The challenge of reconciling competing demands for national economic growth, wildlife conservation and the wellbeing of local communities is widely recognised. In Chiawa, Zambia 2013 this challenge is particularly acute, as a new highway and bridge promise to reverse the area’s historical marginality, promoting it as a premier site for safari tourism and agri-business. High profile conflicts over land rights, however, indicate local people’s fears that this will accelerate dispossession, with profits accruing to outsiders and the community seeing little if any benefit.

New research on wellbeing and poverty in Chiawa provides a novel perspective on these issues. Quantitative and qualitative evidence present local people’s struggles to piece livelihoods together amidst a pervasive experience of insecurity and powerlessness. However, the community understanding of wellbeing and its strong ethic of care and reciprocity constitutes an important resource for building a positive and inclusive future.
Key Findings

Livelihoods in Struggle

• The people of Chiawa are struggling to survive, piecing together marginal and precarious livelihoods through a combination of low or no technology subsistence agriculture, piece-work, and petty business. In 2012, while 70% respondents reported planting maize, only half of them (37%) reported harvesting any. Drought is common, and disastrous flooding also occurs when the Kariba dam upstream opens its spillway gates.

• Work in safari lodges is the most common form of employment. While this brings a relatively high income in local terms it mostly involves low grade, domestic service work which is seasonal and insecure. The increased income benefits the individual household but the impact at community level may be more ambiguous.

• Women heading households on their own are particularly vulnerable to poverty and social marginality. This picture holds across most (objective) measures of economic and social status, qualitative testimony and scores on (subjective) inner wellbeing.

Resource Conflicts

• The growing number and increasing proximity of wild animals in Chiawa presents the most immediate challenge to local wellbeing. Animals frequently destroy crops and present a constant threat of physical injury or even death. People are frustrated at being prohibited from shooting animals and feel the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) provides them with inadequate protection and support.

• The alienation of land to outside investors is a major concern in the community. Most of the more desirable land along the river is occupied by safari lodges and there are several large agri-business plantations. The loss of customary land threatens people’s access to the water, grasslands and firewood on which their livelihoods depend. Some have already been displaced from their homes and farms with little or no compensation.

• Interventions aimed at promoting local development and stake-holding in wildlife management have been subject to elite capture, such that very little benefit is visible in the community at large.

• People feel excluded from decision-making and are afraid to speak up against those in power.

Wellbeing

• A multi-dimensional model of psycho-social ‘inner wellbeing’ was developed through the research. Quantitative scores show people in Chiawa to have low economic confidence, little sense of agency, and low social trust, confirming qualitative evidence in which people describe their experience in more depth.

• Having enough to feed or provide for one’s family is central to local understandings of wellbeing. This extends into an ethic of taking care of others across time and space. For the people of Chiawa, wellbeing thus unites material, moral and relational dimensions. This vision of wellbeing should guide the way that the community and even nation is governed. It is a model of power well used.

• The sense of a common identity associated with strong norms of reciprocity can sometimes make people hesitate to challenge injustice.
Introduction

If you were looking for a stage to dramatise the tensions between national economic growth, wildlife conservation and the wellbeing of local communities, you couldn’t do better than Chiawa. Chiawa is a Game Management Area (GMA), located in Kafue district, Lusaka province. To the south east it borders Zimbabwe and to the east the Lower Zambezi National Park. The majority population is Goba, a people-group that originated in what is now Zimbabwe. Economic growth is represented by the 10,000 hectare plantation of Zambeef, ‘feeding the nation’ through intensive irrigated agri-business. Tourist income supports investment in conservation, with luxury safari lodges attracting an international clientele. Tradition appears in the mud-built houses and labour intensive farming of the local community.

That, at least, is how it appears. In reality, while the new investments have brought some jobs, they have also made village livelihoods more marginal and precarious. The resulting conflicts have made the national news, with a ZAWA car attacked after an elephant killed a local inhabitant; plans for new mines opposed; and protest against the alienation of customary land.

It is not that local people oppose development. On the contrary, they are strongly committed to the education of their children and see the employment that they hope this will bring as the key to a better life. But they want to see development that benefits the community. Until now lack of infrastructure has been a major problem – poor roads and a ferry crossing limited people’s access to health care, government services and marketing opportunities. In 2014, however, this will change, with a new bridge over the Kafue river and a new road linking Chiawa directly with Lusaka and the Zimbabwean border. The challenge is to ensure that the new investment promotes maximum benefit that is both fair and sustainable, contributing not just to national economic growth and conservation of the local environment but also to the wellbeing of some of Zambia’s most marginalised rural people. The aim of this briefing is to provide information that will help to achieve this outcome.

Box 1: Researching Inner Wellbeing

This research presents a new concept of ‘Inner Wellbeing’, a psycho-social approach to subjective dimensions of wellbeing which focuses on what people think and feel they are able to be and do. Inner wellbeing comprises seven domains: economic confidence; agency and participation; social connections; close relationships; physical and mental health; competence and self-worth; values and meaning.

It was constructed through a combination of theoretical reflection and empirical analysis in Chiawa and a rural community in Chhattisgarh state, central India. The survey has five questions (or items) for each domain, which are designed to reflect different aspects of that domain. For each question respondents are asked to select one of five graduated answers on a scale that ranges from negative (-2) through neutral (0) to positive wellbeing (+2). The questions were extensively grounded and piloted to ensure they captured issues that were important to people’s lives locally.

Field research in Chiawa took place in two rounds of four months each, August-November 2010 and 2012. A survey combined objective (self-reported) questions about livelihoods, education, health and social support with subjective questions about satisfaction and inner wellbeing (IWB). We talked to husbands and wives (separately) and women heading households. In 2010 we surveyed 412 people and in 2012, 370. These included 52 women heading households. 358 respondents were surveyed both years. Qualitative data include notes from 54 survey interviews and full transcriptions of 52 open-ended life history interviews and one focus group.
Livelihoods in struggle

Farming in a risk environment

Farming remains a mainstay of livelihoods, often in combination with other activities, such as petty trading (mainly women) and piece-work (various kinds of casual labour). In 2012 25% of respondents stated farming as their main source of survival. Maize is the staple food and most common crop, followed by much smaller amounts of sorghum, cotton and/or groundnuts. Shockingly, although 70% of people reported planting maize in 2011-2, only half of them (37%) managed to harvest any, due to a combination of drought and damage by wild animals. The hazards of farming are leading some to give it up altogether. In 2012 only 78% reported that they had planted crops in the previous year, compared with 97% in 2010. Food security is low: less than 30% of people can survive on their own maize for 10 months or more.

The balance of farming has also changed. As insurance people would traditionally combine farming larger fields dependent on summer rains with the risky more fertile ‘matoro’ land along the river. This option has been progressively undermined. The Kariba dam (1958) removed the natural rise and fall of the Zambezi which replenished soil fertility. Instead, disastrous flooding now occurs when the Kariba spillway gates are opened to release pressure on the dam after heavy rain. Access to matoro land is also restricted by the construction of safari lodges, for which a plot along the river is the most desirable location.

Employment

Employment is the main benefit which outside investment is claimed to bring to Chiawa. Does an increase in employment explain the decline in farming? Overall there is a weak negative correlation between having a job and the likelihood of doing farming (r = -12, p < .05) in 2012, suggesting that this could be one factor. However, the proportion of people with jobs increased only marginally (2%) between 2010 and 2012. Employment is also strongly gendered. Safari lodge work is most common, involving 22% of men, but no women. 4% have (very low paid) commercial farm jobs, including 10% of women heading households. 42 people (12%) have other jobs in government service or the private sector. The majority of these are men (29) and only one (a teacher) is a single woman.

While a job in the safari sector is very desirable for the mainly young men who can get them, the contribution of such jobs to the wellbeing of the community as a whole may be more ambiguous. The main observable changes in Chiawa between 2010 and 2012 were an increased number of cars and bars. This tallies with what many people say, that safari lodge workers spend on conspicuous consumption, girlfriends or drink. People also worry about the way such work sets up divisions in the community. At the same time, a number of lodge workers described how their wages enabled them to honour responsibilities towards the extended family. No doubt the truth lies somewhere in between.

Women heading households

The situation in Chiawa is challenging for everyone but it is especially difficult for women heading households. Single women are significantly worse off economically than married people (especially married men), when measured either by sources of income or asset ownership. In life history interviews they also talked a great deal about the social marginality that they felt, experiencing suspicion and hostility from married women and sexual predation from married men. Where relationships are central to wellbeing, qualitative and quantitative data combine to show single women have much more limited social networks, and these are overwhelmingly kinship based and largely female.
Wellbeing in Chiawa

Given the harsh conditions and material scarcity of village life in Chiawa, it is not surprising that economic sufficiency is the first thing that people mention when you ask about wellbeing. Most people approached this in a collective way, referring to their family’s needs. This suggests the second key aspect of wellbeing in Chiawa: it involves taking care of others. The purpose of wealth is not to accumulate as an individual, but to provide for and share with others.

Most immediately, of course, the others are one’s own family, but it doesn’t end there. There is a broader ethic of generalised reciprocity, a sense that ‘what goes around comes around’. This may extend over generations, taking in not only the living, but also the ancestors. This ethic of care should guide the way that the community, and even the nation, should be governed. It is a model of power rightly used.

In the relatively closed community of Chiawa, where so many people can trace a thread of common identity and belonging, it is hard to avoid interaction even if someone has done you great harm. This seems to result in considerable levels of ambivalence and undercurrents of fear and mistrust, as people suspect that beneath the smiling faces there may be very different thoughts and intentions. One of the most common phrases is: ‘You do not know what is in people’s hearts’, often used as a veiled hint of suspicions of witchcraft. This may be a social indicator of the deep economic and political insecurity that is characteristic of life in Chiawa.

Understandings of wellbeing in Chiawa link the material, moral and relational inextricably together. In the giving and receiving of material goods people affirm and confirm their moral identities and their personal and social relationships, extending through time and space. This may not be always how it is, but it is how it should be.

Box 2: The Anthropologist James Ferguson on Economy, Morality and Relatedness

“The production of wealth throughout wide areas of southern and central Africa is understood to be inseparable from the production of social relations. Production of wealth can be understood as pro-social, morally valuable “work”, “producing oneself by producing people, relations, and things” (Comaroff and Comaroff 1991:143). Alternatively it can be understood as anti-social, morally illegitimate appropriation that is exploitative and destructive of community.” (Ferguson, 2007:72)
Resource conflicts

Wildlife

The hazards of the growing proximity of wild animals is the concern uppermost in the minds of people in Chiawa. This affects people in multiple ways, at worst it means loss of life. An old man was killed by an elephant during our fieldwork in 2012. He had gone into the bush to look for firewood and never returned. People frequently talked of friends and family members who had been killed by animals, particularly elephants and crocodiles.

The impact of such deaths is not limited to the ordinary grief that people feel at the loss of a loved one. They also leave a lasting legacy of fear. One man described how he was out fishing in the river with a friend when the friend was taken by a crocodile. The way he ended the story was telling: ‘It was too much - I haven’t tried again.’

Quantitative data show the hazardous environment undermines people’s inner wellbeing. In 2010 we used the statement: ‘The environment we live in is full of hazards.’ Average scores were extremely low (-1.37 on a scale of -2 to +2) leading to a ranking of 39th out of 42 items.

More common than physical injury is the devastation of crops and livelihood. At one level there is nothing new about this. The threat of animals to crops is a longstanding problem in this area as many others. Lancaster (1981:45) reports that already in the 1960s families were having to sleep in the fields at night on a seasonal basis to protect crops from elephants and other animals. This still continues, but the balance of power has shifted. First, the number of animals and their proximity to the villages has grown. Second, the priority given to wildlife conservation in Chiawa means that people are prevented from many means of protecting themselves and their livelihoods.

Together with the fear and insecurity, there is a great deal of anger. People feel that their lives are considered of less value than the animals’. They seek compensation when animals ruin their crops, but they see the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) as concerned to police the people and protect the animals, and say that they are slow and ineffective in responding when called to help.

“Some wild animals will come and eat in your fields and then nothing else would be given to you. So these are the kind of problems which worry me a lot because otherwise, each and every [way], in this home village of mine, its life is full of hunger. Hunger, not that we are lazy, but hunger that there are natural forces, there are artificial natural forces which cause this problem.”

“GMA - I think this is the worst problem we have because with rain there is nothing we can do … it’s nature but with the Game Management Area, it is something planned by humans. So those people who planned to bring this project, they seem… they don’t really give help to the community. OK - they themselves feel they are helping the community but we as a community - we see it is not enough. It is not adequate. Because you see they say they employed some village scouts but when the hippos and elephants come to the field - those village scouts they are not found to control. And when they go to control sometimes they shoot in the air... but you see elephants it is more like a human being - it gets used to those shots. At the end now - they don’t run away now. They will continue destroying crops. Yes. So this is where we see that the authority they have no sympathy with the communities who are facing such problems and also there is no compensation. You see. And they say ‘don’t shoot, don’t kill’. Now you see people, they are really stranded. We don’t know what to do.”
While the human-animal conflict takes the headlines, this masks the perhaps more dangerous underlying human-human conflicts.

The human-wildlife conflict is itself an outcome of increased pressures on the land, and especially the practices of enclosure linked to modern investments. It is in the competition for land that the potential conflict between economic development and community wellbeing becomes most acute.

There is also direct competition for land between the commercial investors and the local people.

The land in Chiawa is customary land, held in trust by the Chieftainess. While in theory the 1995 Land Act (see Box 3) makes it easier for ordinary villagers to gain title to the land they occupy, the provisions of the Act have been poorly communicated. In addition, the need to gain the local chief’s permission and the cost of the surveying and titling process are in practice prohibitive for all but the most wealthy (Brown, 2005: 90-91). In areas like Chiawa, offering good potential for commercial agriculture and tourism, the process of land alienation has been rapid. By 2012, almost all the most desirable land along the river was in the hands of the safari lodges, except that retained by the Chieftainess herself.

The alienation of land to outside investors carries two specific worries for the community in Chiawa. The first is the loss of access to the river, grass and firewood on which the fragile balance of their livelihoods depends. The second is the loss of their land itself.

The land is in Chiawa is customary land, held in trust by the Chieftainness. While in theory the 1995 Land Act (see Box 3) makes it easier for ordinary villagers to gain title to the land they occupy, the provisions of the Act have been poorly communicated. In addition, the need to gain the local chief’s permission and the cost of the surveying and titling process are in practice prohibitive for all but the most wealthy (Brown, 2005: 90-91). In areas like Chiawa, offering good potential for commercial agriculture and tourism, the process of land alienation has been rapid. By 2012, almost all the most desirable land along the river was in the hands of the safari lodges, except that retained by the Chieftainness herself.

The alienation of land to outside investors carries two specific worries for the community in Chiawa. The first is the loss of access to the river, grass and firewood on which the fragile balance of their livelihoods depends. The second is the loss of their land itself.

In Chiawa, very few local people have titles to their land. While customarily those who have once been granted land have the right to remain on it, the ultimate fear is that people will be displaced from their farms and their homes.

Some have already been moved. Bawa Yamba (2006) reports evictions taking place as early as 1994. It is said that people have been moved without any compensation, or only given very inadequate amounts.

You know people are just buying places here, anyhow, now that means the community will lose suitable land. Because the commercial farmer wants good land and also the peasant farmer wants good land, but you will see that the government will prefer to give that land to a commercial farmer because there are monthly or yearly contributions.”

In the past, we didn’t have these investments that we have now, animals were free to move longer distances, we have the elephant corridor... said to run from Mozambique up to the southern province and elephants used to go through that corridor and they had breeding places along the corridor. One of them is where Zambeef is, it was thick bush. But now that has been blocked, it is a fenced farm, where do the elephants go? They go in the matoro. The points where they used to go and drink have been blocked by lodges, this has caused more human-animal conflict. Just here in Chiawa, between the chief’s house and the high school, elephants used to pass there, now they are forced to pass through that narrow place. Already there is a notice coming there saying that is private land. One day the owner will put a fence there, where will the elephant pass? It will pass through the village, and what will happen? Elephants will kill people. So those are things that need to be looked at if we want to develop Chiawa.”
We encountered people who were currently being threatened with removal, their land staked out with beacons, and told that someone with a counter claim was going to occupy it. The psychological damage of such total insecurity is difficult to assess, but it clearly weighs heavily. One person whose land was directly threatened described it as follows:

“Threatened, ok the threat that I have is that they have just written that they will push me out of that place, demolish your house, so all those are threats that I have faced... Now is quite difficult and hard for me to explain, the way I am coping up with it, because it’s every day it’s confusing me, every time is confusing, so unless it is fully settled, then I’m over that uncertainty...”

While many of people’s complaints focused on the local power-holders, there is also frustration that the national government has not come to their aid.

“The 16,000 hectares, that say they want to grow sugar cane; they will fence it, where is the elephant going to go? It will pass in the village. And the government is doing nothing. This issue was sent to the president and nothing is happening. What is the point of saying let this case go to police and DPP? The government should have just said we don’t want this farm. Let people have this land and if they want to do investment, let it be done with the people.”

Anxiety about increased predation from animals thus escalates into fear of losing the land itself. The people who have longed for better communications are now afraid that the new road and bridge will lead to their dispossession.

“People here, right now they are not sure how long we shall be in this area because you see, yes, development, we need it, but the development which is coming in this area is a development which is consuming our land bit by bit. Bit by bit, our land is being consumed. It means the community, eventually the community will have very little place to live, so that’s why it is a hazard.”

“Most of the land here is not compensated. People are being pushed around, say move that way. This one wants to bring development here and people shifted like that. Yah - some of them just recently, they were compensated but that is not enough, you know. When you give someone 2 million Kwaccha [US$400], what is that? To put another new home, and look for food? Because when you removed me here that means I have to build another house, I need to have food, I need to take my children to school. But when you are planning, you fail to take your child to school because there is a lot of things you think to do.”
Chiawa has seen some pro-poor interventions, but these have generally been short-lived, driven by external agendas, and subject to elite capture. This applies to governance of the GMA, initiatives for the community to get involved in the tourism economy and various NGO interventions. Box 4 describes a broader evaluation of Zambian GMA. Its findings closely match community perceptions in Chiawa.

Safari lodge websites all proclaim the contributions they make to the local community. Given the luxury scale at which they are operating and the associated high revenues they generate, this should be very good news. In fact, however, little if any seems to reach the people.

Various revenue generating ventures have been attempted, including a community campsite, a ‘cultural village’ and a community park. None has proved successful. Explanations range from changes in tourist tastes and interests, through lack of management and marketing skills, to deliberate sabotage and corruption. Whatever the true story, the failure of these initiatives clearly signals the breakdown of local structures of inclusion and accountability, and the trust that these would inspire. People feel the name of the community is co-opted by a few individuals for their personal benefit.

People talked with enthusiasm about particular NGO initiatives – such as a women’s tailoring group – in which they were currently involved. In general, however, while people continue to look to outsiders for new programmes and support, there is a deep sense of disillusionment and disempowerment – that decisions are based on external criteria that local people cannot influence.

This sense of disempowerment also shows in inner wellbeing scores. In 2010 the four lowest scoring items all concerned governance or the environment. They were: ‘I feel I have no power to change decisions that affect me’ (-1.69); ‘We are not able to make organisations fulfil their promises’ (-1.47); ‘I do not get government assistance at the right time’ (-1.41); and ‘The environment we live in is full of hazards’ (-1.37). Box 5 (overleaf) presents the lowest scoring items in 2012. These indicate low economic confidence, little sense of agency, and low social trust.

Box 4: Governance of the Game Management Authority

The GMA is intended to give local people a stake in managing and deriving economic benefit from the conservation of local wildlife. Village Action Groups (VAGs) elect representatives to serve with a ZAWA representative on the Community Resource Board (CRB). The CRB should distribute half of ZAWA revenues, including 5% to the chief. A World Bank sponsored study in 2009, however, found Chiawa to be one of the areas where the GMA had no positive effect on general household welfare. Even poorer people who participated directly in the CRB derived no benefit, whereas wealthier households did. The study concludes “It appears that elites in the GMA capture all the benefits.” (Bandyopadhya and Tembo 2009:11)
Exclusion from Decision-making and Fear of Speaking Up

People from Chiawa have made the national news with their protests against attacks by wild animals and the alienation of their land. Nonetheless, a number of people reflected on the barriers they face in mobilising for change. Ironically, it seems that the close ties characteristic of the local culture of wellbeing can contribute to holding people back.

“In what brings about this division is that each time people try to come together there are always spies there. As soon as you plan for something then some people from that group will again go and report whatever is being discussed. And then those now will say ‘who are the ring-leaders, I think it was this one and that one?’ and then those are called and then threatened. From there they will not come back to the group, they will say ‘ah, I think it is enough for me.’”

In 2012, almost everyone had heard about the planned new developments - the new road and bridge, plus the possibility of a new hotel and (at some distance) a new copper mine. Asked how satisfied they were with the way decisions were being made about these issues, only 12% said they were very satisfied. Overall the results were clearly negative. On a -2 (very dissatisfied) to +2 (very satisfied) scale, the overall average was -0.37, with single women least satisfied at -0.76.

Most immediately, many are simply afraid to speak up. The fear is evident in the way people drop their voices, look over their shoulders, and ask nervously about who will be able to hear our recordings when they talk about governance. Meetings may be fixed to legitimize a decision already made. The community does not feel a safe space.

Norms of reciprocity can also be manipulated to disarm opposition.

Box 5. Eight Lowest IWB Scores 2012 (-2/+2 scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP2  If official decisions are made that affect you badly, do you feel that you have power to change them?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC2  When do you get to hear about events in the community?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC4  What proportion of people in the community are helpful to you?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3  Do you feel that people around you have got ahead of you?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW1  How well have you been able to face life’s difficulties?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP3  Do you feel that you are heard (beyond family)?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1  How well would you say you are managing economically at present?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1  Do you know the kind of people who can help you get things done?</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: AP= Agency and Participation; SC= Social Connections; EC= Economic Confidence; SW= Self-Worth
Implications and Recommendations

The extent of investment interest shows that Chiawa has the material resources for a positive and prosperous future. These are matched by a local culture of wellbeing which gives strong basis for an inclusive model of development, built on an ethic of mutual responsibility, rather than the enrichment of some at the expense of others.

At present, however, threats to lives and livelihoods through increasing exposure to wild animals and the alienation of land deeply undermine people’s material, physical, emotional and psychological wellbeing. Recurrent talk of witchcraft, suspicions of spying and conspiracy, and fear of reprisals for speaking up show deep levels of social and political mistrust which spread a dark shadow through the web of reciprocal relatedness that should constitute wellbeing.

As the new bridge and road near completion, they bring Chiawa quite literally to a crossroads. Continuing in the current direction will mean the development of Chiawa is achieved at the cost of the wellbeing of its people. Gains, such as the rise in children’s school enrolment, will be threatened as the mounting danger from wild animals makes parents fearful of letting their children travel to school. If farming livelihoods continue to be undermined and no community-wide opportunities are generated in their place, people in Chiawa will drift away to join the urban poor or be drawn into informal servicing of the traffic coming past their doors. At the same time, the new infrastructure brings tremendous opportunities and the potential to make good the harms that have been suffered. It is time to act.

Recommendations

Livelihoods in Struggle

- The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock should undertake a full investigation into the support needed to make small-holder agriculture in Chiawa more viable. This should consider issues such as the appropriate crops; potential for irrigation; fencing and other means to defend against predation from animals; scope for mechanisation; facilities for the storage and marketing of produce.

- The Ministry of Tourism and the Arts should devise plans for appropriate long term support for joint ventures that develop local capacity for eco-tourist management and marketing. These need to embrace a vision of the community as part of modern Africa, rather than rely on the mimicry of ‘traditional handicraft and other nature based products’ and ‘traditional entertainment and culture’ which are common in Community Based Resource Management.

Resource Conflicts

- The Department of Lands, Natural Resources and Environmental Protection should give urgent attention to the issue of land alienation and the proper safeguarding of local people’s rights, including the potential restoration of alienated lands into community control.

- The World Bank and other donors who insisted on the land market reform should recognise the many structural problems with the 1995 Lands Act and its implementation. They should furnish sufficient funds and other resources to ensure it achieves its stated purpose of providing security as the basis for development of the poor.

Wellbeing

- A participatory commission should be set up with representation of the Ministries mentioned above, those involved in the governance of Chiawa at all levels, safari lodges, NGOs, and commercial farmers, plus representatives elected by zone from Chiawa villagers outside current governance structures. This should devise, institute and monitor new mechanisms to promote local participation in decision-making and local accountability for resource generation and use, with regular support and oversight to ensure the maximisation and sharing of benefits for the wellbeing of the people of Chiawa as a whole.
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