



OBSERVATIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF STAKEHOLDER RELATIONS AT SOUTH AFRICA'S FIRST WORLD HERITAGE SITE - THE ISIMANGALISO WETLAND PARK AUTHORITY: SOME HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES IN RELATIONSHIP TO DEVELOPMENT AND THE AGRARIAN CRISIS IN NORTHERN KWA ZULU NATAL

Anis Mahomed Karodia (PhD)

Professor, Senior Academic and Researcher,

Regent Business School, Durban, Republic of South Africa

Former Interim Chief Executive Officer (ICEO) of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority, St Lucia, Kwa Zulu Natal Province, Republic of South Africa.

Email: akarodia@regent.ac.za

Note:

The researcher served for a period of eleven months as ICEO. The tenure is rounded off to a twelve month period.

PART ONE OF THE PAPER

PREAMBLE:

The observations and experiences of stakeholder relations at the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority, with its headquarters at the small town of St Lucia, South Africa's first World Heritage Site, in the Province of Kwa Zulu Natal of the Republic is discussed in this paper, in an historical perspective. This narrative is important because observation, active surveillance by the author as Interim Chief Executive Officer (ICEO) and, gleaned experiences over a one year period revealed that, there has and had not been any research conducted at the Park itself, by the Park Authorities or its staff, since the inception of the World Heritage Site, in 2009. This in an indictment to the Park Authorities and, it's so – called research unit. Since the Parks inception, it has to be stated with conviction that, the National Department of Environmental Affairs and the iSimangaliso Board together with the former management of the Wetland Parks Authority, has contributed to a lack of focus in respect of iSimangaliso's strategic plan and objectives, including the lack of a coordinated, sustained monitoring and evaluation process of this premier World Heritage Site and has therefore, also contributed significantly to the collapse of stakeholder relationships since the inception of the Wetland Park Authority, for more than two decades.

Research by the organization into various important facets of conservation which is its main brief, including tourism development, selling the park to local and international audiences as a prime tourist destination, the development of local communities through the enhancement of agricultural development, in order to deal decisively with abject poverty in this area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal, coupled with poor stakeholder relations has never been and had never been, a strategic policy imperative of the Wetland Park Authority nor, has it been an imperative of the National Department of Environmental Affairs, under whose jurisdiction the World Heritage Site falls. It is also important because this paper is perhaps, the first research paper formulated on stakeholder relations within the Park from the aspect that, the author / researcher was appointed as the Interim Chief Executive Officer (ICEO) from September 2017 to August 2018 by the late Minister of Environmental Affairs of the Republic of South Africa.

The appointment of the ICEO was undertaken because of management problems encountered in relationship to poor stakeholder relationships and other salient management difficulties and challenges. During the one year period of the researcher's sojourn as ICEO, he was confronted with many problems and challenges, in trying to transform and restructure the organization afresh, after the exit of the former CEO and the Director of Business Development. They technically had an ongoing acrimonious relationship with many of the Amakhosi (Tribal Chiefs) and communities surrounding the Park, in terms of consolidating and enhancing development through the processes of stakeholder relationships (This was confirmed by staff and a host of stakeholders in 2017 – 2018 and, was also revealed in staff one – on – one interviews and two audit

reports). It has to be placed on record that there was an overt and unnecessary allegiance to the old order by particularly white staff and some African or black staff. This allegiance was misguided and in many ways made the task of the ICEO, during his one year tenure, all the more difficult, in terms of turning around the organization during this period of necessary transition and transformation, which was decidedly necessary because of the entrenchment of the former management for more than two decades and since the promulgation of the World Heritage Site.

Stakeholder relations was at a low ebb for a protracted period of time and therefore, a process had and has been engineered over the period of the tenure of the ICEO, in order to deal with this vexing issue, in order to restore stakeholder relationships. However, it is also acknowledged that trust and a working relationship with different formations - the Amakhosi and their communities had broken down to a point of no return. The Amakhosi and the different communities including the organization of Land Claimants, brought pressure upon the national and local politicians to replace the former CEO because of the acrimonious and protracted breakdown of a working relationship with the former CEO and, some staff of the Wetland Park Authority. It must also be acknowledged that the Amakhosi wield tremendous power including the political outcomes in this area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal. Functionaries within municipalities, government departments, Non – Governmental Organizations (NGO'S) and the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority have to tread cautiously in their engagement with the Amakhosi and their communities in daily dealings with them, or bear the consequences to their own peril.

The narrative and discussion is therefore couched in an historical perspective for obvious reasons and, for the purposes of documenting certain salient features and perspectives in respect of agriculture and development discourse, and in the context of the vital importance of stakeholder relations to the very survival of the Park. The author acknowledges and is very mindful that, not all issues that affect stakeholder relations, can and could have been exhausted in the period of the ICEO's tenure and engagement. Nevertheless, a concerted effort will be made and has been made in this paper to delineate some crucial issues and areas of concern, in relationship to stakeholder relations and, issues that permeate and involve development in general and exemplifying the importance of the agrarian crisis in this area and its importance to general development.

IMPORTANT NOTES:

1. It has to be placed on record that this research paper was initially crystallized in discussions with the Chairperson of the Board at the iSimangaliso headquarters in St. Lucia in 2018 and that, express verbal permission was granted by him to the author, to write on stakeholder relations at the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority and, to capture other relevant issues because, the Interim CEO is essentially a researcher and academic who works at the Regent Business School in the Port City of Durban. The Chairperson indicated in no uncertain terms that, the research paper and narrative be written by the ICEO as an historical document for the organization (iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority).
2. The initial draft manuscript was forwarded to the Chairperson of the Board in comprehensive form. The Chairperson in turn circulated it to the Deputy Chairperson of the Board and he indicated that, she will look at the document and respond in respect to the content. He was also requested to circulate the manuscript to all Board Members.
3. No objections or comments were received from any Board Member in respect of the contents of the manuscript or for that matter from the Department of Environmental Affairs or from any staff member that received the research manuscript. As such the paper and its contents were accepted by all parties and individuals that received the initial manuscript in draft form and, it was at that time an internal document that was not intended for outside circulation or publication until comments were received. In the absence of comments from any quarter until October 2018, a lag period of almost six months, the author found it expedient and necessary to publish the paper / monograph in an international peer reviewed journal.
4. After editing the initial document and adding some new content, the manuscript was finalized and published in December 2018 in the Arabian Journal of Business Management (Oman Chapter) in the month of December 2018, Volume 7. No.4 with ISSN No. 2617 – 3190.
5. The researcher thanks the management of the Regent Business School for allowing him absence of leave to serve as the Interim Chief Executive Officer (ICEO) of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authorities World Heritage Site. It was a singular honour for the Regent Business School that one of its staff members was called upon to serve the nation in this important position given that, the Interim CEO was a distinguished public servant in South Africa for nearly forty years.
6. Due to the length of the manuscript, the paper is split into three separate research papers for publication purposes as part one, part two and part three The title of all three papers will remain the same.

7. Note that a composite and comprehensive bibliography to all three parts or papers will be provided at the end of paper three or part three.
8. The author / researcher places on record that, the mistakes and assumptions made in this paper are his sole responsibility, and registers that any mistakes and statements made in the narrative, if any, were totally unavoidable and that, the content within the narrative is his sole responsibility, and if any adverse statements are made, they are not meant to impinge upon the integrity of any individual past or present associated with iSimangaliso or upon the integrity of any member of staff (past or present) or any members of the iSimangaliso Board or any member of the National Department of Environmental Affairs.
9. That in papers of this nature, often times the subjective predilections' of the author may come to the fore. This is and was totally unavoidable.
10. The paper is written capturing an important part of the history of the Wetland Park Authority and, in some ways is a path breaking document in terms of research imperatives, stakeholder relations and other important issues, including issues about the iSimangaliso Board in relationship to good governance and accountability. It must be realized that this research narrative, as concerns the World Heritage Site, gives credence to the importance of research which was and is a neglected academic facet within the organization.
11. If any individual or organization have opposing views to the content of this research paper they, reserve the right of a published rebuttal in any journal of their choice, to air their opposing views to the content of this narrative.
12. The paper is written without prejudice to any individual or organization but, is written on the basis of enhancing research imperatives to advance academic and intellectual debate and discussion in the context of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority.
13. It is written as a research monograph.

ABSTRACT

The paper attempts to capture the role and limits in implementing, a set of reforms directed at the contradictions of uneven development, with reference to stakeholder relationships within the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority, which was declared a World Heritage Site in 2009, in terms of the relevant protocols and, under which the Wetland Park Authority was established, under the auspices of South Africa's National Department of Environmental Affairs, the World Heritage Council's mandates and, other applicable legislation.

Stakeholder relations within the Park and, its surrounds cannot be divorced from the land question and therefore, the agrarian crisis is, and was characterized in its objective and subjective dimensions, in terms of the sharply uneven development among the rural power base and, in terms of rural poverty and political tensions in this area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal Province. Amidst a host of other issues that encompass the title of the paper, special emphasis will be paid to stakeholder relations as it pertains to the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority and, stakeholder relationships in general.

It is not possible to encompass all of the subtle nuances of the problems, challenges and successes of the World Heritage Site as a Wetland Park Authority, in a paper of this nature. It is hoped that other staff members will conduct and undertake further research on stakeholder relations and, other areas of scientific, social and development relevance, including tourism enhancement, good governance and accountability including a host of other issues that directly affect the Park. Research at the Park has hitherto being limited to outside organizations, independent researchers, universities and students pursuing their own research for various purposes. The involvement of the iSimangaliso Research Unit is limited to very rudimentary administrative issues and not to classical research. The research unit only facilitates access of researchers to the Park and vets the research proposals. The research unit has no trained researchers or for that matter any trained or relevant staff that can conduct research to enhance the research imperatives of the Park. After nearly 20 years of the Parks existence, this state of affairs is an indictment to the imperatives of the Park.

The issue of outsourcing its principal function of conservation to the provincial parks authority in the form of Ezemvelo has been short sighted because Ezemvelo, the provincial arm of the Department of Economic Development, has a myriad of its own challenges and problems. This arrangement can sooner or later collapse and threaten the very survival of the Park, which can lose its World Heritage status and thus damage the international reputation of South Africa and, it's National Department of Environmental Affairs. Observation reveals that it points to the reality that, at the time of promulgating iSimangaliso as a World Heritage Site, the strategies employed were short sighted and, the author asserts confidently that, there has been no oversight, and monitoring and that evaluation has not been afforded by the National Department of Environmental Affairs. By the same token successive iSimangaliso Boards have been incapable of leading the organization

into an era of strategic focus, and some board members have been appointed without the necessary qualifications and expertise to take the organization forward and often times get involved in operational issues which is not its or their mandate. It is also placed on record that some Board members are highly academically qualified with mammoth experience and possess the necessary experience and abilities to steer the Board into the required direction. However, the ICEO did not visibly encounter the necessary stewardship and leadership by many Board Members. This is a very serious downside and must be addressed by the Minister. The paper also argues that the Park should be involved in the modalities of generating greater income outside government revenue, in order to become more self – sufficient and sustainable over time.

Of cardinal and pivotal importance will be the defining of stakeholders because stakeholders cannot only be confined to the Amakhosi and their communities but, must also embrace a host of other stakeholders that engage with the Park authorities. There also has to be a more sustained and coordinated dialogue with the National Departments, in the form of Environmental Affairs, Cooperative Governance, Public Works, Housing or Human Settlements, Land Affairs and other interested parties and NGO's that are involved in development issues. This must also be extended to all relevant provincial departments and municipalities within the area.

It is posited that these formations and government departments need to work together, to avoid duplication of effort and resources, in order to bring about meaningful and acceptable development of the people, given the high unemployment, the seas of poverty and the rising inequality. The time has now arrived for a total onslaught and, a frontal attack on consolidating and enhancing stakeholder relations, in order to deal with the manifest problems that confront all of the people living in this area. To this end iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority can and must play a leadership role in all facets of development, in and around the Park within the confines of the budget allocated to it by its National mother department – Environmental Affairs.

KEYWORDS: Stakeholders; Relationships; Uneven Development; Land Reform; Agriculture; Economy; Rural Periphery; Historical; Conservation; Tourism; Amakhosi (Tribal Chiefs); Dysfunctional; Communities; Municipalities.

1. SOME PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS TO SITUATE THE PAPER

An urgent need exists and existed for a unifying framework that, is sufficiently comprehensive to explain the fact of underdevelopment, and yet simple enough to provide a set of guidelines that can and could be more specific in historical, geographical and ideological contexts, to serve as a basis for policy formulation and political action, to address the salient and vexing issues that affect the numerous communities and their Amakhosi (Tribal Chiefs), in terms of the land question in the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority area, within and outside the Park and, in this region of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal, of the Republic of South Africa. There is no doubt that the declaration of the Park as a World Heritage Site meant that, the indigenous population were not adequately compensated by the democratic government, in terms of money but, more importantly were not given sufficient land for agricultural farming purposes. This has caused much anxiety and tensions, with the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority and, has also created a situation of antagonism and conflict. Stakeholder relations therefore, remains an issue not only for communities but, has a negative impact upon iSimangaliso that, now needs to incorporate stakeholder relations with great intensity and within its strategic mandates. The issue of stakeholder relations was at a very low ebb in the past and, this caused much tension and criticism of iSimangaliso and, finally led to the former CEO exiting the system due to political pressure from many quarters, especially from the Amakhosi and communities in general. In the recent past, since the Interim CEO took office, the strategic focus has and had shifted to a concentration on stakeholder engagement, particularly with the Amakhosi (Tribal Chiefs), the Land Claimant Trusts (It must be registered that there is some opposition to the Land Claimants trusts by various communities who indicate that the trusts, twelve of them, do not represent them and therefore are not democratically elected to represent them).

Of importance to stakeholder relations, it must be recorded that about twenty months ago, a high – level Department of Environmental (DEA) delegation made up of the Minister, the Director General, senior technocrats and bureaucrats met with the Amakhosi and communities and, in this regard the communities believe that, there has been no report back to them by the National Department, the Minister and the Director General of DEA (Department of Environmental Affairs). Isimangaliso managed to organize a high – level meeting with the National Departments bureaucrats and senior officials of DEA and other service delivery formations, at Richards Bay in February 2018 and, assisted in the preparation of the successes registered and outstanding issues that still needed to be addressed (The Director General of DEA who is the highest technocrat within DEA was not present at this meeting). iSimangaliso assisted in the preparation of the successes and outstanding issues that needed to be addressed (It has to be registered that there was and were, no real or significant inputs made by the Department of Land Affairs, the municipalities and other formations that are in – charge of service delivery components to

communities in this area. This is a major shortcoming and sets intervention strategies back - wards and therefore, there has to be an intervention strategy that needs to be put into place with the necessary accountable mechanisms by the government of South Africa, on the basis that many of the issues, tabled by communities fall outside the jurisdiction of the Wetland Park Authority.

The brief was being prepared by DEA for the Minister for purposes of report back to the Amakhosi and the different communities (To date – there has been no report back by the Minister and the Director General, since the initial meeting some twenty months ago and now some thirty months or more has elapsed. In many ways, this is a grave downside and does not help iSimangaliso to deal with a myriad of problematic issues). Facilitated by iSimangaliso as a stop gap measure, a meeting together with senior DEA officials was held with some Amakhosi and community representatives at Mbazwana in the North of the Park around July of 2018. This was considered a high level report back to some Amakhosi and community representatives by the National Department of Environmental Affairs. There were satisfied and unsatisfied stakeholders. The unsatisfied stakeholders insisted that they wanted the Minister to report back and did not want to be briefed by bureaucrats from DEA. This is a vexing issue that will compromise iSimangaliso in the long run, and therefore, requires the Department of Environmental Affairs and other government departments to intervene decisively.

Land reform and rural development programmes can be effective mechanisms in the creation of social articulation and mass based democratic regimes (Karodia, 2007: vii). Observations and experiences within and outside the Park confirms that, non – formal education, extension, training and agricultural development coupled with acceptable land restitution and distribution, after 25 years of South African democracy post 1994, must be pursued by a host of government departments and, cannot be left alone to iSimangaliso as an entity and therefore, conservation, agricultural development, tourism initiatives for the empowerment of rural communities must be pursued and coordinated in the interest of a more acceptable society. In dealing with this issue in terms of land restitution, the SABC on the 14th of October 2018 reported that “The President of South Africa handed over 4586 hectares of land with title deeds to communities in the Mkhwanasi area of Empangeni in Northern Kwa Zulu Natal. The communities were disposed of their land since 1915 and again in 1940 by the colonialists and the apartheid regime in order to grow cane and trees.” This move was long overdue in order to bring about redress and empower the locals and restore their dignity. Much more has to be done by government and, is an intervention strategy or action taken to deal with the populist rhetoric of the expropriation of land without compensation that mainly is targeting whites. It also throws down the gauntlet to the Ingonyama Trust Board (ITB) to begin negotiations with the government in respect of the nearly three million hectares held by the trust.

One of the main challenges and problems that confronts the Wetland Park Authority is the all – embracing reality that communities in and around the Park, consider iSimangaliso as a “mega municipality” which has been exacerbated by the dysfunctionality of the various municipalities in the area, including provincial and national government departments that, are unable to provide essential services to communities and are therefore, reliant upon the Park Authority to provide services, which technically fall outside the purview of its classical mandate as a conservation and tourist agency and, which, has to fulfill the mandates of the World Heritage Council. The issue becomes even more stark on the basis that the Wetland Authority has a small budget of R308 million (2018 / 2019); which has been pruned and cut by the National Treasury because of the fiscal downturn and the recent recession that confronts the country. This is further exacerbated by overt corruption in South Africa and, the dangerous facets of political patronage which must be combined with and, by the reality of a very high unemployment rate, high – levels of poverty and increasing inequality. If this is compared in monetary terms, much larger budgets are appropriated to municipalities in this region and, the larger budgets catered for other national and provincial departments. This situation compromises the Wetland Authority overtly and, sooner or later, it may not be able to deliver on its defined mandates in respect of conservation and tourism which is and should be, its primary function, in order to maintain its World Heritage status.

There are also rumours in many quarters that the Wetland Park is a small entity as a state – owned enterprise (SOE) and that, it should be absorbed and amalgamated with a larger state – owned entity. This is further given credence in terms of its plausibility on the basis that the conservation function presently and over the years has been delegated to Ezemvelo, which is in charge of provincial parks and falls under the Provincial Department of Economic Development. Given the budgetary constraints, it will not be possible at the moment for iSimangaliso to take over this function given the large amounts of money that will be required to absorb this vital function. The inherent danger as it now stands and, revealed by the possibilities of collapse of the provincial parks that faces very serious monetary constraints, could lead to the collapse of iSimangaliso’s conservation function and some infrastructure development projects that have been outsourced to Ezemvelo through specific arrangements. The plausibility of amalgamation into a larger SOE is strengthened by the fact that iSimangaliso has a staff

compliment of only thirty four people, which will change over the next five years if the new structure and organogram will be implemented. The new compliment will be in the region of plus / minus 78 staff members incorporating two wildlife veterinarians also but, the conservation function will remain delegated to Ezemvelo. The two wildlife veterinary posts were engineered by the ICEO in agreement with the National Department of Environmental Affairs. It is mind boggling that the Wetland Park Authority did not cater for these essential positions since its inception as a World Heritage Site dealing with an array of animals both wild and domestic. These veterinarians will also be of great assistance to the surrounding communities that farm with domestic animals.

The proposed larger structure of the organization will not alter the amalgamation of Isimangaliso into a larger SOE and could easily be absorbed. The new structure was formulated by the ICEO, Executives the Board and with assistance from DEA. Given the fiscal crisis that the country is experiencing it is unlikely that the structure will be put into place in a short period of time but, will be phased in over many years. By the same token, the ICEO managed to get the plans and designs for a corporate headquarters approved by the Board with the concurrence of DEA. This is a move in the correct direction and will cost in the region of R40 million and will be built over two years. The money was allocated from the infrastructure budget and at the time of the ICEO's departure the specifications were ready for tender purposes. It is hoped that the building of the corporate headquarters will go ahead as planned and that the goal – posts will not be moved or altered. If it is altered or moved, it will be a great setback for the organization and the sustained and coordinated efforts to realize this magnificent project will have come to naught.

Outsourcing or delegating the conservation function is a dangerous formulae and agreement that, can woefully go awry and compromise iSimangaliso in the future and, to the detriment of its World Heritage status (The problems being experienced by Ezemvelo will be discussed in detail later in the narrative). Even if the amalgamation rumours are true, it might be a move in the correct direction. However, the Department of Environmental Affairs and the government must apply their minds intellectually, professionally and in a coordinated manner considering the monetary aspects, in order to take correct decisions which must not be based on emotion but, has to take all variables into account from the perspective of not impinging upon iSimangaliso's World Heritage Site status but, more importantly from a budgetary perspective. The earlier it is done the better, because with time it will cost much more to implement. It will also bring about certainty and allay staff fears.

During the tenure of the ICEO a definite brief was given to both iSimangaliso and Ezemvelo to look at all the agreements from a legal perspective and to have continuous discussions. Many meetings were held in this regard with the necessary legal representatives of both institutions and, framework documents are being prepared to absorb the conservation function into iSimangaliso's structure, including the total costing of such an exercise to come to fruition, in order to present the outcomes to the National Department of Environmental Affairs, for consideration. A host of subtle variables are at play and therefore, an acceptable strategy must be worked out incorporating a phased approach with a view that iSimangaliso takes over the conservation function over time. The budgetary implications, vehicle costs, travel, housing and other variables must be worked out. This must be done to advise the Department of Environmental Affairs, in order to prepare for any eventuality in the long run and when amalgamation with a larger SOE might be an eventual scenario and possible outcome. Amalgamation will not cause much upheaval because only a few variables at the top level of the structure might be altered to accommodate these proposals, but for all intents and purposes not much will be changed and staff security must be guaranteed. It must also be recorded that the relationship with Ezemvelo had deteriorated to a point of no return for several years under the former management of the Park and was playing itself out in many negative ways. To the credit of the ICEO the relationship with Ezemvelo was restored and continuous meetings are now held with them in respect to development, tourism and conservation.

There are many stakeholders that engage with the Wetland Park Authority of iSimangaliso. The concentration in this narrative and discussion will therefore, be on the Amakhosi (Tribal Chiefs) as one of the most important stakeholders together with their respective communities. Observation and interaction with three important Amakhosi reveals that, there has been a concentration on the issues raised by them in the North of the Park. In many ways, this situation has been engineered in a bias manner by the Chairperson of the iSimangaliso Board and has compromised the Wetland Park Authority because, the Chairpersons approach has not been holistic in nature and, the strategic plan formulated by the Board in conjunction with the Executives in November of 2017, to incorporate stakeholder relations was engineered by him, in terms of his own subjective predilections, based on his own agenda and, was not a well thought out strategy to incorporate all stakeholders and communities. This has overtly compromised the Wetland Park Authority and, one shudders to think what the unfolding

consequences of this strategy will be for iSimangaliso because, much of the stakeholder demands fall outside the jurisdiction and ambit of the Wetland Park Authority.

For all intents and purposes the strategic plan of the organization must be looked at afresh for obvious reasons. Any new strategic plan technically must only be formulated after a period of eighteen months. This will allow for weighing the positives and negatives of the 2017 strategic plan and to make the necessary changes that will be required to reengineer a new strategic plan taking into consideration the variables that were excluded in 2017 and to take into consideration the structural problems that were encountered during the implementation of the 2017 strategic plan. The engineered concentration in the North has not been taken kindly by other Amakhosi and their communities because, there has and is an overt concentration on the Mbila community and other Amakhosi feel that they are being left out and marginalized.

Decidedly, in future, iSimangaliso needs to change its interaction strategy together with the Board, in order to cater for all Amakhosi and other important business stakeholders to foster a more acceptable and cohesive strategy for tourism initiatives and the importance of general development. The Board has hitherto been selective in its stakeholder approach. This must also be determined by the troublesome issues raised by these Amakhosi and, the organization therefore, needs to deal swiftly with the vexing concerns that disrupts the functioning of the organization. The organization under the ICEO's tenure places on record that this engagement is, and must not be totally selective in nature but, it must confront the realities and troublesome situations, to avoid confrontation and therefore, iSimangaliso's attempt must be geared to accommodate all defined stakeholders, without any let or hindrance. Therefore, the attempts to engage must be premised on building and enhancing stakeholder relations with all Amakhosi, their communities and, all concerned formations.

There are also twelve Land Trusts that represent Land Claimants and, continuous and coordinated meetings have been held with them. The Ingonyama Trust Board (ITB) is an important stakeholder in respect of land issues and technically represent His Majesty, the King of the Zulu nation. Land reform has been a slow process and during the ICEO's tenure the ITB was engaged but the process has been slow. In reality and technically speaking the government of South Africa should be engaging with the ITB and this must and cannot be left to iSimangaliso alone. This is important because, engaging with, the ITB has serious political implications that falls outside the purview of the Wetland Park Authority of iSimangaliso. The situation in the Province of Kwa Zulu Natal in respect to land is now volatile, given governments imperatives, and statements post the Ramaphosa presidency that, land be expropriated without compensation. This has fueled much expectation and rightfully so, on the part of the historically black marginalized population of South Africa, and the government is therefore, in a quagmire as to how to handle this issue. If not handled well and diplomatically, it can fuel violence and dampen the spirit of land reform, if the government does not tread cautiously. If the situation is not handled in a composite and equitable manner, it could have serious negative consequences and will impact negatively on an already compromised South African economy and, could drive away much needed foreign investment. This could dampen the spirit of economic revival and, will deepen the high unemployment situation that, is being experienced for more than a decade. At the same time, it has caused much anxiety, apprehension and tension among white land owners and, the white farming population of South Africa and, it has caused international condemnation and, is injuring the much needed foreign investment into South Africa because of policy inconsistency and exacerbated by populist rhetoric by almost all political parties including the African National Congress.

2. SOME IMPORTANT ISSUES IN RESPECT OF THE LAND QUESTION

There is no doubt that land reform remains one of South Africa's most pressing unresolved issues. It must be acknowledged by the democratic government that its attempts to address skewed ownership and economic participation patterns, the result of many years of exclusion and dispossession of black Africans in particular and other designated minorities have been unsuccessful since 1994. The government has now turned to possible changes to the Constitution to deal with these failures. In this regard "Young (2018: 16) states that "Public hearings on these possible changes have highlighted the importance of understanding identity and relationships between groups, not just economics or material wealth, for resolving these sensitive issues. The hearings show that fixing the problem of land reform is not as simple as dealing with legal necessities, or parceling out land to new owners." Young (2018) further adds that "Land reform involves issues of identities and intergroup relations." The views from the study of agricultural landowners (In Young, 2018) shows that through extensive interviews conducted with forty landowners in the Limpopo Province, it was documented as follows:

- That landowners do not see land as only of economic value but also carried deep symbolic value too.
- Land and the ability to own and develop it, is closely related to owners' identities and their sense of belonging.

- Land owners were critical of reform initiatives that seem to be motivated by what they perceived to be political agendas rather than agricultural ones.
- They thought differently about land reform when they believed they were perceived as “farmers” rather than just as representatives of a race.
- They see the potential of reform for establishing lasting relationships.
- The solution to land reform in South Africa lies in relationships between groups, not just dividing up material goods.
- They were more willing to try reform at a community level than at a level where government officials are involved because people depended on each other in communities.
- Landowners believed that the current debate portrayed them as being opposed to reform rather than cooperative” (Young, 2018: 16).

These interpretations arise partly from landowners’ own prejudices and includes racial, class and ideological prejudices and partly from the way in which certain land reform narratives are publicly constructed. Unfortunately, much of the discussion about land reform is conducted in ways that suggest only winners and losers, “us and them”, inclusion and exclusion. For example, according to Young (2018: 16) “Talk about returning the land to our people can unintentionally imply that those who currently own land are not our people. There is probably no single formula that will transform the entire debate. The public discussion needs to make land reform, a South African problem rather than a racial problem. Discussions should provide solutions. This is not a naïve debate.” The conflict associated with land reform will not be addressed by simply redistributing land according to whatever targets are chosen. If reform disregards how South Africans relate to each other in terms of their social identities, the underlying conflict will remain long after any reform process is concluded. The issues of illegal land grabs and expropriation without compensation remain a daily concern for many Indian farmers according to Lutchman (2018: 5). Only a few weeks ago a leaked document reported in the South African press believed to be written by former President Thabo Mbeki, criticized the ANC’s approach to land reform and said that, it was not in line with the governing party’s non – racial policy. This document now has the Indian farmers and other minorities questioning whether the ruling party has their interests at heart.

All of this is further exacerbated by the recommendations made by the former President of the country Kilesh Motlanthe whose main recommendation is that, all land, controlled by the ITB on behalf of the Zulu Monarch be vested in the hands of government thus, marginalizing the King of the Zulu nation and, the many Amakhosi that fall directly under the jurisdiction and authority of the Zulu Monarch. There is an overt and real possibility of the rise of Zulu nationalism within the province of Kwa Zulu Natal, if the land issue is not dealt with in a coordinated manner and, in the interests of all the people that make – up the South African nation. This situation was compounded and overtly compromised by the democratic government post 1994, when it went against the prescripts of the African National Congress’s Freedom Charter, in relationship to the land question and, gave credence and recognition to tribal chiefs in South Africa (See the ANC Freedom Charter, 1955). In this regard, the researcher posits that the ANC should have learnt from international experience and particularly from, the Republic of India, post Indian independence in 1947, when the government did away with the princely states and smashed the last remnants of the Nawabs and Maharajahs that ruled India as independent nations for a protracted period. In this regard, the ANC paid scant reference to international experience and, is today ruing its decision of not dealing decisively with the Amakhosi and Kings throughout the country in respect to the land issue.

The paper will look at some aspects of the ITB and the reform process. The paper will not concentrate on other stakeholders that are involved in the main with tourist activities and the promotion of conservation. The thrust of the paper is therefore, an overt concentration on stakeholder relationships that are involved in the quest for land and, therefore, the land issue is the most key component of this discussion and narrative.

Having delineated the subject matter as succinctly as possible, the paper will look at various other issues in the narrative, to address the issues that permeate stakeholder relations. It is therefore obvious that, the purpose of the paper, is to assess and evaluate some of the parameters of uneven development. All of this has affected the capacity to bring about effective public management and administration on the part of the Department of Environmental Affairs, and other government departments, including the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority. It is obvious that the problems, which this paper attempts to focus upon are located within a socio – historical context and, thus given this scenario, iSimangaliso and both the provincial and national governments of the Republic lack, the support of most people who reside in this area, in terms of governance. This affects the capacity to bring about effective public management and administration of government and,

meaningful agricultural development. This has overtly compromised the Wetland Park Authority. The support of the Amakhosi over time has eroded and the situation is becoming bleaker as each day passes and could, without sustained intervention compromise the Wetland Authority, to a point of no return, causing greater harm to build stakeholder relations, which has been a clear and defined imperative of the management of the Park and the Board (since 2017) over the last year and, since the ICEO assumed office in September 2017.

There is no doubt that the instrumental use of state power was used previously by government and, this brought about the negation of the rule of law and compromises the tenets of democracy. The resulting appearance of the state as a crucial object of class struggle and, this could eventually and consequently lead to the approach of trampling upon the very tenets of democracy and could result in complete mayhem in the country.” (Karodia, 2007: 3 and Karodia, 2017:4). The paper and its ensuing discussion therefore, in a cursory fashion will attempt to highlight some of these issues.

3. A BRIEF HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF ISIMANGALISO WETLAND PARK AUTHORITY

The iSimangaliso Wetland Park is 332 000 hectares in extent and is 220 kilometers stretching coastline (iSimangaliso, (2018), then the Greater St Lucia Wetland Park Authority Proclamation).

South Africa became a signatory to the World Heritage Convention in 1997. The iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority was the first South African World Heritage Site to be listed. It was listed in December 1999, and for three world heritage values. The legislative framework is as follows:

- The World Heritage Convention was brought into South African law in 2000 when the World Heritage Convention Act’s regulations consolidated sixteen different parcels of land under one proclamation in November 2000.
- The Authority was established to manage the Park under the World Heritage Convention Regulations in November 2000.
- The mandate is couched within the framework of the World Heritage Convention Act and its Regulations.
- The mandate is as follows:
 - To protect, conserve and present the Park;
 - To empower historically disadvantaged adjacent communities;
 - To promote and facilitate optimal tourism and related development in the Park.” (Portfolio Committee briefing (2017 – 2018).

4. THE VISION AND MISSION

In terms of the vision, “it is to create Africa’s greatest conservation – based tourism destination driven by community empowerment.

Its Mission is to protect, conserve and present the Wetland Park and its World Heritage Values for current and future generations, in line with the standards laid down by UNESCO and the World Heritage Act, and to deliver benefits to communities living and adjacent to the Park, by facilitating optimal tourism and related development. It consists of a prominent level organizational structure led by the Chief Executive Officer and, directed by the Board of iSimangaliso appointed by the Minister of Environmental Affairs for a period of three years” (Mission and Vision extracted from the Strategic Plan, 2017).

NOTE:

Since the inception of the Wetland Park Authority and through successive Ministers of Environmental Affairs, the iSimangaliso Board had not been constituted as a Statutory Board in terms of the requirements of the law and, the Board was only an Advisory Board. Power was therefore, vested in the hands off the former CEO and the Board was a passive onlooker and had no real authority over the CEO. This situation compromised the Board and the organization. The National Treasury agreed with this arrangement which technically was illegal. In terms of the number of Board members that ought to have been appointed; the Board for protracted periods functioned with more than the required number of Board members. It was only on the first of April, 2018 that the Minister constituted the Board as the Statutory Authority (Accounting Authority). This brought about a process of legality to the Board. However, it must be registered and recorded that the term of the current Board expired in August of 2018. Advertisement for the appointment and constitution of the new Board by the Minister closed in mid - May of 2018 but, the new Board has not been appointed and, it has been stated that the current Boards term will be extended until the new Board is appointed. A number of Board members have already served two terms

on the iSimangaliso Board and therefore are not appointable to the Board once again, or for that matter their terms cannot be extended. The Auditor General queried these arrangements.

5. THE PROGRAMME STRUCTURE IS ENCAPSULATED HEREUNDER AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Park Operations:** To ensure the regulations and management of the World Heritage Values in a manner that facilitates sustainable economic growth and development.
2. **Transformation (Social and Economic Development):** To improve access to job and income generation opportunities for previously disadvantaged individuals and communities.
3. **Commercialization:** To position the Park as a premier tourism destination.
4. **Governance and Administration:** To improve the framework for policy making in iSimangaliso, promote innovative research that supports management objectives (No research has been conducted by the organization ever and research is confined to outside researchers and universities and organizations), and develop, implement, and maintain cost – efficient and effective systems that support the execution of business processes” (Extracted from various iSimangaliso internal and external documents, 2016, 2017 and 2018 and discussion with the CFO and other Executives over time).

A purposeful reading of the vision and mission points to the fact and, together with the programme structure of the organization that, it talks sizably to the empowerment of historically disadvantaged and marginalized communities. (This process was not advanced for nearly two decades, by the former management in any meaningful manner and, therefore, brought the former management into disrepute with communities and their Amakhosi, which eventually led to the removal of the former CEO by means of political pressure). This therefore, speaks to the issue of consolidating and nurturing stakeholder relations. This shows and clearly indicates, the importance of stakeholder relationships to the Park and to its very survival; and for all intents and purposes this aspect must be consolidated and pursued with the necessary vigour, understanding and appreciation by all formations within the organization. Stakeholder relations is therefore, the thrust of this paper and is in many ways a landmark paper in the context of the organization. However, it must be recorded that not much or nothing substantial has been written or researched about stakeholder relations at the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority since its inception as a World Heritage Site.

5. METHODOLOGY

The formulation of this paper does not follow the design and methodologies used in classical research. The paper therefore, confines itself to the author’s experiences and observations over a twelve months period as the Interim Chief Executive Officer (ICEO) of iSimangaliso. It incorporates applicable literature, newspaper articles, books, pertinent to development discourse and books relevant to the subject matter, internal documents, interaction with the Portfolio Committee of Parliament, discussions with some Executives of the organization and general staff of iSimangaliso, some Amakhosi and members of their communities, including meetings with Land Claimant trusts, concessionaires and, relies on observations and experiences gleaned over this period. It also adopts critical analysis within the framework of the narrative and, uses the discussion with some senior staff over the ICEO’s tenure. This in no way dilutes the thrust of the paper and, is generally an acceptable approach within the confines of research of this nature. There are indeed limitations to the study and further research will have to be conducted by the organization, in the form of a longitudinal study on stakeholder relations across the length and breadth of the park and, incorporating a wider array of stakeholders that interact with the Park authorities and its management and, incorporating variables on stakeholder relationships that have not been included in this narrative. Such a study will be more structured and must incorporate both qualitative and quantitative structured questionnaires’.

6. THE CENTRAL CONSTRUCT OR HYPOTHESIS OF THIS PAPER

What is the state of uneven development and the problems in respect of stakeholder relations to iSimangaliso and, some of the issues that permeate the agrarian crisis, which can only be expected to worsen in the future, in the surrounds of this area and the Park, thus leading to further impoverishment of the masses, and leading to even greater poverty and, therefore, a frontal attack upon poverty, absolute poverty, inequality and unemployment must now become a policy imperative through the recent announcement by the President, in September 2018, in terms of the economic stimulus package and therefore, the government must intervene decisively or face the serious possibility of violence.

What type of functional problems and policy issues in respect to agriculture, land distribution and agricultural extension policies can be ushered in and, what recommendations can be made with regards to agricultural development, in order to add

value to the promotion of conservation, development and the understanding and, the promotion of customer needs and perceptions, which are functions of other government departments, both nationally and provincially and, therefore, not the sole responsibility and purview of iSimangaliso as a World Heritage Site, primarily involved in its main objectives as a conservation and tourist promotion entity, with some facets of development that it incorporates within its sphere of influence. On the other hand given the absolute poverty in this area and within the surrounds of the Park, some communities have posited that mining should be an alternative to stimulate economic growth, in order to deal with poverty and thus create a stimulus for creating employment. Communities believe that the government has been short sighted because tourism has not created the impetus for development. This aspect in spite of criticism must be looked at by government on the basis that some organizations have registered their desire to mine in and around the Park and, have made the necessary applications to the relevant government departments to be allowed to undertake mining.

The central construct or theoretical statement is that efficient and effective management of conservation and development, in relationship to stakeholders with particular reference to the Amakhosi and their communities is flawed, due to the legitimacy crisis of state power, lessons from the poor utilization and provision of services, by other government departments both nationally and provincially, in respect of functional areas of agricultural promotion, agricultural extension and training, development and, access to land, which falls outside the responsibility and ambit of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority.

7. SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY AND THE LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no doubt that a study of this nature could and can contribute significantly to stakeholder relations and agricultural debate in terms of development, extension and training within the Wetland Park Authority and, in this Northern part of Kwa Zulu Natal Province. Of even greater significance is the fact that, there is a new wave of legitimacy with some communities and the Amakhosi who have always voiced an opinion against the previous management of the Park, in respect to them being paid scant reference to by iSimangaliso and that, this legitimacy is exemplified by a shift in attitude by the Interim CEO and the management of the Park under the new management dispensation and the Boards interest in stakeholder relationships. In elaborating on the subject matter, the paper will provide some aspects of a pertinent literature review.

8. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

There are no ethical considerations because the issues raised in this paper are within the public domain and that iSimangaliso, the Department of Environmental Affairs, the provincial government, other government departments, the municipalities in the area, the Amakhosi and their communities, including the Land Claimants Trusts and all other stakeholders are privy to the issues raised in this paper and discussed in this narrative.

9. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Some limitations were raised previously and the reader is referred also to those limitations. Indeed, there are many limitations. Firstly, the time spent on couching and preparing this narrative was short. This did not allow for an in – depth analysis of the subject matter at hand. Often within the narrative the researcher's subjective predilections come to the fore and, this is unavoidable in research papers of this nature. That the paper is narrow in respect of the issues of stakeholder demands in general and, it has not incorporated all stakeholders and, is therefore, a narrow concentration on certain stakeholders and that, it expatiates narrowly on the agricultural imperatives for deprived and poor communities in this area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal.

The researcher places on record that the paper is rather long. This is unavoidable because the issues captured and discussed in this narrative has and, had to capture some prominent issues to give length and breadth to the perspectives of stakeholder relations and, thus had to delineate issues discussed within the ambit of this paper from an historical perspective but, moreover captured over a twelve month period, gleaned and synthesized from certain observations and experiences during this period. In this sense and in some way, the paper is written to document some of the thought processes of the researcher concerning this vexing but, principal and cardinal issue, in relationship to stakeholder relationships. However, the length of the paper does not alter or dilute the essence and fundamentals of the narrative, although at times, it may be misconstrued as the researcher being prolix to be profound. This was totally unavoidable.

10. AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority must commission applicable independent research and in – house research by its research unit on a host of stakeholder issues and, must incorporate social and development parameters that affect the lives of communities and the smooth running of the Park and, clearly outline its mandates to government as a World Heritage Site,

that concentrates primarily on conservation, tourism and some development issues in respect of infrastructure for communities and, becomes overtly compromised, when it delves into issues like the land and agrarian crisis, which it has no control over. An in depth longitudinal study is required to understand the vexing issues that affect the Park and the communities that reside in and around the Wetlands but, more importantly to clearly delineate through research, the jurisdictions of the different government departments and agencies and, to hold these role – players accountable for delivering the much needed and required development, addresses infrastructure problems and challenges and, the agrarian crisis and issues that confront this area and their communities.

By the same token, it would be necessary for the iSimangaliso Board to commission relevant and practical research that concerns itself, in respect of good governance and accountability by unpacking cogently its interaction and duties in terms of the various King Reports that regulate the workings of Boards as institutions that, perform an accounting role as a statutory authority and, to understand the workings of government holistically and from the perspectives of regulating its fiduciary duties without compromising iSimangaliso as a state owned enterprise that performs, its duties on behalf of the principal shareholder in the form of the government through the Minister of Environmental Affairs.

Another challenging issue is the great divide within communities with regards mining versus conservation and tourism. Many representatives of communities that iSimangaliso has had meetings with, in large forums within and outside the Park, have argued vociferously that mining initiatives will bring about greater wealth for the area and its poor people and, will create much needed employment, in a deprived and impoverished area. There is no doubt that mining demands will intensify within the ranks of certain communities in the very near future because, conservation and tourism initiatives have not created the impetus for economic growth and development in the area as a whole. This situation sees much resistance against iSimangaliso and the government and could fuel much antagonism and violence against the authorities. The Department of Environmental Affairs and its bureaucrats and technocrats, including government, the Wetland Park Authority and other formations have paid scant reference to mining demands by communities and, there is no sustained and coordinated dialogue in this regard and, it appears that government formations are like ‘ostriches,’ having buried themselves in the sand, unwilling to engage with communities in this regard. This is a display of arrogance and could lead to disastrous consequences in the future. There is no doubt that mining demands will greatly intensify within the ranks of certain Amakhosi and their communities, as was seen “On the 24th of April 2018 in the Eastern Cape. Communities want to mine titanium and feel that it will outweigh the benefits currently accrued through tourism. There are pro and anti – protagonists and the scene has been set for confrontation with iSimangaliso as the Park Authority and the Department of Environmental Affairs.”(SABC, Prime Time News, 24th April 2018).

iSimangaliso, has no control over this issue because technically, it is the implementer of government policy and does not promulgate national environmental policy. Such communities need to engage the Departmental of Environmental Affairs, other relevant government departments and, the government of South Africa. It is therefore, argued and posited that in – depth research must be conducted by government, in order to report to the Amakhosi and the their communities by providing the much needed empirical evidence to clearly show the viability or non – viability of mining as opposed to conservation and tourism. iSimangaliso during the tenure of the ICEO has engaged with community representatives and other formations on talk shows held by the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) and local radio stations. Sufficient inroads are being made but, the situation and interpretation by these communities and their leaders remains volatile in respect to land and, the issues that straddle tourism versus mining. Mining is not an imperative of the Department of Environmental Affairs.

Mtshali (2018: 7) in The Natal Mercury 27 September underscores the point as follows with regards members of the Umgungundlovu traditional community in Bizana, on the Eastern Cape Wild Coast, opposed to titanium mining in the area, say it will have a devastating and disruptive impact on the environment and their livelihoods. Australian mining company Mineral Commodities Resources has, since 2006, applied for rights to mine the titanium wealthy sands which many members of the community have opposed. He further reports that “Should mining go ahead it would result in 70 families living inside the proposed mining area losing their homes and another 150 families would lose grazing land for their cattle, surrender their ploughing fields and access to the sea that they fish. This land was targeted for mining was used to produce food for locals and also to sell, in order to sustain themselves and educate their children.” According to Mtshali, “the question that people are asking the government is how the mine will benefit them when they are uneducated and because mines are highly mechanized, skills will be required but elderly people live off the land – in other words they will not welcome disruption.” The issue is who defines poor? Because the way the elite define development is not the way we, the communities define it. For us “Development is about sustaining our livelihoods, where we get our food, where we get our water, basic human needs,” community representative Mazeka said (2018: 7, In Mtshali).

However, it must be categorically stated that there are also opposing viewpoints to the above painted picture because there are pro – protagonists for mining. The above situation is very different to the iSimangaliso scenario because there is just no fertile land for farming in the area of the Park and outside the Park. The issue is that there has been in the recent past communities in Mpumalanga, the Eastern Cape and also in Northern Kwa Zulu Natal (iSimangaliso) that have reared their heads by claiming the virtues of mining and, such voices will become louder and pose a serious threat to conservation and tourism. This scenario and reality has already been registered by communities and mining houses in the vicinity of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority. This is the burgeoning reality and government has to deal with this issue as best as it can and find a win – win solution to temper the storms that will surely arise, increasingly by communities that feel marginalized because conservation and tourism has not produced the desired economic development and, has also not produced the employment opportunities required by these communities. Poverty and inequality is increasing to alarming proportions and this could soon irk communities to take up resistance platforms against government and iSimangaliso. This is an issue that cannot be easily wished away and therefore government has to tread cautiously or bear the brunt of communities.

11. INTRODUCTION

Mills (1986: 20) points out: “We live in a society that is democratic mainly in its legal forms and its formal expectations.” Through the former apartheid state and increasingly under the democratic South African government post 1994, there has been a growing disillusionment and apathy, which reflects the partial de – politicization of the peasantry or proletariat in this area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal. Towards the realization of reaching the aims of the paper, and in outlining some of the problems that warranted this investigation; the paper is therefore framed within the following analytical parameters to meet the requirements of this research narrative and some of these are enunciated as follows hereunder:

- It failed together with the government to fully comprehend and understand the basic requirements of conservation, tourism, agricultural development, agricultural extension, and the cry and, legitimate demands by the people, the opportunities for mining that, many communities are crying out for and so on.
- It has further failed to understand the basic requirements of the agricultural parameters needed for sustained development on a domestic basis, since the promulgation of the Wetland Authority as a World Heritage Site; and the realization that agricultural development and farmer training are integral to the development of any society.
- There is an absence of systematic data and coordinated documentation of the nature of stakeholder relations, it’s very subtle nuances and the needs of agriculture in general, in this area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal, with reference to the buffer zones created within the Park and outside the Park, which technically is highly controlled by the Park Authority and, the complete absence of the presence of the provincial government under whom development issues in and within the buffer zones fall, in terms of applicable legislation. This is exemplified in, terms of the conventions of the World Heritage Council and, at times on iSimangaliso’s and the provincial governments own subjective interpretations in respect to the use of the buffer zones by communities for farming and other purposes.
- By the same token agricultural policies in general that are being pursued by both the provincial and national departments of agriculture, defined the very nature of intellectual debate that has been given credence by government and above all, a lack of understanding agricultural development programmes and, the need to examine the nature of some of these concerns as it affects communities in the area, living in poverty and exacerbated by absolute poverty, which has led to massive rural impoverishment and;
- In South Africa and this area of Kwa Zulu Natal, land became increasingly concentrated in the commercial sector (Massive sugar plantations), and concentrated in the hands of historic white farmers, many of whom were given the land by the colonialists and the former apartheid state, at the expense of the rural masses and the predominantly black indigenous population.

The problems of agricultural economic management and administration were compounded by the uncertainties arising from the breakdown that occurred almost since independence (Karodia, 1990: 6). Their full implications have not yet unfolded, but it may be useful to distinguish four areas of discontinuity as follows: Karodia posits as follows (1990: 7 – 8) and, in terms of his own analysis and this is therefore, relevant to this paper:

- Many characteristics of the old economic system remained and is still the order of the day, including a large concentration of the ownership of modern means of production in the public sector. Extensive state intervention in the operations of product and factor markets, affected management and development in general.

- At the time of democracy in 1994, the state needed to implement a workable structure even prior to the creation of the Wetland Park Authority to formulate a comprehensive services policies, by means of consensus with the Amakhosi, the communities and all the stakeholders and with black farmers and, in terms of participatory democracy, in accordance with the perceived or felt needs of farmers and communities.
- The post 1994 democratic dispensation and its economy and, the management of agriculture, despite changes in some important variables, was in other respects, moulded by the past. The capital stock in the productive sectors and, some of the infrastructure were the result of past investments (in both good and bad projects). More important, perhaps, were the institutions, the administration and organization, the vested interests and, the habits of thought and work which are a collective inheritance that determines many of the features of the economy today and colours its prospects.
- iSimangaliso, government departments in general, in respect of the management and administration, as concerns conservation and agriculture in the medium – term and within the limits of the new South African democracy, would have to take account of these continuities that, it has inherited from the former political order.
- On the other hand, the conservation debate is modelled on a Eurocentric conservation model and critics and criticism by and large emanate from the white population, which is percussed on debates that take place in the west, with little understanding that African populations appreciated the beauty of nature historically and, could live with nature in harmony without any form of destruction of the flora and fauna and within the confines of the declaration of the Wetland Authority long before it was declared a World Heritage Site. In reality for centuries before, they lived in peace and harmony with the flora and fauna within this area. They have done this from times immemorial without a blemish and had never disturbed the balance of nature (Karodia, 2017 – 2018. Discussions in various meetings with staff and stakeholders).
- The researcher refers to the devastating consequences of the Eurocentric model of conservation that caused devastating destruction, chaos and massive resistance in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and, in the state of Cameroon (BBC, Prime Time News, November 2017). (The reader is requested to access the conservation issues in these two countries to appreciate and understand the destruction caused by the Eurocentric model of conservation and to appreciate glean, and learn from these issues that permeate African countries in general, and the devastating effects upon African economies in general and, the styming of much needed development imperatives).
- From 2014, observation reveals that trees within the Wetland Park have been felled continuously by some local communities, not so much as resistance to the conservation imperatives but, because they have no land to farm upon, compounded by the poor soils, in an arid area and because of survival issues, farm the Wetlands with impunity. The trees within the Wetlands of the Park were and, are felled long before the arrival of the ICEO and, had begun during the tenure of the former CEO and his management. However, the white population, some white staff members and, the white concessionaires apportion blame to the ICEO for not taking action. This can be proved by GIS photographs that, this situation began long before the arrival of the ICEO and began during the time of the former management of the Park. Another major problem being experienced is the stealing of copper piping and the destruction of Park fencing that comes at a great cost to iSimangaliso. There has been a constant cry from the white population to arrest such people. This will be a move in the wrong direction as we attempt to restore stakeholder relations in the area and, it will be short – sighted to behave as though the apartheid system was still in existence. However, given this situation, it will be necessary to engage the Amakhosi more frequently and impress upon them that, their support is required to stem the tide of this destruction and work with the Park Authorities to address salient and real problems that confront their communities.
- Tourist stakeholder relations is primarily concentrated in the white domain of concessionaires plying their tourist activities in the form of business, to cater for local South African populations and the overseas tourist market; they have many demands and often hold the Park Authorities to ransom with unreasonable demands and show a lack of appreciation of the needs and requirements of the black impoverished communities in general. This is exemplified by the reality that experience and observations reveal that, there are no black concessionaires within the Park and the white concessionaires have done nothing to empower the entry of black concessionaires into this lucrative market of business. The white concessionaires market the Park to their advantage and can harness the capitalist economy. They make profits, but the unfortunate reality and scenario is that, they do not empower the black population to participate in a lucrative tourist industry. It must also be registered as an example, that the town of St. Lucia is lily white in respect of business and that there are no black businesses or for that matter black

tourist concessionaires and, only a sprinkling of blacks live in the town because, they are provided housing by either iSimangaliso or government departments that they work for. It is a recipe for exclusion and this status quo must be changed by government.

- By the same token government and iSimangaliso do not play an active part in the empowerment on black populations to enter the tourist industry but, above all do not plough sizeable amounts of money into the hard development issues. This has gone on since the inception of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority and, one gets the feeling that apartheid is still alive in St. Lucia and many of the smaller towns in the surrounds of iSimangaliso. Whites are settlers into these towns from other provinces because, it is like heaven on earth for them and they are divorced and isolated from the realities of democratic South Africa and are apt to maintain this status quo. The much needed redress has not been undertaken by the Park or for that matter, by the Department of Environmental Affairs and by government in general, post 1994. This is an absolute indictment to democracy post 1994 and, to the democratic government but above all too both the Department of Environmental Affairs and to the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority. They must be held accountable together with the iSimangaliso Board for their lackadaisical approach to the empowerment of black people in this area and, to black development in general and business development in particular, for not creating the environment for black concessionaires to emerge and for not, training them in respect of graduating into the business world after twenty five years of South African democracy.

The paper therefore provides a theoretical exposition of stakeholder relations and, the nature of government relations as it relates to development, training and non – formal education.

12. DISCUSSION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

12.1 What are stakeholder relations?

Stakeholders are individuals, groups and entities affected by the operation of your business. Fair treatment and strong relationships with core stakeholders is key to long term profit and business success. Common business stakeholders include customers, communities, employees, owners, suppliers and partners, government agencies and regulators” (Kokemuller, 2007: 1).

According to the HSRC (2007: 9) “Stakeholders are those individuals or groups that have a vested interest in the performance of an organization. If an organization is to survive and prosper, it must pay attention to the interests of its stakeholders. The success of communication and marketing efforts will hinge on the appropriate identification of target groups or individuals.”

In other words, for a customer – centric company like iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority, no stakeholder relationship is more critical than that between the business and its customers. The iSimangaliso Board must always subscribe to good governance and must appreciate stakeholder perceptions which affects the reputation of the organization. In so doing the Board must incorporate the following principles as outlined by the Human Sciences Research Council (February 2012: 6 – 8), which are:

- Monitoring and evaluating of key stakeholder relations communication strategies.
- Institutional collaboration.
- Contribution to development and social progress in Africa.
- Stakeholder Relations in terms of vision.
- Understanding of stakeholder relations.
- Objectives of the stakeholder relations strategy.
- Knowledge advancement.
- Dissemination of knowledge through public dialogue, policy briefs and publications. Must be done also in the local regional language.
- Data dissemination.
- Transformation.
- Promoting an African agenda.
- Enhanced skills.
- Financial sustainability.

According to the researcher through the processes of observation, the key activity areas to be included in a stakeholder plan must incorporate honesty, integrity, and the needs, drafting a measurable marketing plan, profiling the organization adequately and simply, managing and gauging perceptions, developing networks and, implementing a parliamentary stakeholder plan amidst a host of other issues. ISimangaliso and particularly the Board has not really carried out meaningful surveys of its stakeholder requirements, perceptions and felt needs and therefore, the situation is not based on scientific data that emanates from its customers and stakeholders. It is more a case of a hit and run situation. This scenario does not allow for a cogent and acceptable strategic plan based on empirical evidence and, does not allow for sustained and coordinated intervention strategies and, does not speak to the important issues and variables of infrastructure requirements, development issues and addressing the agrarian crisis, the processes of underdevelopment and uneven development, amidst a host of other important issues that require urgent attention and intervention by the Board, the CEO and the Executives of the organization.

The Board is ultimately responsible for stakeholder engagement and, must not be involved in operational issues, although as of 1 April 2018, it is now a statutory managing authority in terms of the delegations accorded it, by the Minister of Environmental Affairs. It must give direction and monitor the organization through the CEO. The Board must avoid and must allow the management of the organization to direct the day to day operations. It is the CEO's responsibility to unpack strategy and subsequently delegate responsibility to various executives and hold them responsible for execution and implementation of the strategic plan.

It must be placed on record that the Board has not given clear direction in respect to the above issues, has got itself tangled in operational issues via the Chairperson of the Board and, it has reneged from its duties in respect of affording the ethical leadership required to steer the Board, in a desired direction of development and, also the organization. In other words observation revealed during the tenure as ICEO that, many Board members agreed with the whims and fancies of the Chairperson and, did not exert their authority in the correct direction and often times, the Chairperson did not share crucial information with Board members, met with the Director General of the Department without informing other Board members, the ICEO, other stakeholders and so on. This was the same when he met with selected Amakhosi and often times used social engineering processes to the detriment of the organization and the Board, in order to gain unfair advantage and thus secure his hidden agendas. Technically, observation reveals that the iSimangaliso Board was run by two or three members in the form of a "cabal" and this does not augur well for the future of the organization, and country and, calls into question the bona fides of some of the Board members of iSimangaliso including the Chairperson.

A standard definition according to the book, Stakeholder Engagement (2010: 6) is "Anyone that can affect or is affected by what you are trying to achieve, in a project environment; engagement signifies all the things we might do with stakeholders: consult, listen, understand, communicate, influence, and negotiate and so on." In other words, it is the process of stakeholder management. It should "Not be a separate activity and must not be outsourced and must be distinct from public relations. Senior members of the management team must continuously develop their understanding of stakeholders, evolving objectives, interests, constraints and expectations whether these are reasonable or not" (2010: 6). Stakeholder management is the systematic identification, analysis, planning and implementation of actions designed to engage with stakeholders. The Board did not input into these important variables and did not give clear and measurable directives in this regard.

Simply put the Board in the main through its Chairperson had no "clue" as to what stakeholder relations meant and entailed and were selective in relationship to what they deemed as important to the consolidation of stakeholder relations at iSimangaliso and, for all intents and purposes rallied to the call of a few influential Amakhosi and did not define in a holistic manner, the needs and requirements of an array of stakeholders that make – up the sum total of all stakeholders that engage with the Wetland Park Authority. This caused much confusion and therefore, the Board was selective in respect of its engagement with the different stakeholder constituencies and, lost complete sight of stakeholder engagement in its true sense. This was a major shortcoming and did more harm to the organization and retarded stakeholder engagement in respect of development and the agrarian crisis that confronts this part of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal.

The ICEO brought this to the attention of the late Minister by means of correspondence to her, but nothing tangible was done by her department or for that matter by the Director General of the Department to intervene decisively, in order to bring the Chairperson and the Isimangaliso Board to book. It must be remembered that, it is hard to quantify and measure the human dimension of any project and, in this case the importance of stakeholder relationships, as a project of utmost importance, in the context of and to iSimangaliso. Further that the aggregate of feelings and attitudes of all parties involved in stakeholder relations must define whether the project is successful or not. As it stood at the time of the tenure of the ICEO,

certain inroads were made in respect of enhancing and consolidating stakeholder relations, perhaps for the first time in the history of iSimangaliso in a sizeable manner but, this was at a superficial and rudimentary level of engagement. Nevertheless, it was a sound start and will have to be taken forward by the Board, the CEO and its Executives in a more purposeful and deliberate manner and must not be left to chance. The new impetus in respect of consolidating stakeholder relationships was acknowledged by a host of communities and the Amakhosi in general. It is hoped that this will be further consolidated and enhanced by the incoming CEO and the Executives and other defined staff, the new Board of the iSimangaliso Wetland Park Authority, with the necessary passion and zeal, in order to deal with the perplexing issues that confront development and the agrarian crisis in this, area of Northern Kwa Zulu Natal.

It has also to be recorded that the Portfolio Committee on Environmental Affairs with whom the ICEO engaged regularly in respect of iSimangaliso's performance via presentations in the South African Parliament in Cape Town, was paid very high accolades in respect of steering the organization and, to this end the excellent performance of the ICEO on behalf of the organization was reported upon by the Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee in his Parliamentary Report; alluding to this outstanding performance on the part of the ICEO and his team, in the form of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO). It is not only an honour to the professionalism of the ICEO in the execution of his duties but, a great honour at the same time to iSimangaliso as an organization and to the government and the Board.

13. PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Public policy is one of the instruments by which governments purposely govern and develop societies. Aristotle's famous dictum and Michael's iron law of oligarchy indicate two aspects of the close interrelationship between politics and administration. The first postulates simply that because administrators are human they will behave politically even when they are behaving professionally; the second is that the administrative process is by its nature especially connected with the political process (Cloete, 1977: 23 – 29). Aristotle's dictum and Michael's iron law of oligarchy refers to two syllogisms. Syllogism according to the Oxford Dictionary of English (2004: 1787) "Is a form of reasoning in which a conclusion is drawn from two given or assumed propositions (premises). Oligarchy according to the same source (2004: 1787) means that "A small group of people (Reference also to some facets of the organization and some Board members of iSimangaliso) having control over a country or organization." In other words, the process of logical inference was based on a form of argument called the syllogism – a proposition is argued or logically inferred to be true from the fact that, the two other propositions are true, whilst in an oligarchy, government is a dictatorship without the consent of the governed. This was the situation in South Africa pre – independence, under the former apartheid government and technically, very little has changed under democracy post 1994. By the same token, iSimangaliso "Historically and up to August 2017 was being run as a "family" business with power centralized in the hands of the former top management of the organization that, paid scant reference to stakeholder relations" (21st Century, 2018; DEA, 2017; and Karodia, 2017). It must be noted that syllogisms are generally ambiguous because of the ambiguity of the word politics. Dictum therefore, is a formal pronouncement from an authoritarian force.

Even if there is agreement on a definition of politics, one is still faced with the problem of an understanding of the terms micro – and macro. Micro – politics in the context of this paper will be the politics within the administrative system itself; while macro – politics will be the politics of the national political system, in which the administrative system operates. In other words, micro and macro politics merely indicate extreme positions on a lineal continuum from the politics of the small group of those of the nation state. To argue that public administration both contains an important political element within itself and, operates within a political context does not necessarily imply that, there is an inescapable connection between the disciplines of Political Science and Public Administration. On the other hand, when one attempts by theoretical analysis to distinguish between political norms and, the norms of public administration, we find that they are inextricably interwoven.

It must be appreciated and this by observation within the Park of iSimangaliso and, is premised on experience that shows the role and limits of the Wetland Authority in implementing a set of reforms directed at the contradictions of public policy formulation, politics, public administration and management, which has contributed overtly to the processes of uneven development. In this regard, both the National and Provincial governments are complicit. This is further exacerbated and perpetuated based on an internal hegemony perpetrated upon the rural masses of Kwa Zulu Natal, political patronage, and the role of the land grabbing elite because of the resilience of power. The intimate relationship of public administration and its politics is clearly demonstrated by Edelman in his *The Symbolic Uses of Politics* (1984: 6). Where he shows "How administrative agencies in the United States, originally established to control industries or other enterprises in the private sector, eventually establish a symbiosis with these enterprises so that, industry becomes essential for the advancement of the

administrator, while the administrator becomes in effect the “representative” of the enterprise in the government process. During such developments, the interest of the consumer or public is quite lost sight of.”

This is precisely what happened in respect of stakeholder relations over more than two decades of the Wetland Parks existence, as was fashioned by the former management of the Park, who in reality became a law unto themselves, ruled by means of fear and stealth, usurped authority, treated in many instances the clients of iSimangaliso with disdain and arrogance (Confirmed by means of unsolicited discussions with various white and black individuals, concessionaires and organizations that engaged with the former management and were treated with disdain and arrogance, (2017 – 2018). This has recently come back to harm the Park by means of the demands being placed upon it by all types of stakeholders, the Amakhosi, the Land Claimants Trusts, demonstrations by communities whether justified or not, by municipalities, youth formations, schools, concessionaires, the St Lucia Ratepayers Association, individuals that represent no one, ad hoc committees and, disparate forces that, hold the organization to ransom.

Edelman thus describes an essentially political process of how political policy may be administered in such a way that, it very nearly produces results opposite to those intended by the politicians and, by the management echelons of public sector organizations. The political scientist and bureaucrats fail to understand that administration can thus distort policy. This is exactly what happened at iSimangaliso over time as was engineered by the former management of the Park, who exploited an array of loopholes to their advantage because, there was no real oversight by the Department of Environmental Affairs in the workings and affairs of the Wetland Park Authority and, this was therefore exploited to the fullest and, the former CEO was the Accounting Officer and, the Board was a passive onlooker with no clout or teeth to engineer any remedial action in terms of the law.

14. POLITICS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The relationship between politics and public administration presents problems that have been of perennial importance and interest, ever since the distinction between the two forms of activity came to be clearly perceived. As with many problems in political science, there is no reason to believe that an ideal solution exists, or that a single set of rules would be equally suitable to the different circumstances that confront iSimangaliso. The nature of public administration however, as practiced in any country is largely shaped by the political, social, economic, cultural, as well as the physical and technological environment in which it operates. In this regard, many of the mentioned variables have eluded iSimangaliso because, the former management and the successive Boards did not apply their minds to these variables in order, to deal with these issues from perspectives of a defined strategy and, did not factor these into the development and strategic plans through successive strategic plans and, imperatives to deal with the vexing issues that confront the Park in terms of development and the agrarian crisis. Basically though, public administration always operates within a political context, the former management paid scant reference to this vital parameter. Public administration by fulfilling its primary function of implementing government policy must respect the political colour of that policy. Unfortunately, this was negated by the former management much to its own peril. The close association of public administration with government policies offers, a fertile field for casting suspicion by merely putting a question mark behind the political neutrality of public administrators who must, in accordance with a basic rule of the democratic system of government always remain neutral.

The above is also applicable to the Board of iSimangaliso. Which as of April 1, 2018 assumed the role of an Accounting Authority (Board) and, will no longer be an advisory Board. It is hoped that it will use this new authority and status in a positive way, in order to take the organization to greater heights. Unfortunately, the Interim CEO did not observe this important phenomenon and more so in the last four months of his tenure. The Board began flouting its authority, created hurdles and has not provided the required leadership nor the required ethical leadership and, the Chairperson flouted the fiduciary rules, began communicating with staff independently and paid scant reference to the authority of the ICEO. The Board must work within the confines of its delegated authority and, in terms of the King IV report on governance. For example, the Chairperson attends Board Committee meetings that goes against the grain of the King IV Report and indicates that he was invited by the Chairperson of a Committee. This is irregular because the Chairperson is the final arbiter of Board Committee meetings and, at the same time the organization has to settle his unnecessary Board claims for attending these meetings and other expenses incurred. This once again proves wasteful and fruitless expenditure on the Chairpersons part.

These changes will place a special role on the Board, which must only be involved, in giving policy direction and putting into place the mechanisms for the implementation of accepted strategy imperatives derived on the basis of consultation with the Executive Management of iSimangaliso. In no way must the Board be entangled into operational issues which was a

feature of the current Chairperson of the Board. It must only be involved in issues, if management cannot resolve issues and the Board should therefore play the role of arbiter and neutral mediator.

However, the factual consideration is that politics and public administration are like the two sides of a coin and this has been accepted by academics. In this regard Beloff (1966: 355 – 365) states that civil servants are in normal circumstances appointed for a life – time career and, according to non – political criteria by a body independent of government and, separate from the administrative machine (This prescript was compromised by the apartheid government and is also compromised with impunity by the so – called democratic government of the African National Congress). It is obvious therefore, their tenure is unaffected by changes in party control. This was seen by the former management of iSimangaliso allowing power to be entrenched in a few individuals for more than two decades. Such a situation bred its own dynamics of fear and control (ICEO, 2017. One on – one interviews with all staff). There was no oversight by the National Department of Environmental Affairs historically and through successive Ministers. The change in the status of the Board from 1 April 2018 will change the dynamics of governance but, will pose its own challenges in the absence of clear delegations to the duties and functions and the protocols of the Board as Accounting Authority, as opposed, to the role of the CEO and the Executives of the organization. This will be dependent on how and what the iSimangaliso Board will delegate to the CEO, the CFO and the Executives, in terms of the operational mandates of these functionaries. The ICEO and the Executives have prepared a guidance delegation document and, have forwarded it to the Board for perusal and possible action. Although approved by the Board, it can be asserted that the delegations are being flouted by the Chairperson. By the same token, the interaction protocol document was delayed by the Board and was not approved by the Board because, it will bind Board members to abide by the stipulations of the protocols that are elaborate. This indicates that the Board does not want to adhere to the basic conditions of the rule of law, thus run rough shod over the ICEO and probably over the incoming CEO, thus compromising the organization financially, as was seen by the triple escalation of Board expenses in the 2017 – 2018 budget year. Unnecessary Board meetings were held and the Chairperson travels widely without recourse to the ICEO. This is a recipe for financial disaster.

A further consequence is that civil servants and the Boards of SOE's must refrain from political activity to a degree which is determined by their nearness to policy decisions. Beloff (1966) further states that "The civil servants first duty is to the state. It is also correct that such loyalty should in normal times be to the government of the day. But not all times are normal, for instance, a government that may claim to represent the general will, may make demands upon civil servants that infringe the moral law." This has become an increasing phenomenon in corrupt South Africa. In actual fact it has become endemic and has become the culture within many SOE's including iSimangaliso for many years and, was a phenomenon under successive Boards that allowed the former management to govern with impunity. Van Zyl (1972: 61 – 63) points out that "Although public administration generally functions in a particular national environmental setting, it thus operates within a political context." This was the reality that the former CEO and some of his staff did not crystallize and take into consideration, which led to their "demises" from iSimangaliso and were asked to exit the organization. This is a clear indication that politics exerts its authority over civil servants and is the main cog in the machinery of governance and public management

The increasing technical character and complexity of modern government activities have involved top public administrators in politics, by the very nature of their primary function for example, policy execution. Under these circumstances the researcher posits that, it must be remembered that both politics and administration are largely service activities and that, the tendency for them to outweigh the productive apparatus of society is always present and always to be resisted. This has become alarmingly difficult in present day South Africa because of victimization and, the very real possibility of losing one's job, if you are seen as anti – establishment by the authorities in charge. This was the fear syndrome that was inculcated within iSimangaliso under the former management. In this regard Beloff, (1967: 355 – 365) states that "The civil servant is after all a servant, not only for the state, but also of each individual citizen and that too is something he forgets at his peril." In other words, the "political" role that the public administrator must play as part and parcel of his proper functioning, is performed under the control of political leaders. Should that control be circumvented the action of the administrators would have to stand the test of public scrutiny. It is not only understandable but, also an acceptable development because of the increasingly technical character and complexity of modern government activities which, have involved top public administrators in politics by the very nature of their primary function, namely policy execution, to be directly involved in matters of governance. Policy – making is the primary function of the political arm of government, but without the advice on factual or value implications from the administrative side, any government will find it difficult to arrive at decisions on many aspects of government operations. In translating government policy into practice, the function of the

administrative arm, the administrative and political decisions, will again be as closely interrelated that the one inescapably affects the other.

15. CONCLUSION

In the final analysis, and in terms of the literature reviewed on the subject matter enunciated above, Cloete (1977: 23 – 29) in a comprehensive analysis advances intuitive hypothesis that “The disciplines, of political science and public administration are essentially complimentary and that, it is true whether the approach to them is normative, descriptive or behavioural; politics contains an administrative element that is often as important as that commonly seen as “political;” that conversely public administration has its internal macro – political behaviour and, operates in a macro – political context, which in turn influences this behaviour” and, finally that, in South Africa and generally the world over, much fruitful research in each discipline could be undertaken in the fields common to both. The subtle nuances as described above was not taken into consideration by the former management of iSimangaliso.

The above expose was important from the perspective that iSimangaliso and its past functionaries, including the past and current Board members in the main did not understand the distinction between politics and administration because, they all operated and operate within the context and milieu of the politics of public administration and public management and, many of the Board members have had no working experience within the public service and, have been apt to disregard the rules and regulations that govern the politics of public administration and management. This has caused much tension between the successive Boards and the management echelons of iSimangaliso over time. Having briefly delineated some crucial aspects of the nuances and distinction of politics and administration in terms of public policy, it thus sets the pace in respect to analysis of several other aspects in relationship to stakeholder imperatives within the context of this paper. This will be undertaken in part two of the paper.

NOTE:

This paper is broken – up into three distinct sections as part one, part two and part three and, will be published at one go as three papers in the same journal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Kindly note that no bibliography is provided because the entire bibliography will be provided at the end of the series of three articles, in the final paper or in part three of this series of articles.

DEDICATION

This three part research paper is dedicated to the memory of the late minister of environmental affairs of the republic of south africa – edna edith bono molewa, who tragically passed away in the month of september 2018. She appointed the researcher as interim chief executive officer (ICEO) of the isimangaliso wetland park authority.

It is also dedicated to some staff of the isimangaliso wetland park authority who serve the organization with pride, passion, resilience, dedication and enthusiasm (these staff know who they are) and, to the lives of the peasantry in this region of northern Kwa Zulu Natal, who live their lives with the hope for a better dawn in the improvement of their lives.