

Local Responses to Colonial Evictions, Conservation and Commodity Policies among Shangwe Communities in Gokwe, Northwestern Zimbabwe, 1963-1980

Simeon Maravanyika

Wageningen University
Netherlands

simeonm06@yahoo.ca

Abstract

This article examines the eviction of Shangwe people from Mafungautsi State Forest in 1963, and their responses. The eviction followed the State's demarcation and gazettement of the forest as a protected area. This was in line with the Forestry Act, enacted in 1948, which sought to preserve the colony's indigenous timber resources. The eviction coincided with the introduction of cotton in Gokwe in 1962. The state anticipated that the Shangwe, a forest community which subsisted mainly by hunting, gathering and pastoralism, would embrace commercial agriculture. This would facilitate a transition from their forest life to full participation in the market economy as cotton growers. While the introduction of commercial agriculture in colonized regions is generally considered to have reorganized African labour, production and consumption patterns at the expense of local agrarian knowledge systems and economic and social organization, the case of the Shangwe offers another dimension to this narrative. The Shangwe resisted eviction from Mafungautsi forest. Their resistance expressed itself in the form of squatting in demarcated areas, illegal harvesting of forest products, poaching of game and land leases to Madheruka farmers, a group of large-scale agriculturalists who had in 1953 been evicted from Rhodesdale, an area set aside for white farmers. This article argues that Shangwe responses; squatting, illegal harvesting of forest production, poaching and land leases, represented more than just resistance to eviction from their habitat. It was also an anti-commodity response; an anti-cotton expression on one hand and a fight for the preservation of their old ways of life on the other. The article sheds light on the impact of colonial forest conservation and agricultural policies at a micro-level in Mbumbuze, Gokwe.

Keywords: Mafungautsi, Zimbabwe, Shangwe, Madheruka, cotton, forestry, conservation, land leases.

Introduction

The 1950s and 1960s were a momentous era of forced change for Shangwe¹ communities of Mbumbuze, Gokwe. Colonial agrarian and forestry policies combined to deliver a vicious blow on Shangwe livelihoods. The first major blow was delivered by state-induced migration of Madheruka² farmers from Rhodesdale³ in 1953 and the consequent introduction of commercial agriculture in Gokwe. The migrant group was largely composed of Shona-speaking people, the majority of whom had emigrated from their traditional homes in districts such as Gutu, Mwenezi, Chirumhanzi and Bikita to Rhodesdale in search of better agricultural land and seasonal employment on white farms.⁴ The migrants were termed "Madheruka" or "MaRhodesdale" by Shangwe people, the first name depicting their sudden and undesired relocation in government-provided lorries and the second identifying the migrants by the name of the place from where they had come, Rhodesdale Estate.⁵ The second blow was eviction of the Shangwe from their forest homeland, Mafungautsi forest.

Prior to 1953 Gokwe had largely been known as an isolated region, infested with malaria, tsetse flies and wild animals.⁶ Local inhabitants of the area, the Shangwe, had only had limited contact with the outside world⁷ with the result that the majority of people in Mbumbuze had not yet been exposed to European clothes, schools, churches and modern farming methods. Because of this, the Shangwe were in turn labeled by colonial officials and by Madheruka migrants as “backward”, “uncivilized” and “resistant to change”, among other negative tags.⁸ Unlike the migrants, the Shangwe were a forest community and not agriculturalists at any significant scale. The immigrants, on the other hand, were large-scale farmers who had gained a lot of farming experience from their contact with the white agricultural sector as seasonal farm labourers and neighbours settled on the margins of white farms.⁹ Madheruka had also acquired a lot of agricultural knowledge from government-provided conservation, extension and master-farmer programmes designed to make African agriculture more productive and environmentally sustainable on small pieces of land (in a context characterized by deliberately engineered land shortages among the African population).¹⁰ Making the two groups, with different economic organization, live in the same habitat set the stage for conflict between them, particularly over land. Madheruka agricultural activities negated the very core of Shangwe livelihood. The Shangwe lived on the forest, while for Madheruka agricultural activities to take place the forest had to be cleared. Clearing the forest did not only provide farmland, but it kept vermin such as baboons, jackals and hyenas away from their fields and domestic animals.¹¹ This was the first frontier of conflict.

The second blow - eviction from the forest – was particularly severe for Shangwe communities. This was done on the basis of the Forest Act of 1948. The legislation provided for the declaration of state-protected forests in the colony to preserve indigenous forests and their bio-diversity.¹² The Forest Act provided for the creation of a government regulatory organ, the Rhodesia Forestry Commission (FC), to preside over management of forests in the colony. Mafungautsi forest was gazetted in 1954.¹³ Nine years later, the Shangwe were forcibly relocated to Zanda plateau and areas on the margins of the 101 000 hectare forest, on the right side of Bulawayo road, such as Mafa, Matashu and Maruta villages while other Shangwe families migrated to far-off places such as Kana, Nemangwe, Chireya and Nembudziya.¹⁴ The eviction deprived the Shangwe of their livelihood. The last straw for Shangwe economic independence was the introduction of cotton in 1962. Cotton production would represent a major departure from their traditional way of life. The State thought the eviction would usher the Shangwe into the vagaries of capitalist farming. Shangwe spirit mediums responded to this onslaught by telling the communities that the ancestors, an important factor in Shangwe day-to-day life, were opposed the cultivation of a “white man’s crop.”¹⁵ The majority of Shangwe people resorted to squatting in demarcated areas, illegal harvesting of forest products, poaching of small game and land leases to Madheruka farmers for survival. This set the stage for a long drawn-out conflict, as to this day the Shangwe are still fighting for permission to return to their old habitat.

Methods and Study Site

A desk study was done to generate historical data used in this article. Two sets of data were used; first published articles and books on the economic history of colonialism in Zimbabwe. This data includes data on the mining and the peasant and settler agrarian sectors in the early colonial period, the evolution of colonial land policy and legislation and the dynamics of migration in colonial Zimbabwe. The second set of data is literature that specifically focuses on Gokwe, such as work published by the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) on Mafungautsi State forest (the transition from top-down forest management to Adaptive Collaborative Management and resource-sharing projects in the post-colonial period). Though

this article does not cite these CIFOR records, they have been useful in making me understand the Shangwe context, especially pertaining to the value of Mafungautsi State Forest, not only in economic terms but also in social ways, as the forest is home to many Shangwe religious sites. The article also relies on various rural appraisal techniques such as interviews that were conducted over a period of two years between 2004 and 2006 and 18 months between November 2010 and April 2012. The research also relied on a developed checklist and participant observation. Interviews were in the majority of cases carried out with people who were at least over 10 years in 1960. The interviews were held in four Shangwe villages – Mafa, Maruta and Matashu and Makuwerere and in two Madheruka villages, Rumhumha and Takaendesa.

The study site, Mbumbuze, Gokwe, lies about 350 kilometres north-west of Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe. Mbumbuze is in Gokwe South, Midlands Province. The three Shangwe communities chosen lie on the margins of Mafungautsi forest, along Bulawayo road that leads to Zimbabwe's second biggest city, Bulawayo. Mafungautsi forest is the third largest indigenous forest in the country. The forest is home to several resources, including timber, thatch grass, broom grass (*Aristida junciformis*), honey, mushrooms, Mopani worms, tea leaves, herbs, firewood, small game such as warthog and hare, among others and the source of four major rivers, Sengwa, Ngondoma, Mbumbusi and Lutope. The rivers drain into the Zambezi River, where Zimbabwe's hydroelectric power is generated at Kariba dam.

Background: Shangwe and Madheruka before 1953

Prior to the 1950s the Shangwe were a forest community. They subscribed to traditional religion. Religion played an important part in their day to day lives, such as in their economic activities. Traditional ceremonies were performed before the commencement of all economic activities, such as agriculture and hunting.¹⁶ The Shangwe were not agriculturalists at a significant scale - they grew small patches of mealies on vleis and river banks, and such production was mainly for local consumption.¹⁷ There was no other market for their produce apart from their community. Ceremonies were carried out before the planting season, where all their seeds were "treated" with traditional medicine. Cattle were also "treated", a tradition called *izikho*, to ensure increased fertility and reproduction.¹⁸ Cattle ownership was important among Shangwe men. Men derived their social status from the amount of cattle they possessed. People with more cattle could easily marry more wives¹⁹, which was important as having many children, especially sons²⁰, was highly valued. Many Shangwe men had many wives, and sometimes up to over 50 or more children. Women's activities in relation to cattle were curtailed²¹; they were not allowed, for example, to enter into kraals, which made cattle husbandry, largely men's preserve.

Hunting was an important economic activity, which accounted for the big part of Shangwe dietary requirements.²² The hunters would spend nights in traditional ceremonies singing, dancing and requesting their ancestors to grant them a good hunt whenever they went out on hunting expeditions. Hunting parties were very common, as they enabled them to pursue bigger game, while individual hunts were also done, usually in search of small game.²³ Hunting was carried out by men. Women engaged in gathering and fishing²⁴. Gathering, like hunting, also contributed to a big proportion of their dietary requirements. Women and small girls would collect *madora* (Mopani worms), roots, wild fruit, mushroom and honey.²⁵ Shangwe communities also relied on the forest for products such as firewood and poles used in the construction of their houses, medicines and broom and thatch grass. In Shangwe tradition, it was a taboo to hunt down more than what was required for their sustenance, and to wantonly cut down trees.²⁶ Shangwe fables, narratives and stories are replete with instances

where those who embarked on misconduct or insolent and contemptuous behaviour that angered the ancestors as they hunted and gathered got punished, the punishments ranging from getting lost for days, sometimes months, only to emerge after traditional ceremonies had been conducted, misfortunes, loss of mental health and even death, usually by getting mauled by wild animals.²⁷

Madheruka, on the other hand were mostly Shona people resident in Rhodesdale and other areas reserved for future white settlement. The majority of these people were not original inhabitants of these areas, but migrants in search of work on settler farms or better land for farming. Many people migrated from Gutu, Chivi, Mhondoro, Chirumhanzi and Masvingo, among other districts.²⁸ Because of their interaction with the farms, Madheruka were large-scale agriculturalists in comparison with the Shangwe. They used mechanical devices such as ploughs, which not only made work easier, but also made it possible to put more acreage under the plough.²⁹ They also used seed expertly prepared by seed companies. This was unlike the Shangwe who still utilized locally smelted hoes and locally selected seed.³⁰ Apart from gaining farming experience, especially as maize farmers, contact with the farms where they got wages, and with the cash economy and towns such as Que Que and Gatooma, also influenced other aspects of their lives such as clothing and diet. Because of contact with Christian missionaries and mission centres, the majority of Madheruka were Christians. They also had access to education, as Christian missions were the first to provide education to Africans.³¹

After the end of the Second World War, the colonial government put in place a plan to evict Madheruka settlers from Rhodesdale, an area designated for white occupation. Their removal paved the way for the settlement of ex-servicemen from the Second World War, and other white immigrants who were flocking to the colony in the wake of an agricultural and manufacturing boom.³² With the ex-servicemen settlement scheme in full swing, the government looked for alternative places for resettling Madheruka. Gokwe was one of the places selected, together with other places such as Sanyati and Mount Darwin.³³ Table 1 below shows the differences between the two groups.

Table 1: Madheruka and Shangwe

Madheruka	Shangwe
'Modern' clothing: such as trousers, shirts, shoes, had blankets	Animal hides (called <i>mabhechu neshashiko</i> , no shoes, wove "blankets" from barks of trees
Educated	Uneducated, and therefore 'backward.'
Predominantly Christians	Traditional religion (sometimes called demon worship by Madheruka).
Smaller family units, largely monogamous	Polygamous, huge families.
Good, big houses, some roofed with corrugated iron sheets.	Small, many poorly built huts to accommodate bigger families, homes had an air of impermanence, built like temporary structures of a transient group
Agriculturalists on a large scale	Hunters, gatherers, poor farmers with small 50 yard patches on river banks and streams
Shona speaking	Shangwe dialect looked down upon and ridiculed.
Richer, by local wealth-ranking standards	in poverty
Personal hygiene prioritized	Dirty, did not use/have access to soap
Had utilized dip tanks for dipping cattle, boreholes for supplies of clean water	None before the 1950s.

Source: Interviews.

Context: Evictions, Commodity Production and Forest Conservation

Shangwe anti-commodity actions should be understood in the context of the colonial land and conservation policies as they related to Africans. Colonial land policy aimed to give the best agricultural land in the colony to white farmers, whose success was seen as the only basis upon which a settler colony could be established in Zimbabwe.³⁴ The first half of the century was dominated by the land question; colonial officials did not mince words in asserting that they desired to have large chunks of land set aside for white use. “We are in this country because we represent a higher civilization, because we are better men,” N. H. Wilson of the Southern Rhodesia Native Affairs Department stated matter-of-factly in 1925, “It is our only excuse for having taken the land.”³⁵ The colony’s first Prime Minister, Charles Coghlan, reiterated this point when he addressed the all-settler Southern Rhodesia Legislative Assembly in 1927, “This is essentially a country where the white man has come and desires to stay, and he can only be certain of doing so if he has certain portions of the colony made his exclusively.”³⁶

This view was by the majority of settlers in the colony. One settler stated in 1949, “Don’t regard the country as a Black man’s country, where the white man is the intruder, an exploiter of black labour, a superior; look at it as an empty country (which it practically is for what are 1 750 000 millions in a country three times the size of England?) to be settled with a white population.”³⁷ The Land Apportionment Act, 1930, was enacted to facilitate racially-motivated land apportionment in the colony. The Act has been characterized as the “white man’s bible” and “Rhodesian form of apartheid”.³⁸ Eira Punt has characterised it as an “attack on the African peasantry in order to safeguard (the settlers’) position.”³⁹ The Act, on one hand, “marginalised African competition by dividing land along racial lines and preserving the best land in the colony for white settlers while on the other hand denying permanent and secure tenure to Africans living in urban areas.”⁴⁰ The Chief Native Commissioner, Herbert Taylor, summarized the essence of colonial African agricultural policy in 1918, “The Native should be trained not so much as a competitor with the white man in the business of life, but as a useful auxiliary to help in the progress of the country.”⁴¹

The 1940s brought new economic realities to the colony. First, there was a boom in commodity prices due to post-Second World War conditions. The Zimbabwean economy was closely linked with the British economy because of its reliance on exporting her agricultural commodities; mainly tobacco and beef, and minerals, mainly gold, to that market. With the outset of the Second World War there was a Sterling devaluation, which saw a rise in the price of the colony’s gold, the demand for the colony’s tobacco also rose, with yields doubling between 1939 and 1945.⁴² The colony’s exports rose even further after the war, as Britain preferred to continue to trade with the colonies more than it did with the United States of America, thanks to crippling dollar shortages in the post-war period. “Lacking dollars British companies were unable to buy as much tobacco as they wanted to from American markets”, Ian Phimister has observed, “Instead they were obliged to take a growing proportion of their requirements from Empire sources within the sterling area.”⁴³ The success of the colony’s tobacco acted as a bait to new settlers, including British ex-servicemen.

The success of exports also made the state to contemplate making Africans venture into cash crops. There had been attempts to introduce cotton from 1904 without much success⁴⁴, mainly due to resistance by African farmers, to the disappointment of Native Commissioners. One example of such frustration was exhibited in 1923 by the Native Commissioner for Sinoia. The Commissioner had spent a lot of time in the reserve, talking to farmers, encouraging them to grow cotton and highlighting the financial benefits of growing cotton over maize. He got encouraging feedback, with a good number of farmers promising him that they would venture

into cotton production. These promises were, however, not kept, leading to the Commissioner, in his correspondence with the Superintendent of Natives, to complain that Africans “will agree to all that is said and do nothing.”⁴⁵ The government moved to create a key institution in July 1936, the Cotton Research and Industry Board whose mandate was to promote cotton growing, to carry out cotton research and to establish and operate cotton ginneries in the colony.⁴⁶ The Board vigorously tried to encourage farmers to grow cotton and, in the case of those who were growing it already, to increase yields in the 1940s.⁴⁷ The state soon set its sights on Gokwe, a region that had largely been ignored from the early colonial period due to its infestation with tsetse flies, malaria and wild animals. Apart from having ideal climatic conditions for cotton the region was thinly populated, making it a perfect place to move thousands of Shona farmers who were illegally settled on land demarcated for white occupation.⁴⁸

Conservation was also a cornerstone of colonial African policy. Scholarship on colonial conservation policies in Zimbabwe has focussed on how such policies were shaped in ways that reflected one major characteristic of colonial rule; the use of coercive devices. Conservation was not, as stated by Beinart, a result of ecological concern. Neither was it applied, in the Zimbabwean context, first to settler agriculture and later to peasant agriculture. A growing body of literature on conservation in colonial Zimbabwe has shown that conservation policies were first applied to African agriculture.⁴⁹ Unlike Beinart’s view that conservation policies were “apparently conceived in (African) best interests”,⁵⁰ Eira Kramer’s research shows that African policy was crafted to deal with land shortage.⁵¹ The “destructive capacity of African agriculture”⁵² was often cited as a justification for “state intervention, but also a legitimation for using force.”⁵³ “For settlers (whites), conservation entailed financial and other incentives” JoAnne McGregor has observed, “for Africans, it entailed coercion and punitive restrictions of resource use.”⁵⁴ It is in this context that forestry legislation should be viewed. Colonial conservation policies sought, in John Mackenzie’s words, “to rearrange nature as well as people and land”⁵⁵ for the benefit of the local white minority.

The eviction of the Shangwe in 1963 has to be seen in the context of failure by the colonial administration to understand indigenous forest preservation practices. Exploitation of natural resources was under the control of spirit mediums, chiefs and headmen.⁵⁶ Management of the resources was done in the interest of the entire community, though one cannot rule out that local leaders’ and individuals often place their self-interest ahead of the common good of the collective.⁵⁷ Traditional leadership had to give their permission for the harvest of forest products such as timber. These traditional system of control lingered on, in spite of colonial interference with the role of traditional leaders. A major manifestation of transformation in the role of chiefs was their being turned to becoming part of the colonial system of governance, where they became a kind of decentralized local government, answerable to colonial officials in the Native Department.⁵⁸ This development had two implications on African communities; first traditional leaders’ authority was weakened as it now derived its legitimacy from colonial officials in the Native Department who could demote chiefs or give financial and other rewards for perceived good work and secondly the chieftaincy institution itself was devalued as chiefs were relegated to become appendages of a colonial system, where their primary role became the policing of their people for the state, rendering them as collaborators and enemies of the people rather than legitimate leaders whose claim to power was purely on traditional grounds.⁵⁹

In Mafungautsi a number of traditional beliefs ensured the preservation of the forest. To begin with, many places were considered sacred because of their rain-making ceremonies. These ceremonies, called *mutoro* in the local language were a very important aspect of the local

traditional religion. There were held in sacred areas where vegetation could not be tampered with in any manner.⁶⁰ There were also places reserved for ceremonies to enthrone chiefs, called *madoraushe*. These were as important as *mitoro* as the installation of chiefs was also steeped in tradition. A new chief had to be properly installed by local spirit mediums to ensure stability in the area and the ancestors' blessings.⁶¹ There were trees and portion of forests that fell in the *marambakutemwa* category. These were trees that people believed the spirits rested in. They could not be cut, unless if they dried up.⁶² Apart from places demarcated as sacred areas, it was forbidden to cut down fruit trees under any circumstances, except if express permission was given by either the chief or the headman. Doing this was punishable by heavy fines by village heads. People also needed permission from their village heads to cut down any other tree species.⁶³ The only trees that could be cut without restriction were those that would have dried up. These were usually cut down for firewood and for the construction of cattle pens, houses and granaries. Apart from restrictions on cutting down trees people were only supposed to harvest forest products for their immediate usage. With the cash economy setting in from the early 1950s, it was made illegal by local chiefs, headmen and mediums to sell wild fruit. Spirit mediums told the people that the sale of fruit would be met by punishment from the ancestors.⁶⁴ The Shangwe cultivated small fields near river banks, called *mativi*. This was not to a large scale. A family field was only about 50 feet in extent, with the biggest fields never exceeding 100 feet.⁶⁵ The Shangwe did not cut down trees in their fields. They could prune some branches and remove shrubs, but tree-cutting was forbidden.⁶⁶

The colonial government assumed that indigenous forests would be degraded if local populations continued to reside in the forests. This fear of a "tragedy of the commons" was unjustified. Scholarship has shown that it was the colonial system itself that accounted for the destruction of the colony's timber resources. Muchaparara Musemwa and Vimbai C. Kwasirai have explored the destruction of timber by farmers and miners from the early colonial period till the 1930s.⁶⁷ "...white commercial farmers generally ignored official advice on discouraging tree cutting...miners contributed to deforestation through cutting trees for timber and fuel needs", Kwashirai has observed.⁶⁸ Musemwa has reiterated this:

...(it was) the impact of magnitude of both (white) farmers and (white) miners' activities on the colony's resources (that) saw the (Natural Resources) Commission passing a decisive recommendation which resulted in the passage of the Natural Resources Act in 1941. This was followed by the appointment of the Natural Resources Board which had powers to ensure the conservation and 'wise utilization' of the colony's natural resources such as soil, water, minerals, trees, grasses, vegetation etc. etc. Thus, unlike in other settler societies, it took the colonial state in Southern Rhodesia almost forty years to respond seriously to demands for formal conservation of natural resources, despite ample evidence...of an on-going unsustainable environmental despoliation at the hands of both farmers and miners...settler worries about conservation in colonial Zimbabwe were not entirely driven by a profound environmental consciousness...⁶⁹

It was, in fact, the activities of the white settlers, especially mining and farming in this case, that were ruinous to the environment, not activities of the Shangwe in Mafungautsi forest. Colonial forestry legislation was not primarily intended to protect only indigenous timber resources, but to promote "extraction of forestry resources for the benefit of white settlers and commercial interests..."⁷⁰

Reasons for Madheruka Resettlement

C. Latham, a delineation officer in Gokwe in the 1960s, has, through his reports, given a glimpse into the colonial psyche in his October 1963 report on the progress of land delineation in Gokwe.⁷¹ The settlement of Madheruka farmers in Gokwe was seen by colonial

government functionaries as having a five-fold benefit to the area; first it would solve the perceived problem of local backwardness by bringing a more “modern” group of Africans, a process that would inevitably result in aspects of Madheruka culture rubbing onto the backward Shangwe and placing them on the road to modernization. The second factor was that Shangwe lives would have to transform – they would have to abandon their forest lives. The government had already planned for this. In 1954 their forest home, Mafungautsi forest was gazetted in line with the Forestry Act, enacted in 1948. The Forestry Commission was created to superintend over the forest, the country’s third largest indigenous forest.

In 1963 the Shangwe were evicted from the forest, and relocated in two areas, at Zanda plateau and on the right side of Bulawayo road, mostly in three villages namely Mafa, Matashu and Maruta. An alternative life, divorced from their former forest livelihoods, had already been arranged for these people; cotton production. Embracing cotton would make the Shangwe large-scale farmers because the nature of cotton production is that the more you produce the more likely you are to get more returns, depending on the grade of your yields, and in addition to this, the more likely you are to get lines of credit and other such incentives as cotton companies jostle to make farmers remain with their stable or to lure them to change companies. The cash economy, with its sweeteners such as sugar, Coca-Cola and clothes, among such other retail products, would complete the change for the regime.

The third anticipated benefit that would accrue from the relocation of Madheruka was that it would help in the development of Gokwe as the Madheruka, described by Latham as “people with fresh ideas and more sophisticated demands”, were an agricultural class. Their thirst for agricultural land would make the relocation a win-win situation for the state; the area from which they had been relocated would be taken over by white, mostly tobacco, farmers, while Gokwe, together with its “backward” Shangwe, would be transformed from an isolated tsetse, malaria and wild animal infested jungle into a progressive agrarian zone. This was the fourth benefit; the clearing of land would help deal with tsetse flies and wild animals. Finally, the opening up of the area for agriculture would bring investment to the area, especially in light of the introduction of cotton. A lot of capital would be directed to the area to fund cotton production and other infrastructural developments such as roads to access the cotton growing areas, storage depots, new retail shops, new schools, clinics, extension services, passenger transport services and other service providers. This, it was thought, would open up new employment and consequently lead to an increase in retail activities and consumption as farmers got more disposable incomes from cotton proceeds and more people got work in the area.

The colonial government hoped that migration to Gokwe by Madheruka farmers would help bring modernization to the Shangwe doorstep. The Shangwe, it was expected, would respond to their eviction from Mafungautsi state forest by embracing large-scale agriculture. This would, naturally, the thinking went, result in them making a choice to plant cotton, which offered more remuneration than maize and other grains. This kind of thinking was reflected in the message that conservation and extension officers brought to Shangwe villages. Cleopas Mhuri’s punch line as he made his rounds in the villages was “*Warima chibage warima kabudura, warima tonje warima suit, warima mapfunde warima mamvemve*”, which can be roughly translated to mean, ‘He who cultivates maize will reap a pair of shorts, he who cultivates cotton reaps a suit, he who cultivates millet gets rags.’⁷²

Madheruka farmers were, on arrival, allocated 10 acres of land for each family.⁷³ A conservation officer, only identified as Maguranyi, was responsible for pegging the land.⁷⁴

This brought a mixture of shock and awe to the Shangwe who, because of their being a forest community, had never seen such an extent of forest clearing. When the Shangwe carried out their farming activities on their small portions of land on riverbeds they did not cut down trees but only pruned leaves and cut small shrubs.⁷⁵ The Shangwe were alarmed by the scale of land clearing. Whole villages had been brought to the place, which meant that the land they cleared was quite vast. Village heads and their people allocated land included Siwothile who was allocated land at Gwehava, Chibase, Rumhumha and Takaendesa. A good number of the new settlers cleared more land than had been pegged for them by Maguranyi.⁷⁶ This became an area of contestation between the two groups. There was also conflict over religion. The majority of the new settlers were Christians while the Shangwe practised traditional religion. The first three denominations in the area were the Methodist and Seventh Day Adventist churches at Gwehava and the Roman Catholic Church at Rumhumha.⁷⁷ The churches preached against local traditions, such as ancestral worship and polygamy. Their message attracted some converts, to the alarm of local Shangwe community leaders. The different religious beliefs manifested themselves in conflict over land. Some Madheruka farmers, such as Nzanga, Mpande and Mavesera, to name a few, cleared and farmed in areas that were considered by the Shangwe to be sacred.⁷⁸

The state played a role in reinforcing stereotypes between the two groups. The Native Commissioner for Gokwe, identified by locals as Siqanyana, advised the Shangwe to be weary of the new comers.⁷⁹ Jocelyn Alexander and JoAnne McGregor have attributed this action by the Native Commissioner to a desire by the colonial state to ensure that Madheruka, who were seen as “dangerously political” would not disseminate their nationalistic ideas to the unpoliticized Shangwe.⁸⁰ Madheruka had already been in contact with early nationalist leaders such as Benjamin Burombo. Burombo had led their resistance against their eviction from Rhodesdale and mobilized resources for legal action against the state. In addition to this, nationalist leaders were in the 1960s detained in a holding camp in the area, at Nyaradza, and at Sikhombela, a reflection of the different levels of political consciousness between the two groups. Nyaradza detention centre held prominent nationalist leaders such as James Chikerema, Maurice Nyagumbo, Ndabaningi Sithole, James Dambaza, Hamadziripi, Madzimbamuto and Marembo.⁸¹

The state put in place infrastructure in areas where Madheruka were resettled. First the state put up boreholes. Thirty seven boreholes were drilled. Table 3 below shows some of the boreholes that were drilled;

Table 2: Boreholes drilled in Madheruka areas.

Place where Borehole was drilled			
Chief Njelele	Kusiririka village	Mloyi village	At Dip tank
Chiwaya Village	Mbangiwa village	Tasiyana village	Komichi village
Mapfumo School	Dzawanda village	Chibase village	Mtupane village
Gwemsele village	Marumisa village	Rumhumha village	Chidhaka village
Mashove village	Gwehava	Chegama secondary school	Takaendesa village
Mazithulela village	Kambani village	Chegama primary school	

Source: Interview with Namunedi Dingane Maraya, Makuwerere village, Sengwa.

Dip tanks were also constructed in the area, the first at Njelele, and the second one at Sengwa. A road was also constructed, resulting in the first bus service, Kambasha, operating in the area. Two more bus services began in the 1960s, one by Matambanadzo, called Zvinemazuva Mbwayakachuta and another one, called Big 4.⁸² Kevias Mhanqwa of Mafa village

remembers their first encounter with the first bus, how the majority of people he was herding cattle with fled into the bush when they saw it approaching.⁸³ In Nemangwe the first bus service, called Mabinjano or Teki, was also introduced in the 1950s.⁸⁴ Churches established schools in the area. The first school in Madheruka areas was Hobani primary school in Njelele. The second was Chegama primary. Later on Chegama secondary school was also constructed.⁸⁵

Shangwe Eviction from the Forest

As noted earlier, in 1948 the Forestry Act was enacted. This was an attempt to refine and operationalize the Native Area Forest Produce Act of 1929, a piece of legislation that had been put in place to govern the way Africans harvested forest products in their designated reserves. This had largely been unenforced. Gokwe was unaffected by this Act as the place remained uninterfered with as a result of its infestation with tsetse fly, mosquitoes and wild animals.⁸⁶ In spite of evidence that it was the commercial activities of white farmers and miners that was causing the degradation of indigenous timber resources, the state insisted that Africans were responsible for it. The Provincial Native Commissioner for Gwelo's Report for 1949 buttressed this notion; "There is a tremendous amount of cutting down of timber by Natives for their huts, cattle kraals and grain drying platforms..."⁸⁷ The Forestry Act, 1948, was amended in 1953, providing for the establishment of the Forestry Commission to superintend over the colony's forest resources. The Commission was operationalized in 1954. That same year the forest was demarcated and gazetted a protected state forest.⁸⁸ It took the Forestry Commission (FC) a long time to operate in the area. Their presence only began to be felt around 1960. The Shangwe continued to conduct their ceremonies and to live as they had done before in the forest. In 1963 Shangwe communities were evicted from the forest, beginning with the Bandakamwe area.⁸⁹ Access to the forest was removed, leaving the Shangwe in economic limbo.

Responses to Eviction

Squatting in portions of the forest was a common method by the Shangwe to access their seized forest home. Squatting should be viewed as part of two struggles over land. First, Shangwe families have used this method to access their lost home. Secondly, the opening up of Gokwe for agriculture was followed by many waves of immigrants coming in, looking for the proverbial paradise. This resulted in Gokwe hosting two types of squatters; evicted Shangwe families or families of evicted people sometimes encroaching on forestry land, and new immigrants squatting in both communal areas and in the forest.⁹⁰ Squatting has to be seen in the context of the rising population in Gokwe. While prior to 1950 the District was very sparsely populated, this changed from 1953 – first with the government programme that brought in Madheruka farmers from Rhodesdale.⁹¹ The relocation of Madheruka was made necessary by the state's desire to settle ex-servicemen from the Second World War and many other settlers who were coming to the colony in response to the tobacco boom that was taking place.⁹²

The 1960s witnessed another big wave of immigrants as people migrated to Gokwe in search of more land. This was a manifestation of pressure exerted by colonial land legislation such as the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 and the Native Land Husbandry Act of 1951.⁹³ In addition to this people also migrated in reaction to rumours that Madheruka farmers who had moved to Gokwe in the early 1950s had become successful as cotton farmers.⁹⁴ The 1970s were also characterized by migration; part of the flow was voluntary migration, mostly because of cotton. By the 1970s the contribution of Gokwe cotton to the national output hovered between 31 and 50 percent⁹⁵, a huge feat considering that cotton was introduced to

the region in 1962. Part of the flow was as a result of internal migration which had to do with the liberation war that was fought against minority white rule between 1972 and 1979, the most intense phase of the war being after 1975.⁹⁶ Table 3 below shows some migration statistics from population census results in 1962, 1969 and 1982.

Table 3

Year (National population census years).	Population	Density (persons per square kilometre).
1962	60 320	4.19
1969	130 400	9.07
1982	238 566	16.69

Source: N. D. Mutizwa-Mangiza, 1990, "Decentralization and District Development Planning in Zimbabwe", Public Administration and Development, 10, 4, p. 13.

The Table shows a phenomenal increase in population in only 20 years. The population rose by almost 400 percent in that small period. This put a squeeze on land, resulting in some people squatting on state land.

For Shangwe communities, being moved from their forest home was largely unpopular. Three villages were created on the forest's margin, the forest and the villages being demarcated by Bulawayo road. The villages; Mafa, Maruta and Matashu still have elders who remember their lives in the forest when they were younger; many generally have good memories of the time. Other forest inhabitants trekked to far-away places such as Kana and Nkai and Nemangwe. The Forestry Commission (FC) soon realized that it could not chase all people successfully. The inhabitants of Bandakamwe were moved to the western part of the forest known as Zanda.⁹⁷ Though the area was not officially de-gazetted, the FC allowed people to settle there. The relations between the people and the FC were relatively cordial, as the FC did not thoroughly enforce regulations in the 1960s. This was probably because of the extent of the forest; it was too huge to police. On the other hand the Shangwe, who had intimate knowledge of the forest and an interest in seeing it preserved against a backdrop of what they perceived to be marauding Madheruka land clearers whose appetite of land appeared to be insatiable. The Shangwe were also readily available to put out forest fires free of charge because of their attachment to the forest.⁹⁸

From the 1970s the FC became more stringent about conditions under which locals could access the forest. A permit system was introduced as the FC sought to generate revenue from the forest. Permits had to be purchased for hunting and harvesting forest products such as broom grass, thatch grass, wild fruit, honey, mushroom, edible roots and edible caterpillars, called *madora* or *amacimbi* in the local language.⁹⁹ Hunting of large game and harvesting of timber was banned. However, at the peak of the liberation war the Forestry service halted its operations as its officers became a target of liberation officers. When the Forestry service was stopped many Shangwe families took advantage of that and rushed to settle in the forest. This was done with the blessing of liberation fighters, who promised villagers that at independence African communities who had been displaced for whatever reason would be allowed to return to their ancestral lands.

Land Leases

Land leases to Madheruka farmers were another way by which the Shangwe were able to subsist without having to grow cotton. Leasing land has to be seen in the context of land hunger – there were limitations imposed by the Native Land and Husbandry Act stipulating how much land each farmer could own. Leasing of land was mutually beneficial as it satisfied

the land requirements of Madheruka farmers while the Shangwe land owner got payment, usually in the form of labour. Land leases helped farmers who were not keen to grow cotton, or to engage in agriculture on a large scale. Some Shangwe farmers even managed to increase the acreages of the land they could put under the plough using labour that was provided in fulfilment of tenancy agreements. Vincent Mafa is an example of a farmer who benefitted from such arrangements. The arrangement helped him to support his big family as he has four wives and over 30 children.

Vincent Sibanda of Mafa village is one Shangwe land owner who leased portions of his land. Sibanda had three tenants. First was Lazarus Mhande. Mhande came from Nkai. When he came to Mbumbuzi he was given six acres of land by Sibanda where he grew sunflowers, cotton and maize. Mhande prospered, by local wealth-ranking standards. He managed to buy his own scotch cart and 15 herds of cattle after a few years. In return Mhande would plough Sibanda's fields free of charge at the beginning of each farming season. The second person Sibanda leased land to was Gambiza Kamututu. Kamututu was from Rhodesdale. "I gave him 10 acres of land", Sibanda recalled, "He did not grow cotton, but groundnuts, rapoko and maize. In return we agreed that he would come with his family at agreed intervals – he had 4 sons and 6 daughters – so the 12 would weed my fields."¹⁰⁰ The third person Sibanda leased land to was Tererai Mangezi. Mangezi hailed from Zaka, Masvingo. He got a 10 acre piece of land. Mangezi ploughed for Sibanda each year, and helped with the weeding of the fields also. With the help of his tenants, Sibanda said he managed to farm on 15 acres of land each year.

There were instances where the cultural differences of the groups would really come out as a result of the lease arrangements. A good example is highlighted by Fukuto Ncube's attempt to benefit from a lease arrangement that he had with a Mudheruka for the purpose of getting a wife. While it was perfectly normal among the Shangwe to marry many wives, Madheruka did not entertain the idea, largely because of their Christian orientation, among other factors. It was also common among the Shangwe for one to marry from his friend's family, as it was thought to cement ties and to guarantee that their daughter/sister would be treated well in marriage. Ncube leased 12 acres of his land to Matsaku. He became quite close to Matsaku's family. Because of this Ncube never really pursued getting a return from this arrangement, resulting in Matsaku utilizing Ncube's land almost for free. But tragedy unexpectedly struck, and Ncube lost his wife. The Shangwe community expected that, because of close ties that had developed between the Ncubes and Matsakus, Fukuto Ncube would be allowed to marry Matsaku's sister, Ruth. After Matsaku became aware of Fukuto's intention relations soured, and the lease arrangements was terminated in the process.

Fukuto Ncube later remarried from another Madheruka family. This led to the second incident. His new wife's brother, Richard Mabhanditi was short of land. Fukuto Ncube gave him 5 acres of land, on the understanding that Mabhanditi would allow Ncube to marry his other sister, Ketty, as his second wife. Mabhanditi agreed. Ncube and Mabhanditi became quite close, a relationship that saw the two even helping each other to grow cotton. When Ketty grew up and reached a marriageable age Mabhanditi reneged on his promise, saying that in Karanga culture there was no room for arranged marriages and that if Fukuto loved Ketty he had to speak to Ketty himself. The deal fell through, with Ncube feeling that there had been a conspiracy between Mabhanditi and his wife to deceive him into anticipating marrying Ketty when she matured. This had, in the short-term, the effect of ensuring that Fukuto Ncube had one wife as he waited for Ketty to grow, to the ultimate benefit of his wife, whose Dheruka traditions opposed polygamy.¹⁰¹ Fukuto's failure does, however, mean that all Shangwe men failed in this regard. Edward Mafa successfully leased his land to three

Madheruka newcomers; Gandiwa Mpala, Chief Mpala and Amos Nyathi. Mafa got his wife from the Mpala family.¹⁰²

There were instances when the Shangwe would give each other land temporarily during some seasons. Such arrangements usually differed with lease agreements with Madheruka. Nkatazo Mafa, for example, would lease his land during some seasons to VaOne Msanika and Mudhara Kwichi. There was usually no payment for this. The person who had been given such land brewed beer and slaughter chickens or a goat. The beer and food would be taken to the home of the person who had provided the land. Neighbours and relatives would then be called, where an announcement of the agreement they had made would be made. The invited persons and the one who would have prepared the beer would publicly thank the person who had given the land, after which people would dance and make merry.¹⁰³

Sticking to past ways: Living off the forest

The Shangwe also continued to live on forest products, albeit illegally, after their eviction in 1960.¹⁰⁴ They poached for game and illegally harvested other products, such as broom-grass and thatch-grass for women and timber for men who needed it for building their granaries and houses. This was, however, in a changed context, and was therefore not the same as had been the case prior to 1950. The first change was that while in the past men like Kaisan Masango had never worked in a field, but specialized as a hunter; hunting from the 1960s became a supplementary activity.¹⁰⁵ Every Shangwe family began to engage in agriculture, both men and women.¹⁰⁶ Secondly hunting, was no longer carried out in hunting parties, it became a matter of personal choice and risk. Hunters had to take the risk to hunt, as they themselves were being “hunted down” by Forestry Commission officers in the forest.¹⁰⁷ The officers would usually beat up the people they met poaching in the forest, and shoot and kill their dogs. In the event that a more serious crime had been committed, such as cases where people used fire to drive animals into nets, the offenders would be prosecuted.¹⁰⁸

Having said that, the Forestry Commission was always crippled by its failure to get adequate staff and funding for its operations. With the size of the forest, it was almost impossible for them to keep every square inch of the forest secure. Another change was that the state began to move game into designated animal sanctuaries such as Chizarira Game reserve near Chitekete, Sengwa Gorge and Nenyunga Game Park, popularly known in Gokwe by its owner’s name, Rogers Game Park.¹⁰⁹ The fourth dimension that might be important to mention is that game meat began to lose its status as the main part of the local diet, while on the other hand domesticated animals such as goats, sheep, chickens, pigs and on rare occasions cows became more prominent in the local diet.

Hunting also became a way of controlling game movements. In Mafa village, for example, they began to have a problem with wild pigs. Pigs would leave the forest and cause havoc on people’s fields. This prompted some people to organize hunts to kill stray pigs. If these fled to the forest they would sometimes be pursued right into the forest.¹¹⁰ A contradiction worth noting in all this is that some of the pigs belonged to the Shangwe in the past.¹¹¹ As they got evicted from the forest over the years, and this is especially true of a military operation that was carried out in 1983 to rid the forest of illegal settlers who had flocked back, buoyed by pre-independence promises of ZIPRA fighters that everyone would be allowed to go back to their traditional homelands after independence. Unfortunately for the Shangwe a dissident problem began, as some dissatisfied former fighters continued to operate after independence. The Shangwe were evicted, as there was a suspicion that they were harbouring dissidents.¹¹² Many people left their pigs and other things, and this contributed to the current wild pig

population.¹¹³ Hunting also changed in another way. While people in the 1940s used spears, some guns had begun to filter into the communities from the 1950s. Some people accessed guns and ammunition at work, such as Johane Mashame. Mashame was employed by the prison service at Gokwe Centre. Because of his huge family (12 wives and over 100 children), he would bring his gun home every weekend and go out to hunt to provide meat for his big family.¹¹⁴ The majority of people, however, continued to hunt with dogs.¹¹⁵

Women continued to gather fruits and other edible forest products such as mushroom and vegetables. They also got products they used on a day to day basis such as broom-grass, thatch-grass, firewood and medicinal herbs.¹¹⁶ Because of the size of most Shangwe families, going to collect products could be a big operation that required a lot of hands and power. Women such as Mathanda Moyo, Mzanda Mpofo and Madhosvi Lunga would take their friends, young ladies and grown up children as well as donkeys with which to transport the fruit back home.¹¹⁷ Some of the things they had done in the past also began to change. For example, roots began to disappear from the daily food portion, as maize gained more importance as the daily staple. Women, before the 1960s, would get edible roots of certain shrubs and trees, such as roots of the *mtiri* tree. After digging and extracting the roots they would be washed, boiled and then eaten as part of a meal.¹¹⁸ Some people also distinguished themselves in getting honey from the forest. Fuka Dube, for example, became renowned for this. His livelihood in the 1960s was based on tapping honey from the forest and exchanging it for his needs in the villages, such as money, maize, tobacco and cannabis.¹¹⁹

Conclusion

Shangwe communities did not take their eviction from Mafungautsi state forest merely as victims of a system that could not be opposed. In spite of their political weakness as a group, they creatively responded to the challenge by devising ways by which they could keep on benefiting from their forest home. Shangwe responses fit in perfectly well with acts of resistance as described by James Scott. Scott views “foot dragging, dissimulation, false compliance, feigned ignorance, desertion, pilfering, smuggling, poaching, arson, slander, sabotage, surreptitious assault and murder, anonymous threats and so on” by oppressed communities and groups as “weapons of the weak.”¹²⁰ Milton Esman has described “weapons of the weak” as;

...common methods by which weaker groups in any society attempt to protect themselves against extractions, material and psychological, of those institutionally more powerful than they, to lighten the material toll of exploitation and the symbolic burdens of subordination, to achieve some minimal autonomy and control over their lives where the main rules that govern everyday existence are made and enforced by others.¹²¹

It is in this context that Shangwe responses should be viewed. Squatting, illegal harvesting of forest production, poaching and land leases represented more than just resistance to eviction from their habitat. It was also an anti-commodity response; an anti-cotton expression on one hand and a fight for the preservation of their old ways of life on the other.

The colonial state sought to re-arrange African lives in a number of ways; communities were evicted from lands deemed to be fit for white use and lands set aside for conservation purposes. The state also sought to rearrange African production, in this case to make African farmers grow cotton. Africans did not give their input to these processes. Lack of input did not however mean that they were just victims of colonial processes as they unfolded. The Shangwe came up with creative responses to this onslaught – in the form of resistance and adaptive mechanisms. These mechanisms were a sustainable reaction to preserving their traditional ways of life and to ensuring their sustenance as a social group.

Notes and References

¹ The term is not an ethnic label. It is often used to denote the early settlers as “primitive”, “backward”, “resistant to change” and “anti-modern.” For more on this see P. S. Nyambara, 2002, “Madheruka and Shangwe: Ethnic Identities and the Culture of Modernity in Gokwe, North-western Zimbabwe, 1963-79”, The Journal of African History, 43, 2, 287-306.

² Like the term “Shangwe” this term does not denote an ethnic label. It is used by early settlers (the Shangwe) to refer to settlers who came to the area from 1953 onwards. The term is “an onomatopoeic word intended to evoke the sound of the lorry engines that brought (Madheruka) to Gokwe.” For more see E. Worby, 1992, “Remaking Labour, Reshaping Identity: Cotton, Modernization and the Culture of Modernity in north-western Zimbabwe”, PhD Thesis, McGill University.

³ Rhodesdale estate stretched from the boundary with Gweru and stretched to Kwekwe, Lalapansi, Chivhu, Mvuma and Gutu. A good portion of the area later came to be owned by Central Estates. The Nicholas van Hoogstraten-owned Central Estates is still operating today, though portions of it have been allocated for resettlement. For more on Madheruka in Rhodesdale see Pius S. Nyambara, 2005, “That Place was Wonderful!” African Tenants on Rhodesdale Estate, Colonial Zimbabwe, c. 1900-1952, International Journal of African Historical Studies, 38, 2, 267-299.

⁴ Author’s interview with Isaac Gavaza, 86, Rumhumha village, 14 September 2011.

⁵ Author’s interview with Cephas Moyo, 60, Makuwerere village, 13 February 2011.

⁶ Author’s interview with Tanyanyiwa Marimbidzike, 75, at Tare township, Nemangwe, 11 February 2012.

⁷ A few people had, however had contact with the outside sector through employment. One Msanika of Mafa village, for example, was a transport rider who transported mail from Gokwe to Kwekwe using a horse-drawn cart. Sitshona Matashu already worked as a cook in Bulawayo at the end of the 1940s. Information from interviews with Samson Msanika (also known as Kohwapakuru), 87, Mafa village, 19 August 2011 and Sitshona Matashu, 84, Matashu village, 27 September 2011.

⁸ Pius S. Nyambara, “Madheruka and Shangwe”, p. 288, 291.

⁹ Author’s interview with Headman Claudio Rumhumha, 78, Rumhumha village, 14 March 2012.

¹⁰ E. Kramer, 1998, “A Clash of Economies: Early Centralization Efforts in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1929-1935”, Zambezia, XXV, I, 83-98.

¹¹ Author’s interview Tafirenyika Shumba Tafirei, 71, Takaendesa village, 13 July 2011.

¹² E. Mapedza, 2007, “Forest Policy in Colonial and Post-Colonial Zimbabwe: Continuity and Change”, Journal of Historical Geography, 33, 834.

¹³ F. Matose and Tendayi Maravanyika-Mutumukuru, “‘Squatting’ as a Means of Establishing Authority over Forest Land in Zimbabwe: A Missing Dimension to Land Reform”, 4, www.indiana.edu/~wow4/papers/matose/wow4.pdf, downloaded on the 8th of September 2012. For more on State forestry policy see E. Mapedza, “Forestry Policy in colonial and post-colonial Zimbabwe.”

¹⁴ Author’s interview with Kevias Mhanqwa, 66, Mafa village, 6 June 2011.

¹⁵ Author’s interviews with Headman Nimrod Mandava, 44, Mandava village, 14 September 2011 and Shadrack Silemba (a spirit medium), Svisvi, Nemangwe, 15 September, 2011.

- ¹⁶ Author's interview with Mutimba Khohliso Weresi, 87, Mafa village, 11 February 2011.
- ¹⁷ Interview with Stephen Sitshela, 63, Mafa village, 18 February 2011.
- ¹⁸ Interviews with Elia Sibanda, age estimated to be in the 60s, 24 February 2011, Gramma Machiro, 56, and Kaizen Sibanda, 65, and Mazamba Maguchwa, 69, a traditional healer, Mafa village in March 2010.
- ¹⁹ Interviews with Kevias Mhanqwa, 15 March 2010 and Vincent Sibanda, 59, 16 March 2010. Mhanqwa has 4 wives and around 30 children while Sibanda has 4 wives and 32 children.
- ²⁰ Interview with Brown Kufa, 62, Matashu village, 23 February 2011.
- ²¹ Interview with Regina Lunga, 83, 16 August 2011, Mugari Tavaena, 65 and Kusha Robert Mpofu, 85, Matashu village, 21 August 2011. Women could, however also own cattle. There were a number of circumstances under which women could acquire cattle. When a woman's daughter got married she was entitled to receive a cow, *mombe yehumai* from her son in law. In cases of severe domestic abuse, tradition also required the husband to give her a beast to show his remorse and repentance. One cow was, in many instances, all a woman began with – the cows would multiply with time. Many women, such as Regina Lunga of Matashu, owned many cattle in their own right.
- ²² Interview with Silas Mapfumo, 83, Matashu village, 27 August 2011.
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Interview with Rhodiwe Matashu, 75, Matashu village, 27 August 2011.
- ²⁵ Interviews with women in Mafa and Matashu villages.
- ²⁶ Interview with King Moyo, 70, 12 February 2012.
- ²⁷ Information about the Shangwe was collected from interviews from Mafa, Matashu, Maruta, Makuwerere, Takaendesa, Rumhumha and Mandava villages in Gokwe South.
- ²⁸ Interview with Isaac Gavaza, 86, Rumhumha village, 14 September 2011.
- ²⁹ Interview with Sitshona matashu, 85, Matashu village, 29 September 2011.
- ³⁰ Interview with Maggie Mthenji, 91, 25 February 2012.
- ³¹ Interview with Isaac Gavaza, Rumhumha village, 14 September 2011.
- ³² Ian Phimister, 1988, An economic and social history of Zimbabwe 1890 -1948: Capital accumulation and class struggle, London, Longman, 219, 224.
- ³³ Madheruka generally describe life in Rhodesdale as having been better than their current life in Gokwe. For more see Pius S. Nyambara, 2005, "That Place was wonderful!": African tenants on Rhodesdale estate, colonial Zimbabwe, c. 1900-52, The International Journal of African Historical Studies, 38, 2, 267-299.
- ³⁴ See the Report of the Commission of Enquiry into the Agricultural Industry, 1934.
- ³⁵ N. H. Wilson, Southern Rhodesia Native Affairs Department, 1925, as quoted by B. N. Floyd, 1962, "Land Apportionment in Southern Rhodesia", Geographical Review, 52, 4, 566.
- ³⁶ V. Machingaidze, 1991, "Agrarian Change From Above: The Southern Rhodesia Native Land Husbandry Act and African Response", The International Journal of African Historical Studies, 24, 3, 559.

-
- ³⁷ A. S. Mlambo, 1998, "Building a White Man's Country: Aspects of White Immigration into Rhodesia up to World War II" in Zambezia, 25, 2, 131.
- ³⁸ Oliver B. Pollak, Black Farmers and White Politics in Rhodesia, 264.
- ³⁹ Eira Punt, 1979, "The Development of African Agriculture in Southern Rhodesia with Particular Reference to the Interwar years", Master of Arts Thesis, University of Natal, 44.
- ⁴⁰ A. K. Shutt, 1997, "Purchase Areas and the Middle Class of Southern Rhodesia, 1931-52", The International Journal of African Historical Studies, 30, 3, 560.
- ⁴¹ The Chief Native Commissioner's Report: Southern Rhodesia, 1918, 4.
- ⁴² I. Phimister, An economic and social history of Zimbabwe, 219, 224.
- ⁴³ Ibid, 226.
- ⁴⁴ T. Moyo, 2001, "A History of the Cotton Industry in Colonial Zimbabwe: 1903-1940s", Bachelor of Arts Honours Dissertation, Department of Economic History, University of Zimbabwe, 10-15.
- ⁴⁵ NAZ S138/189B, Cotton Growing, Correspondence between the Native Commissioner for Sinoia AND the Superintendent of Natives, dated 27 November, 1923.
- ⁴⁶ The Cotton Research and Industry Board (CRIB), First Annual Report for the Year Ending March 31, 1937.
- ⁴⁷ E. Matowa, 1996, "The Cotton Research and Industry Board and African Cotton Production in Southern Rhodesia: 1936-1955", Bachelor of Arts Honours Dissertation, Department of Economic History, University of Zimbabwe.
- ⁴⁸ P. S. Nyambara, 2002, "Madheruka and Shangwe: Ethnic Identities and the Culture of Modernity in Gokwe, north-western Zimbabwe, 1963-79", The Journal of African History, 43, 2, 287-8.
- ⁴⁹ See E. Kramer, 1998, "A Clash of Economies: Early Centralization Efforts in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1929-1935, Zambezia, XXV, I, 83-98 and, by the same author "The Early Years: Extension Services in Peasant Agriculture in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1925-1929, Zambezia, XXIV, II, 1997, 159-179, J. McGregor, "Conservation, Control and Ecological Change" and I. Phimister, "Discourse and the Discipline of Historical Context."
- ⁵⁰ Beinart, "Soil Erosion, Conservationism and Ideas about Development", 52.
- ⁵¹ Kramer, "The Early Years: Extension Services in Peasant Agriculture", 86.
- ⁵² D. Anderson, 1984, "Depression, Dust Bowl, Demography and Drought: The Colonial State and Soil Conservation Policy in East Africa during the 1930s", African Affairs, 83, 321-344.
- ⁵³ J. McGregor, 1995, "Conservation, State Control and Ecological Change: The Politics and Ecology of Colonial Conservation in Shurugwi, Zimbabwe", Environment and History, 1, 257.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid, 257.
- ⁵⁵ J. Mackenzie, 1991, "The Natural World and the Popular Consciousness in Southern Africa: The European Appropriation of Nature" in P. Kaarshoim (ed), Cultural Struggle and Development in Southern Africa, Harare, Baobab Books, 28.
- ⁵⁶ See A. Mandondo, 2000, Situating Zimbabwe's Natural Resource Governance Systems in History, Bogor, Centre for International Forest Research (CIFOR).
- ⁵⁷ Such situations are described by G. Hardin, 2009, "The Tragedy of the Commons", Journal of Natural Resource Policy Research, 1, 3, 243-53.

⁵⁸ For more on this see A. K. Weinrich, 1971, Chiefs and Councils in Rhodesia: Transition from Patriarchal to Bureaucratic Power, London, Heinemann.

⁵⁹ P. Nyambara, 2001, Immigrants, 'Traditional' Leaders and the Rhodesian State: The Power of 'Communal' Land Tenure and the Politics of Land Acquisition in Gokwe, Zimbabwe, 1963-79", Journal of Southern African Studies, 27, 4, 771-791.

⁶⁰ Author's interview with a spirit medium, Shadrick Silemba.

⁶¹ E. Mapedza's interview with Chief Njelele, Gokwe, January 2000.

⁶² V. I. Tanyanyiwa and M. Chikwanha, 2011, "The Role of Indigenous Knowledge Systems in the Management of Forest Resources in Mugabe Area, Masvingo, Zimbabwe", Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, 13, 2, 132-149.

⁶³ Author's interview with Headman Driver Mafa, February 2012.

⁶⁴ Author's interview with Vincent Sibanda and Regina Lunga, September 2011.

⁶⁵ Author's interview with Namunedi Dingane (also called Maraya), 72, Makuwerere village, 13 September 2011.

⁶⁶ Author's Interview with Kevias Mhanqwa, Mafa village.

⁶⁷ M. Musemwa, 2009, "Contestation over Resources: The Farmer-Miner Dispute in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1903-1939", Environment and History, 15, pp. 79-107 and V. C. Kwashirai, "Dilemmas in Conservationism in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1890-1930", Conservation and Society, 4, 4, 541-61.

⁶⁸ Kwashirai, "Dilemmas in Conservationism", p. 541.

⁶⁹ Musemwa, "Contestation over Resources: The Farmer Miner Dispute", 101.

⁷⁰ Mapedza, "Forestry Policy in Colonial and Post-Colonial Zimbabwe", p. 841. Also see McGregor, "Conservation, Control and Ecological Change", 257-79.

⁷¹ National Archives of Zimbabwe (NAZ), S2929/7/3, Gokwe Delineation Reports 1963-5, Report by C. J. K. Latham, Delineation Officer, dated 26 October, 1963.

⁷² Interview with Regina Lunga, 82, Matashu village. To make sense of this statement one has to understand that cotton brought return than maize and millet. The comparison between a suit, a pair of shorts and rags was meant to convince the villagers that only cotton could transform their lives from poverty to riches.

⁷³ This was in line with provisions of the Native Land Husbandry Act which limited African landholding to "economic units" of six acres for each family in areas with good rainfall, and a little more in arid areas. See V. E. M. Machingaidze, "Agrarian Change from Above", p. 567 – 568.

⁷⁴ Interview with Tafirenyika Shumba Tafirei, Takaendesa Village (71 years old), 20 March 2011.

⁷⁵ Interview with Kevias Mhanqwa, Mafa Village, 65, 11 September 2011.

⁷⁶ Interview with Driver Mafa.

⁷⁷ Interview with Mafa Village Head, Driver Mafa, aged 72, 21 September 2011.

⁷⁸ Interview with Regina Lunga on the 26th of September 2011 at Matashu Village, 80 years old.

-
- ⁷⁹ For example interview with Shadrack Silemba (a Shangwe spirit medium), Mandava Village, Svisvi, Chief Nemangwe's area.
- ⁸⁰ J. Alexander and JoAnne McGregor, 1997, "Modernity and Ethnicity in a frontier society: understanding difference in north-western Zimbabwe, Journal of Southern African Studies, 23, 191.
- ⁸¹ Interview with Claudio Rumhumha, aged 78, Rumhumha village, 14 September, 2011.
- ⁸² Interview with Tafirenyika Shumba Tafirei, 71, Takaendesa village, October 2011.
- ⁸³ Interview with Kevias Mhanqwa, Mafa village, 8 February 2011.
- ⁸⁴ Interview with Manhamba Sande, at Tare Township, Nemangwe on 10 September 2011.
- ⁸⁵ Interview with Isaac Gavaza, 85, Rumhumha village, 14 September 2011.
- ⁸⁶ Author's interview with...Tara, Nemangwe.
- ⁸⁷ Provincial Agricultural Report, Provincial Native Commissioner, 20 August, 1948.
- ⁸⁸ F. Matose and T. Mutimukuru-Maravanyika, 2009, "'Squatting' as a means of Establishing Authority over Forest Land in Zimbabwe: A Missing Dimension to Land Reform, http://www.indiana.edu/~wow4/papers/matose_wow4.pdf, downloaded on the 18th of October, 2012.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid*, p. 7.
- ⁹⁰ Pius S. Nyambara has dealt with this development in detail in the post-colonial period in the article "The Closing Frontier: Agrarian Change, Immigrants and the 'Squatter Menace' in Gokwe, 1980-1990s", Journal of Agrarian Change, 1, 4, pp. 534-549.
- ⁹¹ Interview, Gavaza.
- ⁹² For more on the post-war economic climate see I. R. Phimister, 1988, An Economic and Social History of Zimbabwe 1890-1948: Capital Accumulation and Class Struggle, London, Longman, pp. 219-58. For more on post-war resettlement of white farmers see R. Palmer, 1977, Land and Racial Discrimination in Rhodesia, Los Angeles, California University Press, p. 243.
- ⁹³ For more on colonial land legislation and the amount of pressure it exerted on African land needs see H. V. Moyana, 2002, The Political Economy of Land in Zimbabwe, Gweru, Mambo Press.
- ⁹⁴ For more on the successes of Madheruka cotton farmers see P. S. Nyambara, 2002, "Madheruka and Shangwe: Ethnic Identities and the Culture of Modernity in Gokwe, north-western Zimbabwe, 1963-79, Journal of African History, 43, pp. 287-306.
- ⁹⁵ Nyambara, "Agrarian Change, Immigrants and the 'Squatter Menace'", p. 537.
- ⁹⁶ Author's interview Tivafire shumba Tafirei.
- ⁹⁷ Matose and Mutimukuru-Maravanyika, "Squatting' as a means of Establishing Authority", p. 7.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 7.
- ⁹⁹ For more on the importance of these programmes to day to day needs of locals see T. Mutimukuru-Maravanyika, 2010, "Can we Learn our way to Sustainable Management? Adaptive Collaborative Management in Mafungautsi State Forest, Zimbabwe", PhD Thesis, Wageningen University. Also see F. Matose, 1994, "Local

People's Uses and Perceptions of Forest Resources: An Analysis of a State Property Regime in Zimbabwe", MSc Dissertation, University of Alberta.

¹⁰⁰ Interview with Vincent Sibanda, 69, Mafa village.

¹⁰¹ Interview with Fukuto Ncube, 75, Mafa village, 19 September 2011.

¹⁰² Interview with Josiah Mafa, Mafa village, 66, 13 July 2011.

¹⁰³ Interview with Angeline Mafa, 62, 14 July, 2011.

¹⁰⁴ Interview with King Moyo, 70, Mafa village, 12 February 2012.

¹⁰⁵ Interview with Angeline Mafa, 62, 14 July, 2011.

¹⁰⁶ Interview with Regina Lunga, 80, Matashu village.

¹⁰⁷ Interview with King Moyo, 70, Mafa village, 12 February 2012.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Interview with Manhamba Sande, Sande village, Nemangwe, 66, 10 October 2011.

¹¹⁰ Interview with King Moyo, 70, Mafa village, 12 February 2012.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Interview with Dhara Msanika, 65, Mafa village, 2 April 2012.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Interview with Regina Lunga, 80, Matashu village.

¹¹⁵ Interview with Brown Kufa, Matashu Village.

¹¹⁶ Interview with Mabheu Senzela, 70, Matashu village, 26 October 2011.

¹¹⁷ Interview with Dhara Msanika (also known as Kohwapakuru) of Mafa village.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Interview with Killion Lunga, 72, Matashu village, 26 October 2012.

¹²⁰ James Scott, 1989, "Everyday forms of resistance", in F. D. Colburn (ed), Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance, New York, M. E. Sharp, 5.

¹²¹ M. Esman, 1989, "Commentary" in Everyday Forms of Resistance, 221.