>
<th>fuel</th>
<th>fodder</th>
<th>other uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiliaceae (Jute &amp; Linden)</td>
<td><em>Grewia flavescens</em> subsp. flavescens (Chigaramariya)</td>
<td>On river fringes; some in open areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>sacred tree used in burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Grewia flavescens</em> subsp. ? (Dyaukuru)</td>
<td>On river fringes;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>crafts, tool handles, rope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Grewia inequilatera</em> (Mutezwa)</td>
<td>Scattered along river fringes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>crafts, poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Grewia volkensii?</em> (Mutarara)</td>
<td>Scattered in toplands (Zones 4&amp;5)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>fibres for ropes and crafts; leaves eaten as relish; sacred; shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombaceae (Baobabs)</td>
<td><em>Adansonia digitata</em> (Muuyu)</td>
<td>Common throughout area (except Zone 1) incl. in fields</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>important source for fibre (ropes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterculiaceae (Cacao)</td>
<td><em>Sterculia rogersii</em> (Gunjaro)</td>
<td>Scattered on dry hills of Zones 2&amp;3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>tool handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochnaceae (Ochna)</td>
<td><em>Ochna pulchra</em> (Muminu)</td>
<td>Scattered in open woods on sandy soils</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flacourtiaeeae (Kei Apple)</td>
<td><em>Flacourtia indica</em> (Mundudhwe)</td>
<td>On topland kopjes, esp. in Zones 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Genus species</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>fuel</td>
<td>fodder</td>
<td>other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combretaceae (Combretum)</td>
<td><em>Combretum apiculatum</em></td>
<td>Open woodland; co-dominant in Zone 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>poles, tool handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mutsingidzi)</td>
<td>Scattered in Zone 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>poles, tool handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Combretum imberbe</em></td>
<td>Frequent in open areas, esp. Zone 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>and crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Muhweti)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>small poles, tool handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Terminalia prunoides</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kept as an ornamental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mushanje)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtaceae (Eucalyptus &amp; Guava)</td>
<td><em>Syzygium cordatum</em></td>
<td>Scattered along Zone 1 watercourses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>poles?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; <em>S. guineense</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mukute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebenaceae (Ebony)</td>
<td><em>Diospyros mespiliformis</em></td>
<td>Scattered in upland areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>spiritual, place for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mushumha)</td>
<td>Co-dominant in Zone 3 &amp; 4 mopane woodlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>offerings (kudira)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Diospyros guiloensis</em></td>
<td>Uncommon; a few in Zone 3 &amp; 4 fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poles, lathes, tool handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mukukuti)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loganaceae (Strychnos)</td>
<td><em>Strychnos madagascarensis</em></td>
<td>Rocky outcrops in Zone 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>poles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mukwakwa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbenaceae (Verbena)</td>
<td><em>Vitex payos</em></td>
<td>Frequent in Zone 1,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>seeds eaten in famine;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mubhururu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine; spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigoniaceae (Jacaranda)</td>
<td><em>Kigelia africana</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Mubvee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix III: Appendix On Field Methods

This appendix is divided into two parts: 1) a Description of Survey and Interview Methods; 2) a Discussion on Sources. The first section is purely descriptive. In the second section I present the main limitations of this thesis that are imposed by my survey and interview sources. Other relevant limitations are presented in chapter one of this thesis.

Field work was conducted in Zimbabwe between the months of October, 1992, and September, 1993; for the period of January to September, 1993, I was resident in the study site.

Description of Survey and Interview Methods

Formal discussions with people were conducted through two approaches, a survey and semi-structured interviews. The survey was conducted entirely in Shona with the help of my research assistant, as were many of the interviews. Several of the interviews were conducted by myself in English however my limited grasp of Shona prevented me from conducting interviews in Shona by myself. I was able to follow much of what informants were saying in interviews however my attempts to interject were more often than not counter-productive; I found it most effective to speak softly in English to my research assistant who would then integrate my questions into the interview in a less disruptive manner.
The survey was designed to elicit certain baseline information about household composition and resource use in Gudyanga. Once the research was in full swing, priority was given to interviews and other field researches (eg. identifying trees, mapping, etc.). Below is a more detailed description of the structure and content of the survey and interviews.

HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

The household survey consisted of 109 questions (of very differing lengths) that were drafted by myself and then translated into Shona with the help of my research assistant. Translations were double-checked with another resident of the area, a teacher, who was fluent in both English and Shona. After revisions were made, the survey was conducted among 5 households to test for "bugs." Questions that were redundant or too confusing were either clarified or removed. The most difficult questions to work with were in the section on household incomes. People were understandably curious (or suspicious) about why I would need to know about such information. Having anticipated this, I made it explicit from the beginning that I was only interested in sources of income and not amounts; the extra effort required to get reliable information on household income levels did not seem justified in my research. Nevertheless, getting people to express proportions was difficult in itself and the data gathered in
this section of the survey was only indicative and in no way precise. Actual figures or amounts from particular sources may have been easier for people to think about even if they were likely to be less willing to reveal such information.

On average, the survey took about one hour to conduct for each household. Many questions were fairly open-ended and at times elicited some discussion. A total of 38 households were surveyed, representing 11.1% of the 343 households in the study area. While "statistically relevant" the sample size was too small to make definitive quantitative statements about household composition and economy. Figures compiled from the survey are merely indicative and do not reveal complex patterns of ownership and sharing. Households were defined for this purpose as the people who lived together in a "stand" (ie. a residential site approved by local leaders). People often lived in more than one dwelling, and cooked on more than one hearth, however all such people were associated with one "stand" and therefore, in theory, one household head in whose name the "stand" was registered. Spatially, this definition of household was quite simple however it was also much more complex socially. Thus, for example, the following people were counted as members of households in Gudyanga:

1. migrant labourers who worked nearby and went home (in the study area) during weekends or holidays;

2. men who worked and lived in town but whose wives lived with the man’s parents;
3. the young children of migrant-labourer parents who had taken up residence elsewhere but kept their children in the study area (in this case, the parents were not counted as household members).

Of the 38 households surveyed, 23 (60.5%) had adult members working and living elsewhere who were considered part of the household (i.e. they had not started a separate household elsewhere). 9 (23.7%) households had the father of the house, or both the mother and father, away working. 14 (37%) were effectively female-headed -- 5 were older women (divorced and widowed) and 9 were younger mothers (3 widows, 6 with husbands away working). 3 households were polygamous. Among the informants who completed the survey, 8 (21%) were women.

OUTLINE CONTENT OF HOUSEHOLD SURVEY
Section A. Household Composition
Section B. Access to Water
Section C. Woodland Resources
Section D. Arable Resources
Section E. Livestock Holdings
Section F. Incomes
Section G. Responses to Drought

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS
Interviews were arranged in advance and the topic of the discussion was given to participants prior to the interview. Most interviews were conducted between myself, my research assistant and one other resident at his or her home; at times, discussions included friends, siblings and spouses. Interviews were semi-structured in that there was a definite subject area and even certain key questions to be answered but no formal sequence to follow. Formality in the interview depended largely on the degree of formality between the interviewee and myself. Thus, many interviews were fairly open conversations, although almost always on a single topic. I let my assistant pursue his own line of questioning which contributed to his confidence and ultimately the free flow of information. At times discussions led to issues (eg. hunting) which were not of immediate import to my thesis, however we rarely failed to discuss the key matters that we were supposed to cover.

A total of 44 semi-structured interviews were conducted among 29 informants. While a number of informants were interviewed on more than one occasion, no single person was interviewed more than three times. Of the 29 people formally interviewed, 12 held positions in the "traditional" political system; positions ranged from assistants to *samusha* (*mapurisi*, lit. "police"), up the political hierarchy to chief Muusha, the only "non-local" interviewed. Among those people interviewed, 5 were women (3 married, 2 divorced/widowed), 4
were receiving wages (2 locally, 2 outside the community), and 5 both lived in brick homes and possessed some form of agricultural implement such as a plough or a scotchcart (because of the drought, cattle ownership, as another visible sign of wealth, was too low to be relevant to wealth ranking).

Discussions with people that were not set up in advance are not included in this number although they were numerous; there were many occasions when I took people aside to discuss some particular issue and on such occasions I only rarely took notes during the discussion, except perhaps to make note of local terms I did not know. Topics for interviews that were designed in advance are listed below (the number of interviews conducted for each topic is given in brackets).

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW TOPICS

1. Social History (5) - The origins of people and political leadership in area.

2. Local History (6) - The more recent colonial and post-colonial history of the immediate area

3. Local Ecology (1) - Ecological changes in area (eg. drought, erosion & deforestation) and changes in wildlife populations. This topic was explored through informal discussion.

4. Local Economy (10) - Past and present livelihood practices and socioeconomic indicators.

5. Resource Use (7) - Household use of local resources and regulations on access and use.

6. Agroforestry (3) - Relationship between arable land and trees.

7. Political Control - Mostly focusing on the "traditional"
of Land (6) political system, and its role in resource management.

8. Others (6) - Various topics, mostly focusing on cultural issues (e.g. kinship system).

Discussion on Sources

In general, I feel the samples used for both the household survey and the semi-structured interviews were fairly representative of the study area however three qualifications must be made. First, the study area was itself only a portion of larger socio-economic contexts in which social activities occurred. Abstracting information on the study area taken out of this wider context is misleading but necessary given my resources in the field. Thus, the portrait compiled from survey and interview results is not a depiction of a single community; the study site was demarcated for practical purposes. The data collected is more accurately a sample of some much larger area that roughly corresponds with the administrative ward (see Map 3).

Second, although inquiries were not concentrated among any one social group, the very poorest residents -- those without incomes, only marginal access to land, and no relatives in the area -- were not interviewed. Such residents were generally single women with children and were on social assistance; I had occasion to meet such people but found no opportunity or sufficient reason to disturb them with my inquiries. One exception was a very elderly man who was ill and lived with his wife but was apparently without significant
and lived with his wife but was apparently without significant support from his relatives. Although his present circumstances made him among the poorest he had previously been a school headmaster and his history was probably quite unlike other impoverished peoples in the area. Thus, it was said that neither prosperity nor poverty are permanent -- *Aiwa madziwa awa mazambuko, aiwa mazambuko awa madziwa,* "what were great pools are now narrow crossings, what were narrow crossings have become wide pools").

Furthermore, the wealthiest residents -- who generally had well paying jobs elsewhere, very large homesteads, agricultural implements and generally scotchcarts -- were under-represented in this study. All in all, the very top and the very bottom economic strata accounted for 1.4% and 1.2%, respectively, of all households in the study area.¹ In the wealthiest households, the husband/father was in a stable and well-paid job outside of the study area (and therefore spent little time in Gudyanga). These households did not necessarily have bigger fields or make disproportionate use of common woodlands and as such their inclusion in this study of woodlands management was not deemed critical.

¹. These figures are based on my knowledge of such households in the area. It is possible that the poorest fraction is slightly underestimated although this number was checked with the head nurse at the clinic who was knowledgable about residents; impoverished mothers received monthly food rations through the clinic as part of a national Supplementary Feeding Programme.
experiences of these small but significant extremes in the social fabric. Otherwise, relatively wealthy and relatively poor households were equally approached for this study. Given the household focus of this research I did not, for instance, separate out what might be seen as an underclass of (mainly Mozambican) house keepers and herd boys. Such people were not interviewed and were simply treated as a member of the household in which they were employed.

The last major limitation of this study is that it does not specifically highlight gender as a central theme for analysis. While informants were not exclusively men, all research was conducted by men and principal informants were mostly men. This reflects my own structural position in the community and would have been difficult, but not by any means impossible, to overcome. Thus, for example, it was expected that as a man, but especially a foreigner, I would want to speak to the man of the house. In general then, the emphasis in this thesis on those tied to the "traditional" political system, and the under-representation of women, reflected my structural position in the community as a formal guest and as a man employing a male research assistant. The research conducted for this thesis was clearly preliminary. Given a longer period in the field, these limitations could have been more effectively overcome. Breaking through expectations that I observe cultural traditions about who were considered to be the outward bearers of knowledge relevant to a wealthy foreign
man was something I only began to achieve in the field.

Hiring a women as an additional research assistant would have improved the research although this would have been a financial burden.

Although the number of survey respondents is small to begin with (38 informants), greater participation by women would have been instructive. For example, given that much of the daily wood gathering was done by women (and their children), the amounts that men reported for wood gathered would be gross approximations at best and were therefore not used in this thesis. Having multiple respondents discuss each question before answering would have been preferable although this would require that much fewer questions be asked.

Generally speaking, a more gender sensitive approach to this research would likely have produced a substantially different focus to a study of woodlands management. The vast majority of daily harvesting and consumption was done by women whereas the formal institutions that have some role in regulating woodland use were generally controlled by men. This thesis tends to focus on institutions and therefore tends to speak to the role of men more than women. Where relevant (eg. chapter four), the gendered division of labour is discussed.
GLOSSARY OF TERMS USED IN THESIS

Acronyms:

**NLHA**
Native Land Husbandry Act (1951).
- Legislative device that colonial planners attempted (with little success) to use to undermine indigenous tenure in the Reserves by creating private title to land and by restricting the practice of migrant labour. [see pp.60-1]

**Vidco**
Village Development Committee.
- A legally constituted body of local representatives who have no legal powers to make decisions but are the point of articulation between local government and the general populace in the Communal Areas. The term Vidco is also applied to the well-demarcated area that the committee is said to represent and is to ideally contain approximately 100 households. [see p.66]

Shona Terms:

**Dare**
(pronounced "da-ray"; pl. matare)
- The (permanent) site and event of a public meeting called by and presided over by a traditional leader (esp. sadunhu or ishe, q.v.). Interpreted as "court" since colonial times. [see pp.120-1]

**Dunhu**
(pronounced "doon-hoo"; pl. matunhu)
- An area associated with the hereditary leadership of a sadunhu (q.v.), the area being a semi-autonomous sub-division of a nyika (q.v.). Generally translated as "ward". [see pp.45-7]

**Ishe**
(pronounced "ee-shay", pl. madzishe)
- The position held by a person who represents their patrilineage’s claim to have established a collective right to land -- i.e., the founders of an area referred to as a nyika (q.v.). Generally referred to as a "chief". [see p.45]
Musha (pronounced "moo-sha"; pl. misha)
- A residential area associated with the hereditary leadership of a samusha (q.v.). Generally translated, somewhat inaccurately, as "village".
[see pp.47-8]

Nyika (pronounced "nyee-ka")
- The broad country said to be under the leadership of a person holding the title ishe (q.v.) and which is generally not regarded as a sub-division of some larger territory.

Sabhuku (pronounced "sa-boo-ku"; pl. masabhuku)
- The title of a person who was assigned by the colonial government to keep records for the purposes of collecting taxes.
[see pp.116-18]

Sadunhu (pronounced "sa-doong-hoo"; pl. masadunhu)
- The title of a person who is accorded leadership responsibilities and certain forms of respect that stem from his patrilineage’s association with a geographical area [see dunhu] under the wider leadership of an ishe (q.v.). Also referred to as "sub-chief" or "headman".
[see pp.45-7]

Samusha (pronounced "sa-moo-sha"; pl. masamusha)
- The position held by a person who is respected as a traditional leader because of their patrilineage’s connection with an area of residential concentration within a dunhu (q.v.). Often referred to as "kraal-head" (i.e., head of a residential group centred on a common cattle pen).
[see pp.47-8,114-19]
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