

FROM CONFLICT TO NEGOTIATION

Nature-based Development
on South Africa's Wild Coast

Edited by
Robin Palmer, Herman Timmermans & Derick Fay

Human Sciences Research Council
Pretoria
Institute of Social & Economic Research
Rhodes University, Grahamstown

CONTENTS

List of Maps, Figures and Tables	iv
Author Biographies	vi
Foreword	vii
Preface	ix
Acknowledgements	xiii
Introduction	xv
<i>Robin Palmer, Herman Timmermans & Derick Fay</i>	
PART ONE	
1 The Land.	2
<i>Herman Timmermans & Kamal Naicker</i>	
2 The Residents	15
<i>Robin Palmer & Derick Fay</i>	
3 The ●outsiders	30
<i>Robin Palmer & Khayaletbu Kralo</i>	
PART TWO	
4 Competing for the Forests: Annexation, Demarcation and their Consequences c. 1878 to 1936	48
<i>Derick Fay, Herman Timmermans & Robin Palmer</i>	
5 Closing the Forests: Segregation, Exclusion and their Consequences from 1936 to 1994	78
<i>Derick Fay, Herman Timmermans & Robin Palmer</i>	
6 Regaining the Forests: Reform and Development from 1994 to 2001	111
<i>Robin Palmer, Derick Fay, Herman Timmermans, Fonda Lewis & Johan Viljoen</i>	
PART THREE	
7 Poverty and Differentiation at Dwesa-Cwebe	146
<i>Derick Fay & Robin Palmer</i>	
8 Natural Resource Use at Dwesa-Cwebe.	173
<i>Herman Timmermans</i>	
9 Contemporary Tourism at Dwesa-Cwebe	199
<i>Robin Palmer & Johan Viljoen</i>	
PART FOUR	
10 South Africa and the New Tourism	220
<i>Robin Palmer & Johan Viljoen</i>	
11 Conservation and Communities: Learning from Experience	256
<i>Christo Fabricius</i>	
12 A Development Vision for Dwesa-Cwebe	272
<i>Robin Palmer, Derick Fay, Herman Timmermans & Christo Fabricius</i>	
Conclusion	306
<i>Robin Palmer, Herman Timmermans & Derick Fay</i>	
Postscript	312
Appendix A	323
Bibliography	325

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Christo Fabricius has a PhD in Conservation Biology from the University of Cape Town. He is head of the Environment Science Programme at Rhodes University, and previously worked as a research associate in the International Institute for Environment and Development in London. He has 12 years' experience as a nature conservation scientist in the Eastern and Northern Cape Provinces, South Africa.

Derick Fay is currently writing his PhD in sociocultural anthropology and lecturing at Boston University. In 1998–99 he was visiting scholar at Rhodes University's Institute of Social and Economic Research while conducting ethnographic fieldwork in Hobeni, one of the Dwesa-Cwebe communities.

Fonda Lewis holds a Masters degree in Environment and Development from the University of Natal. She was previously employed as a chief researcher at the Human Sciences Research Council. She is currently a project manager for the Natural Resource Management Programme at the Institute for Natural Resources in association with the University of Natal.

Kamal Naicker holds a BA degree from the University of South Africa. He was previously employed as assistant researcher at the Human Sciences Research Council. He is currently a planner at the Monitoring and Evaluation directorate of the Department of Land Affairs.

Robin Palmer has a DPhil from the University of Sussex. He is associate professor in the Department of Anthropology at Rhodes University, and has collaborated with the Institute of Social and Economic Research in several previous research projects in the former Ciskei and Transkei.

Herman Timmermans studied Environmental and Geographic Science at the University of Cape Town. He is based at the Institute of Social and Economic Research, and is actively involved in a number of initiatives directed at reconciling conservation and rural development objectives.

Johan Viljoen holds a BA (Hons) degree in Geography from the University of Pretoria. He is currently a researcher and member of Group Economic and Social Analysis at the Human Sciences Research Council.

FOREWORD

This edition of *From Conflict to Negotiation* is 'special' in two ways. In the first place, it is special for the technical reason that it is more than a second printing yet less than a second edition. The text has not been fully revised as befits a second edition; however, the book has not simply been reprinted. Apart from this foreword there is a substantial postscript that advances the narrative of Dwesa-Cwebe's development to June 2002. Secondly, the new edition is special because its launch coincides with the second 'Earth Summit' (the World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa: 26 August to 4 September 2002).

Besides its South African setting, *From Conflict to Negotiation* has a further relevance to the concerns of the WSSD. In significant ways the book links a major concern of the Rio Summit of 1992 and the new issues tabled for the Johannesburg Summit. Among its other aims, the Rio Summit, as we recalled in the preface to this book, 'provided the first public, international support for an alternative approach to the relationship between PAs [protected areas] and residents, insisting that considerations of social justice and ecological health should be priorities in all aspects of environmental planning'. In the 1990s, the PA-resident interface became an important nexus and test-bed for sustainable development in its translation from philosophy and policy to application, but in the challenging PA-resident context sustainable development as policy was seldom successful in delivering meaningful development to the rural poor (Ashley & Roe 1997; Fennell 1999).

The Johannesburg Summit continues the theme of sustainable development, but with the accent on poverty eradication and the replacement of the donor-recipient model of the relationship between developed and developing countries with a new model that takes account of the unfair terms of trade between North and South that underpins the failure of many local development initiatives. Although this radical approach is already encountering resistance from Northern participants in the run-up to the Johannesburg Summit a more radical approach to sustainable development is needed to halt escalating environmental depredations in the South.¹ ●f all the developing countries, those in Africa are in the most urgent need of development, and the Johannesburg Summit, given its location and leadership, should focus more attention on Africa's plight than hitherto.

Focusing on the conservation and development area of Dwesa-Cwebe on the Wild Coast of South Africa's Eastern Cape province, *From Conflict to Negotiation* explores the relationship between a PA and the adjacent resident communities from before colonialism to the present, and through a major environmental crisis to its resolution. Endemic local poverty and natural resource dependency intensified conflict between the residents and the conservation authority, but after the crisis it also motivated the search for a sustainable solution. Given Dwesa-Cwebe's natural and cultural assets, the chosen path to local sustainable development lies through community ownership, community-based natural resource management and community tourism. ●f all the global markets, however, international tourism is probably the one most skewed in favour of the North (Moworth & Munt 1998; McLaren 1998). South Africa in general and

1 *Mail & Guardian*, 28/6 – 4/7 2002, supplement: World Summit 2002: 'It is actions, not words that count'.

FOREWORD

the Wild Coast in particular are newcomers to this industry. The future success of poverty eradication through community ecotourism at Dwesa-Cwebe, along the Wild Coast, and in the rest of South Africa, thus depends very directly on the outcome of the 2002 WSSD.

Through a heavily embedded and detailed examination of Dwesa-Cwebe's problems and prospects, *From Conflict to Negotiation* bridges the two Earth Summits and provides a pertinent justification of the continuing quest for sustainable development at the grassroots.

Robin Palmer, Herman Timmermans & Derick Fay
Grahamstown, South Africa and Boston, USA

July 2002

PREFACE

Originating in the United States in the 19th century, the concept of the protected area (PA) has been emulated all over the world. Understood as special areas of ecological importance protected by non-consumptive, restricted-access policies, the designation of national parks and lesser state-owned protected areas has been accompanied by eviction of resident populations within the demarcated area and exclusion of those on its boundaries. Especially in the global South where resident communities associated with PAs are more prevalent and more resource-dependent, these have been subject to removals or restrictions by the state and have been forced to modify livelihoods that depended on natural resources in the protected area.

The first 'Earth Summit'¹ provided public, international support for an alternative approach to the relationship between PAs and residents, insisting that considerations of social justice and ecological health should be priorities in all aspects of environmental planning. This new approach to conservation, which came to be known as *sustainable development*, was a response to the increasing recognition among many conservationists that it is neither feasible nor ethical to exclude resident and neighbouring human communities from PAs. The sustainable development approach has gained ground rapidly in recent years, but implementation poses major challenges to governments, conservationists and academics, and has had mixed results thus far. A recent strategy within the sustainable development paradigm is to address the specific interface between PAs and residents in community-based natural resource management (CBNRM). This is an umbrella concept for attempts to devolve management authority to the local level in conservation areas; CBNRM tends to be sensitive to local conditions and thus varies greatly from case to case.

South Africa is part of this global change of heart in the conservation sector, but here the policy shift to sustainable development has been complicated by a number of unique local factors. Apartheid policies were either in place or heavily influential until the first democratic elections in 1994. The isolation of the apartheid years prevented the dissemination of new conservation models among local conservationists. The old ideas and the old guard were not replaced immediately: the integration of many separate conservation authorities into the new provincial governments, themselves in the process of establishment and with more pressing priorities, has delayed the transformation and development of South Africa's many PAs. The project of bringing South Africa's national parks and provincial nature reserves in line with the provisions of the Earth Summit, let alone realising their full potential for rural development, is as yet in its early stages.

This book provides a case study of Dwesa-Cwebe, the focus of one of the earliest efforts in South Africa to convert hitherto excluded residents into co-owners and active partners of a small nature and marine reserve on the 'Wild Coast' of the former Transkei,² now part of the Eastern Cape Province. The Wild Coast is a 300 km stretch of coastline that lies between the Kei river and the border of the KwaZulu-Natal Province. As the name implies, this coast is characterised by an unspoiled, rugged coastal

1 The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

2 In conformity with established academic practice the territory of Transkei is distinguished from the 'independent homeland' of Transkei (1976-1994) by the use of the definite article for the periods before and since 1976-1994.

environment which the South African government is now actively developing, principally on a basis of tourism.

The Xhosa-speaking residents of the land that became the Dwesa-Cwebe PA as well as the adjacent inland area were successively removed or excluded after the annexation of the Transkei to the Cape Colony at the end of the 19th century. In 1994, when other black South Africans were celebrating the advent of democratic government but nothing had changed at Dwesa-Cwebe, the residents mounted successive well-organised mass invasions of the PA, which were particularly destructive of marine resources. This unusual and uncharacteristic protest strategy attracted much public and official attention. Redressive interventions from many quarters have taken place since then, including the project on which this book is based.

'The Dwebe project' was conceived in 1995 by two environmental scientists – Christo Fabricius, then employed by Eastern Cape Nature Conservation (ECNC), and Herman Timmermans, a graduate of the University of Cape Town. With the assistance of Khayaletu Kralo, who had a social science background, Timmermans led this attempt to facilitate rapprochement between the conservation authority and the residents. When it became clear that the Dwebe project's mediation role was being hampered by its association with the conservation authority, Timmermans and Kralo transferred to the Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) at Rhodes University. Professor PA McAllister, then Director of ISER at Rhodes University, re-orientated their project by adding a baseline data-gathering element to its facilitation goal³. The first phase of field research had already commenced when McAllister left ISER and the project. A social anthropologist and leader was urgently needed to replace McAllister, and this dual role was filled by Dr Robin Palmer of the Department of Anthropology at the same university.

As the tasks designated for the first phase of research⁴ were nearing completion, the trajectory of the project was altered. For administrative reasons, the HSRC converted the project into an 'internal' collaborative project for its second phase. To the ISER team of Palmer, Timmermans and Kralo would be added an HSRC team composed of Fonda Lewis, Kamal Naicker and Johan Viljoen. In return for funding and technical support, the more experienced ISER team would provide field training for the HSRC team. A second requirement of the funders was that the project give more attention to tourism. (In the nine months since the acceptance of the original proposal the notion of tourism as a significant contributor to national development had been gaining wide acceptance.)

While these changes to the project were receiving consideration and the two teams were readying themselves for the second phase (which commenced at the end of January 1998), a chance encounter led to a further modification of the research design. A sociocultural anthropology PhD student from the University of Boston, Derick Fay, had elected to base himself at ISER for his doctoral field research at Dwesa-Cwebe. Given a common research focus, informal exchanges between ISER team members and Fay naturally ensued, eventually leading to his collaboration with this book. Fay has

3 Indigenous Knowledge, Conservation Reform, Natural Resource Management and Rural Development in the Dwesa and Cwebe Nature Reserves and Neighbouring Village Settlements, an 'external' project funded by the HSRC.

4 The findings of the first phase remain unpublished to date, but are contained in the interim report to the funders (Palmer 1997).

not only contributed a third community survey to the two the ISER-HSRC teams covered, but his archival research and longer periods in the field have restored a dimension to the project that was lost with the withdrawal of McAllister (with his 20 years of ethnographic research in an adjacent area of the Wild Coast).

Field research in the second phase involved several field trips over a period of nine months. Tasks included the above-mentioned household surveys, reinforced with interviews and site inspections, and an inquiry into local tourism from the residents' and the visitors' perspectives. An important part of the research, carried on before, during and after the period in the study area, was attendance at workshops and meetings about Dwesa-Cwebe. In the inclusive spirit of the new South Africa, the ISER-HSRC project was included among the stakeholders in the co-management, land reform and development processes affecting Dwesa-Cwebe. These encounters provided valuable insights into policy making and delivery at provincial level.

Part of our research brief had been, from the outset, to contribute to local capacity building. Through the holding of facilitation workshops and the training of 12 assistants in social research methods in the second phase, we made a direct contribution to local empowerment. Capacity building, however, was not limited to the field site: our joint involvement in an interdisciplinary, interinstitutional, collaborative, participatory research project requiring the close co-operation of many individuals of different gender, age, ethnicity and nationality also built capacity in ourselves. To the extent that writing the book has also involved close co-operation between a number of contributors, and in particular the three editors, the 'learning curve' has continued well beyond the research phase.

This book is a reasonably faithful reflection of the evolving research project, in particular the final phase, but there were subsequent developments. As a result of resignations from both the collaborating teams, continuity in the project was uneven: the organising and writing of this book was largely in the hands of the three editors. The accreditation of each chapter reflects the relative involvement as well as the contributions of other team members. A late recruit, Professor Christo Fabricius, Head of the Environmental Studies Programme at Rhodes University, made the major contribution to Chapter 11.

The collaborative, interdisciplinary approach to research, with training and capacity building among the aims, has come to the fore in recent years. The project on which this book is based typifies this approach. Whether it represents an advance on the former situation in which research was undertaken by individuals or small, close-knit teams from the same institution and discipline, readers may judge for themselves.

Robin Palmer, Herman Timmermans and Derick Fay
Grahamstown, South Africa and Boston, USA

February 2002

INTRODUCTION

Robin Palmer, Herman Timmermans & Derick Fay

When any environmental issue is probed to its origins, it reveals an inescapable truth – that the root cause of the crisis is not to be found in how [people] interact with nature, but in how they interact with each other; that to solve the environmental crisis we must solve the problem of poverty, racial injustice and war ... (Barry Commoner, quoted in Reid 1995:i)

Commoner's 'inescapable truth' has been acknowledged only recently at Dwesa-Cwebe. The Frontier wars of the 19th century initiated a process of impoverishment and racial injustice in the Eastern Cape which were exacerbated in the study area by a hundred years of conflict between conservation authorities and local residents. In 1994 the conflict climaxed in a series of 'invasions' of the forests and the shoreline. Since then, new stakeholders from the area and beyond have been interacting with each other to an unprecedented extent, with a view to solving the conflict at Dwesa-Cwebe by addressing the human problems that provoked it. Environmental issues of access to the nature reserve and participation in the management of the protected area (PA) were dominant at the outset of the negotiations; at a later stage these were subsumed under the overarching issues of land reform and regional (sustainable) development.

The pathway to development was the spatial development initiative (SDI). These cornerstones of rural development policy in South Africa are essentially development corridors for realising the economic potential of the former bantustans. On the Wild Coast agriculture, forestry and tourism projects were considered to hold the best prospects for development. The Wild Coast SDI that was established in 1996, besides pursuing its development agenda, helped to drive the land restitution negotiations at Dwesa-Cwebe. Land reform is essential to the success of a SDI because any ambiguity or contention in that area is a major deterrent to investors.

The successive interventions and negotiations of the last six years have placed this remote area at the forefront of the South African government's environment, land and development policy agendas. Full title to the communal land¹ and a Deed of Settlement by which the Dwesa-Cwebe Land Trust takes control of the PA have been secured. Dwesa-Cwebe provides one of very few South African examples of successful reconciliation between the interests of local residents and protected areas. In commoner's terms, how people interact with each other rather than how they interact with nature is being prioritised at last.

Given Dwesa-Cwebe's early engagement with conservation reform, land reform and a spatial development initiative, this case study has the potential to yield transferable insights both within South Africa and beyond. We are not alone in recognising the importance of the Dwesa-Cwebe case; it has already featured in a number of reports and articles (Village Planner 1995-96; Vaughan 1997; Wynberg & Kepe 1999). Where this study differs from others is in its *perspective*, its *basis* and its *focus*.

1 A reference to the communal form of land tenure associated with the settled area.

The perspective is neither that of government nor of the NGO sector, nor of consultants appointed by either of these; the basis of the study is environmental and social research – archival as well as field research – undertaken by combinations of researchers over the period 1995 to 1999; and the focus is directly on the case itself, although we were concerned to contextualise the case study in time and space. The issue of bounding the project was a particular challenge. Rural case studies are becoming increasingly difficult to conceptualise, even within the boundaries of single disciplines. The problem stems from the impossibility of isolating a case study heuristically under conditions of rapid social change, national integration and globalisation, and the conceptual and methodological challenges of presenting a fully contextualised case. No discipline is immune from the challenge. Environmentalists and environmental anthropologists have not always acknowledged the broader context of their research. Leach, Mearns & Scoones have rejected ‘attempts to link static, undifferentiated “communities” with “the environment”’, recommending a more contextual approach:

The relationships among institutions, and between scale levels, is of central importance in influencing which social actors – both those within the community and those at some remove from it – gain access to and control over local resources. And this perspective uses the insights of landscape history, and of historical approaches to ecology, to see how different people’s uses of the environment in this context act, and interact, with other’s uses, to shape landscapes progressively over time (Leach *et al.* 1997:12).

Communities appear most ‘static [and] undifferentiated’ – to the outsider at least – when they are most accepting of their disadvantaged position *vis-à-vis* more powerful outsiders, including the state. Assertive actions on the part of communities such as Dwesa-Cwebe, which all over the world are challenging the state and recruiting sympathetic outsiders to their various causes, challenge scholars to come up with more sophisticated models. For example, the environmental entitlements approach is based on the recognition that communities may be in search of power and control (entitlement) over natural resources not so much as an end goal but to attain other end goals (‘endowments’ is the term used by Leach *et al.* 1997). Realising the full value of natural resources requires enabling mechanisms. While institution building and the enforcement of rights on the part of the community can go some way towards converting theoretical assets into endowments, local action alone is rarely sufficient, no matter how strong the institutions. Enabling mechanisms increasingly include those over which the community has no control, such as national and international policies and their implementation (*ibid.*). Communities are increasingly aware, however, that alliances with other similarly affected communities, involvement with intermediaries such as provincial administrations and NGOs, and judicious use of the media can influence policy at these levels.

Activist communities thus help to break the mould of the old-fashioned, bounded rural case study in sociology or social anthropology, but even communities that are not assertive and are not associated with conservation areas are finding themselves embedded in wider relationships and processes than ever before. In rural South Africa,

relationships within households, between households, in villages, between villages, with local leaders, as well as relationships to the local environment and productions, have all been heavily influenced by the new levels of incorporation that colonialism inaugurated and the South African state continued. Changes of government in South Africa and globalisation beyond it have added new levels and intensified their interaction. The transition to full democracy in 1994 was accompanied by the acceleration of this process of incorporation, as well as a major shift towards grassroots empowerment. This ‘macro’ context is our ‘terrain’ as much as the physical landscape of the Wild Coast and within it, Dwesa-Cwebe. It is more embracing than the context Leach *et al.* describe in the above quote because it is not restricted to environmental issues – there are historical and development dimensions to the present study, as well as conservation issues, and these demand a broader approach.

These problems of conceptualisation and contextualisation under conditions of rapid globalisation and change have been addressed, principally, by Marxist geographers (notably Harvey 1989), who have in turn influenced some Africanist socio-cultural anthropologists (e.g. Ferguson 1990; Crehan 1997) and the interdisciplinary field of tourism studies (Urry 1990; Moworth & Munt 1998), to cite but a few sources of relevance to this study. While we acknowledge that a closely integrated framework along these lines, paying close attention to environmental issues (Darier 1999) would benefit our analysis, such an enterprise is beyond the scope of the present study. As noted in the Preface, the project on which this book is based went through successive phases, the most recent a collaborative phase with inputs from a number of individuals of different disciplinary backgrounds and varying research experience. Long-term, interdisciplinary, collaborative projects add a further difficulty to the tasks of conceptualisation and writing up, given the plurality of discourses they contain. The nature of the project also determined that the methodology and the field methods – archival research, participant observation, interviews with key informants, household surveys – should be conventional and straightforward (Appendix A). Under the circumstances, no elaborate framework or synthesis was imposed on the project as a whole; we went for a relatively simple framework with which all the contributors could readily identify. It leaves room for individual contributors to introduce particular models in individual chapters as the occasion arises, and some chapters have taken advantage of this opportunity more than others. The only level at which there was conceptual imposition in this study is that basic level at which the issues of the unit of analysis and the research problem had to be confronted. We now consider these two issues in turn.

UNIT OF ANALYSIS

This case study does not deal with a bounded entity such as a single village, or a single PA. We were concerned, primarily, with the PA-community interface at Dwesa-Cwebe, which is a relationship involving the PA and the eight settlements on the PA’s fence line, which is not a bounded unit. These eight settlements are not distinguished administratively from any others in the four locations and two districts into which the PA’s hinterland is divided. They could be described as ‘neighbouring’ communities, but that hardly captures the nature of the relationship with the PA which – before 1995, at

least – was not neighbourly. We also thought of them as ‘frontline’ communities – a term that characterises their physical position and their historical relationships with the PA. These eight villages recently formed themselves into seven community property associations (CPAs). This category could also be used to distinguish them from other, more distant, less affected communities. But the future of the CPA ‘experiment’ is uncertain and the term would not distinguish the eight villages should CPAs become more general in the area. ‘Frontline communities’ is thus our preferred collective term for the eight villages.

While the frontline communities (FCs) are all structurally similar, have a similar relationship to the PA and are gaining a relationship to the land that singles them out from other communities, the FCs and the PA have entirely different land uses and social compositions. On the one hand, we have scattered but populous villages that are permanently occupied (except for the temporarily absent migrants) and definitely ‘home’ to the inhabitants; on the other, we have a PA that has long been uninhabited except by some of the reserve staff, the hotel manager and staff, the tourists they host and the seasonal holiday makers – for none of these is the reserve a permanent ‘home’. In spite of these major structural differences between the FCs and the PA, and the conflict of interest between the population of the former and the management of the latter, they share and contest the same general territory. This fact, in addition to the economic independence of the FCs on the PA as a source of employment and essential natural resources, binds the two into a single unit of analysis for the purposes of this study.

As with any contemporary study area, Dwesa-Cwebe is closely involved with the outside world, and outsiders have long been involved with Dwesa-Cwebe. The primary unit of analysis – the FCs and the PA – has been a changing, permeable unit long exposed to the world system, and should be studied as such. In order to cope with this wider dimension of the Dwesa-Cwebe case as well as the primary unit, we discerned three analytically separable categories that together make up the broader unit. These are: the land, the residents and the outsiders.

The land

‘Land’ should be understood in the broad sense of ‘territory’. The category thus covers residential sites, cultivated land, grazing, forests, grasslands, rivers, estuaries, the intertidal zone with its marine resources and even the territorial waters six nautical miles into the Indian Ocean. Historical and ongoing human material and cultural interaction with this environment has provided boundaries, names, different land uses, protected status, and, most recently, development nodes. As we were chiefly interested in the FC–PA interface, we did not include the entire communal area in Dwesa-Cwebe’s two districts of Willowvale and Elliotdale, but just the section closest to the PA boundary.

The residents

‘The residents’ are the Xhosa-speaking people who inhabit the FCs. The residents are not a static population, either historically or in the more recent generations. Historically, there have been major movements out of and into the Dwesa-Cwebe area. The longest

resident segment of the population – the Gcalecka – is the smallest; the Bomvana (Cwebe) and the Mfengu (Dwesa) which predominate are comparatively recent arrivals. Their ‘indigenous rights’ to the area derive more from their association with the larger Xhosa and Nguni categories than from any primordial association with the area. In more recent generations, people have moved into and around the study area at different times, some as a result of removals from the PA or its border. A large proportion of the male residents have been engaged in migrant labour for at least three generations, which means that they have spent most of their working lives away from the area.

Although a handful of whites have resided in the area over more than a century, mainly as administrators, traders, foresters, hoteliers, cottage-owners, we reserve the term ‘resident’ for the black population. Whether they draw their subsistence locally or as migrants, blacks are generally-speaking economically and ideologically oriented towards settlement in the area – ‘building the homestead’ as McAllister (1980) expressed it – whereas whites have been mostly sojourners in the area, oriented successively towards the Empire, the Cape Colony or the larger South African society. It is also the case that whites never had rights of permanent residence in black reserves such as those of the former Transkei.

Even though we earlier acknowledged that the FCs and PA together formed our primary unit of analysis, we have separated the ‘land’ and the residents not because we have an old-fashioned view of ecology or conservation, but because the residents were excluded *in practice* from the most valuable part of their local environment in the present case, and are only now regaining a stake in it. Discussing the residents separately from the environment – the land – also emphasises the active role the residents have always had as environmental managers and modifiers. That role was usurped in large measure by the state over a 100 years of colonialism and apartheid. It was reasserted by the protest action and has been recognised in a policy process informed by reconstruction and restitution.

The outsiders

For more than a 100 years the multifarious roles and interests of powerful outsiders have had a profound impact on the study area, and this relationship is set to persist and deepen if the Wild Coast becomes a tourist mecca. ●outsiders include all those who have (or have had) a stake in the study area yet are not residents. The category includes outsiders who have resided in or have property in the general area, such as the administrators, conservators, traders, hoteliers and cottage owners; but it has also included outsiders who administer, represent or study the area from a distance. ●over the past 25 years the formerly predominantly white outsiders have been increasingly replaced by blacks in every sector, from administrators to tourists. Even before this process began, a degree of overlap existed in the ‘resident’ and ‘outsider’ categories. Where residents were simultaneously state officials, such as headmen in the past or rangers employed by the conservation authority, among many other examples, they had ambiguous roles, some appearing more as outsiders than residents to the local population, and being treated as such.

Residents and outsiders, though empowered differentially and in a changing relationship to each other, are conceptualised as acting *vis-à-vis* the land in both cases. This notion gives rise to the theme of the book.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The book concerns the interrelationship of the three components of our unit of analysis – the land, the residents and the outsiders – over time. It has been a relationship based on contestation which has changed to co-operation only in recent years. Whether this unprecedented partnership between residents and outsiders can endure and how co-operation can be furthered, are matters we address at the end of the book.

The land on either side of the Mbashe river has always been contested. This is the fate of all areas unusually well endowed by nature. The ancestors of the Xhosa speakers replaced the Khoisan inhabitants who themselves probably replaced earlier inhabitants. To the best of our knowledge, however, these pre-capitalist inhabitants lacked a sense of private property or the technology to make serious inroads into forests. Pre-modern contestations would have had negligible environmental impact.

Colonialism from a European metropole changed the conditions of contestation towards the end of the 19th century. The annexation of Transkei encouraged teams of speculative sawyers with modern implements to exploit the forests of the Wild Coast. Declaring the forests state property may have saved them from the sawyers, but it drove a wedge between two sections of the land which were crucial to the local subsistence economy – the arable and unforested grazing land, on the one hand, and the forests for emergency grazing and a whole range of additional consumptive uses, on the other. Subsequently, white magistrates and conservationists, supported by superior state power, maintained this alien separation of the land into protected and communal areas to the detriment of the black residents, themselves becoming more numerous, land hungry and poverty stricken with each succeeding generation. And the more desperate these former owners of the land became, the more they depended on ‘free’ naturally occurring resources.

As opposition to white rule and later ‘separate development’ gradually intensified, contestation between the residents and the authorities at Dwesa-Cwebe also increased, climaxing in the ‘invasion’ of the PA in the very year that fully representative government was installed.

The transfer of power in South Africa in 1944 brought legitimacy through majority rule, and with it the contradiction of an urgent need for delivery, on the one hand, but a severe lack of the means to do so immediately and effectively, on the other. Also, the policy framework was going through rapid evolution in the first term of the new government. Coming as it did in the year of transfer, the protest action at Dwesa-Cwebe placed a severe and public test on the neonate democratic state. It was not a resumption of the local–state *conflict* that had existed previously so much as an intense local–state *dialogue*, mediated by a wider range of outsiders, new policies and new issues.

From the beginnings of contact up till the present, therefore, outsiders had tried to restrict the residents by defining the land and making rules about it – rules covering, in rough succession, forest areas, commercial harvesting, community access, places of domicile and recreation, conservation of species, the creation of a nature reserve, land reform, and tourism. Over the same long period the residents, for their part, variously accepted, negotiated and resisted the restrictions on the land (formerly regarded by the residents as communal or open access, depending on type and proximity). Central to local livelihoods, the land has provided residential sites, yielded crops, supported

domestic animals, supplied building materials, firewood, wild vegetables, game, marine resources and medicines.

Before the political transition the most influential outsiders (i.e. the state and its administrators) followed policies that prioritised environmental protection over rural development. Since then, the radical change in state ideology has been accompanied by a change in policy orientation: rural development through conservation and ecotourism (for those areas that have PAs). In stark contrast to the situation before 1994, parties have agreed on the radical transformation of natural resource management and landholding at Dwesa-Cwebe. The residents and the outsiders have become partners in an enterprise that is directed to adding a layer of ecotourism to the multiple livelihoods from which the residents currently wrest a precarious subsistence.

CHAPTER PLAN

Part ●ne introduces the study area and the unit of analysis. It includes three chapters. Chapter 1 describes ‘the land’, concentrating on the physical geography of the Dwesa-Cwebe area, i.e. the PA and the communal area. Chapter 2 provides an overview of ‘the residents’, in terms of their origins, distribution, demography and socio-economic status. Chapter 3 examines various key manifestations of the roles of ‘the outsiders’ – the PA itself, the trading stores, the administrative framework, the existing infrastructure and the ‘external stakeholders’ currently engaged in addressing the legacy of former outsider involvement in the area.

Part Two traces the relationship between the residents and the outsiders *vis-à-vis* the land over time. Contact between residents and outsiders began with the frontier wars, was intensified following the annexation of Transkei and was characterised by paternalism but also continued access to natural resources in the PA until about 1936. This is the period covered in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 shows how the Land Act of 1936 and environmental legislation in the same spirit increased state control after that date, how this became intensified under apartheid and was then replaced by the uncertainties and near anarchy of the transitional years, culminating locally in the protest action in 1994. In Chapter 6 we cover the period of unprecedented community participation in conservation and land reform and regional development, which began in 1994 and continues.

Following the thorough preparation provided by Parts ●ne and Two, Part Three features the findings of the field research. In spite of the restoration of access to the PA, the residents’ socio-economic situation and reliance on the natural environment had not changed substantially. We document local demographic and socio-economic traits and processes at the household level in Chapter 7; we examine natural resource use in Chapter 8; and we survey tourism first from the tourists’ perspective and then the residents’ perspective in Chapter 9.

In Part Four we shift levels, introducing two surveys of current global developments and debates with special reference to South Africa’s position. These two surveys concern the key fields of tourism (Chapter 10) and nature conservation (Chapter 11). ●n the basis of our general findings from these two chapters, as well as the local record presented in the first three sections of the book, we revisit the development and conservation plans for the area and propose our own vision for the development of Dwesa-Cwebe (Chapter 12). In the Conclusion, we summarise the

INTRODUCTION

findings of the project and the arguments in the book section by section, identify major unknowns that are likely to affect future events at Dwesa-Cwebe, and highlight several areas in which further research appears necessary.