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LAND CONFLICT

- Chitsa people lost a territory and chieftainship during the colonial period.
- Headman Chitsa // Parks Authority but his kinsman, Chief Tshovani

OBJECTIVES

- Understand the key issues in the conflict,
- Find a workable solution,
- Disseminate research findings to key stakeholders and the wider readership.
OVERVIEW OF PRESENTATION

- Global, regional and national context
- Key issues in Chieftainship Conflict
- Institutional mechanisms and processes in conflict resolution.
- Lessons learned
- Recommendations.
GLOBAL, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL CONTEXT

1. GLOBAL CONTEXT
   # IUCN categories of protected areas & GNP
      ✓ Gonarezhou is a Category II protected area and is part of the GLTFP

   # Convention on Biological Diversity (Zimbabwe is signatory)

2. REGIONAL CONTEXT
   # The GLTFP Treaty & existing boundaries of GNP

3. NATIONAL CONTEXT
   # Existing legislation (Parks & Wildlife Act, 1996: Chapter 20:14) prohibits occupation
      ✓ Chitsa’s strategy of reclaiming ancestral land and a chieftainship
      ✓ Chitsa’s chieftainship claim pits him against Chief Tshovani

   # Parks’ commitments in the GLTFP
   # Chitsa’s settlement setting precedence for other parks.
KEY ISSUES IN CHIEFTAINSHIP CONFLICT

1. PROXIMATE CAUSES

# Conflict over lineage relations and the chieftainship

✓ Chitsa is the uncle (sekuru) and Tshovani is a nephew (muzukuru).

# Displacement, identity and power.

✓ A product of pre-colonial population movements, colonial land expropriation, labour migration, liberation war and post-colonial organized resettlement >>>> demotion from chief to headman.

# Conflicts over modernity and tradition

✓ 3 spirit mediums settled in Gonarezhou National Park (secret initiation rituals sites in Chitezwani hills)
✓ GNP: gain access to and benefit from transfrontier park projects

# Conflicts over alliances and power

✓ Former Councillor and influential war veteran
✓ Former governor.
2. STRUCTURAL CAUSES

# Population increase and growing competition over natural resources

# Policies as sources of conflict
INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS AND PROCESSES IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

1. INITIAL EFFORTS TO ADDRESS THE CONFLICT

# IUCN/SAFIRE options for dealing with Chitsa settlers
  o Officially recognizing the settlement & redefining GNP boundaries
  o Returning settlers to original homes and negotiating co-management over contested area of park
  o Moving Chitsa’s people out and providing them with irrigation facilities

2. CREATING A PLATFORM FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION >>> Mediation

# Bio-Hub’s assistance & the Chitsa Task Force >>> Soft landing

- Contested legitimacy of a government ‘directive’ to move Chitsa people out of the park
- Contested legitimacy of the 1975 boundary
- (Un)suitability of relocation
- Fears over dislocation of livelihoods
INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISMS AND PROCESSES IN
CONFLICT RESOLUTION CONTINUED

Mechanisms for conflict resolution

# Task Force meeting, >>> June 2006
PWMA; Headman Chitsa and representatives of settlers in Gonarezhou; the private sector; provincial and local government officials; lands officials and Chief Tshovani.

# Entry into conflict situation & adaptation to local royal interests (SM)
Applied research on traditional mechanisms of conflict resolution BUT >> workshop were not culturally appropriate >> a leading traditional authority as a mediator >> to document the mediation process rather than directly influencing it

# Chilo Lodge agreement >>> October 2007
A formal application requesting government to reinstate Headman Chitsa’s chieftainship

# Scaling-up the mediation process >>> December 2007
Two possible routes:
1: to submit the request to the National Chiefs Council
2: to follow the administrative hierarchy (district, province and central government)
LESSONS LEARNED

- The applied research process: *adapting to local interests*; ‘*neutrality’ and time*

- **Differential meanings** attached to land and natural resources

- Framing of conflicts and local dynamics (*Chitsa vs Task Force*)

- Efficacy of **traditional mechanisms** of conflict resolution

- Competing agricultural and conservation policies and local conflicts
1. The Parks Authority

- **IUCN/WWF principles & guidelines on PAs and local peoples (Beltran, 2000)**
  - Recognizing local communities as equal partners in management of PAs.
  - Recognizing rights of Chitsa to disputed land and natural resources
  - Designing an access and benefit sharing regime with Chitsa and other stakeholders

1. Recognizing Chitsa’s ancestral land rights
2. Linking Chitsa’s elevation to Chief to his relocation outside GNP
3. Lobbying appropriate politicians to gain support for Chitsa’s relocation
4. Developing alternative livelihoods outside the GNP
5. Avoiding forcible relocation of Chitsa’s people outside the GNP
6. Allowing Chitsa to access sacred rituals sites

2. Bio-Hub

2.1 Helping Chitsa re-plan his area and developing alternative livelihoods outside park >>> EU PARSEL Project
2.2 Link Chitsa to private sector investors under partnership arrangements >>> EU PARSEL Project
2.3 Disseminating the Chitsa-Parks example in conflict resolution.
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