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Foreword

The International Land Coalition (ILC) was established by civil society and multilateral organisations who were convinced that secure access to land and natural resources is central to the ability of women and men to get out of, and stay out of, hunger and poverty.

In 2008, at the same time as the food price crisis pushed the number of hungry over the one billion mark, members of ILC launched a global research project to better understand the implications of the growing wave of international large-scale investments in land. Small-scale producers have always faced competition for the land on which their livelihoods depend. It is evident, however, that changes in demand for food, energy and natural resources, alongside liberalisation of trade regimes, are making the competition for land increasingly global and increasingly unequal.

Starting with a scoping study by ILC member Agter, the Commercial Pressures on Land research project has brought together more than 30 partners, ranging from NGOs in affected regions whose perspectives and voices are closest to most affected land users, to international research institutes whose contribution provides a global analysis on selected key themes. The study process enabled organisations with little previous experience in undertaking such research projects, but with much to contribute, to participate in the global study and have their voices heard. Support to the planning and writing of each study was provided by ILC member CIRAD.

ILC believes that in an era of increasingly globalised land use and governance, it is more important than ever that the voices and interests of all stakeholders – and in particular local land users – are represented in the search for solutions to achieve equitable and secure access to land.

This report is one of the 28 being published as a part of the global study. The full list of studies, and information on other initiatives by ILC relating to Commercial Pressures on Land, is available for download on the International Land Coalition website at www.landcoalition.org/cplstudies.

I extend my thanks to all organisations that have been a part of this unique research project. We will continue to work for opportunities for these studies, and the diverse perspectives they represent, to contribute to informed decision-making. The implications of choices on how land and natural resources should be used, and for whom, are stark. In an increasingly resource-constrained and polarised world, choices made today on land tenure and ownership will shape the economies, societies and opportunities of tomorrow’s generations, and thus need to be carefully considered.

Madiodio Niasse
Director, International Land Coalition Secretariat
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Executive summary

Macha Mission in Choma District of Southern Province, Zambia was founded by the Brethren in Christ (BIC) Church in 1906 and granted title deeds to 3,003 hectares of land by the British colonial authority of the time. Since then the Mission has built a church, a hospital (which today includes a pioneering malaria clinic), two schools, and houses for its workers. A large market has grown up near the hospital, serving local workers and hospital visitors.

Local people, mainly from the Macha and Mapanza chiefdoms, have over the years settled on unused Mission land. Four villages were established, and by 2009 a total of 222 families were living on Mission land. Thirty-seven more families had fields but not homes on the land. Most were farmers, growing crops (mainly maize, groundnuts, and beans) and rearing livestock (cattle, goats, pigs, and chickens). A few individuals combined farming with small-scale food trading businesses at the market.

In 2005 the Church decided to start making economic use of its land, in order to bring development to the area. According to the Church authorities this meant, among other things, bringing in a foreign investor to introduce economically viable commercial activities such as growing jatropha and building amenities such as a restaurant and guesthouse.

The Church has leased 200 hectares of its land to a privately owned organization called the PrivaServe Foundation, which operates locally under the name Macha Works, for a period of 35 years. Some local people are convinced that some of the economic activities being introduced belong not to this foreign investor, nor to the Church, but to one or other of the key Macha Mission staff.

As a consequence of this commercialization, the Church announced that the “illegal squatters” living and working on the land would be evicted. They were told to move out by the beginning of the 2009/2010 farming season.

The affected villages formed committees to fight the eviction. Many people did not know that the land they lived on belonged to the Mission, as most had been given permission to settle there by village headmen or local chiefs. They attempted to hire a lawyer to fight their case, but in their absence the High Court in Lusaka ruled in favour of the Mission. The 222 families were ordered to leave and most did so peacefully, moving to areas outside the disputed land.

Since taking over the land, PrivaServe/Macha Works has planted a large jatropha field. It has also built an airstrip, an internet café, a radio station, a restaurant, a guesthouse, and a private school. There have been some positive impacts from this, such as the provision of formal employment (around 113 people work for the various development projects) and the provision of education services and new facilities such as the restaurant (although both the school and restaurant are too expensive for most local people).
However, these benefits are far outweighed by the negative impacts. People have lost their homes and the land on which they grazed their animals and grew their crops. Most have harvested little, if anything, this year, and as a result food insecurity has increased. Most of the households interviewed complain of hunger.

A few people have been given land by village heads in new areas, but not enough to meet their needs. They now have to buy the food crops they previously grew, and many have had to sell most of their livestock. Others have moved their animals to neighbouring areas, though this has led to overgrazing and the health of the animals has suffered.

People running businesses have also lost out. Traders have lost their shops or have been prevented from selling at the market. They have less stock to sell and have to travel longer distances. Their incomes have fallen substantially. Some former farmers have turned to small-scale trading at the market to survive.

The situation has created tensions and has affected social cohesion in the area. The people who have been evicted no longer trust the BIC authorities and want the investor to leave. They can see no value in the jatropha field that has displaced them, particularly as it appears to be untended and full of weeds. Some suspect an ulterior motive on the part of the investor.

Some people feel that their Chief, although he attempted to intervene, could have done more to prevent the eviction. Others have come into conflict with their new neighbours, as they compete for limited grazing land. The evictions have also raised questions about the boundaries between local chiefdoms, potentially storing up trouble for the future.

Local residents suggest a number of possible solutions. They argue that the investor should be removed and the displaced people allowed to return. Efforts are under way to find a lawyer to make an appeal to the High Court to reverse its earlier judgment. However, there is no guarantee that this will be successful, particularly as none of the people evicted possessed title deeds to the land they were living on. There is some scope, however, in re-examining the Mission’s original title deeds and in establishing precisely who owns the new facilities, the Church or the investor.

Some argue that the BIC Church and the investor should compensate the displaced families financially. Others believe that the best course of action is for the local chiefs to cooperate in finding land on which the displaced people can resettle permanently. Others suggest that charitable organizations should intervene to provide food and financial assistance, at least in the short term.

The study team is strongly of the view that reform of Zambia’s land laws is necessary to prevent such situations occurring in the future. In this light, it makes the following recommendations to tackle both the immediate needs of the people in the Macha Mission area and the wider issues:

° In Macha, charitable organizations should assist the people affected by eviction in the short term.
The traditional rulers in the area should cooperate to find a solution for the displaced families.

Zambia's land laws should be reformed to prevent landowners from retaining large areas of land for many years without developing them. Ten years is suggested as the maximum period, before the land is reclaimed by the government.

Civil society organizations involved with land issues should:

- Campaign for law reform to provide for squatter rights;
- Help adversely affected families and communities to find legal assistance;
- Establish links between affected communities and charitable organizations that can assist them in cases of hardship.
# Background

The Brethren in Christ (BIC) Church, under the leadership of the American missionary Frances Hannah Davidson, founded Macha Mission in Choma District of Southern Province, Zambia in 1906. Zambia was then a colonial territory under the British South Africa Company (BSAC), which issued the Mission with title deeds to 3,003 hectares of land. Article 12 of the title deeds specifically forbade eviction of the people living on the land prior to issuance of the title. The Article reads as follows: “No native living on the said land and no native village or plantation existing thereon at the date of these presents shall be disturbed or removed without the consent in writing of the Administrator...”.

Over time, the Mission built a church, a hospital, two schools, and houses for its staff and workers on its land. More recently, in the past few years it has built the Macha Malaria Research Centre, which has become well known outside the district (and even internationally). A large market has developed near the hospital, where local residents and people from further afield bring agricultural and non-agricultural produce to sell. Market customers include the many employees of the Mission and also many people staying near the hospital to care for relatives who are in-patients.

Over the years, local people settled on Mission land that the Church had not utilized. They came mainly from the Macha and Mapanza chiefdoms (partly as a result of a shortage of land in their own villages), and by 2009 a total of 222 families were living on the Mission land. Thirty-seven more families from Chikuni and Silubwabwa villages in Chief Mapanza's chieftainship had their fields, but not their homes, on the land.

These figures were arrived at by a group of local residents, after the Church announced its plans to evict the families living on the Mission land as so-called “illegal settlers”. This galvanized the affected villages to get together and form committees, as well as establishing how many people would be affected by the Church’s commercial land lease and consequently by eviction, the village committees collected information on how long the settlers had lived on the Mission land, where they had come from originally, and who had given them authority to live there. The committees obtained information from 209 (94%) of the 222 families concerned. As Table 1 shows, half of these people had arrived on the Mission land during the past 30 years, since 1980. Only one family claimed to have been settled on the Mission land as long ago as 1901, i.e. before the Church acquired it.
Table 1: Periods when affected families settled on Mission land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Families settling on Mission land</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1906</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906–1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921–1950</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951–1980</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980–2010</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: list compiled by committees of affected villages

Many people did not know that the land they lived on belonged to the Mission, but thought that it was customary land under the authority of traditional rulers. Indeed, when asked who had given them permission to settle there, the vast majority (97.1%) of the 209 families who provided information said that village heads had given permission either directly to them or to their ancestors. Only six of the families interviewed had been given the pieces of land they lived on by the Church. These people, or their ancestors, had worked for the Mission and had been given land as a pension or a form of terminal benefit when they retired.

The main activity of the people settled on the Mission land was farming, i.e. growing crops and rearing livestock. Maize was the main crop grown, along with others such as groundnuts and beans. The livestock they kept included cattle, goats, pigs, and chickens; a few people kept guinea fowls.

A few individuals also ran small-scale businesses buying and selling groceries and other commodities at the market near the Mission hospital, combining these activities with farming. It was not possible to establish the exact number of these entrepreneurs, as most businesses were not full-time occupations and nobody kept records of these activities. Most importantly, time constraints did not allow the study team to carry out a headcount of the business people who had settled and/or worked on the Mission land. Some had moved out of the area. Nevertheless, four full-time business people were identified in the course of the fieldwork. These individuals had grocery shops at their homes on the Mission land.

The BIC Church decided to commercialize the use of its land in 2005 (around 100 years after it had acquired it). Approximately 200 hectares located in the north-east part of the area owned by the Macha Mission were leased to an outside investor, PrivaServe Foundation, for a period of 35 years. Land has economic value, said the Church, and this value had to be realized by utilizing it in a commercial manner, which had not been done previously. The term “land commercialization” is used in this report to bring out clearly the BIC leadership’s reason for leasing the land and for evicting the “illegal settlers” who had been living and working on it for many years.
This motivation is seen clearly in the lease agreement, which states the purpose of leasing the land to be “establishing innovative processes at Macha in the fields of progress in health management, managed internet services, power generation solutions, preservation of African culture, mission flying services, innovative school education and research, community centre development, economic development, sports development, agricultural development, leadership development and others, to the benefit of rural development in Macha, Zambia, and Southern Africa”.

The lease agreement was drawn up between the Brethren in Christ Church, Zambia Conference as the lessor and PrivaServe Foundation as the lessee. The agreement lists a number of other development organizations acting with BIC as lessors: “Churches Health Association of Zambia, LinkNet Multipurpose Cooperative Society, Aids Relief/Catholic Relief Services, CDC-Zambia, University of Zambia, Macha Innovative Christian School, and a number of other initiatives”.

Leasing the Mission land for commercial use involved the eviction of the people who had been living on it for many years. People who had been living on the land “illegally” were told to move out by the beginning of the 2009/2010 farming season.

The people affected got together and contributed K30,000 (USD 6)1 per family to hire a lawyer to plead their case in court. A total of K1,600,000 (USD 320) was collected and given to one of the people affected, who was to represent the group in the High Court in Lusaka. It is to be noted that this sum was not enough to hire a lawyer. On his way to Lusaka, the representative met with Chief Macha, who informed him that he was going to Lusaka himself to see His Excellency the President of the Republic of Zambia, Levy P. Mwanawasa, to seek his assistance with this matter. Hearing this, the representative abandoned his trip to the capital, gave the money to the Chief, and returned home.

The representative of the affected people was not present at the court sitting in Lusaka, which ruled in favour of the Mission and the investor, PrivaServe, and against the “illegal settlers”. The ruling meant that they had to leave the Mission land, and the 222 families were told to move out. A force of 150 police officers was put on standby to forcibly evict them if necessary but, except for the six families given their land by the Church, they all left peacefully and settled outside the disputed land. Chief Macha saw the President (since deceased), who directed that the few who had not yet left the Mission land should continue to live there until the matter was reviewed. These six families stayed where they were, but without land to grow crops or graze their animals. However, they were subsequently told to move out by the end of the 2009/2010 farming season – around June 2010 – as were the many other families living outside the Mission land but who conducted farming activities within it.

The evictions involved even those people whose parents had been given the land on which they were living by the BIC authorities, in writing, as a form of pension after they

---

1 An exchange rate of Kwacha (K)5,000 = USD 1 has been used throughout.
had worked for the Church for many years. The Mission’s argument for evicting these people was that the land had been given to individuals and that, once the individual had died, their descendants had no claim to it. They further claimed that the “squatters” were depleting the environment as they were cutting down trees and burning charcoal on the land.

Since the commercialization project began, the investor, operating locally under the name Macha Works, has established the following facilities on the land from which the people were evicted:

- A large jatropha field
- An internet café
- A radio station
- An airstrip
- A restaurant
- A guesthouse
- A private school.

According to senior BIC authorities, these developments belong to the Church while the so-called investor is just the Church’s employee. However, local people negatively affected by the project strongly believe that the developments belong either to the foreign investor or to one or other of the senior Church staff.
Study objectives

The overall objective of this study was to assess the social impacts of the commercialization of the Macha Mission land. Other issues it explored were:

- The mechanisms and strategies that the affected families have adopted in order to cope with their situation;
- Recommendations aimed at addressing the plight of the people adversely affected;
- Views on what can be done both to assist the current victims of land commercialization and how to prevent similar situations occurring in the future.

Study methods

The study started with a brief review of relevant literature in Lusaka. The review of documents continued in the field as more documents became available at the study site. The study team travelled to Choma and to Macha Mission, where it interviewed key stakeholders using semi-structured interviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and direct observations of what was happening. While all the people interviewed were spoken to in the field, the team spoke to some again from Lusaka by telephone in order to verify points or to obtain more information on particular issues.

Sampling frame

The study team interviewed a total of 88 people, all of whom had been affected in one way or another by the commercialization of the Macha Mission land. BIC staff members, one employee of the investor, government officials, and community leaders, both modern and traditional, were individually selected, while people who had been affected by the evictions were selected for interview on the basis of their availability.

Many of the evictees had already moved off the Mission land and it was not possible to follow them up, given the time and financial resources available to the study team; hence only those who were immediately available were interviewed. Table 2 shows the categories of people interviewed, with a brief statement on how they were affected.
Table 2: Categories of people interviewed and how they have been affected by land commercialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>How they have been affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Evicted people</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Had to leave the Mission land. Still on Mission land but not allowed to do any farming on it. A few people are working for the investor who has been responsible for their eviction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– left Mission land</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– not left Mission land</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 BIC administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Made the decision to evict the people and now are very unpopular with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Traditional rulers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The two chiefdoms have received some of the displaced people, thus reducing their own available farmland and especially grazing land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Chief Macha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Chief Mapanza’s secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Village heads/deputy village heads</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Three have had their people evicted, while the remaining two have received evictees, whose livestock has led to overgrazing in their villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Government staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Concerned with the welfare of the evicted population. However, they were not very clear about the implications of the lease arrangement between BIC and the investor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Investor’s administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Responsible for the work being undertaken on the land from which people have been evicted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ward councillors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>One of these councillors has been directly affected personally, while the other is a councillor in a neighbouring ward where some of the evictees have settled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 School pupils</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Children who attended a school that was on the disputed land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty-six respondents were interviewed individually, using semi-structured interviews. These included 36 of the evictees as well as staff from various organizations with a stake in the matter. These included government staff, traditional leaders (chiefs and village heads), ward councillors and school pupils. Focus group discussions were held with the remaining 32 affected people.
Research approach

A brief review of relevant literature was carried out by the study team prior to going out into the field to conduct interviews; this activity continued when the team returned from the field. The study team spent a total of three days collecting primary data, two on the Macha Mission land itself and one in Choma, the administrative centre for the district. Some people had to be interviewed by telephone after the team had returned to Lusaka, as they were not available in the study areas during the three days of fieldwork. Phone conversations were also used to verify and discuss issues further with selected interviewees. A draft report was then written, but it was realized that the information gathered in the three days of fieldwork was insufficient, as a number of key persons had not been interviewed. Hence another trip, also of three days’ duration, was undertaken, before this final report was written.

The study team

The research was conducted by a four-person team, consisting of:

- John T. Milimo, Team Leader, Dean of School of Graduate Studies and Research at the Zambian Open University (ZAOU)
- Henry Machina, Executive Director, Zambia Land Alliance
- Joy H. Kalyalya, Lecturer, School of Education, Zambian Open University
- Twamane Hamweene, Member, Monze District Land Alliance (a branch of the Zambia Land Alliance).

Challenges and limitations

The biggest challenge faced by the study team was the fact that the research exercise raised the expectations of the adversely affected individuals and their families, who expected, and indeed still do expect, some tangible benefits to come from it. Many of the people interviewed hoped that the team’s visits would result in the removal/eviction of the foreign investor (the jatropha farmer), to enable them to return and to resettle on the land. Others thought that the visit would be followed by some compensation, either monetary or in kind, for the land they had lost. The study team, therefore, had to dispel these expectations while pointing out the actual purpose of the study visit (i.e. to assess the social impacts and the conclusions that could be drawn from them).

A major limitation experienced by the team was reluctance on the part of some of the key stakeholders, especially those associated with the BIC Church, to reveal important information relating to the evictions of people from the Mission land. They argued that to
talk openly about land issues would constitute contempt of court as, although the High Court in Lusaka had already made a ruling on the issue of the “illegal settlers”, this had not yet been fully put into effect.

The short period of time allocated to the fieldwork was an even bigger limitation. The three days originally allocated proved inadequate to carry out systematic interviews, especially with the evicted people. It was thus not possible to obtain information from more than a few people regarding the number of domestic animals that they had or the extent of the crops they grew before and after the land commercialization. Inadequate funding was the reason for having so few days in the field. Indeed, during the second trip to the study area, the team leader had to meet the cost of his stay from his own pocket.

The absence of a female member in the study team was another limitation. The eviction involved whole families, and women are key actors in family affairs. Having an exclusively male research team did not allow for a full understanding of events during and after the eviction.

Figure 2 Focus group discussion with victims of the eviction (2)
2 Study findings

While the majority of the people interviewed during the fieldwork noted only the negative impacts of the commercialization of the Mission land, the study team also noted a number of positive impacts, which had already begun to be visible and are likely to increase with time. These are discussed below.

Positive impacts of commercialization of the Macha Mission land

Some positive developments have taken place on the Macha Mission land, though these are rarely mentioned by those who have lost the land that they had used for years. Positive impacts include the provision of formal employment, the provision of education services via a new school, the availability of a restaurant and a guesthouse providing services that were not previously available, and the construction of good-quality modern buildings from which the services are provided.

Employment generation

The generation of formal employment has been the most visible positive impact in the study area. As many as 113 people have been employed by the development projects and activities that have taken place in the less than two years since the land was commercialized. Table 3 shows the number of people who have found full-time employment in the various enterprises that have been created.
Table 3: Number of people employed as a result of land commercialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/activity</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Head office</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Building department</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Private school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Security staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Jatropha cultivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Internet café</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Guesthouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Airstrip</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Children’s play room</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Radio station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: information from the investor’s human resources and administrative manager

In addition to those employed full-time, the airstrip was employing five men as casual workers at the time of the study team’s visit. The jatropha field had employed many more workers when the land was being cleared. Monthly incomes range from K200,000 (USD 40) to K1,000,000 (USD 200). However, the study team was unable to obtain exact figures on salaries as the issue was rather sensitive. It is expected that, as the businesses grow, they will employ many more people and will provide them with monthly incomes that will improve their livelihoods. Prior to gaining formal employment, people depended on income from selling their crops annually through the market to buyers from Choma town. They also occasionally sold their livestock, especially when special need arose.
Introduction of key services to the area

The commercialization of the Macha Mission land has seen the introduction of a number of important services that previously were not available in the area. These services are listed in Table 4, which also contains summaries of comments from stakeholders – both local residents, most of whom have been adversely affected by the land commercialization, and promoters of these services.

Table 4: Services introduced after land commercialization, with comments from stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Radio</td>
<td>Greatly appreciated by the local community, even those who are unhappy with the BIC Church for having evicted them from the land they were living on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Restaurant</td>
<td>The restaurant was built on the site of one of the evictees’ houses. It was said to be too expensive for ordinary Macha residents. The study team found that it was selling a bottle of Coca-Cola for K5,000 (USD 1), about twice the normal price, even in urban areas such as Choma or indeed Lusaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Guesthouse</td>
<td>This will prove very useful for visitors, including those who come to undertake short periods of development work in the area. A good example would be staff from John Hopkins University in the United States, who regularly visit to work with the Macha Malaria Research Centre. The cost of staying in the guesthouse, however, was said to be beyond the reach of ordinary people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Airstrip</td>
<td>This was said to be ideal for staff from Lusaka and from outside the country coming to work on the various development activities and projects in the area, who do not wish to undertake the long and difficult road journey. The airstrip is also providing local employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Internet café</td>
<td>Local people are not yet familiar with internet services. Such services will, however, be of increasing use to visitors from outside the area and eventually to local people themselves. The study team made use of these services itself during its visits to the area. Macha Mission has extended its reach beyond the local area and has started providing services in other provinces, starting with the Eastern and Northwestern provinces. It also played a key role in the E-Learning Africa 5th International Conference on ICT for Development, Education and Training, which was held in Lusaka in May 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Private school</td>
<td>The predominant view of the ordinary Macha citizen was that the school was not accessible to them because the school fees demanded – K500,000 (USD 100) per term – were unaffordable. The pupils the study team interviewed were children of well-to-do parents employed by an external development agency. They expressed satisfaction with the quality of education at the school (despite the high fees), as compared with the nearby government school. The school does, however, run a scheme providing free education/bursaries to 30 orphans each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jatropha cultivation</td>
<td>The majority of those interviewed saw no value in the jatropha crop that has been planted on the Mission land. It takes up a very large portion of the land and is seen to be responsible for the removal of most of the evictees. It was noted that the jatropha field was not at all properly looked after, as it was full of weeds. There has not yet been any harvest of jatropha, as the crop is still barely a year old. However, some positive aspects to jatropha cultivation can also be noted. The Zambian government and development actors are seriously talking of encouraging the production of biofuels, which would reduce the expense of imported fossil fuels. Small-scale farmers in the area could be encouraged to grow jatropha while the large jatropha farm could provide a market for them on the basis of an outgrower scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field research
Infrastructure improvements
The infrastructure, and general appearance, of the Macha Mission area has been improved as new buildings have been constructed to house the recently introduced services; more are planned. These structures will replace the small huts that were previously scattered all over the area. The Bishop of the BIC Church has indicated that all these services are aimed at serving the local communities in Macha and other chiefdoms, and not at generating a profit for the Church.

Figure 3: The jatropha plantation on the Macha Mission land

Negative impacts of land commercialization
The great majority of the interviewees were far more concerned about the perceived negative social impacts that the land commercialization has had in the Macha area. These are discussed below. Due to the time constraints of the study, it was not possible to obtain all the information required from all of the interviewees. Detailed statistics were sought and obtained only from a selected few people on the numbers of hectares they cultivated, their crop production levels, and the numbers of livestock they had both before and after the land was commercialized.

Loss of farming land and its consequences
The commercialization resulted in people being evicted from the land they had been living on and which they used for growing their crops and grazing their livestock. Some people had both their homes and farming land on Mission land, while others had only their farms on this land, with their homes located elsewhere, or their homes on the land and farms elsewhere. Hence, some people lost both their homes and their farms, while others lost their homes but not their farms, and others vice versa. The loss of farming land was described by the majority of respondents as the biggest negative impact resulting
Table 5 shows how severe the effects of land commercialization have been on the local people. Most of them have lost all the land on which they used to grow their food crops. This means that they have harvested nothing at all this year, and as a result their food insecurity has increased. Most of the households interviewed complained of hunger. One 55-year-old woman told the research team, “Inzala yanjila mu ng’anda yesu” (“Hunger has entered our household”). A few people have been given some land on which to conduct...
farming activities by village heads in the new areas they have settled in, outside the Mission land, though the majority were not able to indicate how much. Those who have not been evicted from their homes are in a way perhaps worse off than those who were, as the latter have found land for their fields and livestock in their new locations.

Section 3 below explains how the people who have been affected are currently coping with their situation.

**Effects on livestock rearing**

The people of Macha and Mapanza chiefdoms, like most people in the rural Southern province, have traditionally kept livestock. The Mission’s commercialization process has denied them the land on which they used to graze their cattle, goats, and pigs. Some cannot keep even chickens any longer. The land commercialization has brought about the following negative effects in the study area in relation to livestock rearing:

- Transfer of animals to relatives and friends living in neighbouring villages and chiefdoms that have not been affected;
- Overgrazing on the land to which the affected people have moved their animals;
- Reduction of livestock populations (as shown in Table 6).

**Figure 4: Domestic animals grazing on Macha Mission land**
Table 6 shows the numbers of animals owned by ten of the affected families before the land commercialization, and the numbers remaining afterwards.

Table 6: Numbers of livestock owned before and after land commercialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Before land commercialization</th>
<th>After land commercialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15 cattle</td>
<td>6 cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 goats</td>
<td>20 goats, scattered in three locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 chickens</td>
<td>No chickens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>16 goats</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>48 goats</td>
<td>8 goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>6 cattle</td>
<td>No cattle at his home; the four remaining are scattered in four different locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 goats</td>
<td>No goats or pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>300 chickens</td>
<td>60 chickens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 cattle</td>
<td>11 goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 goats</td>
<td>3 turkeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 turkeys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 ducks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 cattle</td>
<td>No cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 goats</td>
<td>6 goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 chickens</td>
<td>4 chickens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 pigs</td>
<td>1 pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>96 chickens</td>
<td>Sold all livestock because grazing land was not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 goats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>15 cattle</td>
<td>6 cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 goats</td>
<td>No goats or pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 pigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>38 goats</td>
<td>20 goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 chickens</td>
<td>Fewer than 30 chickens scattered in three locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3 cattle</td>
<td>24 goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37 goats</td>
<td>6 chickens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 pigs</td>
<td>No cattle or pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 chickens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: field data

The overall impacts of the land commercialization process with regards to livestock-keeping therefore are:

- Reduced grazing land and hence overgrazing and reduced livestock population;
- Reduced social status for former owners of livestock, as social status is related to the number of animals, especially cattle, an individual owns;
- Social conflicts as people and their animals compete for the same limited grazing land;
- Hostility amongst friends and relatives as, to quote one interviewee, “The people keeping our livestock keep telling us stories about our animals getting sick or dying, while theirs do not”;
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Increased food insecurity.

**Loss of homes**
Apart from the six families remaining on the Mission land, all the 222 families affected by the land commercialization have had to leave their original homes. Their houses have been abandoned and/or demolished. They have had to look for areas that are not part of the Mission land and seek the permission of both the village head person and the local Chief to settle and build their houses in these areas. Those who used the Mission land only for grazing their animals and growing their crops, but who lived outside it, have not been affected with regards to loss of homes.

**Effects on business activities**
The business activities run by some of people who lived on the Mission land have also suffered. One man who in addition to farming sold groceries, mainly to visitors to the hospital, had to demolish his shop, which was worth K6,000,000 (USD 1,200). He was previously earning a relatively high income, with sales of between K12,000,000 and K19,000,000 per month. He has since been forced to move away and trade elsewhere, and he is now making between K4,800,000 and K8,400,000 per month. In addition to this financial loss, he and his family now have to travel a long distance from their home to the market every day.

**Effects on access to vital services**
Traditionally recognized roads and pathways across the land that is now occupied by the jatropha field have been closed. This has made journeys to the Mission much longer, thus making access to services, especially the hospital and the government schools, which were built a long time ago, more difficult.

**Effects on social relations**
The process of land commercialization has created tensions and misunderstandings between a number of key actors in the Macha Mission area. Relationships between the following groups of people are said to have been adversely affected:

---

*Figure 5: A resident with her grandson, still living in her home on the Mission land but without land to grow food*

---

2 Working an average of 24 days per month. These figures represented his monthly sales, not necessarily profits.
Local people and the Brethren in Christ Church: People have developed a dislike for the BIC leaders for initiating the land commercialization that has brought about their eviction. Macha residents believe that the land lease transaction was arranged by the BIC Bishop (the head of the Mission) and a Mr. Kalambo, who was Chair of the Mission Council at Macha. Church members were not involved in the transaction. The Church leaders have argued that the land is theirs and that, therefore, they have the right to evict the “illegal” settlers from it in order to use it commercially. At the time of the evictions, three people were arrested by the police for resisting, but were later released. Members of the local community, especially those affected by the venture, have consequently blamed the Church for their current plight. The following quotes attest to these deteriorating relationships:

° “This Mission became a Mission because of us the people, that is, in order to serve us. Now it has become a Mission [whose purpose is] to promote jatropha at the expense of us the poor. This is very unfair.”
° “They [the Mission] are chasing us from the land because they gave it to a white man to grow jatropha. We have seen nothing good in the jatropha, which they are promoting at the expense of our livelihoods.”
° “The top Church administrators who leased the land seem to have a hidden agenda. They leased the land for personal gain.”

Local people and their traditional ruler: While people appreciate Chief Macha’s intervention, which prevented the eviction of the few families who still remain on the land, many thought that he could have done much more to assist them and to prevent the land being leased altogether. The money that the people contributed (K1,600,000/USD 320) to hire a lawyer was given to the chief when he went to seek the assistance of the President of the Republic. The people do not know how this money was actually used. The Chief was, however, against the decision to lease out the land.

Evicted families and their neighbours in their new homes: Some of the people who have lost their grazing land are now grazing their animals in other people’s villages and on their land. This has led to overgrazing in these locations, which in turn

---

3 In a strictly legal sense, the traditional leader has no role to play in this case since, under Zambian law, the land is under leasehold tenure. Traditional leaders have jurisdiction only over customary land. This is probably why Chief Macha decided to take a political route in an attempt to prevent the eviction.

4 In the neighbouring chiefdoms of Macha, Mapanza, Muchila, and Chikanta.
has led to poorer health for the animals of both the affected people and those not directly affected. This has sparked quarrels between the two groups of people.

- **The local people and the investor:** The local people feel hostile towards the foreign investor, whom the Macha Mission’s senior staff call their employee; they regard him as having grabbed the land they were living on and having caused their eviction. The people do not see the value of the jatropha plantation, which is full of weeds and apparently untended. Some feel that the jatropha farmer has another, hidden agenda and that this is why he is not serious about growing jatropha in the correct manner.

- **The chiefdoms of Macha and Mapanza:** Although currently there is no hostility between the two local chiefs, the commercialization venture has raised questions and created misunderstandings regarding the boundaries of the Macha Mission land and the boundaries between the two chiefdoms. Some claim that all of the land in question lies within Chief Macha’s area, while others claim that part of it lies in the area headed by Chief Mapanza. Some, especially those in Chief Mapanza’s area, want to have the land properly surveyed and demarcated. These issues could potentially sow seeds of discord between the two chiefs in the long run, if things are left as they are now.

Furthermore, the jatropha plantation has caused environmental damage. A report by the Forestry Department, which undertook a visit to the Macha Mission land in October 2009, recommended that the “squatters” be evicted because they were deforesting the area by cutting firewood and burning charcoal (Mulomba 2009). However, after the people had been evicted, the investor uprooted almost all the large trees on the land and ploughed the whole area before planting jatropha, thus contributing to even worse deforestation. Unlike the investor, the settlers were at least selective in cutting the types of tree they needed for their activities.

**Overall impacts**
The following lists summarize the impacts, both positive and negative, that the land commercialization has had in the Macha Mission area.

**Positive impacts**
- Provision of much-needed formal employment;
- Provision of services that were previously unavailable;
- Introduction of modern infrastructure.

**Negative impacts**
- Loss of farm land;
- Loss of grazing land;
- Loss of homesteads;
- Reduced agricultural activities and production, including of maize, groundnuts, and other staple crops;
• Loss of sources of income (land, livestock, businesses);
• High poverty levels for people who have lost their means of livelihood;
• Greater food insecurity;
• Fall in agricultural production for most families to almost zero;
• Undesirable competition for resources such as farming and pastoral land, with increased potential for social conflict;
• Blocked access roads to and from the hospital and other services available at the Mission;
• Antagonism between the BIC Church authorities and the local community; and
• Marginalization of local people in favour of what is considered to be a dubious foreign investment.
3 Coping strategies

In response to the problems experienced due to the commercialization of the Macha Mission land, the affected people have adopted a number of coping mechanisms. These include the following:

° Buying and selling at the market: Instead of undertaking farming activities as they used to before they were evicted, many affected people have started running small businesses at the market located near the Mission hospital. The exact numbers of people doing this could not be ascertained due to the study’s time limitations. The businesses mostly involve buying farm-related commodities from neighbouring farmers or groceries from the nearby town of Choma and selling these at the market.
° Migrating to non-Mission land: People whose houses were demolished had no option but to leave and settle in other villages. Some of those who have continued to live on the Mission land have sent their livestock to friends and relatives living in non-affected areas. A few are also cultivating crops in these areas.
° A few people are dependent on the very small pieces of land around their homesteads, though these can produce very little to support their livelihoods.
° One household is selling bananas that grow around its homestead.
° Another household is renting out a house next to its main living quarters.
4 The way forward

This section describes what people think should be done in order to alleviate the misery they are facing because of the commercialization of the Mission land, followed by a brief discussion of what can actually be done under current Zambian law. It concludes with a few concrete suggestions and recommendations.

Interviewees’ suggested solutions to the problems faced

The people interviewed suggested the following ways of solving the problems that have been created by the land commercialization:

° Remove the jatropha farmer and let the displaced people return. Some went so far as to vow that they would die on the land on which they had lived for so long and would refuse to be relocated.
° Make an appeal to the High Court in Lusaka to reverse the judgment that ordered the evictions. Efforts are already under way to find a lawyer to make such an appeal.
° Force the Brethren in Christ Church and the jatropha farmer to adequately compensate the displaced families.
° Encourage Chiefs Macha and Mapanza, and the neighbouring Chiefs Muchila and Chikanta, to sit down together and find land in their respective chiefdoms to which the displaced people can relocate.
° Create and/or arrange access to a charitable organization that will assist the displaced families.
What may be feasible, and what may not

According to the Lands Act of 1995, a person holding title deeds to a piece of land has a right to evict “squatters” who have settled on the land illegally. The landowner is not obliged to pay any compensation to illegal squatters when they are evicted. This means that the court might be unlikely to reverse its decision to evict the so-called “illegal” settlers at Macha Mission. Moreover, none of the people evicted possessed title deeds to the land they were living on – not even those whose ancestors had been given land by the Mission in writing.

More positively, the local chiefs in the area (Chiefs Macha, Mapanza, Muchila, and Chikanta) may be able to help the affected families by providing them with land on which to permanently resettle. Charitable organizations may be able to provide some financial assistance, which would enable families to secure adequate food. This would be a short-term solution, but it would go a long way in sustaining the people adversely affected.

Article 12 of the original title deeds held by the BIC could be re-examined. As stated in the introduction to this report, Article 12 specifically forbids the “disturbance or removal” of the people living on the land given to the Mission by the BSAC. The main question here, however, is whether any of the affected families can claim to have been living on the land as far back as 1906, when the title deed was issued. Only one of the 222 families affected claims to have had ancestors living on the land before it was allocated to the BIC Church.

According to Zambian law, land that has not been developed for 18 months should be repossessed by the Commissioner of Lands. However, cases such as this one continue to occur without the Commissioner taking action. Moreover, “development” implies constructing a minimum of a slab for building, in which case the developments undertaken mean that Macha Mission has already complied with the law. In other words, the law is inadequate and needs review. It should not be the case that anyone – an individual, a private company, or a church organization – should continue to exclusively own land for many years, and do nothing to develop it or develop only a small portion. In the Macha case, the land had been held for more than 100 years, from 1906 when the Mission was established to 2008 when it leased out the land and forcibly removed the people who had been living on it and developing it. In other words, title deeds should expire when those claiming to own land have not carried out any improvement on it for a certain number of years or have developed only an insignificant piece of the land.
Recommendations

In view of the study team’s findings, the following recommendations are made:

- There is a need for reform of Zambia’s land law to prevent landowners from holding on to large pieces of land for many years without developing them. Ten years is suggested as the maximum period of time that an owner (private individual, national or foreign investor, church organization, etc.) may hold title to land without developing it.

- Civil society organizations involved with land issues should:
  - Campaign for law reform to provide for squatter rights;
  - Help adversely affected families and communities to obtain legal assistance;
  - Establish links between affected communities and families and charitable organizations that can assist them in cases of hardship.

- Charitable organizations (e.g. World Vision, Kara Counselling, and Plan International) should become involved and assist the people of the Macha Mission area who have been forcibly removed from the land on which they previously earned a living.

- Traditional rulers in the area, i.e. Chiefs Macha, Mapanza, Muchila, and Chikanta, should sit down together and try to find a solution for the displaced families.
Annex 1: Selected case studies

The 14 case studies outlined here paint a revealing picture of what has happened on the Macha Mission land as a result of the commercial land lease. Most of the interviewees are people adversely affected by the commercialization, both women and men, but the viewpoints of those who have benefited are also included, as is that of one of the traditional leaders interviewed. The names of interviewees have been withheld because of the sensitivity of the case.

Mr. A.

Mr. A. and his family lived on the Macha Mission land “for a long time”. He had built a five-roomed house worth K25,000,000 (USD 5,000), and had ten hectares of land. “They [the Mission officials] told us to move out or else they would demolish our house. We were told that police officers would come to evict us. I asked to be compensated but was given only K8,000,000 (USD 1,600) by the white man [the investor]. My family and I left the house and are now living in another village where we do not have a single field on which to grow crops,” he recounted.

“I used to keep 15 head of cattle but now I have only six. We had 16 goats but now we have none at all. We had eight pigs; now we have none. We used to produce about two hundred 50kg bags of maize per year, but now we produce nothing. We used also to produce about ten to fifteen 50kg bags of groundnuts, nineteen 90kg bags of cotton, and one or two bags of beans. Now we have to buy all these commodities. We do not have enough land to graze our animals. The land was very fertile. Now it is being used to grow jatropha.”

Mr. A. further noted: “We stopped talking about the case publicly because we were going to be cited for contempt of court. Three people from our community were arrested and forced to move after they tried to resist the eviction.”

Mr. A and his family now depend for their livelihoods on buying and selling commodities at the market.

Mrs. B.

Mrs. B. is a 55-year-old widow who lives with her 12 children and grandchildren. Her family was not evicted from their house because her late husband was a former employee of the Mission, which gave him the land to build it. The family has, however, no land on which to grow crops, as this has been taken by the investor.

Mrs. B. told the research team how the family was evicted from their land: ‘One day we just saw a bulldozer ploughing through our field, without consulting us. When we asked them what they were doing, they said, ‘This is LinkNet land and not your land’. They
planted jatropha and prevented us from growing anything on the land we had been using for many, many years. We do not see any good in this jatropha.”

She went on to list the losses she and her family have suffered now that they can no longer use the land: “We used to grow our own maize, sweet potatoes, and vegetables for consumption. Now we have to buy all these. We used to produce thirty 90kg bags of maize; now we do not grow anything. Inzala yanjila mu ng’anda yesu [Hunger has entered our household]. We consume one-and-a-half 20kg bags of mealie meal every week, which we have to buy. We have no relish. We even buy pumpkin leaves, which we used to grow ourselves.

“We have now become market traders and have to buy and sell vegetables in order to raise money to survive. We raise only about K20,000 (USD 4) per day.

“We were shifted during the rainy season [i.e. November 2009]. The land where we were growing these crops was very fertile. Now it is being used to grow jatropha. We do not have enough land to graze our animals. There were 150 police officers earmarked to come and evict us. The Mission is not doing anything to address our problem.

“Our chief said he went to the State House in order to see the President of the Republic and asked him to intervene and help address the problem. Maybe this is why they have not destroyed our houses.”

The interviewee further noted: “The Mission became a Mission because of us people, that is, to serve us. Now it has become a Mission which promotes jatropha investment at the expense of us the poor. This is very unfair.”

Mrs. C.

“I am 32 years old and have four children. My husband works for the investor as an artist. We came from Lusaka and are currently renting a house that is going to be demolished because it is in an area meant for jatropha growing. When this happens, my husband’s employer will know where to take us. I also used to work for the same investor at his guesthouse, but was laid off. I was not employed on a permanent basis but as a casual worker. My monthly salary used to be K400,000 (USD 80) while that of my husband is K1,000,000 (USD 200) per month. I am happy with the investor because he gave my husband a job; before, when we were in Lusaka, he had no job.”

Mrs. D.

The interviewee is 35 years old and married with three children. She said, “The Mission told us to move from where we had built our houses and where we have been living for many years. We had built a big shop near the market but they forced us to demolish it. We lost a lot of money used to construct the shop.

“The Mission is preventing us from building good shops near or at the market, saying we are squatters. Meanwhile we do not have land we can go to. We have asked the nearby villages for land, but they say they do not have enough land to share with us.”
“They [the Mission] are chasing us from the land because they gave it to a white man to
grow jatropha. We have seen nothing good in jatropha, which they are promoting at the
expense of our livelihoods.

“Before they evicted us, we used to produce twenty-four 90kg bags of maize. But now we
have not grown any food because they have prevented us from doing so. We are now
buying maize at between K10,000 and K12,000 per 20kg. We also have to buy other food
crops. We get money from selling salaula [secondhand clothes] and chitenge5 material
and make about K70,000 (USD 14) per day if we manage to sell anything. We need help
to address this problem.”

Ms E.
Ms E. is a single, 29-year-old woman who has been displaced and has moved to another
village, where she asked for and obtained some land. She lives with her parents in a
household of 15 people. She has three children (one in Grade 3, another at pre-school,
while the third is a baby).

This is her story: “These jatropha people came, saying they had bought the land and
wanted to put a sewerage system on our land and forced us to shift. We had 38 goats
and 30 chickens when we were forced to move, but now we have 20 goats and fewer
than 30 chickens scattered in three homes because of the shortage of grazing land where
we are now. It is not easy to manage the goats and the chickens either, because they are
scattered, and the number continues to go down. The people who are keeping our goats
keep telling us stories that one of them is sick or has died, or has produced a premature
baby which later died, etc.

“I sell kapenta [small dried fish] and cellphones at the market. When I was at my former
home it used to take me about 20 minutes to walk to the market and I used to make
about K7,200,000 (USD 1,440) per month when I sold a lot. Now I walk for 90 minutes to
get to the market and make about K1,680,000 (USD 366) per month.

“We were not compensated when we were displaced. The Mission has prevented us from
constructing more permanent structures. We depend on the market for survival.

“Our Chief Macha told us that we should move off the land because the new owner had
bought it. We wanted to be given land where we could sell our merchandise, but they
wanted to move us far away, to a place where there is no business.

“We contributed K30,000 (USD 6) per family to pay a lawyer to take the matter to court
but we have not seen any benefit from it. At one time the church committee even closed
the market, preventing us from trading from there, but now we are using it again.”

5 Fabric which women commonly wrap around their bodies.
**Mr. F.**

"I am 45 years old. I came from Chief Mapanza’s area. The purpose of relocating to this area was to advance my business prospects at the Mission market, where I deal in groceries.

“When I came here, I requested land from headman Chikuni, who gave it to me and informed me that it was traditional land and not Mission land. Though I came for the sake of my business, I am also a farmer and before I was evicted I used to produce the following:

- 300 x 50kg bags of maize
- 16–30 x 200kg bags of cotton
- 24 x 50 bags of unshelled groundnuts.

"I also kept livestock, namely three head of cattle, 37 goats, 12 chickens, and three pigs.

"Although we had been told not to, I did some ploughing on the same Mission land this farming season. My production has, however, gone down drastically. I only harvested twenty-four 50kg bags of maize and eighteen 50kg bags of groundnuts.

"I have shifted to headman Chikuni’s village, where I am squatting and have built a temporary shelter. My forced eviction has had a very negative effect on me and my family of some 30 members.

"I had three buildings on the Mission land, but these have been destroyed. The distance to school for my children has lengthened. My business has decreased as some of the goods that were kept in the grocery store were destroyed together with my houses. Previously I used to earn up to K12,000,000 (USD 2,400) in sales per month. This has reduced to only K7,200,000 (USD 1,440) per month, or K300,000 (USD 60) a day. The jatropha farming that is taking place in the fields where I used to grow my crops is not benefitting me or my family at all."

**Mr. G.**

"I am 39 years old and came here from Choma. I have a family of ten – five children, four wives, and myself. I was given this piece of land by the headman of Siwimikamwi village. The main source of livelihood in my family is the shop I run. I also do a bit of farming. The shop is located on the headman’s land, who gave it to me. I did not know that it belonged to the Mission.

"The land which I was given was large enough to enable me harvest twenty 90kg bags of maize. This season, however, I have not grown anything because I have been evicted from the land. My family is surviving on my business sales. In order to make ends meet, I often exchange my groceries for maize with local farmers who do not have the cash to buy groceries. I also buy maize from the farmers and later resell it to the Food Reserve..."
Agency [the national agency which purchases maize from farmers]. I have recently bought 200 bags of maize and I am in the process of buying more.

“I would not wish to move anywhere else since business is good here. This is because there is a large population here, concentrated around the big Mission hospital.”

Mrs. H.

“I am 60 years old and have a family of eleven. I am one of the people affected by the investment taking place in the Macha Mission land. My husband and I, the late village headman Chikuni, used to work in Ndola. We used to send people to clear our piece of land, which was given to us by Chief Mapanza. We finally came to settle here after retiring from formal employment in 1981.

“In 1994 my husband was installed as village headman by Chief Mapanza, but two years later he passed away. In 2008 my son was appointed village headman. I also have a small business at the Mission market, where I have been running a restaurant since 1993.

“When we came here, we never knew that this land belonged to the Mission. We only saw the springing up of the airport and the road leading to it, the jatropha fields being cleared, and other investments. The road went through my field, because part of the field was on Mission land.

“When all was well, our crop production was:

° 100 x 50kg bags of maize
° 25 x 50kg bags of groundnuts
° 20 x 50kg bags of sunflower, and
° 50 x 50kg bags of sweet potatoes.

“This year, after being evicted, we have produced only 21 bags of maize and three bags of groundnuts.

“This investment has had a negative effect on me and my family in a number of ways. I have lost half of my field to the Mission; this was not my fault, as we were not told in 1981 when we came here that we were settling on Mission land. Because of this, I have reduced my agriculture production levels, and I have lost grazing ground for my livestock.

“The investments that have taken place due to the leasing of the Mission land have seen some good new facilities built. However, these are too expensive for the majority of the community to use. The private school, where pupils are expected to pay K500,000 (USD 100) per term – meaning K1,500,000 (USD 300) per year – is out of reach for the ordinary citizens of the area.

“I believe that the Government should help us. We should not be moved off the land we have living on for many years. Laws should be amended to allow for idle land to be given to, and used by, people who need it.”
Mrs. I.

"I am 26 years of age, married with four children. We came here from Chief Mapanza's chiefdom, in order to live with my in-laws (my husband's parents). We were given a piece of land when we requested it from the village headman. However, he never told us that the land allocated to us was on Mission land. The purpose of relocating to this area was mainly to farm and to carry out business activities. Our harvests then were 75 bags of maize, 12 bags of groundnuts, and 50 bags of sweet potatoes.

"This year we did not plant on time, as we feared the Mission personnel would cut down and destroy our crops. Consequently we have only harvested 28 bags of maize; we did not grow any groundnuts or sweet potatoes.

"We voluntarily moved away from the Mission land and built ourselves another house elsewhere. We used my business money to build our second house. Since we used the capital to build the house, however, my business has been negatively affected, as the move was unplanned. The first house we built a cost of K4,000,000 (USD 800) and the second one at K7,000,000 (USD 1,400). We are currently running a business selling groceries, which gives us about K480,000 (USD 96) a month. Business at the Mission market is good. Most of the population there is employed by the Mission, or by the government school or the hospital, and there are also many people nursing relatives at the hospital.

"We have not seen anything good from the investment that has displaced us. This investment has led to me losing my fields as they turned out to be inside the Mission land. The new facilities that have been built are beyond our reach. They are too expensive for us."

Mr. J.

"I am a married man of 26 years of age and have five children; two are my own children while the other three are dependants. I was born here on the Mission land. My parents used to work for the Mission and when they retired they asked for a piece of land outside the fence of the Mission buildings, thinking that this was outside the Mission land. I bought a house for K350,000 (USD 70) within the Mission land from somebody who wanted to relocate elsewhere. The house, however, belonged to the Mission. When I learned this, I left with my family and settled in a nearby village. The land given to us there could only accommodate a home and not any farming activities; the reason for this is that the area is congested with people who have been evicted by the Mission.

"When things were normal, my farming activities allowed me to produce 30 bags of maize and three bags of groundnuts. It has not been possible to produce anything this past farming season – we did not plough because we were being evicted.

"In order to secure a livelihood for my family I purchase clothes from Lusaka, which I sell at the Macha Mission market. I make between K700,000 (USD 140) and K1,600,000 (USD 320) in a month from selling these commodities. However, I still need land for some
farming activities. I do not want to go anywhere else as I was born here and am used to this place.”

**Mrs. K.**

“I was born in Namwala district in 1957 and came to the Mission land in 1990. Due to illness I need to be near a hospital. I have had three operations, and I have to go for regular medical check-ups. I was given a piece of land by the village headman, on which I settled.

“When things were normal, that is, before the land was leased, I used to harvest as follows:

- 20 x 50kg bags of maize
- 3 x 50kg bags of groundnuts
- 3 x 50kg bags of sweet potatoes
- 1 x 50kg bag of beans.

“I used to hire oxen to plough my fields. This season, however, I did not grow anything as I was chased away from the land I used to live on and plough. I am currently squatting with a good Samaritan who took pity on me. This person has, however, told me I must move out once this farming season is over. I have not yet found a place to relocate to.

“I am currently surviving by doing piecework around the area despite my poor health. I am left with no choice but to work for other people in order to survive. This new investment has brought misery to my life and to my family members. I need assistance in order to secure a piece of land elsewhere.”

**Mr. L.**

“I am 64 years old. I came to the Mission in 1975, initially to work at the hospital. After my retirement I asked for land in Chief Mapanza’s area. Headman Himoonde gave me and my family a piece of land to settle on. The situation is that my homestead is outside the Mission land while my three fields, which cover an area of nine hectares, are within it.

“Before all this confusion I used to produce the following crops:

- 105 bags of maize
- 20 bags of groundnuts
- Two bags of beans.

“This year, after being disturbed by the evictions, I have grown only 56 bags of maize and 10 bags of groundnuts. I did not manage to grow any beans.

“My family and I have, however, benefited from the land lease venture as I have secured a job with the foreign investor. I work as an administrative officer and earn K700,000 (USD 140) a month. However, though employed, I still need my field, as farming is in my blood,
and working for somebody else is only temporary. I am willing to go and live anywhere as long as there is land for farming. I currently own seven cows and oxen, ten goats, and 30 chickens. My grazing area has become limited, as my animals used to graze on Mission land, which I have had to leave. They now graze in nearby villages outside the Mission land."

Mr. M.

“I was born on this Mission land in 1974. My grandfather used to work for Macha Mission. When he retired, the Mission gave him a piece of land as his pension. It even went further and built him a house on the land.

“I have a family of eight people: my wife, four children, two dependant orphans, and myself. My life occupation is farming, but I have also been working at the hospital for the past two years. I used to grow 35 bags of maize before the land lease saga. This year I did not plough at all. I am therefore solely dependent on my job at the hospital, which pays me K350,000 (USD 70) a month. This is not enough to adequately provide for my family.

“Before being evicted, I used to have 21 goats, four pigs, and 96 chickens. I sold all my livestock to make ends meet and because grazing land was not available. My family and I are still living on Mission land thanks to the intervention of Chief Macha, who went to see the late President Levy Mwanawasa, who stopped the execution of the eviction order.

“I am not ready to move anywhere else, as this is my inheritance from my grandfather, who was given land instead of money as a pension by the Mission. This investment is not welcome, as it is making our lives difficult. We cannot grow food or rear animals – this is our tradition and means of survival.”

Mr. N.

“I became village headman in 1958. My village is not within the Mission land but the majority of the villagers used to graze their animals on Mission land. Now, after the evictions they are all using the small piece of land available in our village to graze their animals. There are as many as 1,600 cattle and 563 goats, and these have caused over-grazing in the one small village.

“We tried to prevent the evictions by working closely with Chief Macha, but nothing tangible has been achieved as the people are still suffering. I agree that some members of the community have found work with the investor, but for us life is land. We want this white man (who people feel is responsible for the evictions) to move elsewhere and let the people back onto the land they have been living on for years. Let the government intervene and help the people regain their fields and grazing land.”
Annex 2: People interviewed

Besides the 68 people who have been personally affected by the commercialization of the Macha Mission land, the following people were interviewed:

- Chief Macha, the traditional ruler of the area in which most of the affected people live
- The Administrative Secretary of Chief Mapanza
- The Bishop of the Brethren in Christ Church
- The District Commissioner of Choma district
- The Ward Councillor of the area in which the affected people live
- The Ward Councillor of a nearby community
- Five village headmen and assistant headmen
- Macha Mission Hospital Director
- The Pastor of Macha Mission
- Two former pastors who have been adversely affected by the land commercialization
- Three pupils at the school built following the land commercialization
- The Human Resources and Administrative Manager of the investor
- The Community Development Assistant working in the area
- The Agricultural Block Extension Officer working in the area.
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