

Sustainability Research Institute

SCHOOL OF EARTH AND ENVIRONMENT



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

**Historical perspectives on pastoralism and land tenure
transformation in Ngamiland, Botswana: What are the policy and
institutional lessons?**

Basupi, L V., Quinn, C H., Dougill, A J

February 2017

No. 105

SRI PAPERS

SRI Papers (Online) ISSN 1753-1330

First published in 2017 by the Sustainability Research Institute (SRI)
Sustainability Research Institute (SRI), School of Earth and Environment,
The University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)113 3436461

Fax: +44 (0)113 3436716

Email: SRI-papers@see.leeds.ac.uk

Web-site: <http://www.see.leeds.ac.uk/sri>

About the Sustainability Research Institute

The Sustainability Research Institute conducts internationally recognised, academically excellent and problem-oriented interdisciplinary research and teaching on environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability. Our specialisms include: Business and organisations for sustainable societies; Economics and policy for sustainability; Environmental change and sustainable development; Social and political dimensions of sustainability.

Disclaimer

The opinions presented are those of the author(s) and should not be regarded as the views of SRI or The University of Leeds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ABSTRACT | 3 |
| ABOUT THE AUTHORS | 4 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 5 |
| 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS | 7 |
| 2.1. METHODOLOGY | 7 |
| 2.2. STUDY AREA..... | 7 |
| 2.3. ORAL HISTORIES | 9 |
| 2.4. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS AND EXPERT INTERVIEWS..... | 9 |
| 2.5. DATA ANALYSIS | 10 |
| 3. RESULTS..... | 11 |
| 3.1. HISTORICAL LAND USE PRACTICES | 14 |
| 3.1.1.ETHNIC PASTORAL GROUPS | 14 |
| 3.1.2.MBANDERU/HERERO SETTLEMENTS PATTERNS..... | 14 |
| 3.1.3.TRADITIONAL PASTORAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND STRATEGIC MOBILITY | 15 |
| 3.1.4.1920s – 1960s – THE TSETSE FLY PANDEMIC AND ERADICATION CAMPAIGN | 18 |
| 3.2. DROUGHT AND LAND TENURE TRANSFORMATION..... | 18 |
| 3.2.1.1960s – 1980s SEVERE DROUGHT CYCLES | 18 |
| 3.3. THE ERA OF LIVESTOCK DISEASE OUTBREAKS | 19 |
| 3.3.1.1995: THE CBPP PANDEMIC..... | 19 |
| 3.3.2.2007: HABU FMD OUTBREAK | 22 |
| 3.3.3.2012: THE GREEN ZONE /RANCHES PROTECTION BUFFER FENCE | 22 |
| 3.3.4.2014: KARENG FMD OUTBREAK | 23 |
| 3.4. PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT LAND USE..... | 23 |
| 3.4.1.RANGELAND ACCESS AND CONTROL | 23 |
| 3.4.2.HUMAN – WILDLIFE CONFLICTS AND FMD | 25 |
| 3.4.3.PASTORALISTS’ VULNERABILITY..... | 26 |
| 4. DISCUSSION | 27 |
| 4.1. FLEXIBLE MOBILITY AND LAND TENURE TRANSFORMATION | 27 |
| 4.2. POLICY AND INSTITUTIONAL LESSONS..... | 29 |
| 5. CONCLUSION | 30 |
| 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 31 |
| 7. ABBREVIATIONS..... | 31 |
| 8. REFERENCES..... | 32 |

ABSTRACT

Pastoral societies in dryland Africa continue to face changes to their pastoral systems. These systems are influenced by a range of historical factors but little use is made of this information to design policies that suit pastoralists' landscapes. This article provides a synthesis of historical perspectives on pastoral land use and tenure transformations in Ngamiland, south of the Okavango Delta, Botswana. Currently, little documentation of herders historical perspectives exist and less is known about how past experiences can be applied to sustainable pastoralism policies. In this article, current land use pressing issues are examined and analysed within the context of the area's past experiences. We use a series of oral histories with key informants, focus group discussions, expert interviews and rangelands field observations. Ngamiland historical perspectives depict a pastoral landscape that has been shaped by a variety of factors; livestock diseases, droughts, land tenure transformations associated with rangeland policies, and the pastoral identity especially of the Herero/Mbanderu ethnic groups. Pastoralists have followed unique trajectories, specific to their rangeland conditions and socio-cultural context. Resilience to climate shocks and diseases has been weakened by inequitable patterns of control over rangeland resources. The article proposes a strong role for historical perspectives in informing policy debates on sustainable pastoralism. It offers insights on information of direct relevance to topical policy and institutional challenges. From experiences of the past, lessons can be drawn of the sort of practices, processes and institutions required for pastoralism policies including planned and/or targeted pastoralists' adaptations.

Keywords: Environmental histories; Livestock mobility; Institutions; Rangeland policy; Vulnerability; Okavango Delta

Submission date 13-10-2016;

Publication date 13-02-2017

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Lenyeletse Vincent Basupi., is a PhD candidate in the Sustainability Research Institute, University of Leeds. His PhD research involves investigating impacts of land tenure transformation policies and rangeland subdivisions on pastoral systems and pastoral livelihoods south of the Okavango Delta in Ngamiland District, Botswana. The research combines qualitative participatory methods with quantitative spatial analysis using a Participatory Geographic Information System (PGIS) to investigate the local dynamics of land use and pastoralism.

Claire Helen Quinn., is an Associate Professor in the Sustainability Research Institute, University of Leeds. She is an environmental social scientist with over 15 years of experience working on interdisciplinary projects in Africa and the UK. Her research interests lie at the interface between social and agricultural dimensions of environmental change and sustainability. Specifically, her focus is on the livelihoods, vulnerability and adaptive capacity of farmers, and their relationships with governance, ecosystem services and landscapes, and supply chains.

Andrew John Dougill., is Professor of Environmental Sustainability and Dean of the Faculty of Environment at the University of Leeds, UK. He is a dryland environmental change researcher who has developed research approaches that integrate a range of disciplines including soil science, ecology, development studies and environmental social sciences. He has expertise in leading the design and implementation of interdisciplinary 'problem-based' research projects focused on sustainability issues at range of scales. His work has developed innovative research methodologies for using scientific approaches together with local participation to ensure locally relevant research outputs across dryland Africa.

1. INTRODUCTION

Policy debates on pastoralism have given increasing attention to issues of communal area development and management (Rohde et al., 2006, Behnke, 1987). Many policies have been attempted in various African countries to increase livestock production in communal areas while at the same time maintaining the forage quality of the range (Mwangi, 2009, Bruce and Mearns, 2002, Fratkin, 1997, Cleaver and Donovan, 1995). In this effort, traditional pastoralism has been commonly viewed as unproductive and directly responsible for rangeland degradation (Oba, 2013, Magole, 2009).

Pastoral societies and their use of rangelands have been shaped by a range of historical factors, but little use is made of this information to make policies that suit pastoralists' landscapes and local knowledge bases (Fernandez-Gimenez, 2006). Research on pastoralism has given increasing recognition and support to traditional pastoralism, livestock spatial mobility (Notenbaert et al., 2012, Niamir-Fuller and Turner, 1999, Scoones, 1995) and to rights of pastoral people to control and manage their grazing territories (Adriansen and Nielsen, 2002, Swift, 1991). It is argued that flexible livestock mobility reduces pastoralists' vulnerability to climate change and the likelihood of livestock-induced rangeland degradation (Brottem et al., 2014). However, such recognition has not translated into the protection and maintenance of traditional pastoralism of flexible mobility-based systems (Kitchell et al., 2014, Fernandez-Gimenez and Le Febvre, 2006). Many governments in sub-Saharan Africa, still faces the challenge of developing the right combination of policies and institutional frameworks that address and accelerate pastoral development while protecting rangelands biodiversity (Notenbaert et al, 2012).

The history of land tenure transformation in Africa shows a prevailing trend whereby the erosion of collectively – held communal grazing lands and natural resources under customary tenure is being hastened by policies that support privatisation of formally communal grazing lands (Rohde et al., 2006). Intensified means of livestock production through privatisation are often incompatible with a mobility strategy, especially when privatised land tenures prompt pasture fragmentation and underpin long-term ecosystem service diversity losses (Ellis, 1995). The improved livelihood prospects of pastoralists remaining in communal grazing areas is hence potentially

challenged by higher vulnerability to livestock diseases incidences, climate variability and land degradation. Livestock mobility in resource-scarce environments is critical for reducing the concentration of livestock in smaller territories thus contributing to Sustainable Land Management (SLM) (Moritz et al., 2013). Historical perspectives help increase our understanding of landscapes, thus providing a reference point for assessing current pressing issues (Swetnam et al., 1999).

Botswana represents a case study country that has focused agricultural development policy on communal land privatisation (Rohde et al., 2006, White, 1992) and fencing linked to animal health policies (McGahey, 2011). The ranching system was formally introduced in 1975 through the Tribal Grazing Land Policy (TGLP) as an option to promote the conservation and sustainability of dryland ecosystems (Magole, 2009, RoB, 1975). This was later extended by the National Policy on Agricultural development (NPAD) of 1991. The relevance of the ranching system and its principal assumptions has been hotly debated in the pastoralism literature (Rohde et al., 2006, Dougill et al., 1999, Ellis and Swift, 1988). What is limited in the academic debate is a detailed understanding of the historical evolution of pastoral landscapes and land use patterns, and how historical perspectives are embedded within the policy processes. Less is understood about the interlinkages between multiple historical factors and evolution of issues in shaping pastoralists' landscapes and land use patterns. Such lack of empirical analyses on the historical evolution of issues for communal rangeland areas affects the sustainability of current rangeland policies. To understand current pastoral land use patterns and policies, a historical perspective is useful (Fernandez-Gimenez, 2006). Understanding pastoral histories can also help build the capacity of pastoralists to successfully adapt to the contemporary challenges of pastoral system transformations. The article offers insights on information of direct relevance to topical policy and institutional challenges.

The paper aims to provide a synthesis of historical perspectives on pastoral land use and tenure transformations in Ngamiland, south of the Okavango Delta, Botswana. The paper objectives are to; (1) identify historical occurrences that influenced pastoralists land use patterns and determine their impact on current form of land use; (2) explore pastoral communities' perspectives on current land use and rangeland access; (3) explore the relevance of historical perspectives to lessons regarding policy processes, institutions and instruments for SLM in pastoral landscapes.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Methodology

A mixed- method approach; oral histories, Focus group discussions and Expert Interviews was employed in the seven study villages; Sehithwa, Toteng, Bodibeng, Bothatogo, Kareng, Semboyo and Makakung. The villages were selected on the basis that the majority of residents practice agro-pastoralism and rely heavily on livestock, particularly cattle, as the largest monetary investment in agricultural assets and livelihoods.

2.2. Study area

Ngamiland District is situated in north-western Botswana (Figure 1). It is home to one of the world's largest inland deltas; the Okavango. Land in the district is broadly zoned into different uses: communal areas, National Parks, Game Reserves, ranches, wetlands, controlled hunting areas and wildlife conservation areas (operated as tourism concessions) (TLB, 2006). Flow over the delta extends over a great area feeding into the Thamalakane, Kunyere, Nhabe and Boteti rivers. The hydrological system of the district has a significant influence on livestock grazing, particularly around Lake Ngami. Data were collected from villages south of the Okavango Delta, around Lake Ngami; Sehithwa, Toteng, Bodibeng, Bothatogo, Kareng, Semboyo and Makakung (Figure 1), where the principal livelihood activity is pastoralism (Tlou, 1985). Table 1 shows human and livestock numbers in the study villages.

Table 1: Human and livestock numbers in the study villages

| Village | Human population | Cattle population | Goats population | Sheep population | Donkeys and Horses |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Sehithwa | 2748 | 16635 | 1712 | 471 | 953 |
| Toteng | 909 | 24828 | 3743 | 1015 | 1444 |
| Bodibeng/Bothatogo | 1333 | 26842 | 4070 | 1313 | 1816 |
| Kareng | 1,259 | 37722 | 4760 | 707 | 1850 |
| Semboyo/Makakung | 531 | 19986 | 3484 | 632 | 1299 |
| Total | 6780 | 126013 | 17769 | 4138 | 7362 |

Data Source: CSO, 2011 DVS, 2015




Figure 1: Ngamiland study area Source: Authors Data sources: Tawana Land Board, Ministry of Agriculture – Land Utilisation

2.3. Oral histories

An enquiry into the pastoral history of the area was conducted through oral histories (Hay, 2010). The purpose of conducting oral histories was to collect information from a wide range of people with experience of pastoral systems, especially around issues of land tenure transformation and historical occurrences that affected and influenced pastoral land use patterns. Through historical accounts, we reconstruct how pastoralism, land use and tenure has changed over time as well as establish past land management practices and historical timelines of major events influencing land use. The selection of participants was based on purposive sampling (Tongco, 2007). Many key informants were chosen based on their extensive knowledge and experience. In order to find participants, we established rapport with members of the pastoral community through visits and interactions. We visited cattle posts and examined watering points. We also helped some pastoralists in transporting fodder to calves and participated in Foot and Mouth disease (FMD) vaccinations. Through such visits, we gained insights about the pastoral systems and explained our research to potential respondents. Potential respondents were identified and appointments for detailed in-depth interviews made. Others were recruited through the snowballing technique (Speelman et al., 2014) where one informant or groups identify one or several other potential knowledgeable herders who in turn recommends the next potential key informant. We also visited and held talks with members of farmers' committees and farmers' associations who suggested further potential respondents. Most informants were older men and women, mostly of the Mbanderu and Herero tribes who were young during the 1940 – 1960s and had witnessed most of the transformations in communal land in Ngamiland since the era of the Tsetse fly pandemic (1960s). Some of the histories narrated were passed down through generations. A total of 26 informants were sampled from across the study villages.

2.4. Focus group discussions and Expert Interviews

In order to gain insights into the current land use issues, nine focus group discussions (8-14 participants per focus group) were held as follows; Semboyo (n = 9 attendees), Makakung (n = 12), Bothatogo (n = 10), Bodibeng (n = 8), Toteng (n = 9), Sehithwa (n = 8), Kareng (n = 6). Data from focus groups was also used to corroborate information from professional informants and Oral Histories. Focus groups targeted different

stakeholders and groups in the community, especially pastoralists with experience in communal areas, members of the communal farmers' associations and farmers committees. One of the focus groups targeted only women (n = 14 participants; Agro-pastoralists, members of farmers committees drawn from across the lake villages; Sehithwa, Bodibeng, Toteng, and Bothatogo) in order to incorporate divergent views and also to avoid a situation whereby influential male members of a group dictate the discussions. Another focus group targeted youth farmers (n = 14 youth participants who are engaged in pastoral farming and those that were active in community projects, drawn from across the study villages). This was meant to solicit views and perceptions of youth groups concerning topical issues of pastoral land use and rangeland access. Interviews were also held with government officials in the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Veterinary Services (n = 4); Tawana Land Board, Division of Land Use (n = 2); District Land Use Planning Unit (n = 2); Department of Environmental affairs (n = 2), National Development Bank (NDB) (n = 1), Department of Wildlife and National Parks (n = 4) and Department of Forestry and Range Resources (n = 2). The purpose of these interviews was to get an in-depth understanding of pastoralists' issues, perspectives on current land use, pastoralism and policy issues from professional experts.

2.5. Data Analysis

Oral history data were analysed based on the Miller–Rosser et al. (2009) analysis approach. This involved: (i) Testimonies' of each respondent were transcribed using Microsoft Word and interpreted to derive meaning from each historic account using a coding framework summarised in Table 2; (ii) searching for commonalities: extrapolation of common themes from each narrative, each individual testimony was cross-validated and inconsistencies identified; (iii) writing the narrative, the interpretation of all participants testimonies was constructed into one story per theme emanating from the (Miller - Rosser et al., 2009). Historical literature was used to validate and contextualize participants' accounts. Findings from oral histories were directly compared to historical literature at University of Botswana library - Botswana Collection and Botswana National Archives. The following were used; History of Ngamiland (Tlou, 1985), Herero/Mbanderu history (Gewald, 2002, Almagor, 1980) and History of the Basarwa (Dziewiecka, 2008). Relevant quotations were used to explain and clarify data (Patton, 1990)).

Other qualitative data from focus groups were transcribed and analysed using content analysis to identify the main themes or issues emerging from the discussions (Adam et al., 2015). The development of themes involving the orderly and continuous search for patterns was used to produce full descriptions that shed light on the issues under investigation (Gale et al., 2013).

3. RESULTS

This section presents the paper results based on the objectives. First, a coding framework (Table 2) is presented followed by detailed sections of themes generated from the data. The framework shows a structured output of the reduced and summarised data from oral histories and focus groups. First, we give an account of major historical occurrences affecting pastoralism and pastoral land use patterns in Ngamiland since the earlier 1920s through to the era of communal rangeland privatisation in the 1970/80s up until the present. The account is drawn primarily from elderly informants selected from across the study villages. The information gathered was corroborated with some secondary data from existing literature. Secondly, drawing from data gathered from focus group and expert interviews, we discuss local pastoralists' perspectives on current land use and how rangeland privatisation has affected pastoral land use and land tenure. Finally, the study offers some insights on how historical perspectives can be used to inform policy on sustainable pastoralism.

Table 2: Coding Framework

| Codes from data | Basic themes (ideas within organising themes) | Organising themes (clusters of similar issues) | Global themes (claims, arguments or assertions) |
|---|--|--|---|
| Critical historical factors | In migrations Settlement patterns Okavango delta seasonal variations Opportunistic movement strategies | Biophysical factors Socio-economic and or -political factors | HISTORICAL LAND USE PRACTICES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnic pastoral groups, geopolitical and socio-cultural context • Traditional livestock management practices and strategic livestock mobility • Tsetse fly and eradication campaign |
| Tenure Transformation Climate variability | Government policies; Services to Livestock Owners in Communal Areas (SLOCA) and TGLP including animal health policies | Water reticulation through borehole drilling expansion of usable grazing area | DROUGHT AND LAND TENURE TRANSFORMATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe drought cycles |
| FMD and Access to markets Human – Wildlife Conflicts | FMD, implementation of FMD vaccination campaign Fences destroyed by elephants, opportunistic farming, Farmers associations, Lots of stray animals, mostly not vaccinated and likely responsible for some of the spread of FMD Working relationship between farmers and veterinary officials | Containment and control Exclusion from markets Consultations and cooperation | THE ERA OF LIVESTOCK DISEASE OUTBREAKS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FMD is the most damaging to pastoralism and the frequent outbreaks have systematically terminated beef exports in Ngamiland, a factor which significantly contributes to the continuous increase in livestock numbers in the communal areas as there is no offtake |
| Rangelands access, rangelands allocations and consultations | Ranches allocation procedures Lack of voice in decisions about land use and allocation of land resources Traditional water ponds inaccessible, congestion between the fences and | Allocations and inequitable patterns of rangeland access and use | PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT LAND USE AND TENURE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rangeland Access and Control |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Perspectives on veterinary cordon fences/ animal health policies</p> | <p>the lake, overgrazing and bush encroachment, wildlife migratory corridors between the lake and the sandveld blocked</p> | <p>Enclosure at the wildlife/livestock Interface Enclosure at a rangeland scale</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complex allocation processes that exclude poor communal area pastoralists ● Human-Wildlife Conflicts ● Foot and Mouth Disease ● Pastoralists vulnerability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ lack of resilience to the occurrences of uncertain events; droughts, livestock diseases, exclusion from markets |
|---|--|---|--|

3.1. HISTORICAL LAND USE PRACTICES

3.1.1. Ethnic pastoral groups

In Ngamiland South of the Okavango Delta, the Herero and Mbaderu ethnic groups, are the dominant community. Pastoralism is their main livelihood activity and their transhumant system is understood to have developed under variable geopolitical, social and climatic conditions (Tlou, 1985). Information presented here is based on oral history accounts corroborated by historical literature. Oral histories detail that Herero and Mbaderu pastoral communities in Ngamiland have their origin in Namibia. Historically, people who speak dialects of the Bantu language *Otjiherero* belong to the three broad divisions within the *Otjiherero* – speaking society in Namibia; the Herero, the Mbaderu, and the Himba. These people share a number of cultural elements that relate to social organisation, preferred economy, epistemology, and spatio-political organisation. The Mbaderu and Herero speak the same language, both live a pastoral way of life and practice the same pattern of land and livestock management (Almagor, 1980). In spite of these similarities, they have maintained two separate identities, divided by an ethnic boundary. Many of these people fled to Ngamiland during the German – Herero colonial war of 1904 – 1914 (Tlou, 1985). During that period, *Kgosi* Sekgoma Letsholathebe (*Kgosi* translates as Chief or King in Setswana) ruled the Tawana Kingdom in Ngamiland (Gewald, 2002, Tlou, 1985). In order to establish a strong base for the Tawana Kingdom, Sekgoma allowed the Mbaderu and Herero groups to become full members of the Tawana Kingdom yet retain their own identity; speaking their own language and continuing their pastoralist way of life (Tlou, 1985). Through the practice of *mafisa*¹, and through the royal cattle loans provided by *Kgosi* Sekgoma, the *Otjiherero* refugees were able to re-establish themselves as wealthy cattle owners within a generation (Gewald, 2002).

3.1.2. Mbaderu/Herero settlements patterns

Oral history testimonies of pastoralists interviewed in Sehithwa, Bothatogo, Bodibeng and Toteng suggest that Mbaderu pastoralists have been expanding their territories

¹ *Mafisa* is a traditional practice which is similar across most Tswana tribes, entitling the loan of cattle to a borrower, who in exchange for herding is entitled to the milk, to use the cattle as draft power, as well as keeping some of the offspring of the herded cattle (Parsons, 1974).

around Lake Ngami, especially along the western margin of the Delta, since the early 1930s. The number of settlements along the dry Kalahari Sandveld remained low until the 1950/60s outbreak of the tsetse fly pandemic after which settlements in the sandveld increased. Most cited stock losses due to diseases alongside the Okavango swamps as reasons for moving inland.

Information gathered from key informants and focus groups suggest that the area stretching from the southern and eastern shores of Lake Ngami to Kuke cordon fence (Figure 1) was Basarwa territory. The settlements around the Khwebe hills were a well-known area for the Basarwa, who had relatives in the adjacent, Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR). The inhabitants of the Khwebe hills, otherwise known as the *Kwe* people (*Kwe* meaning place of people), were nomadic hunter-gatherers (Dziewiecka, 2008). Ngamiland was seen as being rich in grasslands, woods and water, especially during the wet season, and Okavango floods attracted a lot of game making it a favourable place for the *Kwe*, '*...the Kwe were generally carefree people..., they knew the land...faced with the worst drought in the 1960s, we moved further south until we reached the Khwebe hills (Figure 1), we found the Kwe, ...they showed us spring water in the hill...the land was good, some of our animals survived the harsh drought...*' (Oral histories data, 82-year-Old Mbanderu pastoralist, Bodibeng, 2015). Respondents reported that, following the arrival of the Mbanderu pastoralists, the *Kwe*'s mobility started to decrease and temporary encampments were gradually replaced with semi-permanent settlements on cattle posts. Some were employed by the encroaching Mbanderu pastoralists and were paid a calf or two a year for their service, enabling them to accrue some cattle of their own. The area of Khwebe hills was demarcated as ranches under the TGLP and is now inaccessible by the Basarwa of *Kwe* or Mbanderu pastoralists. The remnants of the *Kwe* people can be found in Somelo, a Remote Area Dweller (RAD) settlement 70 kilometres south-east of Maun.

3.1.3. Traditional pastoral management practices and strategic mobility

Oral history narratives suggest that before the land tenure transformation, Herero and Mbanderu of Lake Ngami viewed their grazing landscapes as an interconnected ecological zone, divided into neighbouring localities and grazing grounds for different seasons. Herding practices involved following seasonal transhumant patterns between areas around the delta in the dry season and sandveld grasslands in the wet season. It was important that grazing areas had sufficient resting time from the

previous grazing cycle. The grazing system was enforced by the chief (Traditional leader or ‘*Omuhona*’). Clans controlled different grazing areas and cattle posts (‘*ofarama*’ or ‘*kombanda*’) areas established around large pans (‘*macha*’ or ‘*ovikango*’). If pastoralists did not follow the grazing patterns, fines were imposed by the chief and a council of elders in the clan known as land overseers. These transhumant pastoralists adopted an approach involving controlled but flexible movements away from the delta to the sandveld grasslands during the wet seasons, including reciprocal access agreements with neighbouring clans in order to respond to environmental variability. Table 3 summarises factors that influenced the Mbanderu/Herero temporary migrations, while Figure 2 shows pastoralists' conceptualisation of settlements around Lake Ngami and their adjacent rainy season pastures before fences and land sub-divisions.

Table 3: Factors that influenced pastoralist temporary migrations before the land tenure transformation (Focus group discussions data, 2015)

| Factor influencing strategic mobility | Justification |
|--|---|
| Fluctuations in forage and water availability | <p>Take advantage of resources found in different places in different seasons such as water in the sandveld pans and surrounding grasslands</p> <p>Allow grass to recover around Lake Ngami and Okavango riparian woodlands which were typically dry season grazing areas</p> |
| The number of livestock herds owned | <p>In order to take advantage of a diversity of ecosystems those with larger herds utilized herd splitting and grouping as a strategy to cope with drought or climatic variations; lactating, pregnant cows and calves were kept separate and closer to settlements, the males and non-producing females could travel long distances without water and were kept at distant encampments moving from one pan/<i>ovikango</i> to another in search of better grazing and water</p> |
| The seasonality of the natural regimes; rainfall, Okavango delta seasonal flooding | <p>Reduce the probability of crop damage and resultant fines because floodplains were used by agro-pastoralists for flood recession agriculture known as ‘<i>Molapo</i>’ farming or ‘<i>Ondondu</i>’ farming (<i>Molapo</i> means river in <i>Setswana</i> and <i>Ondondu</i> means river in Otjiherero).</p> <p>Avoid the moist conditions of the delta which is often a breeding ground for insects and disease outbreaks. Such movement strategies were used to combat the spread of FMD or the Nagana disease associated with the tsetse fly.</p> |

During rainy season buffaloes move from the core of the delta to the peripheral areas of the delta hence increasing the possibility of mixing with cattle. By moving away to the sand veld such mixing was avoided hence pastoralists argue that outbreaks of FMD were low and manageable

Skill level of the herder and labour availability

Knowledge of the herder was paramount in exploiting the different characteristics of the range, determining niche specialization of herds and herd splitting for herds' survival during prolonged dry season and drought periods.




Figure 2: A - sketch map, drawn by pastoralists during a focus group discussion at Toteng showing pastoralists' conceptualisation of settlements around Lake Ngami and their adjacent rainy season pastures before fences and land sub-divisions.²

² The pans were normally associated with the rainy season because of the water that is collected. Once the rainy season started, small groups from individual compounds left their settlements and moved away from the lake in search of better pastures. They spent the entire rainy season within a single pasture area, around a specific pan, returning only when water sources had dried up. Each settlement had their own pans which they controlled and regulated through reciprocal access agreements and social relations.

3.1.4. 1920s – 1960s – The Tsetse fly Pandemic and eradication campaign

Respondents reported that from the mid-1920s – late 1960s, they were confronted with frequent outbreaks of sleeping sickness and nagana disease caused by the tsetse fly. The Tsetse pandemic played a critical role in settlements and migration patterns (including configuration of kinship networks) of different ethnic groups around the Okavango Delta. To flee the ravages of the tsetse fly, people moved out into the sandveld with their livestock. Riverine lifestyles were disrupted and new settlements emerged. According to local informants in Sehithwa and Toteng, neither the colonial government nor the Tawana authorities were able to handle the problem. The only alternative for pastoralists was to move to unaffected areas in the sandveld. It was only in the mid-1960s under Sir Seretse Khama (Botswana's first president from 1966 – 1980) that the tsetse was effectively controlled. According to Tlou (1985), the tsetse fly had the most devastating effects on the spatial distribution of the Ngamiland population because unlike mosquito-borne malaria, the tsetse fly-borne diseases, sleeping sickness (trypanosomiasis) and nagana, afflicted both human and cattle alike. Settlements such as Semboyo and Makakung emerged during this period as the Herero pastoral groups migrated further into the sandveld.

3.2. DROUGHT AND LAND TENURE TRANSFORMATION

3.2.1. 1960s – 1980s Severe drought cycles

This period was characterised by recurrent droughts owing to consecutive seasons of poor rainfall. Respondents reported that the impact of the 1965/66 drought was so significant that by the middle of the drought period grazing fodder was almost non-existent and many cattle died. Weaker and severely emaciated cows were kept near homesteads and fed on branch leaves pruned from trees around the Okavango Delta. Some calves were slaughtered so as to reduce stress on their mothers. There was a massive movement of animals to areas with water, '*...every drought in Ngamiland brought other pastoralists from different parts of the district to Lake Ngami, which even up to now has the highest concentration of cattle in Ngamiland*' (Oral histories data, 69-year-old Mbanderu pastoralist, Sehithwa, 2015). However, respondents reported that little water collected in the pans (*macha*) and lagoons dried up. Some pastoralists moved as far as the Khwebe hills in the current Hainaveld ranches area. It was also during this period that the government introduced the TGLP to curb the problems of

overgrazing that were reported to be commonplace in the communal grazing lands. So, this marked the start of an era of tenure transformations.

Another severe drought hit the country in 1982. Participants in both focus groups and oral histories recalled that in the midst of this drought, the government introduced the SLOCA programme (Services to Livestock Owners in the Communal Areas); a government grant scheme designed to help small-scale pastoralists in the communal areas with water reticulation through borehole drilling and construction of drift fences. Some pastoralists were able to drill boreholes through this scheme and as a result, new lands in the dry Kalahari sandveld were opened up for grazing. However, some Mbanderu and Herero pastoralists reported that they were reluctant to invest in borehole drilling because they still had hopes of going back to Namibia; *'...some pastoralists thought then, it will be futile to do so, drilling a borehole is expensive and again you cannot carry a borehole to Namibia'* (Oral histories data, 74-year-old Herero pastoralist, Semboyo, 2015). Many Tswana-speaking tribes invested in boreholes leaving those reliant on the water from Lake Ngami; majority Mbanderu/Herero pastoralists. During the interviews, most Tswana-speaking tribes referred to the Lake as *'Lecha la ma Mbanderu'* (Meaning Lake of the Mbanderu). Some boreholes were drilled by the government for communal use. Pastoralists also reported that they were provided with free diesel and engine maintenance parts. The development of water resources signified the expansion of usable grazing area in Ngamiland as pastoralists stretched further into the sandveld. However, most of the SLOCA boreholes are now reported to be dysfunctional, as pastoralists reported that *'...they were expensive to maintain and most of the water was saline...'* (Oral histories data, 59-year-old member of the Kareng farmers' committee, Kareng, 2015). The period also coincided with the construction of the southern buffalo fence (Figure 1) to separate cattle from buffaloes, so access to the Okavango swamp grazing areas was lost at this time.

3.3. THE ERA OF LIVESTOCK DISEASE OUTBREAKS

3.3.1. 1995: The CBPP Pandemic

In February 1995, an outbreak of Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia (CBPP) known as cattle lung disease occurred in western Ngamiland, with first cases reported along the Xaudum valley (Figure 3). Respondents reported that this period was the most disturbing period of their lives as pastoralists; *'...many families were impoverished and*

had to rely on government temporary relief programmes...' (Oral history data, 69-year old Mbanderu pastoralists, Sehithwa, 2015). CBPP is an acute or chronic disease of cattle and water buffaloes. According to officials at Department of Veterinary Services (DVS), during the early stages, the disease was confined to the western part of the district. Despite control measures, the disease continued to spread rapidly to the east, prompting the government to resort to total eradication by clearing the entire district of cattle. In total, 320,000 cattle were killed of which 114,000 cattle were eradicated from the ranches and 206,000 were eradicated from communal lands (DVS, 2000). According to respondents, the CBPP caused enormous disruption to the spatial configuration of the pastoral landscape, which resulted in a major restructuring of the landscape and pastoralism. Following the outbreak, more veterinary fences were introduced. Three major fences were constructed as emergency control measures in 1995 to contain the spread of CBPP; Samochima (Red line fence), Ikoga (Yellow line fence) and Setata (Green line fence) (Raborokgwe, 1997) (Figure 3). Pastoralists in the villages of Semboyo and Makakung indicated that the Setata fence changed their land use patterns completely. Livestock spatial movements were curtailed and grazing lands bisected, with some water resources becoming inaccessible. Restocking started in 1997 and by the end of the year, about 70,000 cattle had been reintroduced (DVS, 2000). The period also coincided with the implementation of the NPAD fencing component.

Following the declaration of the country as CBPP free, local conservation groups, notably the Kalahari Conservation Society (KCS) and local communal pastoralists convinced the government to demolish the Setata fence. While conservation groups cited environmental concerns, such as blockage of ungulate migratory routes, pastoralists argued that they had been separated from their critical grazing land and water resources. As a result, the Setata fence was decommissioned while the remaining two, Samochima and Ikoga fences, were declared permanent and incorporated into the Department of Veterinary Service (DVS) Master Plan.




Figure 3: CBPP in Ngamiland, progression of the disease, 1995 – 1996 Source: Compiled with data from Department of Veterinary Services, Maun (2015)

3.3.2. 2007: Habu FMD outbreak

In April 2007, an outbreak of FMD was reported at Habu along the Okavango Delta buffalo fence. Pastoralists reported that government responded to the outbreak by reconstructing the Setata Fence. Cattle in the entire district could not be slaughtered at the Botswana Meat Commission (BMC) abattoirs, which respondents indicated, resulted in serious financial constraints as they couldn't pay school fees or have enough to eat. In the process, cattle numbers continued to accumulate in the district. The government set up a relief fund under the National Development Bank (NDB). In this fund, cattle were used as sureties for loans. A farmer could register up to 30 cattle with the Bank at BWP 1,500 per animal on the basis that pastoralists would repay the loans once they started selling to the BMC abattoir. During interviews, some pastoralists claimed that they were being driven into extreme poverty and did not have the means to repay the loans. An interview with NDB staff in Maun revealed that 721 pastoralists used the fund before it was stopped but so far only 55 had managed to clear their loans. '*...we are owed around BWP 103 million (\$10.3 million) by Ngamiland pastoralists, there is no market due to the recurrent FMD in the area...*' (Expert Interview data NDB officer in Maun, 2015).

3.3.3. 2012: The green zone /ranches protection buffer fence

The fence (see Figure 1) was constructed in 2012 as an emergency measure to prevent FMD from spreading into commercial ranches and Ghanzi district. However, communal pastoralists argued that they never agreed to the creation of the fence on the grounds that it exclusively protects ranchers while at the same time cutting communal pastoralists off from their traditional grazing land and water resources. Pastoralists argued that the money used to construct the fence could have been used to maintain the southern buffalo fence which would have solved the problem for all pastoralists (ranchers and communal pastoralists). Pastoralists reported that lots of cattle from the communal areas die because they become stranded along the fence while seeking to access traditionally good grazing on the ranches side³. Interviews with government officials revealed that the fence was not preceded by any impact

³ Most ranches are unfenced, before the fence, cattle could roam freely and thus utilised numerous pans for grazing and watering on the ranches' side.

assessment or feasibility study since it was assumed that it would follow the ranches boundary.

3.3.4. 2014: Kareng FMD outbreak

In April 2014, an outbreak of FMD occurred in Kareng communal lands, an area that has been free from the disease for a long time. It is rare to experience an FMD disease outbreak in the sandveld areas. According to a veterinary officer, the 2014 outbreak started in Tubu, an area within the swamp, *'...that cattle crush and the surrounding cattle posts were surrounded with water following the floods and were inaccessible...so they missed the routine vaccination...'* (Expert Interview data, Veterinary officer, Maun, 2015). However, pastoralists blamed the outbreak on elephants which destroy veterinary fences, especially the buffalo fence, allowing cattle to cross to the buffalo area or vice versa. Following the outbreak, the Department of Veterinary Services imposed stringent livestock movement protocols on herders. Livestock herding was not allowed except with a permit from the veterinary extension officer, even within the same vaccination area. Pastoralists reported that this resulted in an increase in stray animals and increased livestock predation as they were not able to conduct routine herding and night kraaling of their animals.

3.4. PERSPECTIVES ON CURRENT LAND USE

3.4.1. Rangeland access and control

Respondents reported that they objected to the enclosure by TGLP ranches, mainly on the grounds of reduced resource access and restricted mobility. They feared that changes in the structure of the landscape would significantly jeopardise their way of life as a self-sufficient pastoral community. Some informants still recall that they were told during the consultations, a period which they referred to as *'during Seretse Khama'*, that the ranches would not affect any communal area pastoralists as they would be demarcated in unused land, in the areas close to the CKGR. However, many respondents argued during focus groups that the land referred to as unused was never there, that in actual fact these were rangelands that were important to pastoralists for managing periods of excessive drought and disease outbreaks near the delta system and some portions were occupied by the San communities. Respondents reported that over the years ranches have been pushing closer, and have encroached further onto communal grazing lands, especially during the implementation of the NPAD

ranches; *'...the pastoral character of our community has long been lost, so are the ethnic boundaries which distinguished us from the other tribes...'* (Interview data, 68-year-old Mbanderu pastoralist, Bothatogo, 2015). Respondents argued that they wanted to preserve their pastoral identity, maintain the traditional arrangement in which they had regulated access to grazing resources by pastoral communities and also maintain their territorial integrity.

During focus groups, respondents were critical about government consultation processes, especially the NPAD ranches allocation process. Many argued that the ranches, which were allocated around cattle posts, did not consider many poor pastoralists who did not have boreholes but depended on the communal areas and the numerous sandveld natural water pans for survival. As respondents stressed; *'...government officials came to the Kgotla (traditional gathering place) and told the community that those with boreholes will be allocated ranches, the community agreed because they didn't know what that meant...some people had just borehole points and those were treated as boreholes and were allocated ranches...'* (Focus group discussion data, Toteng, 2015)

A few respondents reported that they tried applying for ranches, but the allocation process and requirements were beyond their comprehension so the majority of those ranches were given to outsiders or those with financial resources; *'...also, business proposals and management plans are demanded from us, overriding the rich practical experience we have as pastoralists ...'* (Focus group discussion data, Toteng, 2015), *'I tried to apply for an NPAD ranch and I think my ranch management plan was comprehensive enough...but still, the land board turned down my application...'* (Youth focus group discussion data, Sehithwa, 2015).

The allocation process for the ranches is a complex process for an ordinary communal area pastoralist, especially those without boreholes. First, the Land Board requires an applicant to show proof of financial resources in excess of BWP250 000 (US\$25 000) to develop the ranch if allocated (TLB, 2015). *'The applicant is also expected to demonstrate through a business or ranch management plan a thorough knowledge of the ranching management processes; paddocking, rotational grazing, fire management, water development and disease management ...'* (Expert Interview data, Maun, 2015). Such requirements exclude poor communal area farmers from competing with those with financial resources. Moreover, most of the business plans

and management plans submitted for ranch applications are prepared by consultants (Ntingana, 2010). This means that the understanding of the commercial ranch management strategies demonstrated in the management plan is a theoretical understanding by the consultant and not the applicant. The majority of the communal area pastoralists do not have financial resources to hire a consultant to write management plans for them. The allocation system is such that it gives those who previously had only *de facto* rights to grazing around their boreholes exclusive rights to previously communal grazing lands (RoB, 1991). The large costs of drilling and equipping a borehole ensures that owning a borehole remains a privilege of the wealthier.

3.4.2. Human – Wildlife Conflicts and FMD

One of the pertinent issues in the area is human-wildlife conflict, especially with elephants, which respondents argued is the major contributing factor to the rampant FMD. Most of the respondents complained about the ever-increasing elephant and buffalo populations; *'It is not fair that as Ngamiland farmers we continue being impoverished by these increasing buffalo and elephant population...if the government cannot help us, they should allow these animals to move to other parts of the country...'* (Focus group discussion data, a member of Ngamiland Integrated Farmers' Association, Sehithwa, 2015). Buffaloes are considered the carrier of FMD. Elephants' extend their range into cattle post areas and arable lands, damaging livestock water resources and veterinary fences that separate cattle from buffaloes.

Respondents appeared to be critical about the way government departments are handling the FMD pandemic. The Department of Wildlife and National Parks is criticised for failing to control the movement of elephants which continue to destroy veterinary cordon fences on a daily basis; *'...the attitude of authorities when dealing with the control and containment of FMD is worrisome...there is no maintenance of the buffalo fence. We have long called for the electrification of that fence but up to now nothing is happening...'* (Focus group discussion data, a member of the farmer's committee, Kareng, 2015). Government officials acknowledged that efforts to mitigate the conflict at the interface between elephants and shrinking rangelands have met with limited success. However, others still blamed pastoralists for their reluctance to help the government to contain the problem; *'....frequent damage of the buffalo fence by elephants presents our single greatest challenge in confronting the FMD scourge. We*

continue trying...but at the same time ask for maximum cooperation from pastoralists...others are reluctant, we urge them to do their part by stopping their cattle from moving closer to the buffalo fence ...' (Interview data, Veterinary officer, Maun, 2015).

3.4.3. Pastoralists' vulnerability

Vulnerability denotes pastoralists' lack of resilience to the occurrences of uncertain events; droughts, livestock diseases, exclusion from markets, resource scarcity in the form of marginalised access or rangeland degradation (Rass, 2006). Historical narratives suggest that people living on the fringes of the Okavango Delta have experienced difficulties over a long period of time. Agricultural production (both arable and pastoral) has proven to be risky in Ngamiland. Risks range from diminishing communal grazing lands, drought, livestock diseases, predation, conflicting land uses, floods and destruction of crops by animals. The FMD pandemic and the enclosure of the formerly wet season grazing pastures and water resources continues to undermine the livelihood of the Mbanderu and Herero with communities reporting that many impoverished young men and women are being forced into seeking employment in town or the government labour intensive drought relief (*Ipelegeng*) programme; '*...We now depend on government hand-outs for survival because the land is not enough for sustainable pastoral farming and there are no markets for livestock products...*' (Focus group discussion data, Toteng, 2015).

Some respondents reported that they used to diversify their income sources by working off-farm, selling fuel wood, logs, thatching grass and wild berries. This is no longer the case as all these are now enclosed by the ranches protection buffer fence; '*I used to cut logs, droppers, thatching grass and gather wild berries in there and sell, now my business has collapsed because all these resources are now on private land...we can't even go near that fence because we are afraid of the soldiers...*' (Oral histories data, 68-year-old pastoralist, Bothatogo, 2015).

The persistently high stocking pressures in the communal areas especially around Lake Ngami are driven not only by large numbers of animals, but also by the effects of a shrinking land base. As pressure on land increases, the pastoralists' mode of subsistence is left in a situation of worsening vulnerability. Discussions in focus groups and subsequent expert interviews both stressed that the effect of overgrazing between

the ranches protection fence and Lake Ngami has significantly reduced both the grass cover density and biodiversity of the area. Bare soils and a significant presence of invasive and alien species such as of *Acacia mellifera* (*Mongana* or *Hook thorn*) were observed and some areas were choked with bushes. Congestion in communal areas has also made it difficult to control the spread of FMD.

Expert interviews and focus groups revealed that the exclusion from livestock markets has resulted in part-time and town dwelling livestock owners. This has resulted in neglected livestock near major settlements, roads, rivers and the Lake, including lots of stray animals. Some respondents argue that this is also a major contributing factor in the spread of livestock diseases since these stray animals are never vaccinated. Citing the destruction of their cattle-led lifestyle, and land use policies which pastoralists argued favours mainly two types of land use (wildlife and commercial ranching), some Herero pastoralists expressed their desire to abandon Ngamiland and repatriate to their native Namibia; *'...I haven't been able to sell since 2007, the land has seriously diminished since the erection of that fence (the ranches protection buffer fence)...BMC buys only from the ranches, we poor pastoralists are in the dark. I think it's meaningful to go back to Namibia...'* (Oral histories data, 65-year-old Herero pastoralist, Makakung, 2015).

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Flexible mobility and land tenure transformation

Understanding how pastoral landscapes have changed over time in response to a range of influences is essential for planning and policy development and can promote a clearer understanding of likely future changes in pastoral landscapes (Cousins et al., 2007). Adaptation and response strategies must be grounded in pastoralists historical experience and knowledge (Ericksen et al., 2013). Pastoralists have a deep knowledge and understanding of their environment and have developed grazing practices and adaptation strategies which are consistent with their environment and socio-cultural context (Rohde et al., 2006). Historical analysis of the ways in which they have adapted and dealt with pressures on their resources, including diseases, can be useful in identifying policy options with potential to promote sustainable land management (SLM) in drylands (Batterbury and Bebbington, 1999). Ngami

pastoralists, have customarily used risk-spreading tactics over the years that include strategic movement of livestock away from disease prone environs such as the Okavango Delta Swamps, and to access pasture resources and water in sandveld pans after rains including herds splitting to take advantage of the varied and uncertain environmental conditions.

Dryland pastoralists rely on the demonstrated coping strategy of mobility in order to respond to environmental variability and occurrence of uncertain events such as droughts (Fernandez-Gimenez and Le Febre, 2006, Ellis, 1995). Mobility allows strategic access to scarce and scattered rangelands resources; water and pasture (Vetter, 2005, Kaye-Zwiebel and King, 2014). In Ngamiland, the *de facto* privatisation of communal rangelands did not take into consideration this effective strategy of extracting value out of these marginal lands. Frequent and severe droughts in the 1960s/80s appear to have been the most important factor that led the government to conclude that rangelands are in crises and therefore in need of an intervention. This then gave impetus to rangeland enclosure and privatisation through TGLP. While government's rangeland policy was developed because of a belief in degradation caused by communal access and overstocking (Rohde et al., 2006, White, 1992), historical evidence suggests that they were actually responding to rangelands variability caused by drought. The process of rangeland tenure transformation is changing the patterns of resource tenure and access, reinforcing the dominant patterns of winners and losers in the communal areas (Tache, 2013, Cullies and Watson, 2005). The use of boreholes as a mechanism in ranch allocation effectively meant that grazing land is allocated *de facto* to an elite of cattle owners who have acquired exclusive use of the land by making the necessary investment in borehole drilling and water reticulation (Perkins, 1996, White, 1992). In Ngamiland, resource-poor pastoralists who could not afford to invest in borehole drilling subsequently lost the opportunity to capture private land. The ensuing scenario is one in which pastoralists are squeezed between fences (Magole, 2009), their resilience to climatic shocks, diseases and uncertainties have been significantly weakened, and problems of congestion and land use conflicts could easily lead to the very problems of rangeland degradation that these policies and strategies had purported to prevent.

4.2. Policy and institutional lessons

The historical evolution of pastoralists' issues and land use greatly influence contemporary forms of land use and can help structure possible entry points for sustainable land use policy making and implementation. Historical perspectives recounted by local pastoralists can provide important insights into key events and changes in an area. Understanding the contexts for such events is key for providing insights for policy (Scoones, 1997). In Ngamiland livestock disease outbreak emerges as a key theme. FMD outbreaks have occurred with increasing frequency in recent years. Livestock owners appear to be less observant of animal health issues than was previously the case. A strategy which emphasise getting the general conditions right for livestock owners to make the necessary commitment and investment in the fight against the disease, in a manner suitable to the local condition and taking into consideration historical context is suggested.

In Ngamiland pastoralists seasonal movements served as a means of controlling grazing lands, preventing out of season grazing, managing livestock diseases and human-wildlife conflicts especially migratory elephants and buffaloes as the timing of movement was critical. Although the allocation of rangeland resources existed especially between villages and clans around important historical natural water pans, customary enforcement of movement patterns by village chiefs were an effective means of managing rangelands and livestock and also provided pastoralists with secure access rights to key grazing resources, especially in periods of scarcity such as during dry or drought periods. These traditional livestock management institutions have been significantly altered by rangelands transformations. The centralisation of land resources management has meant that a complex network of sectoral institutions is used to manage communal lands, excluding the pastoralists and their leaders thus rendering them losers in the land competition (Cullies and Watson, 2005, Peters, 1994). Pastoralists' resilience to climate shocks and uncertainties has been weakened as a result. The new pastoral environment means that pastoralists' vulnerability is increasing even to slight variations and intensity of rainfall (Letai and Lind, 2013). The increasing dominance of scientific knowledge to policy planning has tended to result in the adoption of a technocratic approach to policy making, which neglects historical experience in formulating current policy problems and solutions (Rennie, 1998). In Ngamiland historical perspectives highlight uncertainty, unpredictability and non-linear

change to pastoralists' landscapes. Interventions must proceed through a process of reflective learning and adaptation (Scoones, 1997).

5. CONCLUSION

The article proposes a strong role for historical perspectives in informing policy debates on sustainable pastoralism. Understanding the management of rangelands through pastoralism has substantial policy relevance in sustainable land management and poverty alleviation. Findings from this study show that in Ngamiland pastoral landscapes, the trajectories of change can be outlined within four themes: Mbanderu/Herero historical land use practices, disease outbreaks, climate variability and land tenure transformation facilitated through expansion in borehole technology and rangeland policies. Hence, the effect of communal land tenure transformation on SLM and pastoralists adaptive capacity requires understanding complex socio-ecological systems and developing methodologies that can tackle the root cause of problems. From experiences of the past, lessons can be drawn of the sort of practices, processes and institutions required for pastoralism policies and planned pastoralists' adaptations. Against this background the consequences of introducing a new policy or legislative instruments can be examined more critically. The abundant environmental knowledge of rural pastoral communities can promote alternative ways of thinking about policy problems by embedding landscape histories within these processes. In Botswana, relatively little effort has been made to integrate historical perspectives into land use planning. Past attempts to support pastoral development have failed to successfully balance the needs of critical pastoral areas through appropriate policy and technical approaches. Interventions in pastoral landscapes will require an integrated development approach that cuts across different natural resource management sectors to address cross-cutting issues; diminishing communal grazing lands, livestock disease and pastoralists vulnerability among others so as to develop policies that suits specific pastoral landscapes. In this process, it is knowledge of the past which should form a point of reference by which institutions perceive issues, assess scientific choices and justify decisions.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by funding from the Government of Botswana, the Botswana International University of Science and Technology and the University of Leeds Sustainable Agriculture Fund Bursaries. The study was carried out under the Government of Botswana research permit number EWT 8/36/4 XXX (73). We thank the Ngamiland pastoral communities for sharing their opinions and for their active participation in the research. Many thanks to Dr. Susannah Sallu for the insightful comments and suggestions.

7. ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---------------|--|
| CBPP: | Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia |
| FMD: | Foot and Mouth Disease |
| NPAD: | National Policy on Agricultural development |
| SLM: | Sustainable Land Management |
| SLOCA: | Services to Livestock Owners in Communal areas |
| TGLP: | Tribal Grazing Land Policy |

8. REFERENCES

- ADAM, Y. O., PRETZSCH, J. & DARR, D. 2015. Land use conflicts in central Sudan: Perception and local coping mechanisms. *Land Use Policy*, 42, 1-6.
- ADRIANSEN, H. K. & NIELSEN, T. T. 2002. Going where the grass is greener: On the study of pastoral mobility in Ferlo, Senegal. *Human Ecology*, 30, 215-226.
- ALMAGOR, U. 1980. Pastoral Identity and Reluctance to Change: the Mbanderu of Ngamiland. *Journal of African Law*, 24, 35-61.
- BATTERBURY, S. P. J. & BEBBINGTON, A. J. 1999. Environmental histories, access to resources and landscape change: An introduction. *Land Degradation & Development*, 10, 279-289.
- BEHNKE, R. H. 1987. CATTLE ACCUMULATION AND THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF THE TRADITIONAL LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY IN BOTSWANA. *Agricultural Systems*, 24, 1-29.
- BROTTEM, L., TURNER, M. D., BUTT, B. & SINGH, A. 2014. Biophysical Variability and Pastoral Rights to Resources: West African Transhumance Revisited. *Human Ecology*, 42, 351-365.
- BRUCE, J. W. & MEARN, R. 2002. Natural Resource Management and Land Policy in Developing Countries: Lessons Learned and new challenges for the World Bank. *International Institute of Environment and Development, iied*.
- CLEAVER, K. M. & DONOVAN, W. G. 1995. Agriculture, poverty, and policy reform in sub-Saharan Africa. *World Bank discussion papers. Africa Technical Department series. Washington, D.C. : The World Bank. , WDP 280*.
- COUSINS, B., HOFFMAN, M. T., ALLSOPP, N. & ROHDE, R. F. 2007. A synthesis of sociological and biological perspectives on sustainable land use in Namaqualand. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 70, 834-846.
- CULLIES, A. & WATSON, T. 2005. Winners and Losers: Privatising the commons in Botswana. *Willprint, Colchester*.
- DOUGILL, A. J., THOMAS, D. S. G. & HEATHWAITE, A. L. 1999. Environmental change in the Kalahari: Integrated land degradation studies for nonequilibrium dryland environments. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 89, 420-442.
- DVS 2000. Livestock Report: CBPP, destocking and restocking. *Department of Veterinary Services, Maun, Botswana*.
- DZIEWIECKA, M. 2008. Place of People: The Khwebe Hills in the History of Ngamiland. *Botswana Notes and Records*, 40, 11 - 20.
- ELLIS, J. E. 1995. Climate variability and complex system dynamics: implications for pastoral development. *In: Scoones, I. (ed.), Living with Uncertainty: New directions in pastoral development in Africa, Intermediate Technology Publications, Exeter, 37 - 46*.
- ELLIS, J. E. & SWIFT, D. M. 1988. Stability of African pastoral ecosystems: Alternate paradigms and implications for development. *Journal of Range Management*, 41.

- ERICKSEN, P., LEEUW, J. D., THORNTON, P., SAID, M., HERRERO, M. & NOTENBAERT, A. 2013. Climate Change in sub-Saharan Africa: What consequences for pastoralism. In Catley, A., Lind., J., and Scoones, I. (Eds). *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins, Pathways to sustainability*, Routledge,, 71-81.
- FERNANDEZ-GIMENEZ, M. E. 2006. Land Use and Land Tenure in Mongolia: A Brief History and Current Issues. *USDA Forest Service Proceedings*, RMRS-P-39, 30-36.
- FERNANDEZ-GIMENEZ, M. E. & LE FEBRE, S. 2006. Mobility in pastoral systems: Dynamic flux or downward trend? *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 13, 341-362.
- FRATKIN, E. 1997. Pastoralism: Governance and Development Issues. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26, 235-261.
- GALE, N. K., HEATH, G., CAMERON, E., RASHID, S. & REDWOOD, S. 2013. Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 13, 117-117.
- GEWALD, J. 2002. 'I was afraid of Samuel, therefore i came to Sekgoma': Herero refugees and patronage politics in Ngamiland, Bechuanaland protectorate, 1890 - 1994. *Journal of African History*, 43, 211 - 234.
- HAY, I. 2010. *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Canada, Oxford University Press.
- KAYE-ZWIEBEL, E. & KING, E. 2014. Kenyan pastoralist societies in transition: varying perceptions of the value of ecosystem services. *Ecology and Society*, 19.
- KITCHELL, E., TURNER, M. D. & MCPEAK, J. G. 2014. Mapping of pastoral corridors: practices and politics in eastern Senegal. *Pastoralism*, 4, 1-14.
- LETAI, J. & LIND, J. 2013. SQUEEZED FROM ALL SIDES Changing resource tenure and pastoralist innovation on the Laikipia Plateau, Kenya. *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins*, 164-176.
- MAGOLE, L. 2009. The 'shrinking commons' in the Lake Ngami grasslands, Botswana: the impact of national rangeland policy. *Development Southern Africa*, 26, 611-626.
- MCGAHEY, D. 2011. Livestock mobility and animal health policy in southern Africa: the impact of veterinary cordon fences on pastoralists. *Pastoralism*, 1, 1-29.
- MORITZ, M., LARISA CATHERINE, B., DRENT, A., KARI, S., MOUHAMAN, A. & SCHOLTE, P. 2013. Rangeland governance in an open system: Protecting transhumance corridors in the Far North Province of Cameroon. *Pastoralism*, 3, 1-10.
- MWANGI, E. 2009. Property rights and governance of Africa's rangelands: A policy overview. *Natural Resources Forum*, 33, 160-170.
- NIAMIR-FULLER, M. & TURNER, M. D. 1999. A review of recent literature on pastoralism and transhumance in Africa. In: Niamir - Fuller, M. (ed.). *Managing Mobility in Africa Rangelands: the legitimization of transhumance*, Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd, London, 18-46.

- NOTENBAERT, A., DAVIES, J., DE LEEUW, J., SAID, M., HERRERO, M., MANZANO, P., WAITHAKA, M., ABOUD, A. & OMONDI, S. 2012. Policies in support of pastoralism and biodiversity in the heterogeneous drylands of East Africa. *Pastoralism*, 2, 1-17.
- NTINGANA, T. 2010. Consultant fault? Boreholes and the fencing policy in Ngamiland: A discussion paper. Sustainable Land Management Workshop. *Tawana Land Board, Maun. Botswana*.
- OBA, G. 2013. The sustainability of pastoral production in Africa. In: Catley, A., Lind., J., and Scoones, I. (Eds). *Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins, Pathways to sustainability*, Routledge, 29-36.
- PATTON, M. Q. 1990. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods.*, Sage Publications, Inc, Newbury.
- PERKINS, J. S. 1996. Botswana: Fencing out the equity issue. Cattleposts and cattle ranching in the Kalahari Desert. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 33, 503-517.
- PETERS, P. E. 1994. *Dividing the commons: politics, policy, and culture in Botswana*, Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.
- RABOROKGWE, M. V. 1997. Cordon Fences and wildlife issues. In: *Proceedings of a National Conference on conservation and management of wildlife in Botswana: Strategies for the twenty first century, 13th - 17th October 1997*, 114 - 120.
- RASS, N. 2006. Policies and strategies to address the vulnerability of pastoralists in sub-Saharan Africa. *FAO Pro-poor Livestock Policy Initiative*, Working paper No 37.
- RENNIE, R. 1998. History and Policy - making. *The social science sphere*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK, ISSJ 156.
- ROB 1975. Republic of Botswana, National Policy on Tribal Grazing Land: Government Paper No. 2 of 1975. *Government Printers, Gaborone, Botswana*.
- ROB 1991. Republic of Botswana, National Policy on Agricultural Development (NPAD). *Government Printers, Gaborone, Botswana*.
- ROHDE, R. F., MOLEELE, N. M., MPHALE, M., ALLSOPP, N., CHANDA, R., HOFFMAN, M. T., MAGOLE, L. & YOUNG, E. 2006. Dynamics of grazing policy and practice: environmental and social impacts in three communal areas of southern Africa. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 9, 302-316.
- SCOONES, I. 1997. The Dynamics of Soil Fertility Change: Historical Perspectives on Environmental Transformation from Zimbabwe. *The Geographical Journal*, 163, 161-169.
- SCOONES, I. E. 1995. Living with uncertainty: New directions in pastoral development in Africa. *Intermediate Technology Publications, London*.
- SPEELMAN, E. N., GROOT, J. C. J., GARCIA-BARRIOS, L. E., KOK, K., VAN KEULEN, H. & TITTONELL, P. 2014. From coping to adaptation to economic and institutional change - Trajectories of change in land-use management and social organization in a Biosphere Reserve community, Mexico. *Land Use Policy*, 41, 31-44.
- SWIFT, J. 1991. LOCAL CUSTOMARY INSTITUTIONS AS THE BASIS FOR NATURAL-RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AMONG BORAN PASTORALISTS

- IN NORTHERN KENYA. *Ids Bulletin-Institute of Development Studies*, 22, 34-37.
- TACHE, B. 2013. Rangeland enclosures in Southern Oromia, Ethiopia: an innovative response or the erosion of common property resources? *In: Catley, A., Lind, J., and Scoones, I. (Eds). Pastoralism and Development in Africa: Dynamic Change at the Margins, Pathways to sustainability, Routledge*, 37 - 46.
- TLB 2015. Tawana Land Board, Allocation guidelines for ranches and other commercial plots. *Maun, Botswana*.
- TLOU, T. 1985. *A history of Ngamiland: the formation of an African State*, Gaborone, Botswana, Macmillan Publishers.
- TONGCO, M. D. C. 2007. Purposive Sampling as a tool for Informant Selection: Research Methods. *Ethnobotany Research and Application: A journal of Plants, People and Applied Research.*, 5.
- VETTER, S. 2005. Rangelands at equilibrium and non-equilibrium: recent developments in the debate. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 62, 321-341.
- WHITE, R. 1992. *Livestock Development and Pastoral Production on Communal Rangeland in Botswana: Case study for Workshop: New directions in African Range Management Policy, Matopos, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*, London, UK, Commonwealth Secretariat.