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1.0 Introduction

Namibia has 13 political regions, with 107 constituencies. Superimposed on some of these geopolitical boundaries, are the traditional authorities, usually headed by a chief. Today, there are 42 officially recognized traditional authorities in the country, scattered in all regions. Whereas regional and constituency boundaries are well documented in official records, there is a dearth of boundaries pertaining to traditional authorities. The Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, being the national custodian of state land in particular, recognized the need for such a survey and approached GTZ for funding in this regard. This study is thus a response to that call. It was designed to survey and map boundaries of all recognized traditional authorities in Namibia, along with areas under which respective land boards operate.

2. Objectives

As set out in the terms of reference, the objectives of this project was to map land board area of operations, tied in with areas of officially recognized traditional authorities. This was to be achieved by means of consulting each traditional authority separately, and make use of satellite images, aerial photographs and, when necessary, a GPS.

3. Methodology

The study was carried out into two main phases, namely, desk study and fieldwork. The desk study included the selection and printing of images, overlaid with relevant thematic layers, such as schools, water points, villages, cutlines, constituency boundaries, and roads. This was necessary for facilitating the delineation of boundaries on maps as guided by each traditional authority.

Unlike traditional methods of surveying and mapping, however, this exercise relied exclusively on the deliberation of each traditional authority. Their background and insight reflected also on the output of areas mapped. Chiefs governing relatively large areas, often rely on their councilors, whereas some chiefs, especially those who have been in power for longer periods, proved to have extensive knowledge of their districts.

Fieldwork took place between June 28 and August 23, 2008. Typically, regional staff from the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement either accompanied the mapping team to each traditional authority or they introduced the team to the community telephonically. Depending on individual communities, a chief may not necessarily attend the pre-arranged meeting; while in other communities, the chief may only be accompanied by a councilor, adviser, or secretary.

Following the introduction of the aims and objectives of the project, traditional authorities were requested to consult a map covering their area and mention places or landmarks found on the images or maps which define borders between them and their neighbors. Boundaries are then drawn on hard-copies as they were being identified. After fieldwork, the boundaries
were then captured in digital format, using on-screen digitizing method. Satellite images were primarily used as a backdrop. ENVI 3.5, ILWIS 3.3, Arcview 3.2 and ArcGIS 9.2 were the programs used to input, manage, store or output the data.

The north-central and north-eastern regions were covered by the latest set of Aerial Photographs obtained from the office of the Surveyor’s General, at a spatial resolution of 0.5 m. For an area at over 100,000 km², however, this data set yielded a much larger volume, thus exerted significant pressure on hardware in data handling and printing. On average, the maps were printed at a scale of 1:70 000. The high spatial resolution of the aerial photographs, therefore, was not fully taken advantage of, which ultimately mattered less, as diagnostic landmarks for mapping areas of interest were spatially much larger.

The rest of the country was covered by mosaic of Landsat images. These mosaics have a spatial resolution of 28.5 m. They were georeferenced using UTM coordinate system. In accordance with the terms of reference, no field survey was undertaken in the southern part of the country. The boundaries presented from Hardap and Karas were taken from an archive, showing the so-called homelands.

With the exception of the map covering the Hardap and Karas regions, all maps used the UTM coordinate system. The datum WGS84, along with two zones, 33S and 34S, covering Namibia were employed accordingly.

4. Results

4 (a) Traditional Authorities

Out of 42 recognized traditional authorities nation-wide, only seven (7) or 17% are from Hardap and Karas. They were thus not visited during this exercise, pursuant to the terms of reference. Four of the traditional authorities were visited and failed to help map their areas under their control. A summary outlining the circumstances of these four communities, as well as borders for traditional authorities visited and took part in the exercise are discussed and presented below.

4.1 Kavango Traditional Authorities

Five (5) traditional authorities received official recognition in Kavango. From west to east lie the Kwangali, M bunza, Sambyu, Gciriku and Mbukushu/Hambukushu. Along with individual maps generated for each community, the setting and key issues that emerged from discussions are presented below.

4.1.1 Kwangali

Hompa Daniel Sitentu Mpasi was met at his residence. An adviser and the secretary were in attendance. Salient from the discussions, was the land given to the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority in 1946, which was facilitated by the then Commissioners for Owambo and Kavango. This was due to a lack of grazing area in Oukwanyama. The boundaries for
Kwangali were then identified on the map. However, the Chief insisted that the land given to Oukwanyama Traditional Authority be also presented on the same map for historical reflections. *Figure 1* presents the two areas delineated.

*Figure 1: Area under Kwangali Traditional Authority along with a portion given to Oukwanyama in 1946.*

**4.1.2 Mbunza Traditional Authority**

The meeting took place at Hompa’s residence. In addition to an adviser, the secretary and two senior councilors were also in attendance. Before the delineation of borders began, Hompa Kaundu highlighted major border disputes between his community and neighboring Sambyu.

*Figure 2: Area under Mbunza Traditional Authority*
As far as 2003, the then Governor of Kavango Region facilitated the resolving of these borders disputes. These disputes were more rampant from Naingopo southwards.

Typically, movement of people in search of grazing land or water in that area tends to be used as a front for claiming land. Historical borders, although they exist, are thus largely ignored; and therefore fuelling border disputes between these two communities. *Figure 2* presents the results of the borders set-out from the meeting with the Mbunza representatives.

### 4.1.3 Sambyu Traditional Authority

The meeting took place at the office of the traditional authority in Kayengona. The chairperson of the Traditional Council, his deputy, a senior councilor and two councilors, a representative of the council in the Land Board and the secretary attended the meeting.

A senior councilor gave a historical background to what is left to their land. He acknowledged a series of meeting that took place in the past as an attempt to resolve border disputes in both their eastern and western neighbors. Due to a lack of progress, confidence in similar meetings has now been eroded considerably.

*Figure 3: Area under Sambyu Traditional Authority*

To illustrate the complexity of traditional borders between neighboring communities, the senior councilor, Mr. Thikerete, started around the 18th century when border conflicts were non-existent. By then, their eastern borders were essentially marked by Ndonga-linene. A straight line would then run from there down south. By 1937, the border shifted some 20 km westward to Lundjallala, under pressure from the national government of the day.
To the west, Kapako, where the Mbunza Traditional Office is located today, formed the pre-colonial borders between the Sambyu and Mbunza communities. Like the shift to Lundjalala in 1937, the western border moved to Sikondo, just west of Sauyema. In 1952, another shift witnessed the borders moving to Sauyema. The final border shift took place in 1972, when it moved to Mumanya, near Rundu Post Office, the old Police Station.

In light of the shifts of borders mentioned above, driven by national government of the day, this community is of the opinion that the Central Government should take centre stage and simply demarcate borders between disputing communities. In so doing, communities will be obliged to observe the borders set by the ultimate custodian of the land, being the Ministry of Lands and Resettlements.

The outcome of mapping resulted in a map presented in *Figure 3*. It transpired, however, that in its current form, there is a no-man’s land stretching about 8 km between the Sambyu and Gcriku Traditional Authorities. As presented in section 4.1.4, the land that the Gcriku recognized as their borders follow the Constituency boundaries whereas the Sambyu, oriented theirs to begin near Kapako. Kapako lies some 8 km west of the constituency boundaries. However, the Sambyu reckons that this border ought to move some 10 km east of the constituency boundaries, and regard that area under dispute.

### 4.1.4 Gcriku

The appointment with Hompa Shiyambi was made to meet at his residence. Hompa was accompanied by a senior councilor, and the secretary. The process of delineating borders followed rather swiftly following the introduction of the exercise, and the result is presented in *Figure 4*.
4.1.5 Mbukushu

Fumu Erwin Mbmbo Munika was met at his residence. He was accompanied by the secretary. A brief historical account revealed that major disputes exist regarding the Bwabwata, variously known as East Kavango, Kavango 2, Caprivi Strip, Caprivi Game Reserve or Caprivi National Park. This area is equally claimed by two other communities, namely, the Mayeyi (section 4.3.1) and the Masubia (section 4.3.3). Moreover, the area is zoned as a game reserve, the status which the Mbukushu Traditional Authority questions its legal authenticity.

Figure 5: Area under the Mbukushu Traditional Authority

A historical map presented during the meeting to substantiate his authority over Bwabwata, shows the area in discussion as Kavango Area 2. It appears very identical to a pre-colonial map that shows homelands (Mendelsohn et al, 2002). In the view of this community, reference to Bwabwata using the name “Caprivi” in any form is therefore a premeditated exercise aimed at misleading the nation and to be used as a basis for land grabbing. Thus, Kwando River defines the correct borders between Mbukushu and Caprivi, according to the Mbukushu.

Unlike Mahango Game Reserve, which falls under his area and its legal documents related to its establishment exists and known to him, Fumu Munika challenges the Government to produce similar documents confirming the agreement made between his community and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. It is his desire that this dispute and that with Caprivi be resolved in a rational manner. Figure 5 presents the area under the Mbukushu Traditional Authority as delineated with the assistance of Fumu Munika.
4.2 Aawambo Traditional Authorities

Eight (8) traditional authorities are recognized amongst Aawambo. From east to west, they include Ondonga, Oukwanyama, Uukwambi, Okalongo, Ongandjera, Ombalantu, Uukwaluudhi and Uukolonkadhi. All of them were visited and the results are presented in sections below.

4.2.1 Ondonga

The Ondonga Traditional Authorities was one of the few that warmly welcomed the mapping exercise of this project. It was so welcoming that our first stop-over, meant to set an appointment, was immediately turned into a fully-fledged mapping exercise. The Council was in session then, which enabled us to deal directly with individual councilors in charge of outlying villages of the Authority. More than 15 members were in attendance.

Unlike sparsely populated areas, densely inhabited parts, especially on the northwest and mid-west, were mapped with ease. This was mainly due to the fact that areas with fewer or no settlements were mapped using diagnostic landscape features, such as major pans, which could be far apart or non-existent. In contrast, schools, places of worship, and village names were used extensively to supplement landscape features in delineating borders in more densely populated areas. A major challenge was experienced in under-populated, forested areas, which lacked heterogeneity, hence a monotone in images and/or maps. These scenarios were widespread at most traditional authorities.

Figure 6: Area under the Ondonga Traditional Authority
As presented in Figures 6 and 7, major disputes exist between the Ondonga and Oukwanyama Traditional Authorities, especially in the east and northeast of Ondonga. Moreover, disputes of note also rise in the south-west with the Uukwambi community.

4.2.2 Oukwanyama

The Council for the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority was met at their office. Eight districts, namely, Onamutayi, Ohaingu, Omhedi, Onamhinda, Okelemba, Eudaneko (Onengali), Hakafiya (Eenhana) and Kongo were represented by one or more officials, including a senior headman / headwoman. Four advisers have also attended the meeting. Due to other commitments, the Queen was unable to attend.

Figure 7: Area under the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority. Note, western borders are open-ended, as borders between Oukwanyama and Ombalantu could not be defined; neither the borders between the then Okalongo and Ohaingu districts could be defined at the time of field mapping (see text for details).

Before mapping could be done, it was noted that historical maps showing the Oukwanyama Traditional Area do exist. Major concerns arose in the delineation of the western borders. In the past, the Okalongo district of Oukwanyama bordered with Ombalantu to the west. Through ‘hearsay’ from the side of the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority, however, it transpired that Okalongo became an independent entity. As a result, a senior councillor from that district who could have assisted in the delineation of borders between Oukwanyama and Ombalantu was not present. Similarly, mapping district borders between Okalongo and Ohaingu as a surrogate was not attempted due to the fact that the sitting councillor for Ohaingu has been fairly new in her position, and yet to meet the headmen / headwomen in...
her district for briefing on their borders. In essence, the undertone with respect to Okalongo is that their authority as an independent entity was not discussed with the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority; nor the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority being officially informed. It was for these reasons that the borders to the west were not mapped and therefore, translated into Oukwanya having open-ended borders (Figure 7).

4.2.3 Uukwambi

Chief Herman Iipumbu was met at his office. He was joined in the meeting by the secretary. During the mapping exercise, the Chief variously co-opted the assistance of selected senior headmen, depending on the area under study. Uukwambi constitutes five (5) districts, Onamega, Olupembana, Ogongo, Otuwala and Oshikuku. The outcome of this mapping exercise resulted in a map presented in Figure 8.

![Figure 8: Area under the Uukwambi Traditional Authority](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

4.2.4 Okalongo

Okalongo was the only traditional authority of Aawambo that was not mapped. The council, comprises the Chief, about five senior members and two advisers, was met at their office. The legitimacy of the mapping team was made as an issue by the council, despite repeated reassurance from Mr. J Nkolo, an official from the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, who is also the secretary of the Omusati Land Board. The authenticity of the mapping team is thus considered to have been merely used as a pretext and keep the underlying reason(s) for opting not to take part in the exercise undisclosed. These ulterior motives and their apprehensions are best left without speculation here.
4.2.5 Ongandjera

The council of the Ongandjera Traditional Authority was intercepted while attending a course on land registration at their office. The only noticeable absence was that of King Japhet Malenga Munkundi.

The boundaries were delineated following a short historical summary of how the borders have been changing, mainly due to political reasons. The result of the Odendaal Commission was one such political move that changed drastically the borders between traditional areas. Before the Odendaal commission, for example, the borders of Ongandjera to the west run parallel to the Kamanjab-Ruacana road. Presently, it shifted inward for up to 25 km (running parallel to the Powerline from Ruacana). Results presented in Figure 9 partly reflect these changes, as the community remained strongly opposed to that shifting of the borders in the 1960s. There is also a significant overlap between the sparsely inhabited areas of Uukwaluudhi (Figure 11) and Ongandjera, known in local dialects as okuti.

![Figure 9: Area under the Ongandjera Traditional Authority](image)

4.2.6 Ombalantu

A full-house of the Ombalantu council was met at their office. Although they initially met for unrelated matters, Chief Mukulu attached value to the exercise and invited the council to accord the mapping team the necessary assistance. Given that much of Ombalantu area is relatively populated, no significant border overlap emerged between them and neighboring communities. Their borders to the east could not be evaluated against those of their neighbors, however, since no mapping from that community was carried out (see sections 4.2.3 and 4.2.4). The resultant borders are captured in Figure 10.
4.2.7 Uukwaluudhi

The meeting with the Uukwaluudhi Traditional Authority took place at the residence of King Josia Shikongo Taapopi. The council was in session, thus most of its members were in attendance. The defined boundaries are shown in Figure 11. In addition to a significant overlap with the Ongandjera area (section 4.2.5), there appears to be border disagreement with a community from the area of Kaoko. The extent of that overlap could not be spatially determined, however, as the neighboring community or communities showed reservations in taking part in the exercise (sections 4.8.3 and 4.8.4).

4.2.8 Uukolonkadhi

The council was met at their office. The mapping exercise took place rather swiftly and the results are presented in Figure 12. As mentioned in section 4.2, the borders at sparsely populated areas proved rather imprecise for lack of unambiguous, distinguishing features and remoteness of the areas. A similar challenge took place in the extreme northwest of this community.

Figure 10: Area under the Ombalantu Traditional Authority
Figure 11: Area under the Uukwaluudhi Traditional Authority

Figure 12: Area under the Uukolonkadhi Traditional Authority
4.3 Caprivi Traditional Authorities

Caprivi has a total of four (4) officially recognized traditional authorities. From east to west, they are Masubia, Mafwe, Mayeyi and Mashi. All were visited and results from each individual community are detailed in subsequent sections.

4.3.1 Masubia

The traditional authority of the Masubia was met at their office. Following a briefing on the purpose of the mapping exercise, the council deemed it necessary to consult with Munitenge Maiba Kisco Liswani III, who was at his nearby residence. The consultation session with Munitenge took place in the absence of the mapping team. Some two hours later, the mapping team was presented with a copy of a document written by the Post Commander at Schuckmannsburg directed to the Secretary for SWA in July 1930.

The content of the letter (Appendix I), deals with the boundary between the areas of Chief Chikamatondo and Chief Mamili. Specifically, it enquires for the record in Windhoek indicating location of where the borders between the two communities start along the Zambezi River as there were varying locations given by each community.

This copy, according to the chairperson of the council, was the ultimate response to the intended mapping of the area under their jurisdiction. Consequently, no mapping took place for the Masubia Traditional Authority.

4.3.2 Mafwe

Like with the Masubia, the briefing of the meeting at the Mafwe Traditional Authority took place at the office in the absence of Litunga George Simasiku Mamili. In the same way, the council decided that the Chief be consulted in this regard. In no time, the meeting was then shifted to the Chief’s residence and continued under his guidance.

The council felt this exercise was long overdue and that considerable adversities have already taken place due to the absence of authoritative borders between traditional authorities. Thus, they regarded this late response to such a need as rather acerbating the already deteriorated situation in the region.

The Mafwe articulated that what turned the situation from bad to worse on land issues in the Caprivi is the call made by government for some communities to establish independent traditional authorities. Cases in point are those of the Mayeyi and Mashi, who, prior to independence, have been integral districts of the Mafwe Traditional Authority. With the approval from Government, these two communities established their power on a land under the influence of the Mafwe. No consultation with the Mafwe was done in the process nor was the delineation of borders brought to a table for discussions. As a result, Mafwe set their borders to span all their pre-independence area of jurisdiction. In so doing, the only borders that they recognize between them and neighboring communities are those with the Mbukushu in the west and Masubia in the east (Figure 13).
Another relevant matter is related to the border around Bukalo. This area was mentioned to belong to the Mafwe, though presently administered by the Masubia. It was given to the Masubia in 1969 as a relief measure following recurring floods that hit their area annually. The agreement set at the time was to regard Bukalo channel as the western-most area that they could use. That portion of the land was also added to the map shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13: Area under the Mafwe Traditional Authority. The eastern portion (in black shade) was given to the Masubia Traditional Authority in 1969 due to recurrent flooding of their area.

4.3.3 Mayeyi

The Mayeyi Traditional Authority was met at their office. Shikati Boniface Shufu, a few senior headmen, and the secretary led the mapping exercise. Figure 14 depicts the results obtained.

Not surprisingly, on the basis of the content in section 4.3.2, the Mayeyi area overlaps with that of the Mafwe. The extent goes as far as Lusu to the east. Significant overlaps with the Mashi to the north were also noted.
Figure 14: Area under the Mayeyi Traditional Authority

Figure 15: Area under the Mashi Traditional Authority
4.3.4 Mashi

Like the Mayeye, the meeting with the Mashi Traditional Authority held at their office. More than 20 members, including Litunga Joseph Tembwe Mayuni, were in attendance. They were complemented by their representative to the Land Board as well as the secretary. Figure 15 captures the area that was delineated with the community.

Having set the middle of the Kavango River defining their borders to the west, more than 50% of the Mashi’s area overlaps with their western neighbor, the Mbukushu. Thus, both communities claim ownership of Bwabwata. As mentioned in section 4.3.2 the very same area marked by the Mashe community, was also included in the area for the Mafwe. Besides, up to 20 km of border overlaps exist with the Mayeye authority to the south and south-east.

4.4 Damara Traditional Authorities

Five (5) recognized traditional authorities are lumped under the Damara heading. They reside in the regions of Omaheke, Khomas, Erongo and Kunene. All five were visited and results are presented below.

4.4.1 !Gobanin Traditional Authority

This community is settled in the Omaheke Region. Chief Gariseb Stafanus, two senior councils and one additional member attended the meeting at Otjinene.

Figure 16: Area under the !Gobanin Traditional Authority
Chief Stefanus acknowledged that the borders between his community and the Maharero are rather ill-defined. The mapping exercise has nevertheless resulted in a map shown in Figure 16.

4.4.2 /Khomanin Traditional Authority

Chief Gawa-Nab Josophat leads a profusely bleeding community. The /Khomanin community turned out to be the only one amongst the Damara that has no communal land. Met at his residence in Windhoek, along with three senior traditional councilors, Mr. Dawid Hansen, Mr. Daniel !Uri-!kho and Mrs. Juliane Gawanas, they anguishly gave a synopsis of how the Odendaal commission left them with no land of their own.

Originally, they occupied the !Aa-!Aexas area, now centered on today’s Daan Viljoen. The result of the Odendaal commission witnessed a scattered community. Some took refuge in Okombahe under Chief Goaseb, in Kunene under Chief Gariseb, and Otjimbingwe under Chief Haraseb. The rest became farm laborers, or moved to Windhoek. Chief Gawa-Nab Josophat himself moved to Windhoek, back in the 1960s. Ever since, the community remained scattered across the country, having their land being parceled into either state land, in the form of Daan Viljoen, or commercial farms.

![Figure 17: Resettlement farms on which some of the !Gobanin community members are accommodated, in the absence of a communal land of their own.](image)

With the onset of political independence, their plight in claiming their land back still remained a dream. Latter, the resettlement program of the government resolved to attend to the need of this community. Big in number as they are, however, so far they are resettled over 12 farms, scattered in the Khomas region. Figure 17 merely presents the farms over which a
small segment of this population is being resettled. In that respect, the mapping of this exercise acted as an unpleasant reminder to their dire situation. It is thus the hope of this community that their land reverts back to them in their lifetime, especially for the now aging Chief who witnessed the bitter relocation from his own area that was once under his authority as an agile leader.

4.4.3 !Oe#gan Traditional Authority

Chief #Nu-axa !Gáseb was met at his Windhoek residence. With the assistance of a historical document detailing the partitioning of former Damaraland into wards, he meticulously called off areas that are under his jurisdiction. The results are captured in Figure 18.

![Figure 18: Area under the !Oe#gan Traditional Authority](image)

4.4.4 Tsoaxudaman Traditional Authority

With their power-base centered on Otjimbingue, the Tsoaxudaman Traditional Authority was met at their office. The only concern they have regarding their borders is related to some of the landless !Gobanin (section 4.4.2), who were resettled into two of the farms under their control. The farms were bought by Government in 1993 for emergency grazing reserved for the Tsoaxudamans. In the following year, the !Gobanins moved in. In the view of the Tsoaxudamans, the occupation of this farms by the !Gobanins spells border dispute. Figure 19 depicts the area under the Tsoaxudaman Traditional Authority.
Figure 19: Area under the Tsoaxudaman Traditional Authority

Figure 20: Area under the !Gaiodaman Traditional Authority
4.4.5 !Gaiodaman Traditional Authority

Chief Haraseb of the !Gaiodaman community was intercepted in Windhoek. He came to town for official duty. Like in the case of the !Oe#gan (section 4.4.3), Chief Haraseb consulted a historical document detailing the division of former Damaraland into wards. Three notable overlaps with their Swartbooi neighbors (section 4.5.1) occurred, however. The farms 677, Noute and Ruspoort are claimed by both traditional authorities. The net result is presented in Figure 20.

4.5 Nama Traditional Authorities

According to the Terms of References of this project, fieldwork to the southern part of the country, where most of the authorities under this grouping reside, was not necessary. With the exception of the Topnaar and the Swartbooi, mapping of the rest of the Nama Traditional Authorities were made possible using the archive data. The results are presented in Figure 21.

Figure 21: Area under the Nama Traditional Authority as extracted from historical records (Modified from Mendelsohn et al., 2002). Note that there are nine (9) recognized traditional authorities under the Nama grouping. Two of them are mapped separately in Figures 21 and 22.

4.5.1 Topnaar Traditional Authority

The Topnaar community resides in the Namib Naukluft Park. The visit with the Chief culminated into Figure 22. A concern related to their southern borders was raised during the
meeting. Though the Kuiseb Valley forms part of the current borders to the south, historically, the borders run some 10 km parallel to the river, from its southern bank. Figure 22 shows the borders in its current form.

Figure 22: Area under the Topnaar Traditional Authority

4.5.2 Swartbooi Traditional Authority

The Swartbooi community is centered on Fransfontein, southern Kunene. Vice Captain, Uirab, took the lead in this exercise at the instructions of Captain Luiperd, who was away for official duty in Keetmanshoop. In consultation with a handwritten map, several farms were identified as constituting their borders (Figure 23). As highlighted in section 4.4.5 the farms 677, Noute and Ruspoort to the north are also claimed by the !Gaidaman Traditional Authority.
4.6 Tswana / Kalahari Traditional Authorities

This group of authority comprises the Batswana ba Namibia and the Bakglagadi. Each one was visited accordingly. Their respective outcomes are outlined below.

4.6.1 Batswana ba Namibia Traditional Authority

Kgosi-kgolo Constans Letang Kgosimang was met at Gobabis. He gave a brief historical account on the Aminuis area, where part of his community resides. Initially, the Batswana lived in southern Aminuis. It was that area, over which his father had control. The rest of Aminuis was shared amongst the San, Mbanderu, Herero and Bakglagadi. Such an arrangement has now been dissolved to the extent that mingling of communities within Aminuis is a norm.

The increased population of the Batswana led Chief Kgosimang to acquire additional land through the former second-tier government. That acquisition of land resulted in a total of nine (9) farms. In addition to the area south of the town of Aminuis, these farms are currently under his authority (Figure 24).

As mentioned earlier, there are five different communities sharing the Aminuis area. Whereas individuals live relatively in harmony with each others, the area of Aminuis is characterized by serious land ownership contests amongst the existing traditional authorities. Chief Kgosimang is thus of the opinion that dividing the land into exclusive zones for each traditional authority be prioritized by Government. Under the suggested setup, individuals,
regardless of which community they might belong, would still exercise freedom of movement within the area.

Figure 24: Area under the Batswana ba Namibia Traditional Authority

Figure 25: Area under the Bakglagadi Traditional Authority
4.6.2 Bakgalagadi Traditional Authority

The traditional authority of the Bakgalagadi was met at their office. Kgoshi Hubert Tidimalo Ditshabue was joined by seven members of the council. While acknowledging the existence of other traditional authorities in the area, they considered themselves as the main custodian of Aminuis, inclusive of the Corridor. In their view, major land issues that marred Aminuis could be resolved with a formal recognition of a supreme traditional authority in the area. As depicted in Figure 25, Aminuis was subsequently mapped as the area under the Bakgalagadi Traditional Authority.

4.7 Mbanderu Traditional Authority

Representative of this community was met at their office. They were met, however, at the unfortunate time when the community was battling the succession issue, following the passing away of Chief Nguvaupa Munjuku II. In a nutshell, the communal land to the north of Omaheke is exclusively under their authority. Between them and the Maharero community, their boundaries follow the constituency boundaries. This led to considerable overlap with their neighbors north of Omuramba Otjinoko. Their arm of power also extends to Aminuis, Otjombinde, Eiseb, and an unidentified area in Kaoko. Except for the latter, all other areas are included in Figure 26.
4.8 Herero Traditional Authorities

There are five (5) communities that constitute the Herero Traditional Authorities. They are Kambazembi, Zeraua, Otjikaoko, Vita, and Maharero. All were visited and the findings are presented below.

4.8.1 Kambazembi Traditional Authority

The residence of Chief Kambazembi was the seat of the meeting. More than 10 council members, including their representative in the Land Board, were in attendance. The purpose of the meeting was immediately introduced. The council, however, felt it necessary that they needed time to discuss the matter in the absence of the mapping team. An hour or so later, the mapping team was invited back to the meeting.

Although emphasis was placed on defining contemporary area that falls under their authority, the community insisted that the mapping should concentrate on the historical land in Namibia (their area extended into Botswana) that was under their domination. To resolve the impasse, two separate areas were thus suggested, one covering the historical land and the other, reflecting the current situation (Figure 27).

Figure 27: Area under the Kambazembi Traditional Authority. Note that the area in light-grey was added to reminisce on the historical area that was under their authority, which the community insisted that it should form part of the map. That historical land includes the core area (in dark-grey) currently under their authority.
4.8.2 Zeraua Traditional Authority

Zeraua Traditional Authority has their office located at Omatjete. During the visit, the mapping team was informed about their area that was taken away in the early 1960s under the ruse of combating foot and mouth disease. During that time, a fence running some 2 km into their land was erected. Upon completion, some 360,000 ha of land lied to the outside of their area. Assurance was made repeatedly that the erection of the fence was a temporary measure aimed at fighting the food and mouth disease. Ever since, the 360,000 ha was incorporated into the bordering commercial farms. The map presented in Figure 28 reflects the general location of the eastern borders prior to the erection of that fence.

Figure 28: Area under the Zeraua Traditional Authority

4.8.3 Otjikaoko Traditional Authority

The Otjikaoko Traditional Authority was met at the office of the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement at Opuwo. Chief Paulus Tjavara, along with a large delegation, was in attendance. This community opted to save for the future the mapping of the area under their authority for a multitude of practical reasons.

Cardinal amongst these reasons is the fact that the land in their region is essentially “interlinked”, primarily as a consequence of their pastoral lifestyle. Since their movement in the region is dictated by prevailing climatic conditions and environmental factors, the authority over the land is fairly elusive, especially in the outlying areas. This does not necessarily imply that there are no surveyed borders between them and their neighbors. They cited the Uukwaluudhi community as an example of their neighbors that trespasses over the
area of Okao. Intra-borders, i.e. within Okao, are what they were reluctant to discuss. The motive rests in the unresolved matters within the wider community, particularly the differential, official recognition of some traditional leaders at the expense of others.

Presently, there are only two traditional leaders that are officially recognized by the government. For either one of these leaders to meet privately with the mapping team, therefore, they fear that it would create the impression that recognized leaders have gone as far as dividing the land of Okao between themselves. Such a turn of event would thus fuel disharmony in the region. The suggestion is therefore to consult all existing leaders in the region, regardless of their recognition status, and map out their respective areas of influence in an open manner. Ideally, however, the recognition of all traditional leaders in the region should precede the mapping assignment.

### 4.8.4 Vita Traditional Authority

The meeting between the mapping team and Vita Traditional Authority took place at Kaoko-Tavi. More than 20 individuals attended the meeting. In the absence of the Chief, a senior headman acted on his behalf. Representative of this community echoed similar sentiments as the Otjikaoko detailed in section 4.8.3. In addition, they requested a copy of a map showing the borders of Kaoko as defined before independence. The intention is to use the map and prepare themselves for future mapping.

### 4.8.5 Maharero Traditional Authority

Considered themselves as the root of all Herero Traditional Authorities, the Maharero Council was met at their office for this project. Chief Alfons Maharero was accompanied by nine (9) senior members of the council.

![Figure 29: Area under the Maharero Traditional Authority](image-url)
The core area of Otjinene was mapped to fall exclusively under the Maharero authority. An enclave situated to the north-west was set aside for the !Gobanin community. However, an area located between east of the Epukiro Constituency boundary and north of Omuramba Otjonoko has been also claimed by the Mbanderu community (section 4.7). Eiseb, Otjombinde and Aminuis were also added to the map, on the basis of their representatives that are located there and exercise power along with other traditional authorities, with whom they share the land. Figure 29 graphically summarizes these areas.

4.9 San Traditional Authorities

Three recognized traditional authorities feature under this umbrella. Ju/'hoan and !Kung are in the Otjozondjupa Region, whereas the office of the Hai-/om is situated in the Kunene Region.

4.9.1 Ju/'hoan Traditional Authority

Chief Tsamkxao #Oma was met at Tsunkwe. The borders that resulted from the meeting are shown in Figure 30.

Figure 30: Area under the Ju/'hoan Traditional Authority
4.9.2 !Kung Traditional Authority

In the absence of Chief Arnold, a senior councilor assisted the mapping team at the office of the !Kung Traditional Authority. Like the borders of the Ju/'hoan, this community turned out to have less issues pertaining to their area of jurisdiction. Result is presented in Figure 31.

![Figure 31: Area under the !Kung Traditional Authority](image)

4.9.3 Hai-//om Traditional Authority

Like the !Khomanin community (section 4.4.2), the Hai-//om followed a similar fate of being landless. Their settlements were historically centered on the Etosha National Park. Following their removal from the park, most of them moved into commercial farms, Outjo, Oshivelo, and Tsintsabis. Some remained in the park. Gaob Khamuxab lives in Outjo, where he was met along with a number of his council members.

Presently, there are “one and half” farms (Figure 32) in the vicinity of Etosha where some of his subjects are being resettled. Approximately 45 000 ha of land in the vicinity of Etosha National Park is currently under discussions. The intention is to set it aside for the Hai-//om community. In their quest for a communal land, they uncompromisingly curved out an area on the map, essentially characterizing their deep seated ideal situation. Along with the “one and half” farms that some of their community members occupy, the curved area is included in Figure 32.
Figure 3: Resettlement Farms on which some of the Hai-/om community members are accommodated, in the absence of a communal land of their own. The light grey color represents an area ideally under their control.

4. (b) Land board Areas

With the exception of the Khomas, all regions have land boards. In essence, these land boards are composed of officially recognized traditional authorities. In alphabetical orders, land boards for each region, except for Hardap and Karas, are presented below.

4.10 Caprivi

The area for the Caprivi Land board is presented in Figure 33. It comprises four traditional authorities, namely the Masubia, Mafwe, Mayeyi, and Mashi.
Erongo has four (4) recognized traditional authorities. They include the !Oe#gan, Tsoaxudaman, Topnaar, and Zeraua. The area they collectively represent is shown in Figure 34.

Figure 33: Caprivi Land board Area

Figure 34: Erongo Land board Area
4.12 Kavango

The combined areas of the Mbukushu, Gciku, Sambyu, M bunza, and Kwangali form the boundaries for the Kavango Land board (Figure 35).

Figure 35: Kavango Land board Area

4.13 Kunene

Although Kunene has five (5) recognized traditional authorities, Figure 36 presents only the area collectively occupied by the Swartbooi, !Gaiodaman, and the Hai-#om communities. As outlined in sections 4.8.3 and 4.8.4, the areas for the Otjikaoko and Vita traditional authorities were not mapped, thus excluded from Figure 36.

4.14 Ohangwena

O hangwena Land board is made up by a single traditional authority. However, the map presented in Figure 37 is incomplete. This is due to the open-ended western borders of the Oukwanyama Traditional Authority, discussed in section 4.2.2.
Figure 36: Kunene Landboard Area (incomplete)

Figure 37: Ohangwena Landboard Area (incomplete; refer to text)
4.15 Omaheke

The Land board area (*Figure 38*) for the Omaheke region resulted from a combination of five (5) traditional authorities. These authorities are the Maharero, !Gobanin, Mbanderu, Batswana and the Bakglagadi.

![Figure 38: Omaheke Land board Area](image)

**Figure 38: Omaheke Land board Area**

4.16 Omusati

There are a total of five (5) traditional authorities, namely Uukolonkadhi, Uukwaluudhi, Ombalantu, Ongandjera, and Okalongo, in the Omusati Region. The borders of all but Okalongo, contributed to the content of *Figure 39*, to denote the area of the Omusati Land board. Okalongo was not mapped as described in *section 4.2.4*.
4.17 Oshana

The area for Oshana Land board coincides with the Uukwambi Traditional Authority. About half of the Uukwambi area falls in the Omusati Region, as revealed in Figure 40.

Figure 39: Omusati Land board Area (incomplete)

Figure 40: Oshana Land board Area
4.18 Oshikoto

Like Oshana and Ohangwena, Oshikoto consists of a solitary traditional authority that constitutes its Land board area (*Figure 41*). Ondonga, cutting across three political regions of Oshana, Ohangwena and Oshikoto, is that traditional authority.

*Figure 41: Oshikoto Land board Area*

4.19 Otjozondjupa

Kambazembi, Ju/'hoan and !Kung are the officially recognized traditional authorities that constitute Otjozondjupa Land board area. The total area covered by these three traditional authorities is shown in *Figure 42.*
5. Conclusions

At the time when this study was planned, there were a total of 42 officially recognized traditional authorities in Namibia. Approximately 83% (n=35) of them were visited for this mapping exercise. Okalongo, Otjikaoko, Vita and Masubiya were the only traditional authorities visited, but opted not to take part in the mapping exercise for various reasons. Seven (7) of the traditional authorities that were not visited are located in the southern half of the country. The terms of reference limited a visit to that part of the nation.
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Appendix I

a) Copy of a letter from the Masubia Traditional Authority presented as a response to the mapping exercise.

[Page with text]
b) Copy of a map presented by the M bunza Traditional Authority
c) Copy of a tribal levy collection list from the Mafwe Traditional Authority testifying districts under their control by 1990.

TRIBAL LEVY TOUR 1990

1. Ku kupiwa ma Induma Silalo kuli ba ikopanye ni batu ba bona ku libelela ba telisi ka lizazi leli tosilwe.

2. It is requested of the Silalo Indunas to advise their people to wait for tribal levy collectors on the set dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waya Waya</td>
<td>13/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasheshie</td>
<td>14/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachinga</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaenda</td>
<td>15/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikubi</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaiyangale</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikosinyana</td>
<td>16/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makangwa</td>
<td>17/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasida</td>
<td>20/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachona</td>
<td>21/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singalawwe</td>
<td>22/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisheke</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kengola</td>
<td>23/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chol</td>
<td>24/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngonga</td>
<td>27/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liumuli</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyanshulu</td>
<td>28/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saowo</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songwai</td>
<td>29/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malengaleng</td>
<td>30/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batubaja</td>
<td>31/08/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopani</td>
<td>03/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linyanti</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muketela</td>
<td>04/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinchinani</td>
<td>04/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanono</td>
<td>05/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonu</td>
<td>06/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawoza</td>
<td>07/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masokotwani</td>
<td>10/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machita</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kweza</td>
<td>11-12/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikishabuka</td>
<td>13/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyako</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubiza</td>
<td>14/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisikili</td>
<td>17/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namalubi</td>
<td>18/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imukusi</td>
<td>19/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunkwe</td>
<td>20/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liselo</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msfuta</td>
<td>21/09/90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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