

1 Conflicts as Indices to Evaluating the Effectiveness of Natural  
2 Resources Conservation in the Cross River National Park, Nigeria

3 Dr. Andrew-Essien<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup> University of Calabar, Calabar

5 *Received: 6 June 2012 Accepted: 2 July 2012 Published: 15 July 2012*

6

---

7 **Abstract**

8 Despite the legislative frameworks put in place to enable the preservation of natural resources,  
9 it is discovered that conflicts undermine the sustainable conservation of natural resources. The  
10 paper examines the nature and intensity of conflicts within the Park while highlighting the  
11 critical causes for conflicts within the area. A total of three hundred and ninetyfive  
12 questionnaires were distributed to eight study communities and the National Park  
13 management to elicit information on the factors that account for conflicts in the park.  
14 Findings show that conflicts exist in the park owing to a number of factors which include park  
15 location and objection of the communities to the restrictions imposed on access to natural  
16 resources. These collectively manifest as threats to the communities and the park objectives.  
17 The factors accounting for this are identified to include lack of adequate employment of  
18 community members by Park management, lack of compensation by the park management to  
19 community, unemployment, closeness of park boundary to communities and the restrictions of  
20 livelihood sources of the communities. The study advocates for community enlightenment,  
21 and the adoption of participatory approaches in creating and managing the National Park.

22

---

23 *Index terms*— Enlightenment, community, unemployment, closeness.

24 **1 INTRODUCTION**

25 Despite the numerous functions performed by National Parks, it is observed that Park environment frequently  
26 strive under conditions of conflicts. Conflict may be regarded as a struggle over values and claims to scarce  
27 status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to injure, or eliminate their rivals (Otite  
28 and Albert 2001), Thayer, (2005), Davey, (1993), Coser (1956), Cordell, J. (1993). The conflict situations in  
29 park areas are often attributed to conditions of discordance between the park management and the surrounding  
30 indigenous communities based on the multiple-values attached to the existence, sustenance, welfare and the role  
31 of the natural resources within such environments.

32 The steadily increasing incidences of these conflicts reflect that a consensus has not been reached that will  
33 enable the conservation scheme to be achieved. The resulting consequences have been the emergence of series of  
34 Author : University of Calabar, Calabar. E-mail : liessien@yahoo.ca criticisms on the impacts created by the  
35 establishment criticisms on the impacts created by the establishment of National Parks. This is because while  
36 the designation of a national park could be seen to result in future conservation benefits to humankind; it has  
37 also resulted in destabilizing the ability of people to survive in present times. It is thus clear that there is a  
38 genuine clash between the needs of biodiversity conservation and the development needs of the people.

39 The commencement of a strict conservation policy by the management of the Cross River National Park,  
40 witnessed a strong resistance by communities of the zone. This is because the strict conservation policy demanded  
41 restrictions on the ability of the support communities to have free access to the natural resources within the park  
42 environment. The consequences have manifested in the form of conflicts of varying dimensions between park

## 6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

---

43 authorities and the indigenous peoples of park communities owing to the rich diverse ecosystems of the park;  
44 which contain plant and animal resources, produce seeds and fruits for consumption, flavorings, spices, medicines,  
45 building materials and other uses (Schmidt 1996).

### 46 2 a) Conservation versus Development conflicts in Protected 47 Areas

48 Concern has been highlighted on the need to have insights to the compatibility of conservation and development  
49 in human inhabited protected areas. Fisher, C. and Ury ??1985) and Buckles and Rusnak (1999) identified some  
50 of the causes of conflicts related to natural resources utilization to include situations where natural resources  
51 are embedded in an environment or interconnected space wherein actions by one individual or group may  
52 generate effects that disrupt the livelihoods of those surviving on it for food; natural resources may be embedded  
53 in a shared social space where complex and unequal relations are established among a wide range of social  
54 actors, resources scarcity , increasing demand and unequal distribution; situations in which natural resources  
55 are used by people in ways that are defined symbolically. From the foregoing, it can be deduced that protected  
56 area conflict is largely connected to contests over resources and access to them and into the forces that make  
57 such competition increasingly widespread. The availability of natural resources is not the causes of conflict,  
58 rather the forces that compel and make such competition widespread and thus trigger tension and often lead  
59 to clashes ( Imeh, and Adebobola 2005). In other words, the environment is linked to the base of all social  
60 conflicts that pertain to resources use and conservation. Ghirmine & Pimbert (1997) explain the protected -area  
61 conflict and the interrelationship of macro-trends as emanating from primary focus on rising income per capita,  
62 productivities and technological modernization, while the issue of rural social security and sustainable livelihood  
63 have received secondary attention. Over-looking basic community needs is the dominant reason for conflicts  
64 thereby undermining the conservation goals. Daniels (2002) highlights three administrative procedures employed  
65 in many National Parks which are often conflict inducers. They include the Top-Down, Mixed Management  
66 and Bottom-up Management approaches. The three approaches have been adopted in human inhabited areas  
67 worldwide and have resulted in varying impacts. The top-down management approach involves a command  
68 management in which the management of protected areas is strictly controlled by the park authorities while the  
69 local communities have no direct control or power in the administration and management of the park and its  
70 resources. The resulting effects of such management mode have been the involvement of local communities in  
71 economic activities that are less sustainable than previously engaged in. The second approach which illustrates  
72 resource management in protected areas is the mixed top-down and bottom-up concepts which attempts to  
73 partially involve local communities in the management and administration of park areas. The resulting impacts  
74 have been the creation of various land uses, anthropogenic landscape features, culturally significant and sacred  
75 areas and natural resource distribution to enhance the local communities' abilities to support their livelihoods  
76 within the confines of the Park (Arambiza 1995, Leitao 1994, Njiforti, and Tchamba, (1993) and Mitchelle 1993).  
77 The third park management approach is the bottom-up community participation and it involves a total and  
78 complete participation of the indigenous people in the management of park affairs.

### 79 3 II.

### 80 4 METHOD OF STUDY

81 The study made use of questionnaires to collect data from a total of eight study communities within the two  
82 Divisions of the Cross River National Park namely the Oban and Okwangwo Divisions . Within the Oban Division,  
83 selected communities are Abung, Okarara, Neghe and Oban. In the Okwangwo Division, the communities selected  
84 include Butatong, Bamba, Okwabang, and Okwangwo. Questionnaire data was collected using a dual perspective  
85 assessment method involving the National Park management and its host communities.Two hundred and eighty-  
86 one questionnaires were distributed to eight study communities while one hundred and fourteen questionnaires  
87 were also distributed to the National Park management to elicit information on the factors that account for  
88 conflicts in the park.

### 89 5 III.

### 90 6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

91 In analyzing conflicts in the Cross River National Park, a total of two hundred and fifty-five (255) respondents,  
92 equivalent of ninety-one percent (91%) of those sampled from the communities, indicated being aware of the  
93 existence of the park. Twenty-six (26) respondents, representing nine percent (9%) indicated not being aware of  
94 the existence of the park. Responses from the questionnaire showed that there is a significant level of awareness  
95 of the Park existence. a) Conflicts in the Cross River National Park.

96 The study considered the need to establish the level of association or relationship of integration that existed  
97 between the communities and the Park management. One major way of so doing is to examine the communities'  
98 acceptance of the National Park Support Zone Strategy based on the designation of communities into the  
99 Park's Support Zone as outlined by the Park for the communities located within and around the Park. From

100 the responses, two hundred and six (206) respondents, representing seventy-three percent (73%) regard their  
101 communities to be part of the Support Zone, while a total number of seventy-one (71) respondents, representing  
102 twenty-seven percent (27%) objected to their communities being part of the Support Zone. Two hundred and  
103 fifty-four (254) respondents within the communities or ninety percent (90%) indicated the existence of differences  
104 of opinion between the Park management and the communities. Twenty-seven (27%) respondents, making up  
105 ten percent (10%) of the sample, denied the existence of any differential opinions between the Park and the  
106 communities.

107 From the National Park's perspective, the acceptance of the existence of conflicts between the park management  
108 and its surrounding host communities, is also clearly established by the response of eighty-seven (87) respondents  
109 or seventy-eight percent (78%) who opted for yes and twenty-five (25) or twenty-two percent (22%) of respondents  
110 who are not aware of the existence of any disagreement between the Park and its host communities. To further  
111 buttress the Park management's knowledge of existing conflicts, it was necessary to determine the knowledge of the  
112 conflict types. A percentage representation of respondents' responses show that sixteen percent (16%) indicated  
113 open hostilities, fourteen percent (14%) chose resentment, nineteen percent (19%) selected disagreement and  
114 fifty-one percent (51%) indicated noncooperation with the Park management.

115 Various divisions of the park are affected by the disagreement in disparate proportions. Respondents indicated  
116 that Oban Division is most affected. Eighty-six (86) respondents or seventy-five percent (73%) affirmed this fact,  
117 while twenty-eight (27) respondents or twenty-five percent (25%) selected the Okwangwo Division as being most  
118 affected by disagreements. b) Threats faced by the National Park management in conservation.

119 The major challenge faced by the National park in its strive to achieve conservation in the Cross River  
120 protected area exists in the form of threats. Threats are actions or decisions undertaken that are most likely  
121 to mar the success of deliberate efforts. The establishment of the National Park is a deliberate effort aimed at  
122 achieving the conservation of natural resources from unreasonable exploitation. To clarify the existence of threats  
123 in the park, respondents, who are staff of the National Park, were required to ascertain if the park conservation  
124 scheme was in any way threatened and the nature of the threats that existed. Twenty-four (24) respondents, or  
125 twenty-one percent (21%), considered poaching to be a problem faced by the park authorities, while sixteen (16)  
126 respondents, representing fourteen percent (14%), regarded illegal logging to be the threats that is most likely  
127 to disrupt the conservation efforts. Thirty-five (35) respondents, constituting thirty percent (30%) of the sample  
128 population, selected noncooperation of rural communities in the conservation process. Twelve (12) respondents  
129 or ten percent (10%) accepted ignorance of the park's objectives for establishment, while twenty-seven (27)  
130 respondents, or twenty-three percent (23%) of the park management study population accounted for intrusion.  
131 c) Factors responsible for Conflicts in the Park.

132 An analysis of the park authorities' responses shows that there is a high consciousness of the existence of  
133 reasons for the conflicts. This is because sixty-six (66) respondents or fifty-eight percent (58%) acknowledge  
134 that reasons exist for the conflicts, while forty-eight respondents or forty-two percent (42%) do not acknowledge  
135 the existence of reasons for the conflicts within the park. The reasons given by the park management as being  
136 responsible for the conflicts in the National Park include, lack of adequate employment of community members  
137 by Park management (12%), lack of compensation or failed promises by the park management to community  
138 (16%), unemployment and alternative development (25%), closeness of park boundary to communities and the  
139 restrictions of livelihood sources of the communities.

140 From the sampled population, it is seen that forty-eight (48) respondents, representing forty-two percent  
141 (42%) attributed the disagreements to lack of education of the people by the park management, thirty-two  
142 (32) respondents or twenty-eight percent (28%) selected failed promises by the park management, twenty-  
143 four respondents or twenty-one percent (21%) opted for lack of alternative livelihood sources, while ten (10)  
144 respondents, representing eight percent (8%) identify unemployment as being the central reason the communities  
145 would have for conflicts.

## 146 7 d) Implications of Conflicts in the Cross River National 147 Park.

148 It would be an understatement to assert that the persisting conflict situations between the park management  
149 and the communities of the National Park have implications on the conservation process. However, both positive  
150 and negative implications result from the challenges that surround the National Park. e) Positive Implications.

151 The main argument presented by the proponents of environmental conservation is in line with the need to slow  
152 down the human misuse of the natural environment and thereby put in place a pragmatic utilitarian conservation  
153 in which the environment is protected, not only for its authentic and spiritual values (biometric preservation), but  
154 also to enable the availability and subsequent use for the present and future. This is in line with Zimmermann's  
155 (1966) definition of a resource, as being, not merely characterized by physical presence, but also the use value,  
156 which plays a more significant role.

157 In addition to this, the human development index establishes a relationship between wealth and human  
158 development, and anchors on the fact that human development ranking is based primarily on the average life  
159 expectancy, health, literacy and nutritional indices. Hence, the conflict situation in the protected area of the Cross  
160 River National Park is a reflection of the high level of suppression and marginalization of the rural populace,

## 9 CONCLUSION

---

161 which is rapidly calling for attention in order to set in motion strategic machineries that can aid the human  
162 development of this area. f) Negative Implications.

163 The spates of conflicts within the National Park have highlighted effects which cut across a wide sector of  
164 the environment. With incidences of conflicts on the increase, the ecological integrity of the environment is  
165 threatened, particularly as intruders, who having inhabited the area for long, are well-informed of the geographic  
166 configuration of the park, and would indiscriminately exploit the resources therein to the detriment of the  
167 conservation objectives. In addition to this, it is seen that the variables that are affected as a result of the  
168 existing differential conservation and development value of the National Park resources are intricately linked, and  
169 as such, rather than the progress March 2012 development of the area will continuously be experienced.

170 In an era where literacy and technological developments are on the increase, it would not be sufficient for  
171 the African environment to be backward and slow in its developmental strides. In order words, to favourably  
172 compete with other nations of the world, there is the need to re-examine critically, the existing factors of conflicts,  
173 such that solutions and options are selected and implemented that will enable conservation and development to  
174 integrate for, as succinctly described by the pragmatic utilitarian conservationists, 'the greatest good, for the  
175 greatest numbers, for the longest time'! (Gifford Pinchot) This, simply put, refers to the need for both the park  
176 management in addition to their adopted policies, to co-exist peacefully with the communities and their strides  
177 to eke out their known means of livelihood development in a familiar environment and in occupations that they  
178 can readily associate with, for growth and development.

179 IV.

## 8 RECOMMENDATIONS

180 There is a strong and urgent need for the Government at both federal and state levels, to adopt participatory  
181 approach in creating and managing protected areas that have tremendous ecological values. Final decisions that  
182 involve environmental programmes should be based on the pulse observed at the grass-root level. Representatives  
183 from affected communities, government administrative officials and conservation experts are stakeholders who  
184 should be involved in the development of strategies that are associated with protected area creation and  
185 management.

186 A social assessment is necessary for the establishment of conservation projects that directly affect the lives of the  
187 rural people inhabiting the area. This can be commissioned where it was omitted as a process of initiating a park  
188 around an already inhabited area. This is relevant because, a fraction of the responsibility of government involves  
189 ensuring that the interests of its citizens are protected, such that the people exist in comfort. Government's  
190 responsibility to its citizenry further includes creating an enabling environment for its people acquire or develop  
191 a legitimate and sustainable means of livelihood that is enhanced by the relevant formulation and execution of  
192 policies. It is therefore vital for the government to assist the rural communities attain a level of development  
193 that is sustainable.

194 In order for the conservation process to be effective in the Cross River National Park, it is necessary to  
195 consider some relevant issues. The first is that conservation processes in areas that are inhabited by indigenous  
196 communities often have a much longer history than government-designed protected areas and as such the  
197 traditional conservation processes of indigenous communities are legitimate and can be adopted to further enhance  
198 the conservation scheme. Secondly, it is vital to recognize diverse governance types within a protected as being  
199 legitimate for the effective coverage of the area and the promotion of a high level of connectivity within a large area  
200 such as the Cross River Park. There is also the need for the park management to design enlightenment programmes  
201 for communities, affected by the park or conservation activities that have significant cultural contents (Lusigi  
202 1992). The essence of this is to address issues or points of conflicts from a cultural perspective. The situation of  
203 the Cross River National park demands enlightenment programmes with a cultural bias prior to the establishment  
204 of the Park. The affected communities had developed a tradition surrounding their means of livelihood, including  
205 their occupations, foods and land-use management processes. These cultural patterns have been handed down  
206 through ancestral lineage. The development of new sources of livelihood would therefore require a high level  
207 of re-orientation and adaptation. Consultants that understand the culture of affected communities would be  
208 relevant in championing conservation issues within the communities .

209 V.

## 9 CONCLUSION

210 Currently, many countries have been challenged in the provision of sound and realistic approaches for the effective  
211 conservation of their natural resources, particularly where the sources of livelihood of rural communities have  
212 been affected. The establishment of protected area projects such as the National Park in any ecologically well-  
213 endowed resource environment should be primarily for the benefit of the indigenous people and subsequently, the  
214 world at large. However, it would appear that the initiators of conservation programmes reflect and emphasize  
215 more on the long term benefit of biodiversity conservation to mankind, which is often to the detriment of the  
216 people and communities occupying protected areas. This can in metaphoric terms, be described as preparing a  
217 meal for the unborn child, without first nurturing the womb that carries the child. In relation to this statement,  
218 it would be an under-estimation to declare that the people and communities inhabiting the Cross River National  
219

---

221 Park enclave and support zones have been deprived. Hunger, sickness, unemployment, poverty and premature  
222 deaths are the conditions that characterize the current situations in these areas.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Conflicts as Indices to Evaluating the Effectiveness of Natural Resources Conservation in the Cross River National Park, Nigeria © 2012 Global Journals Inc. (US) and growth of this area being gingered, a backward



---

223 [Cordell ()] 'Boundaries and bloodlines: Tenure of indigenous homelands and protected areas'. J Cordell .  
224 *indigenous peoples and protected areas*, (London) 1993. Earthscan Publication.

225 [Otitie ()] *Community conflicts in Nigeria: Management, resolution and transformation*, O Otitie , I .  
226 2001. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

227 [Njiforti and Tchamba ()] *conflict in Cameroon, parks for or against people" In Indigenous people and protected*  
228 *areas: the law of mother earth*, H Njiforti , N Tchamba . 1993. London: Earthscan.

229 [Conflicts as Indices to Evaluating the Effectiveness of Natural Resources Conservation in the Cross River National Park]  
230 *Conflicts as Indices to Evaluating the Effectiveness of Natural Resources Conservation in the Cross River*  
231 *National Park*, Nigeria.

232 [Davey (ed.) ()] *Creative communities: Planning and co-managing protected areas' In indigenous peoples and*  
233 *protected areas: The law of mother earth*, S Davey . Kemf E. (ed.) 1993. London: Earthscan.

234 [Leitao ()] *Indigenous people in Brazil, the Guarani: A Case for the UN. Cultural Survival*, A Leitao . 1994. p. .

235 [Daniels ()] *Indigenous peoples and neotropical forest conservation: Impacts of the protected area systems on*  
236 *traditional cultures*, A Daniels . 2002. (Macalester Environmental Review)

237 [Fisher and Ury K (ed.) ()] *Interpersonal conflict. 2nd (ed). (Dubuquer, I. A: Brown, C Fisher , Ury K . Human*  
238 *communication Tubbs, S. L and Moss, S (ed.) 1985. 1985. 1991. New York: McGraw Hill.*

239 [Schmidt ()] *Kingskid Concept*, A Schmidt . 1996. 2001. Nigeria National Park Profile.

240 [Lusigi ()] 'Managing protected areas in Africa'. W Lusigi . *Africa* 1992.

241 [Coser (ed.) ()] *On conflicts, their resolution, transformation and management" in Community conflicts in*  
242 *Nigeria*, L Coser . Otitie, O., Albert, I. (ed.) 1956. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.

243 [Michelle ()] 'Problem solving exercises and theories of conflict resolution'. C Michelle . *Conflict resolution,*  
244 *theories and practise: Integration and Application*, D Sandole, Van Merwe (ed.) 1993. Manchester University  
245 press.

246 [Imeh and Adebobola ()] 'The effects of poverty in the conservation of biodiversity: the Nigerian experience'. N  
247 Imeh , H Adebobola . *Science in Africa. on-line magazine* 2005.

248 [Arambiza ()] *The Kaa-Iya protected area of the Grand Chaco: A case collaborations between In Indigenous*  
249 *peoples and biodiversity conservation in Latin America*, E Arambiza . 1995. Copenhagen: EKs-Skolen Trykkrei  
250 APS.

251 [Thayer ()] *The nature of conflict and conflict over nature: protected areas, tran-frontier conservation and the*  
252 *meaning of development*, D Thayer . 2005. New York; Skidmore College-Saratoga Springs.

253 [Ghirmine and Pimbert K (ed.) ()] *The nature of conflict and conflict over nature: protected areas, transfrontier*  
254 *conservation and the meaning of development*, A Ghirmine , Pimbert K . Thayer, D. (ed.) 1997. 2005. New  
255 York; Skidmore college-Saratoga Springs.