Land and Conflict in the Madimbo Corridor: Seminar for TPARI

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is twofold, firstly to detail and examine the conflict between the Communities claiming the Madimbo Corridor and the Department of Defence, with the aim of highlighting potential lessons for other community conflicts surrounding conservation areas. Secondly it is my intention to introduce the Madimbo Corridor to the TPARI programme, provide some insight into its value and provide an overview of recent developments with regard to its future.

Introduction

The Madimbo Corridor is a 29 000¹ hectare strip of land located in the far north of Limpopo Province, running alongside the Limpopo River. It is bordered in the east by Kruger National Park, and in the west by private farmland. The terrain is mostly what is locally described as 'sandveld', semi-arid with sparse vegetation, limited water resources and poor soils. In contrast to this arid belt extending southwards to the foot of the Soutpansberg Mountains. The Limpopo river frontage is relatively fertile and has a long history of human habitation, most notably the 12th Century town of Mapungubwe to the west of Musina. Mapungubwe was believed to have supported a relatively large population, however the surrounding bushveld appears to have been wetter during that period then it is today.

As well as being more fertile the valley, also constitutes a unique eco-system which includes a number of important environmental features,

the forest and pans are sensitive to changes in water quality and supply. In such arid areas these pans are especially valued wetland assets. The fifty one kilometre stretch of rare virgin gallery forest which is over a hundred years old is the

¹ There are a number of different size estimates given, according to the Restitution Notice in the Government Gazette the SANDF had control of 29 093 hectares, of which 6360 hectares formed part of the Makuleke claim, leaving 22 733 hectares for the Gumbu-Mutele claim.

only forest of its kind south of the Limpopo except for small areas in the Vhembe/Venetia Nature Reserve²

This eco-system supports a diversity of wildlife species which are dominated by the perennial presence of elephant and buffalo, (with seasonal fluctuations in numbers). A land use planning report for the Land Claims Commission states with regard to the wildlife present in the Corridor;

there are plenty of impala, kudu and small antelope such as duiker, steenbok, and klipspringer. Occasional groups of zebra, buffalo and hippo frequent the area seasonally and relatively rare species such as leopard, nyala and wild dog may be seen. The narrow shape of the reserve and its unfenced river-front, open to the multiuse livestock and wildlife area (CAMPFIRE Project) of Mtentengwe in Zimbabwe, means that the reliable presence of wildlife for game viewing will always be a problem. The extreme north eastern location and low altitude of Madimbo gives it an extremely rich bird fauna, round 340 species have been recorded³.

The Corridor recently has fulfilled 3 functions, it is in a Veterinary Controlled Area, primarily to prevent the spread of foot and mouth disease, and is bisected by an electric fence that divides it into two zones. The South African National Defence Force, (SANDF), who have controlled the corridor since 1968, use it for training and border security which has resulted in the presence of some infrastructure, including 2 bases in close proximity to each other, an airfield and a number of patrol roads. There are also a number of areas that are used for training with live ammunition, including mortar rounds and missiles up to 107mm⁴. In 1994 the DOD requested the Corridor be declared a nature reserve, under the name Matshakitini, which has been identified as an important addition to the regions conservation areas, it is bordered by sections

² Poonan, 1996b: 2.

³ Knill, 2000:7

⁴ Department of Defence, 2004.

of the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park, (GLTP) to the north and the east, and has been viewed as "a key piece in the development of the Trans-Frontier Conservation Area".

Conflict over the Corridor

Prior to their forced removal, the inhabitants of the Corridor consisted of a number of Venda-speaking clans and a Tsonga speaking clan. The former in the west and central sections of the Corridor, the latter in the east. Traditionally "the land was used mainly for purposes of grazing cattle, some small farming, fishing and the use of sacred/religious sites". The villages were located a short distance from the Limpopo, but were moved back a number of times, eventually to the boundary of the Military Area. This series of forced removals, from the 1930's to the 1980's, occurred because it suited a number of interests. In the eastern section of the Corridor, the aim was to increase the size of Kruger National Park, basically extending it to the Limpopo. In the western and central sections of the Corridor, the removals took place to create a buffer or killing zone controlled by the military, to prevent guerrillas crossing the border from Zimbabwe. The removals also acted to consolidate the homelands of Venda and Gazankulu.

Initially there were 3 claims lodged for the Madimbo Corridor, one by the Gumbu Community, one by the Mutele Community, both Venda speaking, and one by a Tsonga speaking community the Makulekes. The Makulekes claim was settled in

⁵ Langeveld, 2000.

⁶ Ibid.

 $^{^{7}}$ The village of Gumbu was moved 4 times, its current location is about 10km south of the Limpopo and its original position.

⁸ See Davis 1987.

⁹ The Homelands of Venda and Gazankulu were reserves for Venda and Tsonga speaking South Africans.

1999, as part of their agreement with Kruger National Park over the Pafuri Triangle. The Gumbu and Mutele Communities maintain that the relationship between themselves and the Makuleke were good¹⁰, but the issue of land restitution has created a certain degree of hostility. After the Makuleke land claim was lodged, Chief Mutele in turn, claimed a portion of the Makuleke land, "because six families from his tribe, called the Ndanis, lived in the section of the Madimbo Corridor that belonged to the Makulekes. According to Livingstone Makuleke, Chief Mutele deliberately undermined the Makuleke land claims process"¹¹. The land dispute between the Gumbu-Mutele claimants and the Makuleke is still not resolved, the Chairman of the Gumbu-Mutele Community Property Association recently stated that Chief Mutele signed away their land, which did not belong to him and that they want it back¹².

After intervention by the Regional Land Claims Commission, (RLCC), the Gumbu and Mutele claims were merged in 1999. With a consolidated land claim established, competition for the corridors resources was relatively simplified, with the Claimants, assisted by a regional NGO, Nkuzi, being opposed by the Department of Defence, (DOD). The RLCC was officially mandated to support the community and acted as the primary negotiators with the DOD¹³.

The Claimants: Conflict between the SANDF and the surrounding

Communities predated the land claim, primarily as a result of Community members

¹⁰ "We were not happy to be separated with our neighbours who spoke Shangaan. We were more then neighbours to an extent that we were marrying each other and we practised the same culture and belief", T.J Ngubane, 1997.

¹¹ Poonan 2000: 55. The conflict was settled by the Makulekes giving 200 hectares to Chief Mutele from another area.

¹² Interview with Nelson Masikhwa.

¹³ Interview with Mashile Mokono.

and their livestock crossing the old border fence¹⁴ into the Military Area. The bush around the borderline villages is both unproductive and over-taxed. As with livelihoods in most of rural South Africa, and particularly in areas as undeveloped as this, natural resources offer a supplement to other sources of subsistence. More recent studies ¹⁵have highlighted the importance of indigenous resources for rural communities for food security. The Corridor is highly attractive to the Communities in terms of its resources, its use has been almost entirely for military purposes, thus wood, grazing, plant and wildlife stocks are relatively high.

In addition to this, utilizing natural resources in the Corridor was to some extent viewed as a means of resistance, "they were trying to resist the army by saying that this was our land and we can do whatever we can do on our own land". Shortly after the land claim was lodged the border fence began to be frequently damaged, Community members blamed it on elephant, but large sections of the fence disappeared completely, which resulted in cattle ranging freely into the Military Area¹⁷. The SANDF responded by arresting a number of trespassers and there have been numerous allegations of harassment of Community members near the border fence. Clearly, there is a duality of purpose in the technically illegal use of resources in the Corridor by the Claimants, namely the practical and the symbolic. For exceedingly impoverished Claimants, the addition of the resources in the zone between the border fence and the veterinary fence are important and for all intents and purposes it was utilised by the Communities, who had essentially re-occupied the area¹⁸.

¹⁴ The boundary of the military area was the old border between the Transvaal and Venda.

¹⁵ See Shackleton et al, 2000.

¹⁶ Interview with Elisa Makushu.

¹⁷ Interview with Tshililo Manenzhe.

¹⁸ A SANDF representative even complained to RLCC officials that cattle were becoming a hazard on the runway, particularly at night.

In September 1999 the Claimants with support from Nkuzi, frustrated by the lack of response to the claim gambled on a public protest action. In a fundamentally symbolic action Community members tried to enter the Military Area. The police allegedly responded with live ammunition as well as rubber bullets¹⁹ and arrested 19 people during the protest and over the course of the next few days. Despite the arrests the protest had some success, the Minister for Agriculture and Land Affairs agreed to fast-track the claim, which was gazetted 6 months later. The reaction from the Department of the Land Affairs was not mirrored by the DOD who remained obdurate²⁰.

The Claimants used active resistance, whereby they began to use the zone between the veterinary fence and the border fence, essentially challenging the SANDF for control of it. It could be argued, with good reason, that communities as impoverished as these and who rely on the surrounding environment for their subsistence would try and utilize the Corridors resources regardless of a land claim. Despite some arrests and the alleged harassment the SANDF lost control of it, and by the time they offered it to the Claimants for co-use, it was already happening in practice. As a second form of resistance the Claimants used the protest in 1999 and the subsequent threat to 're-invade' the Corridor, which the Claimants and their supporters used as a catalyst when they perceived the RLCC and the Government as a whole was dragging its heels. The protests were partly designed to gain media attention²¹, which had some success. Nkuzi also arranged for a visit from an international NGO, the FIAN²², who visited the area in August 2002 and started a letter campaign. The campaign had limited success as most the letters sent out to

¹⁹ See Shirinda, 1999.

²⁰ The Claimants threatened to 're-invade' the Corridor in January 2001.

²¹ Interview with Tshililo Manenezhe.

²² The Foodfirst Information and Action Network, FIAN claimed the refusal to restore the land to the Claimants by the government was a denial of the Claimants right to food.

different government departments, including the Presidents Office, were passed on to the Regional Land Claims Commissioner²³.

The actual negotiations were carried out by the RLCC, with inputs from Nkuzi and CPA members. The location of the Claimants so close to their land allowed them to put pressure on the DOD locally, but it also meant that they were isolated from Government Departments, Nkuzi helped here. Keeping in contact with the Claimants and being located nearer to the Corridor, they could access and lobby the RLCC and other government departments far more successfully then the Claimants themselves²⁴.

Regional Land Claims Commission: The initial investigation into the Corridor by the RLCC opposed restoration to the Claimants, in the their Mandate to Negotiate they recommended that the Provincial Parks Board form joint venture schemes for eco-tourism and that Government Departments look at developing the land the Claimants were already on instead, particularly an irrigation scheme along the Mutele river²⁵. But the Claimants maintained a demand for full restoration throughout²⁶ the negotiations, leading the RLCC²⁷, to press for a settlement agreement at the beginning of 2002, land use planning for the Claimants was put on hold in favour of focusing on the negotiations, with the option of the DOD leasing the Corridor²⁸.

The RLCC began negotiating from a dominant position, the evidence of forced removals was overwhelming, and the Claimants were still in relatively intact

²³ Interview with Mashilie Mokono.

²⁴ Nkuzi have a senior member of the RLCC and, Joyce Mashamba, the Limpopo MEC for Education, on their board.

²⁵ See Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights, 2000.

²⁶ See Rannditsheni, 2002.

²⁷ The previous Commissioner had been Durkje Gillfillian.

²⁸ Interview with Mashile Mokono.

Communities bordering their land. The threat of the Land Claims Court was a trump card which appears to have broken a deadlock on more then one occasion as the Land Claims Commissioner, Mashile Mokono explained,

I will try to negotiate, if the Army do not agree, as the Land Claims

Commission we will refer the matter to Court and request the Court to order the state to restore the land. Well, when you start saying that, the Politicians start saying that maybe you need to allow us time to find a solution and to come up with a discussion²⁹.

The Department of Defence: The intransigence of the DOD led to the Claim process stagnating for nearly 2 years. They provided a number of reasons for their retention of the Corridor, stating that it provided a unique environment for exercises, in particular as a location for tracking, survival instruction, water skills and specialized training for the Special Forces units and a number of regular Army and Air force units³⁰. In addition the Army is responsible for border security.

In response to the threat of court action the DOD proposed 4 settlement agreements. After the Minister of Defence approved the retention of the Corridor in October 2000, and reiterated this during a visit to the Corridor in February 2001, the RLCC and Claimants rejected this. In November 2002, following the threat from the RLCC to take the matter to the Land Claims Court, the Minister of Defence proposed a number of concessions for a settlement agreement:

- That the DOD should retain the Corridor, but the Claimants would be allowed, visits for rituals and other spiritual purposes.
- Controlled co-use of the land south of the foot and mouth fence, (which would include grazing and firewood collection)

²⁹ Interview with Mashile Mokono.

³⁰ The Air Force use the landing strip to practice night-time landings and take-offs because of the lack of light pollution.

And the opening of two corridors one on the eastern and one on the western side of the Military Area, approximately 400-500m wide to allow access to the river³¹.

The Claimants and the Land Claims Commissioner rejected this first proposal. A second proposal offered a portion of the western side of the Corridor for the Claimants sole use, this was once again rejected, as was the 3rd proposal which enlarged the area offered.

The RLCC and the Department of Public Works both recommended that the DOD restore the land to the Claimants and then lease it, which the DOD accepted in February this year³². The 4th proposal offered a large portion of land in the west and a kilometer wide corridor to the Limpopo in the east.

The DOD's first negotiator was an Air Force Officer named Lt-Col. Van Heerden. His relationship to the Claimants and the RLCC was often quite hostile³³ and a number of meetings included bitter recriminations about the treatment received by Claimants at the hands of SANDF soldiers. Both the Land Claims Commissioner and the current Deputy-Minister of Defence expressed views that the negotiations had been damaged by "elements hostile to transformation in the department of defence".³⁴. Certainly the black SANDF officer sent to make the 3rd proposal for a settlement agreement on behalf of the DOD appeared to be far more placatory³⁵.

The outcome of the negotiations is still uncertain, in July the Claimants were informed by the RLCC to prepare for the Restitution Ceremony, which occurred on the 14th of August. The Claimants were informed through Nkuzi that the title was to

³¹ See Department of Defence, 2004.

³² See Ibid

³³ Personal observation from meetings.

³⁴ Comment made by Mululeki George during an interview with the journalists, Madimbo Base.

³⁵ Personal observation.

be given to the Claimants, but the DOD would lease part of it³⁶. At the ceremony no settlement agreement was signed, the Claimants were informed that the RLCC and DOD were still discussing what portion of the Corridor the latter would lease. The RLCC produced a background to the claim for the restitution ceremony which states the DOD want to lease the western portion of the Corridor, which result in the portion which could potentially be used for conservation being isolated from the GLTP. To date the Claimants still have not been informed of what the settlement agreement is.

Land Use and the Future of the Corridor

There are five land-use options, other then the current use by the SANDF, and these are mining, agriculture, ranching, natural resource utilization and tourism. Most plans for the Corridor have envisaged a mixture of options.

Mining:. The awarding of a prospecting permit to Duo Corporate

Developers³⁷, a Diamond Mining Consortium in 1995, resulted in the Corridor, and to
a lesser extent the surrounding Communities, being the centre of a battle between
conservationists and the mining corporation. In the issuing of a prospecting licence,
Poonan argues,

with the exception of the Wildlife Society, [who opposed the licence], all the role players in the process of the granting of the diamond prospecting permit,

³⁶ Interview with Gloria Ratshitanga.

³⁷ Duo Corporate Developers are referred to by a number of names, particularly Madimbo Mining Corporation. Duo subsequently entered into a partnership with an Australian mining company called Moonstone. See Steenkamp and Urh, 2000.

followed untransparent and undemocratic procedures in that they favoured Duo and they did not consult with the communities who are claiming back the land³⁸

The Community was subsequently lobbied by the Duo Diamond Corporation, particularly Chief Mutele, who initially backed Kruger National Park and the conservation lobby, but later switched sides³⁹. In addition to the attention paid to the Mutele Traditional Authority, which included at least one allegation of bribery⁴⁰, a study found that several people were placed in the surrounding communities to "preach the gospel of the mine"⁴¹..

There has been further interest in mining in the Corridor, in 1998 Pafuri
Minerals applied for a prospecting permit for nickel, ostensibly backed by the Mutale
Community⁴². However the permit was eventually refused due to an agreement
between "the Minister of Minerals and Energy and the Deputy Minister of
Environmental Affairs and Tourism to the effect that no authorization for prospecting
or mining would be issued for the Madimbo Corridor until the land use of the area had
been determined"⁴³. There is also a graphite mine that used to employ people form
the Claimant Communities. Companies that have approached the Claimants more
recently have been told that no decision will be made before a business plan is drawn
up⁴⁴, but the Claimants appear to be heavily in favour of mining. The most common
defence of mining is as a potential source of employment, as the Chairman of the
Gumbu-Mutele CPA said in reference to examples of neighbouring land use,
"Makuya park⁴⁵ does not employ lots of people, but the Tshikondeni mine employs

³⁸ Poonan, 1996: 10.

³⁹See Steenkamp and Urh, 2000.

⁴⁰De Klerk, 1996

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² See Tleketle, 1999.

⁴³ Brown, 1998.

⁴⁴ Interview with Nelson Masikhwa.

⁴⁵ Makuya is an ex-Venda game reserve in the area that borders Kruger.

lots of people" ⁴⁶. Mining also has the backing of local Chief, Tshikundamalemma, who remains an influential figure ⁴⁷. The lobbying by Duo Corporate Developers in 1996 has also had some effect, the Claimant communities were told that a mine would provide thousands of jobs and would be a quick road to development ⁴⁸. Whether or not mining is viable is still debatable, there are indications that mining is not a sustainable long-term option nor economically viable ⁴⁹ in any form.

Livestock: The use of the Corridor for livestock to the south of the veterinary fence is already a reality, the Claimants have been agitating for grazing camps and access to the Limpopo as a matter of urgency since 1996 The land the Claimants currently occupy is neither suited to livestock farming and is far too small for the existing livestock numbers, in consequence a number of cattle die of starvation most winters⁵⁰. However the Corridor itself is not suitable for livestock farming either⁵¹, and issues like disease control would have to be resolved. The Minister of Agriculture announced at the Restitution Ceremony that the veterinary fence will be moved nearer to the river, which would prevent contact with Zimbabwean livestock, it would also presumably prevent wildlife crossing the Limpopo into the Corridor. It is unlikely that any future land use plan for the area could discount grazing, although it might be possible to integrate it into most development strategies, including conservation to a limited extent⁵².

Agriculture: The viability of using of the Corridor for agriculture is limited, irrigable soils have been identified, but access to sufficient water is problematic.

⁴⁶ Interviews with Nelson Masikhwa, Muzweda Mahwasane.

⁴⁷ Mr Mahwasane informed a CPA Meeting the Chief Tshikundamalemma wanted them to choose mining.

⁴⁸ Poonan, 1996:17.

⁴⁹ See Ferrar, 1996 and Knill, 2000.

⁵⁰ Nkuzi Development Association, 1999.

⁵¹ See Ferrer, 1996. The Development Bank estimates a grazing capacity of 12 hectares per livestock

⁵² See Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights, 2000.

Commercial agriculture would also be limited by climatic conditions, and the distance to markets⁵³. A greater problem could be posed by the contamination of parts of the Corridor and the surrounding environment. Aside from unexploded ordinance at a number of sites, the Army used herbicides on a massive scale to remove a sisal fence that was intended to prevent people and livestock crossing, this was subsequently replaced by the electric fence that served the same purpose. The herbicides, according to a task team created in 1996 and appointed to investigate the herbicide contamination, was the Northern Provinces 'worst ecological disaster'. The last spraying occurred in 1994, and contaminants have been found from Messina to the Kruger National Park, and were subject of complaints from the Mozambican Authorities. The long term affects of the contamination are as yet undetermined, but so Poonan reported, "the use of herbicides has certainly ruled out agriculture as a land use option for communities. Ralph Mynhardt from the Agricultural Research Council said that land in the area was no longer fit for growing fresh produce".

Eco-tourism: Eco-tourism according to the LAPC report and the initial RLCC discussions was perceived as the most viable and sustainable land use option, the natural features of the Corridor, the presence of 'big 5' species and its proximity to other major conservation areas appear to support this⁵⁷. This complements the vision of the Corridor as an addition to the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism favoured this option,

The Matshakitini Nature Reserve falls within the proposed Transfrontier

Initiative which extends from the Kruger National Park into Mozambique and

Zimbabwe. It is in a sense the missing piece of the puzzle. If it is combined with the

-

⁵³ See Knill, 2000.

⁵⁴ Poonan, 1996: 9.

⁵⁵See Ibid

⁵⁶ Poonan, 1996: 9.

⁵⁷ See Ferrar, 1996.

Kruger Park, this would raise the commercial value of Madimbo physically and in a management context. This could have an economic multiplier effect brining in opportunities for more growth. Agriculture and Environment believe that the ecotourist option can dovetail with the interest of the claimants as well as those of the SANDF. It would be possible to integrate limited cattle grazing, crop farming, access to religious sites and the interests of the SANDF into a fundamental eco-tourist option under a shared management agreement 58.

The most fundamental problem with this plan is the opposition of the Claimants, who have remained vociferously opposed to eco-tourism and conservation. A number of CPA members have voiced the fear that tourism and conservation would see the Claimants once again fenced off from their land and would prevent other landuse options, particularly grazing and firewood collection. Claimant's perceptions of mining, fed by lobbyists from mining companies, is that it would provide wealth, employment and development in a relatively short period of time⁵⁹. Similarly agriculture on neighbouring farms have produced an unrealistic perception of the Corridors agricultural potential The fear of manipulation from external actors is also evident, the CPA rejected a series of workshops on land use planning organised by Nkuzi in case people were influenced by the eco-tourism option⁶⁰. The only voice of dissent at this stage has come from Chief Mutele, who expressed concerns about deforestation and poaching in the Corridor⁶¹.

⁵⁸ Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights, 2000.

⁵⁹ De Klerk A. 1996...

⁶⁰ Nkuzi Development Association, Minutes of Meeting, Sigonde Village 18th February 2000.

⁶¹ SABC News, 2004.

Conclusion

It would be hubristic to draw lessons from a single case study, particularly one as complex as this, however a few general observations might be useful.

Firstly, if an impoverished community is located on the boundaries of the land in question, they are likely to want to get more immediate access to supplement their subsistence. If the land offers additional resources like firewood or grazing Community members are more likely to take advantage of it if it lies within easy reach. As the RLCC first proposal for a settlement indicated, to keep the Corridor as a conserved area massive development would have to take place in the Communities.

Secondly, new farm boundaries cut across previously shared resources, and in many cases boundaries prior to surveying were fluid. Hence the continuing dispute between the Gumbu-Mutele Claimants and the Makuleke, this is partly as a result of each claim being dealt with individually, a more holistic approach might have forestalled these disputes and possibly permitted a more coherent land-use plan for the whole area. Communal land is also difficult to control, already there are concerns about unrestricted use of the Corridor by both the Claimants⁶² and by people from outside the Communities⁶³.

Thirdly, conservation needs much better public relations if its proponents want to persuade local Communities of its benefits, it is associated with the loss of land and Communities being fenced out in favour of, predominantly white, tourists.

Finally, the cultural value that the Corridor holds for the Claimants is very strong, and might well, if these things could be measured, equal the economic value land as Thornton argues, for many South Africans, "is central to their assessment of

-

² Ihid

⁶³ Interview with Tshililo Manenzhe

their own identity and sense of worth and well-being"⁶⁴. Access to their land is a very important part of the Claim, and land-use options that might threaten this could well be rejected on those grounds.

Whatever the future of the Corridor, it appears, in the current circumstances, likely that the SANDF will remain a presence in the area and that the Claimants will seek to use the resources of the Corridor to improve their lives. The political will required to push for the inclusion of the Corridor into the Transfrontier Park is currently absent, with both the RLCC and the DLA stating they will support the Claimants in accessing mineral rights, agriculture and grazing. The RLCC may well put notorial conditions on the title, preventing or stipulating certain conditions of ownership. One fundamental change that has occurred has been the power relations between the Claimants and the SANDF, the virtual occupation of the zone south of the veterinary fence was already changing this, but with the Claimants as the new land-owners, a new chapter in the dispute has begun.

Selected References

Brown Lyn (1998), <u>Open Letter Regarding Madimbo Corridor: Nickel Prospecting</u>
<u>Permit for Pafuri C.C, 22 January.</u>

Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights, <u>Minutes of Meeting of Government</u>

<u>Department Stakeholders on Possible Restoration Options Re: The Gumbu/Mutele</u>

<u>Claim</u>, 24th January 2000. Regional Land Claims Commission Archives.

-

⁶⁴ Thornton, 2000: 133.

Davis. S. M. (1987), 'Apartheids Rebels: Inside South Africa's Hidden War', New York: New Haven.

De Klerk A. (1996), <u>Matshakitini Community Programme: Second Report.</u>

Department of Defence, Recommendations for Land Restitution Claim: Madimbo Corridor: March 2004

Development Bank of South Africa, Institute for Development Research: Data Research (1989), '<u>Development Information: Region G'</u>, Halfway House: Development Bank of Southern Africa, Corporate Affairs Division.

Ferrar Tony and Associates (1996), <u>Community Based Tourism in the Northern</u>

<u>Province</u>, submitted to the Land and Agriculture Policy Centre.

Gilfillian D. (2000), 'General Notice No.1265 of 2000', Department of Land Affairs.

Gilfillian D (1999), <u>Status Report On Gumbu Community Claim (Madimbo</u> Corridor), Regional Land Claims Commission Archives.

Knill G. Dr. (2000), 'Submission to the Land Claims Commissioner: Gumbu/Masisi Land Claim (Madimbo Corridor), Intergrated Land Use Options', Department of Agriculture and Environment.

Knill G. Dr to Gilfillian D, <u>Memo: Gumbu-Mutele Land Claim</u>, 7th February 2000, Regional Land Claim Commission Archive.

Langeveld C.F.H. (2000), <u>Mandate to Negotiate</u>, <u>Restitution Package:Matshakatini</u>

<u>Nature Reserve/Madimbo Corridor</u>, Regional Land Claims Commission.

Masikhwa Kakhathi Nelson, (2001), Affidavit, Land Claims Court for South Africa.

Mokono Mashile to General Nyanda, Letter dated 14th February 2002, Regional Land Claims Commission Archives.

SABC News, <u>Madimbo Corridor Faces Ecological Disaster</u>, 13th June 2004, <u>http://www.sabcnews.co.za/south_africa/general/0,2172,81646,00.html</u>

.

Ngubani T.J. 'Statement to Nkuzi on Forced Removals', 24th November 1997.

Nkatingi Miyelani, Landfeld Chris, Voster Anida and Manenzhe Tshilio. (1999), <u>'The</u> Verification Report for Gumbu/Mutele Land Claim', 1 December.

Nkuzi Development Association (1999), Land Needs Assessment.

Poonan Unjinee (1996), Land, Animals and Diamonds: A Case Study of the Madimbo Corridor

Poonan Unjinee (2000), <u>Community-Based Conflict Resolution and Conservation: A</u>
<u>Case Study of the Makulekes</u>, submitted as thesis for Masters Degree, Johannesburg.

Rannditsheni Moses, <u>I Will Do Everything in My Power to Give the Land Back to The Rightful Owners</u>, Regional Land Claims Commission Media Release, 23rd January 2002.

Regional Land Claims Commission Pamphlet, <u>Gumbu/Mutele Settlement</u> Celebration, 14th August 2004.

Shackleton Shoena E., Shackleton Charlie C. and Cousins Ben (2000), 'The Economic Value of Land and Natural Resources to Rural Livelihoods: Case Studies from South Africa' in Cousins Ben (ed.) <u>At the Crossroads: Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st Century</u>, Braamfontein and Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies and National Land Committee.

Shirinda Sharami. (1999), <u>'Complaint about Police Behaviour at Madimbo, 15th September 1999'</u>, 17th September.

Steenkamp Conrad and Urh Jana. (2000), <u>'The Maluleke Land Claim: Power Relations and CBNRM in a South African Case Study'</u>, IIED Occasional Paper no.18.

Thornton Robert (2000), 'The 'Land Space', Land and Landscapes n Contemporary South Africa', in Skalnik Peter (ed.), <u>SocioCultural Anthropology at the Turn of the Century: Voices from the Periphery</u>, Prague: Set Out.

Tleketle Dan to Moosa M.V. Letter dated 16th July 1999, Nkuzi Files.

Yakpo Kofi (2003), <u>Agrarian Reform and the Right to Adequate Food in South</u>
<u>Africa</u>, Fact-Finding Report, FIAN International

PRA Map Created by Nkuzi and CPA Members, 1999

