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Throughout my studies in Environmental Science and Public Policy, I have become extremely interested in the policies that govern the ways in which humans interact with their natural environments. I have been able to combine this study of environmental science and policy with my interest in international development by looking at various options for sustainable development. The field of sustainable development, as the World Commission on Environment and Development describes it, deals with methods to “meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”¹ I have come across many methods for sustainable development in my studies, but I was particularly intrigued by a presentation at the Center for International Development Undergraduate Associate Program at the Kennedy School of Government given by Greg Carr. Mr. Carr spoke about the restoration of Gorongosa National Park in Mozambique and the efforts that the Carr Foundation was making to include “ecotourism” in this area. He explained how the Foundation had begun to educate local communities about plans for the new park, and about how they could be employed there. He also mentioned that revenues from tourism activities in the park would go to local communities for development purposes. This concept, through which local communities benefit from the conservation of natural resources, seemed to combine my interests in environmental science, public policy, and sustainable international development.

After this introduction to the concept of ecotourism, I became interested to learn how the theory translated into practice in order to determine whether ecotourism is successful. After studying ecotourism in my courses, I realized that it was essential to view ecotourism in the field. Tanzania was one of the first places that I considered, due to the plethora of nature-based tourism activities found in this country as well as its relatively stable political and social environment. I conducted further library research and traveled to Tanzania for five weeks to view ecotourism first-hand.

During my travels, I began to wonder whether ecotourism caused more harm than good. If ecotourism is supposed to be used as a sustainable development tool, then the local communities and governments involved should receive a significant portion of the revenues generated, and projects should create minimal cultural and environmental damage. Yet, by traveling to Tanzania by air, I wondered whether I had paid too much money to non-Tanzanian companies and had used too much environmentally harmful jet fuel to make the trip worthwhile for the Tanzanians who were implementing the projects or for achieving environmental protection. I became aware of my ecological footprint, as I traveled, again by air, from Dar Es Salaam to Arusha and back, and as I drove over 300 miles in sport-utility-vehicles to visit ecotourism sites. I wondered as I spoke with villagers near these sites whether my presence and my interview questions were damaging their culture. I observed the elementary school classrooms and other facilities that were built with the revenues from these projects, and I wondered whether the potential harm caused by my trip, and the trips of all who embark on ecotourism excursions, were a worthy tradeoff for these benefits. I began to question the feasibility of achieving sustainable development goals through ecotourism. The driving question of
this thesis became: is ecotourism worthwhile for those involved in the planning and implementation of projects?

Throughout my time in Tanzania, I repeatedly encountered the slogan of the Tanzania National Parks Association (TANAPA): “Conservation for Sustainable Development.” This organization manages Tanzania’s fourteen national parks and therefore, oversees the bulk of nature-based tourism in Tanzania. The fact that this is their slogan is revealing about the way in which Tanzanian tourism is perceived and marketed. Through my field research, I aimed to perform careful analysis of whether these perceptions of Tanzania’s nature-based tourism do indeed manifest themselves in actual tourism projects. This thesis reflects my desire to understand the concept of ecotourism, to observe how it has been applied in Tanzania, and to determine whether ecotourism projects can achieve their desired goals of conservation for sustainable development.
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTB</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCED</td>
<td>UN World Commission on Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Tourism Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
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Introduction

The objective of this Environmental Science and Public Policy Senior Thesis is to examine the global concept of ecotourism, to analyze how this concept has been applied in a national and local context in Tanzania, and to understand how and under what conditions ecotourism functions as a sustainable development tool. “Ecotourism” has become a catchphrase in the environmental movement, the tourism industry, and the sustainable development sector in the past few decades. The Oxford English Dictionary defines ecotourism as “tourism to areas of ecological interest (typically exotic and often threatened natural environments), especially to support conservation efforts and observe wildlife.”1 There are multiple definitions of ecotourism in use, however, and since the emergence of this term, debate has continued on what exactly ecotourism entails. Many ecotourism projects include a focus on nature as the attraction, conservation of ecological and cultural diversity, inclusion of local communities and indigenous peoples in the planning and implementation of projects, and minimization of negative environmental impact. Due to the multiple focuses that ecotourism projects can have, therefore, ambiguity exists about what does and does not qualify as ecotourism. This confusion results in part from the variety of disciplines from which ecotourism emerged and the historical context surrounding the creation of this term.

Ecotourism emerged in the early 1980s as a result of changes within the tourism industry, the environmental movement and the field of economic development. It emerged as a potential option for appealing to particular environmentalists who were

---
upset by the destructive and intrusive nature of many tourism activities, for satisfying the wants and needs of tourists, for aiding governments in their aims of economic development, and for providing income for indigenous and rural communities while preserving their ecology and culture. However, these multiple goals are not always reached through ecotourism activities, leading some to believe that “ecotourism” is a “feel-good term which, in fact, can hide many sins.”\(^2\) Often, the disbelief of such skeptics is justified; even though the goals of and principles behind ecotourism are admirable, it is difficult to achieve all of these aims given the diversity of interests motivating ecotourism. Yet, is it actually possible that a form of tourism can preserve the environment and culture of communities involved while bringing in revenue for economic development? Can the results of ecotourism projects actually be viewed as “conservation for sustainable development,”\(^3\) such that ecotourism becomes a worthwhile endeavor for the actors involved in its implementation? This thesis aims answer these questions.

Chapter 1, *Ecotourism as a Contested Global Concept*, seeks to gain an understanding of ecotourism in a global context by examining how it has been conceptualized over time and analyzing the fields from which the concept originated.\(^4\) This chapter presents six commonly cited principles of ecotourism that will provide a template for evaluation of ecotourism in subsequent chapters.


\(^3\) This is the slogan of the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA).

\(^4\) By “conceptualized,” I refer to the discussion about how groups and individuals have formed concepts of what the goals and principles of ecotourism should be, based on their unique knowledge and experience.
Chapter 2, *Tanzania’s Ecotourism – the National Context*, discusses how ecotourism has been conceptualized and implemented in Tanzania by analyzing historical developments in environmental issues, the national economy, and the national tourism sector. This chapter also discusses the way in which Tanzanian residents and organizations, from the national government to small-scale NGOs, have interpreted the international concept of ecotourism (according to the six principles from Chapter 1) to fit the national context.

After setting out the international theory and Tanzanian conceptualizations of ecotourism, Chapters 3 and 4 analyze case studies of ecotourism projects to demonstrate how the theory of ecotourism translates into practice. These cases are assessed according to the template from Chapter 1 in order to compare and contrast the local, national, and international models of ecotourism.

Chapter 3, *Case Study: The Cultural Tourism Programme*, discusses the Cultural Tourism Programme (CTP) that was initiated by the Netherlands Development Agency (SNV) and the Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB) throughout Tanzania by analyzing two specific programs in depth: the program in Ng’iresi village and the program through the Osotwa non-governmental organization (NGO).

Chapter 4, *Case Study: Ecotourism Activities in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area*, discusses the implementation of ecotourism in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area.
(NCA) by analyzing three ecotourism programs that take place there: walking safaris, campsites, and Cultural Bomas (CBs).

The final chapter, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, synthesizes the information learned from the case studies with the theories of ecotourism established in Chapters 1 and 2 in order to compare and contrast the international, national, and local conceptualizations of ecotourism. Through this discussion, this chapter addresses some of the larger questions considered throughout the first four chapters, including:

- Can ecotourism actually be “conservation for sustainable development”?
- Are ecotourism activities worthwhile for those involved in the planning and implementation of projects and for those who are supposed to receive the benefits?
- What sorts of effects do ecotourism projects have on local communities?
- If ecotourism can be effective at reaching the goals of sustainable development, should more tourists be encouraged to participate in ecotourism activities?
- Is ecotourism a practical and effective sustainable development option for policymakers?

Although these questions cannot and will not be answered with a simple “yes” or “no,” this concluding chapter explores the answers to such questions in order to provide a greater understanding of the conditions under which the goals of ecotourism can effectively be achieved.

This thesis considers the global, national, local, and case-specific conceptualizations and manifestations of ecotourism through the lens of sustainable
development, focusing on economic prosperity, environmental protection, and social development. These ideas are explored by moving from the global standard of ecotourism to Tanzanian to specific cases of ecotourism. The figure on the following page can be used as a framework to guide the analysis contained in each chapter.
Figure 0.1. Organizational Chart
Chapter 1
Ecotourism as a Contested Global Concept

INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to discuss the emergence of the concept of ecotourism and to outline its global importance. The chapter does so by examining the concept, contextualizing it within the different fields from which it has grown, and by tracing its evolution over time. Placing the theory of ecotourism within its historical context allows for an understanding of the implementation of the ecotourism projects. Situating ecotourism within three fields of global influence emphasizes its international importance and indicates that ecotourism can be framed in a variety of ways through differing definitions. Thus, by exploring the origins of ecotourism in the fields of development, tourism, and environmentalism, and by examining the evolution of the concept, this chapter demonstrates the complex nature of this rapidly-increasing form of tourism.

THE ORIGINS OF ENVIRONMENTALISM

The theories of environmental conservation and community management of ecosystems, which are embedded within the concept of ecotourism, have their historic roots in the ideas of environmentalism. The intellectual concern for the protection or conservation of nature that is characteristic of recent environmental movements goes back at least to the last decades of the eighteenth century, according to environmental historian Ramachandra Guha.¹ During that time, the Industrial Revolution had caused countries and their citizens to realize that human behavior and modernization could
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destroy the environment. These sentiments, which emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, caused what Guha calls the “first wave of environmentalism,” in which intellectuals such as William Wordsworth, John Ruskin, and Also Leopold criticized the Industrial Revolution, searched for scientific techniques to manage nature, and aimed to preserve “untouched” areas. In the United States, groups were formed either to address the excesses of resource-based capitalism, or to try to isolate capitalist development from certain protected areas valued for their aesthetic, spiritual, or recreational qualities. This environmental concern was not limited to American and European environments, however; it eventually found its way to many colonies.

When colonial leaders of France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Portugal and Spain met in London in 1900 for the Convention for the Preservation of Wild Animals, Birds and Fish in Africa, their main objective was “to prevent […] uncontrolled massacre [of wildlife] and to ensure the conservation of diverse wild animal species in their African possessions which are useful […] or inoffensive […] to man.” This treaty was replaced in 1933 by the London Convention Relative to the Preservation of Flora and Fauna in their Natural State. Although protection of wildlife was highlighted in these treaties, another main goal was to maintain the prospect of sport-hunting, which provided young men serving in colonial outposts a form of recreation that offered trophies rarely to be found in Europe. Although their motivations were somewhat self-interested, the

---

2 Ibid, 5.
5 Guha, 45.
colonists’ concerns, and those of conservation-minded scientists, provoked the ideas of game management and establishment of protected areas that persist today. In the early twentieth century, Aldo Leopold, a United States ecologist and forester, proposed philosophies of “game management” modeled closely on the principles of scientific forestry that had been introduced in Germany in the eighteenth century.\(^6\) The Germans had put forward the idea of “sustainability” at that time as a way of maintaining a specified yield from a forest over time through predictions and planning.\(^7\) These ideas of sustainability were adopted by nineteenth and twentieth century thinkers, such as Leopold, and led to a movement from species protection to habitat protection and on to the protection of all forms of biological diversity.\(^8\) The principles underlying ecotourism, including concern about environmental degradation and attempts to mitigate environmental damage, emerged as a result of these concepts that had been introduced in the eighteenth century and were further developed in the twentieth century.

### The Modern Environmental Movement

After surviving two World Wars, the planet stood at a crossroads in determining the way in which the natural environment should be handled. Though many natural landscapes had been destroyed by the horrors of war, the focus of many countries was on industrial reconstruction rather than environmental preservation. As a result, the modern environmental movement did not emerge until the late 1950s and the early 1960s. This movement, incorporating many of the ideas put forth during the eighteenth and

---

\(^6\) Ibid., 55.
\(^8\) Guha, 57-58.
nineteenth centuries, was propelled in 1962 by the publication of Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring*. Carson’s writing about the harmful effects of pesticides sparked controversy about the way in which humans were altering the environment. This seminal text in turn caused like-minded works to be published and prompted the establishment of environmental groups like Greenpeace, founded in 1971.

These progressions led to increased studies of ecological systems and to international conferences on environmental management. The field of “recreation ecology” emerged in the early 1970s and promoted studies of the environmental effects of human recreation. The idea of the “carrying capacity” of an ecosystem – the concept that environmental factors set limits on the population that an area can sustain and when these limits are exceeded, the quality of the environment in this area declines – also emerged at this time. Various groups and individuals came together to discuss these issues at international conferences, including the United Nations (UN) Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972 and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) held in 1973. The heightened awareness of environmental issues on a global scale as a result of these conventions led to the establishment of environmental movements in developing countries, especially those with world-renowned ecosystems, such as Kenya. As an

---

12 CITES aimed to combat the commercial exploitation of endangered species through international trade restrictions. The relative failure of this convention led to the negotiations of the 1992 United Nation Convention on Biological Diversity.
example, Wangari Maathai, a Kenyan environmentalist and 2005 Nobel Peace Prize Recipient, founded the Green Belt Movement in Kenya in 1977 to sustain the local environment through planting trees. Such groups led protests and proposed reforms to various sectors, including the tourism industry. This increased focus on global environmental concerns that was spurred by the modern environmental movement penetrated many fields, including the field of economic development.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Since the emergence from feudalism of the modern nation-state in the fourteenth century, the promotion of economic development can be said to have become “an objective of state policy,” according to historian Heinz Wolfgang Arndt.  

By the eighteenth century, when the industrial revolution began in Britain, a desire for material progress had spread from England to other Western European countries and then to countries within their empires. As the rapidly industrializing countries of Western Europe engaged in the process of colonization, problems of underdevelopment and development strategy began to present themselves to colonial policymakers and administrators. These leaders were primarily concerned with the development of the natural resources of their colonies such as gold, silver, and cocoa. Others were convinced that they were the bearers of civilization and Christianity, bringing “the pacific triumph of reason over barbarism.” Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, classical economists such as Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, and Karl Marx, were

---

14 Ibid.
15 Ibid., 22.
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concerned with the capitalist development of their own Western countries, although many of these theories were later applied to ideas of development in the Third World.

The major interest of Western governments, economists, and public opinion in the economic development of the Third World emerged during and immediately following World War II. These years saw the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (now the World Bank), along with the formation of the UN, all in 1944. The events of World War II had changed the balance of world power, as former colonial powers were greatly weakened while movements for national independence were strengthened. Between the mid-1950s and the mid-1970s, over forty African and Asian colonies achieved independence and entered the world economy. The newly independent countries developed programs of action to improve the livelihood of their citizens, and developed nations contemplated how they could and if they should provide assistance to less developed countries. Programs were focused mainly on raising living standards and on industrialization through capital formation, investment in human capital, and trade.

By the mid-1960s, statistics revealed that many developing countries had enjoyed rapid economic growth, yet growth in per capita income had not eliminated poverty or underemployment and had frequently widened the gap between rich and poor. Purely statistical measures, such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), often understated the improvements that had occurred. Therefore, development economics became less growth-oriented and more concerned with social development, taking a

---

17 Arndt, 43.
18 Ibid., 50.
19 Ibid., 3.
20 Arndt, 90-91.
“basic human needs approach,” including issues of health, education, employment, poverty, and inequality in plans of action. Additionally, throughout the 1960s and 1970s, alternative methods of development were considered, as concerns were raised about how the rapid development that was occurring in some developing countries was affecting natural environments.

**Sustainable Development**

During the early 1980s, the concerns of economic development were combined with concerns about threats to earth’s ecological equilibrium. Areas with high levels of biological diversity in Africa, Asia, and Latin America often face issues such as rapid population growth, lack of capital, and foreign debts, which lead to over-exploitation of natural resources and the loss of biodiversity. The ideas of sustainability reemerged to combat these problems, and the 1980s saw a focus on the idea of sustainable development as a means of mitigating the aforementioned problems while still providing economic benefits to people in the developing world. The UN World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) was assembled in 1983 at the request of the UN General Assembly. The WCED published a report entitled *Our Common Future* in 1987, which defined sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own

---
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needs.” 23 This is one of the most cited definitions of sustainable development and it governs many current and ongoing development projects. Such ideas of sustainable development were considered further at the “Earth Summit,” the UN Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Five documents emerged from this conference, including Agenda 21, which is seen as the eight-hundred page “bible of sustainable development” that gives numerous recommendations on how to implement sustainable development. 24 Through Agenda 21 and the principles set forth by the WCED, tourism began to be seen as a means of redistributing economic resources, mitigating the socio-economic situation both at local and national scales, and contributing to biodiversity conservation. 25 Our Common Future explicitly mentioned “linking species conservation with development aid” and “promotion of wild-life based tourism” as effective tools to achieve sustainable development. 26 Members from the travel and tourism industry recognized that tourism could “contribute to the conservation, protection, and restoration of Earth’s ecosystem.” 27 Thus, tourism that was designed to have less negative environmental impact emerged as a potential sustainable development tool, causing significant changes in the tourism industry.

25 Gössling, 304.
26 WCED, 162 and 164.
Chapter 1

THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

Tourism has become an extremely large global sector in which virtually any community can participate. It is a highly capital and labor intensive industry, which involves the creation of an infrastructure of attractions, accommodation facilities, transportation capabilities, and communications.\(^\text{28}\) This infrastructure accommodates tourists, who were defined by the UN Conference of International Travel and Tourism (1963) as temporary visitors who spend more than 24 hours in destinations other than their normal place of residence for the purposes of holidaymaking, recreation, study, religion, visiting family and friends, or business.\(^\text{29}\) This sector has now become the world’s largest industry in terms of the numbers of people participating, the employment capacity, and the amount of resources generated.\(^\text{30}\) Each year, tourism generates 200 million jobs – 10 percent of all jobs globally\(^\text{31}\) – and is one of the top five sources of foreign currency for 83 percent of developing countries.\(^\text{32}\) Tourism is expected to draw 1.6 billion international travelers in 2020.\(^\text{33}\) This sector has only recently grown in size, due to a combination of historical circumstances.

Travel, especially international travel, was once seen as an activity limited to the wealthy. The introduction of the jet aircraft in the late 1950s doubled the speed of air travel and wide-bodied jets, introduced in the 1970s, reduced the average cost per person,

\(^{30}\) Ibid., 1.
\(^{32}\) Luvanga, Shitundu, and Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania, 10.
\(^{33}\) Vanasselt.
making travel easier and more accessible.\(^\text{34}\) Additionally, the wealth amassed in Western countries gave citizens more leisure time and cheaper transport.\(^\text{35}\) There was a worldwide increase in paid holidays in the twentieth century, following the institution of the 1938 Holidays with Pay Act in Britain and the inclusion of the right to paid holidays in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Vacationing became routine and “since the emergence of the Côte d’Azur in southern France as a summer resort in the 1930s, ‘horizontal holidays’, consisting mainly of lying on a beach in the sun […] have grown rapidly in popularity.”\(^\text{36}\) Residents of developed countries had an urge to view the exotic and to experience nature, which was fueled by the pressures of living in highly urbanized, industrial countries.\(^\text{37}\) These individuals began to venture to developing countries, which hold most of earth’s biodiversity. However, these increases in travel and tourism did not come without criticism.

Many environmentalists began to criticize the tourism sector, citing high energy consumption, pollution of the environment, trampling of natural habitats, and littering, among the many problems with tourism.\(^\text{38}\) Some environmentalists also said that, “the tourist destroys what he is looking for whilst finding it,”\(^\text{39}\) by damaging the ecosystems within and surrounding tourism sites and by threatening the cultures of the communities visited. The sharp increase in tourism, combined with the insistence of environmentalists that the tourism industry improve its environmental standards, led to the search for a form

\(^\text{35}\) Ibid, 1.
\(^\text{36}\) Ibid., 2.
\(^\text{37}\) Ibid., 1.
\(^\text{39}\) Ibid., 3.
of tourism that would satisfy the demand for travel but would not be harmful to the environment.

THE EMERGENCE OF AND INITIAL RESISTANCE TO ‘ECOTOURISM’

The combination of historical changes in the environmental movement, the field of sustainable development, and the tourism industry led to the search for alternatives to mass tourism, such as ecotourism. Hector Ceballos-Lascuráin, a member of various Mexican non-governmental organizations (NGOs) is widely credited with coining the term ecotourism, using “ecotourismo” in written correspondences in 1983, and using “ecotourism” in an advertisement for one of his ecological tourism projects in the March-April 1984 edition of *American Birds*.40 He emphasized ecotourism as ecological tourism which could become very important for conservation.41 The term was also related to other forms of tourism that were emerging at the time, including “nature tourism,” and “low impact tourism.” Ecotourism fell between these forms, and was presented as a type of tourism that could both focus on nature and reduce negative environmental impact. Ceballos-Lascuráin could not have predicted the staying power of this term, nor could he have anticipated how much controversy it would spark. Even though ecotourism is now a widely used term and the World Tourism Organization (WTO) has shown that ecotourism and nature-based tourism account for more than 20 percent of total international travel,42 the concept was initially met with skepticism.

Ecotourism was not initially understood or accepted by experts in the environment, tourism, or development fields. These experts questioned whether

40 Wearing and Neil, 4.
41 Ibid.
42 Vanasselt.
ecotourism was simply a fad, “a tourism industry marketing exercise that effectively packages ‘nature’ for affluent urban dwellers to ‘experience’ a romantic world now lost to us moderns”, or “a way for environmentalism to enter the mainstream in the 1990s after losing its impetus in an economic rationalist world.” The motivations of project managers and communities involved in ecotourism projects were questioned, as some wondered whether the possibility of high profits from ecotourism activities in comparison to other competing land uses was given priority over conservation of resources. Although ecosystems were being preserved, the main motivations seemed to be economic and the reasons behind ecotourism were therefore questioned.

Interested individuals and groups were and remain to be skeptical about whether the concept can be sustainable. Although many ecotourism activities aimed to have fewer negative environmental impacts than other tourism activities, travel-related resource consumption still existed in any type of tourism and could even be exacerbated if tourists are encouraged to visit distant, exotic ecotourism sites. If tourists must travel half-way around the world to visit ecotourism sites, much environmental degradation could be caused by the plane flights through the release of carbon dioxide. Other groups, including the local communities who were being asked to implement ecotourism, were skeptical for different reasons. They did not understand the need for a different product in the tourist market, and harbored reservations about the capacity of ecotourism to generate sustainable benefits. According to Guha, colonists had “identified with the

43 Wearing and Neil, xii.
45 Gössling, 304.
land but not with the men and women who had dwelt there long before their arrival,” and had seen the land as theirs for the taking.\textsuperscript{47} These colonists had routinely excluded indigenous communities and local citizens from tourism projects and invasions of colonists had steadily eroded the land, water and biological resources in these areas.\textsuperscript{48} Additionally, tourism often stimulated the problems of begging, posing for photographs, performing dance routines, and casual or organized sex.\textsuperscript{49} Thus, local communities were skeptical of being involved in ecotourism projects and were also worried that they as “individuals in communities with a unique cultural traditions [would be…] part of the attraction themselves, whether they want[ed] to be or not.”\textsuperscript{50} Despite these issues, however, ecotourism still had the potential to provide economic benefits for countries that were searching for means of development. Therefore, finding ways to sustain the ecotourism industry became essential to the preservation of these ecosystems and to the sustainable development of these areas.

\textbf{Evolving Definitions of Ecotourism}

With the ensuing wide acceptance of ecotourism as a legitimate and useful idea, various parties began to define exactly what ecotourism should entail. Since ecotourism is a theoretical concept that was introduced into the tourism industry through the blending of the related fields of conservation and sustainable development, the term can be framed in a variety of ways. If conservation is the chosen focus, then ecotourism can be seen as...

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{47} Guha, 46.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Sindinga, 22.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
travel to natural areas that does not harm the environment and that supports preservation of nature. If sustainable development is the focus, then ecotourism can be seen as travel to natural areas that can occur now and far into the future and that provides financial or other benefits to the communities that implement ecotourism projects. If tourism is the focus, then ecotourism can be seen as a type of tourism that draws a different demographic than does traditional mass tourism to an ecologically-based location. Therefore, those who attempt to define ecotourism can situate it within any one of these contexts, which has led to a diversity of definitions.

Some definitions identify ecotourism solely as a form of tourism that has a natural or exotic area as the destination. Other definitions are more elaborate, and include conservation and the support of local communities in the planning or implementation of projects. With such a multiplicity of definitions, it is difficult to know if any of these definitions could be a “correct” description of ecotourism. Ecotourism specialist Ron Mader said that, “ecotourism is defined by its lack of definition,”\(^{51}\) suggesting that the pursuit of a single definition is somewhat futile. However, recognizing similarities and differences between these many definitions of ecotourism and understanding why there are so many definitions is essential for understanding how both producers and consumers of ecotourism conceptualize and therefore engage in ecotourism activities.

The Québec Declaration on Ecotourism, which was the result of the World Ecotourism Summit in 2002, states that “ecotourism embraces the principles of sustainable tourism concerning the economic, social and environmental impacts of

tourism,”52 and presents four ecotourism principles. The International Ecotourism Society (TIES), which was a key participant in the World Ecotourism Summit and is a leader in ecotourism research, defines ecotourism as “responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people.”53 TIES also presents six principles that those implementing and participating in ecotourism projects should follow. These definitions from the Québec Declaration and TIES are often cited by other works and are two of the most thorough and encompassing, as they deal with effects that ecotourism can have on visitors as well as on the environment, culture, economy, and politics of the tourist destination. Table 1.1 groups the various principles of ecotourism cited by TIES and the Québec Declaration into six overriding criteria for ecotourism. Criteria and principles like these provide lofty goals that ecotourists look for and that ecotourism operators strive to achieve.

Other definitions are more open-ended and are less restrictive in their guidelines. For instance, the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines ecotourism as “tourism to areas of ecological interest (typically exotic and often threatened natural environments), especially to support conservation efforts and observe wildlife.”54 This definition does include the components of nature and conservation, but the inclusion of the word ‘especially’ signifies that preservation of nature is not a requirement of ecotourism. In addition, the OED definition does not include the ends of economic or community
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development. Russell K. Blamey, who has contributed significantly to the body of ecotourism literature, defines an ecotourism experience as “one in which an individual travels to what he or she considers to be a relatively undisturbed natural area that is more than 40km from home, the primary intention being to study, admire, or appreciate the scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural manifestations (both past and present) found in these areas.”

This definition focuses on the actions of the tourist as the determinants of the ecotourism experience. Additionally, the inclusion and italicization of the word ‘primary’ indicates that travelers who have intentions other than viewing nature or culture may also be considered as ecotourists. The previous two definitions of ecotourism leave out the impacts that the tourist can have on the environment, culture, economy, and political atmosphere of the tourism destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Stated Text</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction</td>
<td><strong>responsible travel to natural areas</strong> that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people</td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Conservation</td>
<td><strong>provide direct financial benefits for conservation</strong></td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Contributes actively to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage</strong></td>
<td>Québec Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities</td>
<td><strong>provides financial benefits</strong> and empowerment for local people</td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Community Empowerment through Participation</td>
<td><strong>Includes local and indigenous communities in its planning, development and operation, and contributing to their well-being</strong></td>
<td>Québec Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people</strong></td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism</td>
<td><strong>minimize impact</strong></td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Lends itself better to independent travelers, as well as to organized tours for small size groups</strong></td>
<td>Québec Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness</td>
<td><strong>build environmental and cultural awareness and respect</strong></td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interprets the natural and cultural heritage of the destination to visitors</strong></td>
<td>Québec Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>provides positive experiences for both visitors and hosts</strong></td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>raise sensitivity to host countries' political, environmental, and social climate</strong></td>
<td>TIES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothetically, ecotourism can be defined by any one of the principles outlined by the Québec Declaration or TIES, and in this sense, there are many possibilities of how ecotourism can be described. However, even these commonly cited concepts of ecotourism are mutable, and TIES has proposed additional principles for its list. The ability of those describing ecotourism to combine various principles into one term is another factor that enables a plethora of definitions of ecotourism to exist and why it continues to be a contested concept.

Using the international conceptualizations of ecotourism developed in this chapter, Chapter 2, *Ecotourism in Tanzania – the National Context*, discusses the origins and conceptualizations of ecotourism in Tanzania.

---

56 TIES proposed to include “support international human rights and labor agreements” among its principles. However, this principle was not approved by the TIES Board of Directors due to lack of expertise on this subject. Even so, multiple sources, including Martha Honey’s *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?* include this principle. (Kate Maschman, Personal Communication, 19 March 2007.)
Chapter 2
Ecotourism in Tanzania – the National Context

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is one of the most important sectors of the Tanzanian economy, earning over USD 500 million annually and accounting for 15 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP).\(^1\) Almost 28 percent of the land is set aside as national parks and game reserves (see Map 2.1). As a result, many tourism attractions in this country are nature-based. However, communities located in areas that support tourism attractions are not always included in the planning or implementation of projects, nor do they benefit from traditional tourism activities. Therefore, due to the community focus of ecotourism as defined on the international scale, the term ecotourism when used in Tanzania has become equated with any type of tourism that focuses on community involvement and development. The Tanzanian government has defined ecotourism as “a purposeful travel to natural areas to understand the culture and natural history of the environment taking care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem, while producing economic opportunities that make the conservation of natural resources beneficial to the local people.”\(^2\) This is a fairly encompassing definition of ecotourism, which allows for projects with a variety of interests and objectives to be considered as ecotourism projects. The broad scope of this definition is reflected in the diversity of projects considered as ecotourism in Tanzania, creating a situation in which certain projects and activities that are not considered ecotourism from the global standpoint have that classification in Tanzania.

---

\(^1\) The United Republic of Tanzania and Kigoda (MP), Honourable Dr. Abdalla O., Economic Overview of Tanzania (Arusha, Tanzania: International Investors Forum for the Tourism Sector, 2002).

\(^2\) The United Republic of Tanzania, National Tourism Policy, ed. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (Dar Es Salaam: Government Printer, 1999).
This chapter sets the national context for ecotourism in Tanzania by reviewing environmental history, and recent changes in the national tourism sector. This chapter also examines how various actors define ecotourism in Tanzania, in order to understand how they have adapted this international concept to their particular experiences. Finally, by addressing the various categories of ecotourism that have emerged in Tanzania, this chapter presents the models on which current Tanzanian ecotourism projects are based.

**HISTORY OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCE USE**

Throughout the history of the area now known as Tanzania, short- and long-term climate change, calamitous droughts, excessive rains, exhaustion of soils, outbreaks of disease, and infestations of crop pests have caused communities to change their patterns of interaction with the land.\(^3\) During the pre-colonial era, many of these forces of change were at work, as Tanzania was an area of pastoralists and farmers, who were connected through elaborate systems of trade. Khoisan hunters, Cushitic herdsmen and cultivators, Nilotic pastoralists, and Bantu agriculturalists constituted Tanzania’s nineteenth century population, although the boundaries between these groups were not always clear.\(^4\) According to historian John Iliffe, communities during this time “measured out their lives in famines,” due to the unreliable patterns of rainfall.\(^5\) Their means of subsistence in these conditions was a complex combination of hunting and gathering as well as pastoralism and agriculture. Most of the societies at the time used patrilineal systems of inheritance of land, although much of the land was “freely available” because of shifting

---

\(^5\) Ibid, 13.
modes of production.\textsuperscript{6} Due to this lack of a wholly centralized system of government, pre-colonial Tanzanian systems of environmental management have been represented as being simple. These representations led to an “implicit distinction between national

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, 16.
institutions, which are assumed to be able to affect change and improvement, and villages, ‘clans’ or ‘tribes’ of the countryside, which are regarded as obstacles to development and progress.” The idea that local communities were unable to be effective stewards of their land carried into the colonial regimes and subsequently caused significant environmental alterations.

The transition from pre-colonial to colonial society “involved continuity as well as change.” Tanzania was a German colony, which from 1884 was known as German East Africa until it was converted to a British-administered trust territory called Tanganyika in 1920. Diseases introduced by Europeans began to spread throughout both the human and animal populations, causing changes in certain populations of wildlife and livestock. This damage weakened both the economic and nutritional base for many groups in Tanzania. The rinderpest plague, which spread in the area that is now Tanzania from 1889 until the early 1900s, was caused by a group of Italian invaders who, in 1887, inadvertently introduced the virus by importing oxen from India. This disease killed cattle, and as a result, approximately two-thirds of the Maasai population in Tanzania, who rely on cattle for subsistence, died. These drastic changes in the human and animal populations upset the ecological balance that had before kept the tsetse fly under control and had “traditionally kept the grasslands from growing into dense fields and thickets.” As tsetse fly populations increased and caused the livestock to decrease, populations of larger wildlife that were immune to the tsetse fly increased. This burgeoning of wildlife

---

7 Giblin and Maddox, 2-3.  
8 Ibid, 7.  
10 R. H. Nelson, 10.
caused some European conservationists, who were often ignorant of the ecological history of the continent, to believe that this was “the ‘true Africa’ of wild game.”

In order to preserve this new ecological phenomenon, the Germans prohibited native Tanzanians from inhabiting and grazing areas containing significant amounts of wildlife. The Germans also aimed to maintain the agricultural and pastoral productivity that supported exports of raw materials such as coffee, sisal, tobacco, tea, lead and copper by imposing certain practices on existing Tanzanian land use systems, such as constructing terraces, digging up crop stubble, and planting trees. Many Tanzanians resisted these practices and insisted on continuing their traditional ways of life. The colonial officials responded by removing local communities from certain areas in order to create a system of national parks and game reserves modeled off of the recently created United States national parks. These developments were reinforced by conventions on African Flora and Fauna of the early 1900s (see Chapter 1) and “laid the foundation for the top-down, preservationist style of management that came to characterize African conservation policies,” according to ecotourism specialist Martha Honey. Local communities were no longer allowed to access these areas without licenses for hunting and other practices, which were very difficult for them to obtain. Thus, the German and later, the British colonial powers, established a precedent of gazetting protected areas.

11 Ibid.
13 Yellowstone National Park, established in 1872, was the first national park in the world. The creation of the US system of national parks included the forced removal of Native American populations.
Conservation for Sustainable Development?

through the removal of indigenous groups and the subsequent transformation of traditional Tanzanian life.\textsuperscript{15}

The depletion of environmental resources and the displacement of native Tanzanians from their lands existed throughout the era of British rule in Tanganyika. In 1950s, certain populations, such as the Maasai, attempted to reclaim their land, which had been seized during the establishment of protected areas. Unfortunately, such efforts were hindered by European conservationists, such as Bernhard Grzimek, the president of the Frankfurt Zoological Society. Grizmek led a campaign against allowing Maasai to graze their animals in protected areas, which culminated in the production of the book and film, \textit{Serengeti Shall Not Die}. The film received an Academy Award, bringing much attention to the idea that it was the practices of the Maasai that were detrimental to wildlife habitats. These sentiments were confirmed by other influential European conservationists who spoke out against the Maasai in the Serengeti, including British paleontologist Louis Leakey. As Leakey presented his paleontological findings, he lectured about the damage that Maasai grazing was inflicting on the Serengeti plains. As a result of these vocal European sentiments, the Tanzania National Parks Association (TANAPA) was established in 1959 under British rule with the mission of “manag[ing] and control[ing] the appropriate use of natural resources in all national parks in the country.”\textsuperscript{16} TANAPA did not ameliorate the situation, however, and it banned local communities from engaging in certain agricultural activities in national parks. Therefore, conflicts between the government and local communities continued and centered on the uses of how land should be used in protected areas.

\textsuperscript{15} R. H. Nelson, 2 and 10.

After independence in 1961, the colonialis t environmental legacy remained, with the creation of four additional national parks in the decade following independence. However, foreign agencies, such as the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), feared that the end of colonialism would mean the end of Africa’s wildlife.\(^\text{17}\) Their fears were not completely unwarranted, as many newly independent African nations focused almost exclusively on rapid economic growth and industrialization. Tanzania’s first president, Julius K. Nyerere, chose the method of self-reliance, in which a country prioritized production of goods within the country, instead of relying on international trade.\(^\text{18}\) This system, termed *Ujamaa*, which means ‘familyhood’ or ‘shared family values’ in Swahili, was seen as the basis of African Socialism. The *Ujamaa* system downplayed the role of international trade and industrialization and advocated a return to traditional lifestyles and land use practices.\(^\text{19}\) In addition to this return to the land, Nyerere spoke about the importance of maintaining African wildlife in his “Arusha Manifesto,” saying, “these wild creatures amid the wild places they inhabit are not only important as a source of wonder and aspirations but are an integral part of our natural resources and our future livelihood and well being.”\(^\text{20}\) Here, Nyerere highlighted the continued economic dependence on natural resources in the post-colonial era, which encouraged many international organizations to donate money to the government on behalf of conservationist efforts.

---

\(^\text{17}\) Honey, 225.
\(^\text{18}\) Rist, 134.
\(^\text{19}\) Ibid, 131.
In advocating environmental protection, the Tanzanian government wanted to maintain the stream of revenue that could emanate from European and American tourists who were visiting national parks and game reserves. TANAPA continued to both limit access to resources in protected areas and to expel groups from within, perpetuating the historical link between the system of protected areas in Tanzania and the exclusion of various groups from their traditional ecosystems. All agricultural activities and grazing activities are still prohibited within national park boundaries, according to the National Policies for National Parks. These circumstances have created an antagonistic relationship between local communities and the tourism industry that exists today.

With the creation of additional national parks in the northern region, communities have migrated to the south, which has created much conflict, especially between farmers and herders regarding the issue farm invasion. Differing opinions of land use persist and charcoal burners and farmers practicing “slash and burn” agriculture are accused of destroying trees by certain environmental groups, although these Tanzanians may simply be adhering to more traditional land use practices. Various solutions to these sorts of environmental issues have been proposed, although they are often controversial. Sport hunting is seen as a paradox in conservation activities, but some, such as Honey, believe that “trophy hunting helps curb poaching, does less environmental damage, and brings in much more foreign exchange (the Wildlife Conservation estimates it is 55 times more) than do photographic safaris.” However, local communities are often excluded from
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23 Ibid, 97.
24 Honey, 244-245.
activities like these and feel marginalized in the face of preservationist considerations. Due to Tanzania’s reliance on its natural resources and the importance of the natural landscape in the tourism sector, mediating these historically situated conflicts between local communities and the natural environment is essential to the sustainability of tourism as a significant source of economic income for Tanzanians.

**Tanzania’s Tourism Sector**

In the years following independence, tourism was not seen as a priority sector for development because of Tanzania’s emphasis on self-reliance. During the 1960s and the early 1970s, the government focused only on wildlife conservation and put little emphasis on utilization and promotion of tourism sites. For example, the College of African Wildlife Management, one of two on the continent, was founded in Mweka, Tanzania in 1963. Promotion and marketing of tourism within and outside the country did not begin until the Tanzania Tourist Corporation was established in 1971. However, this momentum was interrupted by extensive drought in 1974, the war with Uganda’s Idi Amin from 1978 to 1979, and the economic crisis that lasted from the late 1970s until the mid 1990s. These events caused stagnation in the tourism industry, which was exacerbated by the closing of the border with Kenya in 1977. Prior to this border closing, most tourists had entered Tanzania via Nairobi, Kenya. However, since the economic liberalizations of the mid-1980s, the government has made efforts to encourage both foreign aid and investment throughout the country, aiming to set Tanzania apart from Kenya. This government impetus was followed by a large boost in infrastructure

---

development, funded by the World Bank and fifteen other donors in 1994, leading to an explosion of the tourism industry from the mid-1990s until today (see Figure 2.1).

Recently, Tanzania has become a major tourist destination, attracting visitors from around the globe. In 2004, 582,807 international tourists visited Tanzania.\textsuperscript{26} In 1999, tourism accounted for about 60 percent of all exports of goods and services and in 2001, earnings from tourism contributed 16.5 percent to national GDP.\textsuperscript{27} Most tourists who come to Tanzania participate in traditional, large-scale tourism activities, including visits to national parks, safari hunting, visits to heritage sites, scuba diving, and snorkeling. Advertisements cite Tanzania as “the finest safari destination in all of Africa […with] incredible concentrations of wildlife. It is remote and peaceful, but more importantly, it is the true Africa, undamaged and unspoilt.”\textsuperscript{28} Advertisements like these, which are reminiscent of the colonial ideas about African wildlife, have drawn an increasing number of visitors to Tanzania, causing policymakers to become concerned about potential impacts on the environment, culture, and economy of the communities involved in tourism.

Policies relating to tourism were drafted in the early 1990s, on the eve of the upsurge of the Tanzanian tourism sector. The Ministry of Tourism, Natural Resources, and the Environment (now the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism) was created in 1991 in order to promote “sustainable conservation of natural and cultural resources

\textsuperscript{26} Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tourism Division, \textit{Tourism Statistical Bulletin} (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tourism Division, 2005) 10.
\textsuperscript{27} Luvanga, Shitundu, and Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania, 18.
\textsuperscript{28} Promotional advertisement of Mafigeni Safari and Tours, Duiwelskloof, South Africa, web site <www.mafigeni.co.za/more_info-tanzania.htm > in R. H. Nelson, 7.
and development of sustainable tourism.”29 This agency created the National Tourism Policy in the same year. This policy, revised in 1999, emphasizes promotion of private sector investment and environmental protection in order to maximize tourism’s contribution to the country’s development.30 The policy also “seeks to assist in efforts to promote the economy and livelihood of the people, essentially poverty alleviation, through encouraging the development of sustainable and quality tourism that is culturally and socially acceptable, ecologically friendly, environmentally sustainable, and economically viable.”31 In addition to this tourism policy, other developments have encouraged investment in and promotion of tourism throughout Tanzania. Private
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**Figure 2.1.** Tanzania Tourist Trend (Source: MNRT)

30 The United Republic of Tanzania, 6-7.
31 Ibid., 5.
investment was encouraged through the Tanzania Investment Act of 1997, which created the Tanzania Investment Center (TIC), designated “to coordinate, encourage, promote and facilitate investment in Tanzania and to advise the Government on investment related matters.” The TIC approved 229 tourism projects in 2000. There are now extensive guidelines for engaging in tourism activities, and tourist agents are required to obtain licenses, which can only be obtained after various conditions are met. These policies and guidelines aim to minimize the negative impacts and maximize the benefits of tourism that are experienced by the relevant actors in tourism activities.

The tourism industry has both positive and negative effects on the actors involved due to its size. The government is able to collect much revenue through taxes and through National park fees. Tourism also provides for increased sales of various goods and services, such as agricultural products and handicrafts, diversification of local economies, and creation of an inlet for foreign exchange. Official data indicate that there were 157,000 people employed in the Tanzanian tourism sector in 2001, which was about 1.2 percent of the labor force in this year. Although this percentage of employees seems miniscule, this sector was able to contribute 16.5 percent to national GDP, indicating that slight changes in the tourism sector could cause significant changes in the national economy. Tourism also affects the composition of the labor force, by creating job opportunities which are less labor intensive and small-scale in comparison to other non-agricultural activities, and by supporting livelihood activities such as livestock
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33 Luvanga, Shitundu, and Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania, 15.
34 The United Republic of Tanzania and Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tourism Division, Guidelines for Tourism Business (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: Tourism Division, 2004) 4-5.
35 Ibid.
keeping, crop farming, harvesting, and small enterprise.\textsuperscript{37} However, although there is much potential for positive impacts on the national economy, it can be difficult for stakeholders to ensure that all involved benefit.

Although there are many potential benefits from tourism in Tanzania, there are also numerous negative effects. These impacts include large-scale transfer of tourism revenue out of Tanzania, environmental degradation, cultural degradation, and exclusion of local businesses, inhabitants, and products. Local people have often been unable to participate in tourism activities because of a lack of transportation or communication, lack of customers, lack of capital, seasonality of business, and cultural distortion.\textsuperscript{38} Tanzania is beginning to alter some of its tourism policies and to diversify its tourism activities in order to maximize the benefits received from tourism.

A recent change in traditional tourism activities has been an increased focus on sustainability. The mandate of TANAPA, according to its policies written in 1994, is:

\begin{quote}
to manage and regulate the use of areas designated as National Parks by such means and measures to preserve the country’s heritage, encompassing natural and cultural resources, both tangible and intangible resource values, including the fauna and flora, wildlife habitat, natural process, wilderness quality, and scenery therein and to provide for human benefit and enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for future generations.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

These policies reference the management policies of US national parks and were written with consultation from IUCN and the Frankfurt Zoological Society. The language of sustainable development is apparent here, as the benefit and enjoyment of future generations is mentioned as motivation for managing national parks effectively. TANAPA imposes limits of acceptable use and development which limit the number of

\textsuperscript{37} Luvanga, Shitundu, and Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania, 46.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 44.
\textsuperscript{39} Tanzania National Parks National Policy Committee.
people, vehicles, and facilities that can be within a certain park at one time. National parks each have a Community Conservation Service (CCS) component, which deals with outreach to local communities in order to ensure that some of the benefits of conservation are shared in an appropriate manner. Therefore, through these types of mandates and policy changes, Tanzania’s nature-based tourism industry is beginning to embrace a number of the international principles of ecotourism.

**TANZANIA’S ‘ECOTOURISM’**

Due to the economic, political, cultural, and environmental circumstances in Tanzania, the country is well-suited for the implementation of the international concept of ecotourism discussed in Chapter 1. Tanzania is a relatively politically and socially stable country, with fewer conflicts than other countries in the region. Additionally, Tanzania has a comparative advantage in terms of the outstanding wildlife and natural resources found in the country. Tanzania also draws tourists interested in viewing traditional cultures, providing an opportunity to combine traditional nature-based tourism activities with cross-cultural exchanges that can benefit local communities.\(^{40}\) The main example of this is found with Maasai pastoralists in Northern Tanzania. Through these types of tourism, Tanzanians can potentially harness foreign investment and revenue from international tourists in order to use tourism as a tool to promote high rates of macroeconomic growth.\(^{41}\)

Despite these potentials, the implementation of ecotourism in Tanzania may be difficult for various reasons. Since Tanzanian ecotourism activities may be linked to

\(^{40}\) Severre, 11.

traditional safaris and hunting, it can potentially have negative environmental impacts. Additionally, local Tanzanians can be taken advantage of both in terms of exploitation of culture as an attraction, and in terms of withholding revenues from the local communities involved. Some studies have confirmed that inhabitants of villages containing a tourist attraction do not receive as many of the benefits from tourism as other Tanzanians and foreigners, especially in terms of employment. Unfortunately, many Tanzanians lack prerequisite skills or training to be employed in the tourism sector. The Multi-Environmental Society (MESO), a Tanzanian NGO, has cited additional weaknesses as “the lack of management skills and education in the tourism sector in the local communities [and a lack of] initiative and efforts from the community to [initiate] the project.” In light of these concerns, it may be difficult to have full local community participation in tourism activities.

Even if local communities are interested in implementing ecotourism activities in their areas, the government may hinder these efforts. The Tanzanian government often levies high taxes on private investment, which tend to hamper the ability of local tour operators to compete in the international wildlife tourism market. Communities also encounter barriers with the government when attempting to participate in tourism activities because of legislation which prohibits tourism activities from taking place on their lands as opposed to National Parks and Game Reserves. However, the national
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42 Luvanga, Shitundu, and Research Programme on Poverty Alleviation in Tanzania, 29.
43 Ibid.
45 Akunaay, Nelson, and Singleton, 5.
46 Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Wildlife Conservation (Tourist Hunting) Regulations (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: Government Printer, 2002).
government does include many of the principles of international ecotourism in their policies.

The main focus of Tanzanian policy on ecotourism is “the continued existence of [natural] attractions.”\footnote{47 The United Republic of Tanzania, 10.} The National Tourism Policy states that “the tourist industry depends on the proper conservation and sustainable management of the environment,” as stated in the National tourism policy.\footnote{48 Ibid.} This policy also stipulates that “it is imperative for communities living within or around [tourism] areas to be fully involved in the development and management of these attractions and in addition, to get a share of the income generated from tourist activities within their areas.”\footnote{49 Ibid., 17.} Other national policy documents support ecotourism in Tanzania, including the National Environmental Policy (1997), the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania (1998), and The National Policies for National Parks in Tanzania (1994). It is important to note, however, that community participation and empowerment discussed in the international standard of ecotourism are not included in the Tanzanian government’s definition of ecotourism. The specific ramifications of this omission will be discussed in subsequent chapters, but it appears that despite this omission, many ecotourism projects in Tanzania do take these issues into consideration.

A number of NGOs and private tour operators have formed their own unique conceptualizations of ecotourism. Definitions of ecotourism from Petro Ahham (director of MESO),\footnote{50 Petro Ahham, Personal Interview (Arusha, Tanzania: August 7, 2006).} Thad Peterson (Co-founder of Dorobo Safaris),\footnote{51 Thad Peterson, Personal Interview, (Arusha, Tanzania: August 15, 2006).} Joseph Kessy (TANAPA),\footnote{52 Joseph Kessy, Personal Interview, (Arusha, Tanzania: August 15, 2006).} Jo Anderson (Jo Anderson Safaris)\footnote{53 Jo Anderson, Personal Interview, (Arusha, Tanzania: August 15, 2006).} and Benjamin Andulege (Wildlife...
Division, MNRT) are shown in Box 2.1 below. Too Mr. Peterson, ecotourism is “an abused term nowadays and is a great label to have if you want to sell something.” Ms. Rosada Msoma of the MNRT likewise notes that ecotourism is a term of marketing and that she does not know how ecotourism should be defined because many definitions of ecotourism are debatable. Therefore, each actor involved in Tanzanian ecotourism has his or her own perspective regarding what ecotourism is and how it should be defined. Although the differences in their definitions are subtle, each actor highlights a certain set of principles that they view as essential components of Tanzanian ecotourism. Table 2.1 below provides a comparison of these definitions of ecotourism. This table provides a comparison of the variety of conceptualizations of ecotourism in Tanzania, according to the international principles. Ecotourism projects are based on various models that adapt
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**Box 2.1. Tanzanian Definitions of Ecotourism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Travel to natural places and to the people associated with these places that empowers and helps the people find better ways to live, treating them as equal and helping with their rights and ownership”</td>
<td>Thad Peterson, Dorobo Safaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ecologically friendly tourism with two main purposes: 1) not to cause any ecological disturbances in the area [tourism operators] are moving to, and 2) visiting that place should bring benefits to the people that are living in that area”</td>
<td>Joseph Kessy, TANAPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tourism that has to be done in a way that clearly benefits and contributes towards the conservation of the ecosystem that it is in. If a community is within this area, then it has to be included in the project”</td>
<td>Jo Anderson, Jo Anderson Safaris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Visiting natural sites, learning about the local culture and giving opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges [through which] surplus income goes to improve the economic power of local residents, conserve the environment, and re-establish nature”</td>
<td>Petro Ahham, MESO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A tour that is so tied to nature, that cares about nature, and that is tied to looking at social and cultural activities”</td>
<td>Benjamin Andulege, Wildlife Division, MNRT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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54 Benjamin Andulege, Personal Interview, (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: August 21, 2006).
55 Peterson.
56 Rosada Msoma, Personal Interview, (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: July 24, 2006).
to these principles, including NGO initiatives, Community-based tourism (CBT), and cultural tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Primary Focus on Nature</th>
<th>Promotes Conservation</th>
<th>Financial Benefits</th>
<th>Empowerment through participation</th>
<th>Reduces Negative impact</th>
<th>Cultural Education and awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzanian Government</td>
<td>Purposeful travel to natural areas</td>
<td>Conservation of natural resources</td>
<td>Produces economic opportunities that benefit local people</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Takes care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem</td>
<td>To understand culture and natural history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thad Peterson</td>
<td>Travel to natural places</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Helps the people find better ways to live</td>
<td>Empowers the people</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>[travel] to the people associated with these places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Kessy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Brings benefits to the people living in that area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>[Does not] cause any ecological disturbances [and is] Ecologically friendly</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Anderson</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Contributes towards the conservation of the ecosystem that it is in</td>
<td>Clearly benefits the area it is in</td>
<td>Include[s] a community [if it] is within this area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Andulege</td>
<td>Tour that is tied to nature</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Cares about nature</td>
<td>Is tied to looking at social and cultural activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petro Ahham</td>
<td>Visits natural sites</td>
<td>Conserves the environment</td>
<td>[Provides] surplus income</td>
<td>[Provides] income to improve the economic power of local residents</td>
<td>Reestablishes nature</td>
<td>[Teaches] about local culture and giv[es] opportunities for cross-cultural exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGO initiatives

Many of the environmental NGOs working in Tanzania have chosen to include ecotourism in their roster of activities. These organizations include international groups such as WWF, which was involved in “linking sustainable fishing, handicrafts, small-scale industries, and ecotourism,” through the creation of Tanzania’s first marine park on Mafia Island, as well as local NGOs like the Multi-Environmental Society (MESO). MESO is a community-based NGO that aims “to promote awareness, utilization and conservation of both natural and cultural resources” in Tanzania. MESO runs eco-cultural trips and safaris in the Karatu district of Northern Tanzania. The African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) is another NGO that operates locally in Tanzania as well as in other eastern and southern African countries. Their ecotourism activities include negotiating agreements between local communities and private tour operators as well as small enterprises for Maasai women who make handicrafts. Although many of these initiatives allow for these smaller organizations to work directly with communities in tourism activities, members of these organizations still state that local communities are not benefiting as much as they could be from tourism in Tanzania. Therefore, finding alternative ways of including local communities in tourism activities is necessary.

57 Honey, 253.
58 Ahham, Olang, and Schlamminger ,1.
59 Although Mr. Ahham states that projects are ecotourism projects, the phrase ‘eco-cultural trips’ is emphasized as a “term of marketing that is used to make a point,” emphasizing that both the environments and the cultures of these communities are affected by ecotourism activities.
60 Dr James Kahurananga, Personal Interview, (Arusha, Tanzania: August 7, 2006).
Community-Based Tourism

The organizational structure of Tanzanian villages lends itself to joint ventures between tourism operators and communities that can be mutually beneficial. According to Tanzania ecotourism specialist Fred Nelson, certain legal provisions allow tourism operators “to work with a defined group of people (the village) living in a clearly defined area (the village land), and administered by a democratically elected corporate body capable of entering into legal contracts (the Village Council).”\(^6^1\) Tourist agents can establish activities on village lands after directly signing an agreement with the Village Council. No involvement with the national government is required, and investors are increasingly choosing this model for their projects. A portion of the revenues from the projects goes to the local communities in exchange for the use of their land. In addition, activities such as walking, horseback riding, and night game drives, which are prohibited or restricted in the national parks, can be carried out on community lands.\(^6^2\) Therefore, these types of projects directly incentivize locals to conserve the environment. Some projects also insist on including locals in tourism through employment and education. However, these projects do not focus on the cultures of the communities involved, unlike other types of Tanzanian ecotourism.

Cultural Tourism

Cultural tourism is emerging as an important ecotourism activity in Tanzania. This activity does not require specialized skills on the part of community members. In these projects, community members lead visitors on tours to demonstrate the lifestyles
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\(^6^2\) F. Nelson, 6.
practiced in the community. Many of these programs use the revenue for community development projects, which can promote empowerment of local communities. Some of these tours directly promote conservation, by funding conservation projects with the revenue from tourism, while others indirectly promote conservation of natural resources by emphasizing local uses of the land on these tours. If run effectively, these projects channel revenue directly to local communities, lessen environmental impact, because most of the tours are day-long walking tours, and provide an avenue for intimate cross-cultural exchange with minimal infrastructural inputs.

**Differences between Tanzanian Variations of Ecotourism**

Distinctions between cultural tourism, CBT, and nature-based tourism are difficult to draw because many of communities involved in CBT projects are extremely dependent on their natural environments. Aloyce Nzuki of the MNRT explained this by stating that Tanzania’s “definition of cultural tourism would match the world’s definition of ecotourism [because it] benefits communities and aims to protect the natural environment.”⁶³ Correspondingly, a variety of subtly distinct projects have emerged in Tanzania as a result of the adaptation of the international definition of ecotourism to the national context. Differences between the manifestations of ecotourism in Tanzania and the national definition are shown in Table 2.2.⁶¹
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⁶³ Aloyce Nzuki, *Personal Interview*, (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: July 24, 2006).
⁶¹ Because NGO initiatives are highly varied, they are not included in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2: Manifestations of Ecotourism in Tanzania versus the National Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle:</th>
<th>National Ecotourism</th>
<th>Community-Based Tourism</th>
<th>Cultural Tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Conservation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Local Communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Empowerment through Community Participation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

As a result of environmental and economic changes in Tanzania, the tourism sector has begun to emphasize ecotourism in its vision for the future of Tanzanian tourism. Due to the structure of the Tanzanian ecotourism sector, it appears that the most relevant stakeholders in ecotourism activities are policymakers, tourism operators, local communities and tourists. These actors work together to establish tourism activities that are unique to the national and local context. These types of ecotourism (NGO initiatives, CBT, and cultural tourism) have come to the forefront because the majority of Tanzania’s tourism is already nature-based; therefore, ecotourism projects differ from traditional safaris or other tours by placing the emphasis on community participation. In conclusion, although the Tanzanian definition differs from the international definition in terms of the exclusion of the principle of empowerment through community participation, Tanzanian models are still able to address these principles through country specific models.

Chapters 3 and 4 present five case studies of ecotourism in Tanzania in order to analyze how the Tanzanian models of ecotourism have been concretely implemented. These chapters also discuss how the relevant stakeholders (policymakers, tourism operators, local communities, and tourists) gain and lose from ecotourism activities.
Chapter 3
Case Study: The Cultural Tourism Programme

INTRODUCTION

This chapter analyzes the Cultural Tourism Programme (CTP) that has been in operation in Tanzania since 1995. The objectives of this program are to provide a unique opportunity for visitors to enrich their stay in Tanzania by experiencing the authentic cultures of local people, to provide income generation and employment in rural communities, and to directly involve locals in the design, organization and operation of tours. By analyzing two specific cases from this program that has been supported by international, national, and local stakeholders, this chapter addresses how the concept of ecotourism has practically been implemented in Tanzania.

This chapter discusses the origins of this program in order to understand how national ideas of ecotourism have been implemented in Tanzania. It analyzes the benefits and drawbacks of these programs by looking at how the significant actors in ecotourism activities (policymakers, tourism operators, local communities, and tourists) are affected. Thus, an understanding of the context in which this program emerged and the mechanisms that have enabled it to operate for over a decade aids in identifying how and why the implementation of ecotourism may differ from the national and/or the international conceptualizations of ecotourism discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Using Table 2.2 as a template, the CTP initiatives will be assessed against the national standard of ecotourism.

1 Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB) (a), Tanzania Cultural Tourism Programme: Visit the People! (Tangiers, Morocco: Seminar-Workshop on Sustainable Tourism Development and Poverty Reduction, 2006).
STRUCTURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE CULTURAL TOURISM PROGRAMME

The CTP was initiated in 1995 through a joint venture between the Netherlands Development Agency (SNV) and the Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB). At this time, a group of young Maasai approached SNV and TTB to obtain support for a tourism initiative that could serve as an income opportunity for certain villages. These villages are located close to natural attractions, with 70-80% of their economy based on forest products or agriculture.1 By 1996, three programs had been established with support from TTB and SNV in training, marketing materials, and program management costs. Between 1996 and 2001, SNV and TTB worked with members of additional villages, mainly in Northern Tanzania, in order to support local tourism initiatives that involved significant community participation. In 1999, the CTP won the To Do! 99 Award for Socially Responsible Tourism, given by the German Institute for Tourism and Development (Studienkreis für Tourismus und Entwicklung). As of August 2006, there were twenty-four CTP projects in operation throughout Tanzania (See Map 4.1). CTP is now one of the most celebrated projects in the country, and officials at the MNRT recommend it as an exemplary ecotourism project.2 These projects, coordinated but the TTB Tourist Information Office in Arusha, include both nature based activities (hiking in forests, visits to waterfalls and caves, mountain climbing, canoeing, fishing, and bicycle tours) as well as cultural activities within certain villages.

---

2 Nzuki.
The goals of the CTP as explicitly stated in its promotional literature are: 1) to provide an opportunity for tourists to visit local people, discover unknown treasures and experience authentic cultures; 2) to encourage direct involvement of local people in designing, organizing tours and guiding their guests; 3) to create employment and income
generation opportunities for locals, 4) to promote community development projects\(^3\) through community development fees; 5) to encourage local people to participate in conservation efforts to maintain the beauty and health of their environment, and 6) to minimize possible negative social, cultural, and environmental effects from tourism.\(^4\) The projects also aim to allow visitors to see how they contribute to the improvement of living conditions in the villages they visit.\(^5\) The basic premise behind these goals is that “rural life is an attraction in itself,” attractive because it can provide visitors to Tanzania a “unique opportunity to compliment their visit with culture, magnificent scenery and other unknown treasures” while generating income for the communities visited.\(^6\)

The guiding principles of the CTP are compared to the theoretical models of ecotourism in Tanzania in Table 3.1. This table shows that the goals of the CTP are in line with the international standard of ecotourism discussed in Chapter 1 and those of community-based tourism and cultural tourism discussed in Chapter 2, with slight differences. Therefore, although the programs managed by the CTP are not explicitly acknowledged as ecotourism in any of the promotional literature, the CTP does adhere to many international principles as well as Tanzanian understandings of ecotourism.

The CTP is structured in a manner that promotes increased community involvement in tourism activities. The guides who lead the tours are members of the village being visited, allowing them to showcase their knowledge of the cultural and of
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\(^3\) These programs include improvements to primary / secondary schools, renovation of cattle dips, support of tree nurseries, repair of irrigation systems, maintenance of access roads, and construction of dispensaries.

\(^4\) TTB (a) and Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB) (b), *Tanzania Cultural Tourism Programme*, (Arusha, Tanzania: no date added).

\(^5\) TTB (a).

\(^6\) TTB (b).
natural attractions of their homes. These guides lead tours that consist of smaller groups of tourists, normally groups of four or five. Most of the tours last for a half or a full day. Camping areas are offered within the villages and locals provide camping space and food. Some programs also offer “home stays”. The homes of some villagers are often visited as a part of CTP activities in order to expose tourists to daily life in rural Tanzania. Tourists are charged a standard fee for these programs, which is divided into revenue for the guides and other individuals who participate in the program (cooks, hunters, etc.), funds for program coordination, and for a Village Development Fund. The Village Development Funds have financed projects such as maintenance and improvement of primary schools, tree nurseries, and irrigation systems. In 2001, the Village Development Fees accrued US$25,609.\(^7\) These Village Development fees comprised approximately 26.7 percent of the fees accrued from all of the CTP programs between 1996 and 2001.\(^8\)

Many of the CTP projects are found near the city of Arusha in Northern Tanzania. This city is a hub of the northern tourism circuit, since visitors arriving at Kilimanjaro International Airport visit Arusha en route to larger national parks (Lake Manyara and Serengeti) and the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, This is one of the most important

\(^7\) Zeppel, 147.
\(^8\) Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB) (c), Tanzania Cultural Tourism Programme Report (Arusha, Tanzania:, 2006) 12.
areas for tourism in Tanzania, drawing in many international visitors. Guidebooks, like the *Lonely Planet Guide to Tanzania*, claim that the CTP programs around Arusha “offer an alternative to the safari scene in town and a good opportunity to experience local culture.”9 However, the goals of the CTP program mentioned above indicate that these programs can do more than serve tourists’ needs. They aim to promote conservation and encourage community participation in tourism activities. Therefore, I selected this program for analysis due to its prominence in Tanzania and its stated goals. I visited two of the CTP projects near Arusha: the Ng’iresi Cultural Tourism Programme and the Osotwa Cultural Tourism Initiatives.

**NG’IRESI CULTURAL TOURISM PROGRAMME**

During an SNV-sponsored irrigation project in Ng’iresi village, located 7km northeast of Arusha on the slopes of Mount Meru (see Map 3.2), local people and the SNV recognized that there were several possible tourist attractions in the area.10 The SNV partnered with the local village to develop a tourism program within the village. This program was one of the first CTP projects to be initiated in 1996. According to the *Lonely Planet Guide to Tanzania* tourists can “visit local irrigation projects, see Maasai houses, enjoy some walking, and visit a local farm. There [is] also a longer overnight option with a hike up a small volcano.”11 Advertisements of this program emphasize the culture, natural scenery, and community development aspects of Ng’iresi, which is a village of farmers of the Wa-Arusha tribe of the Maasai family. Moreover, the promotional brochure produced by the TTB advertises Ng’iresi as a “village [that]
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10 Christopher, Herry, *Personal Communication*, (Ng’iresi, Tanzania: August 3, 2006).
11 Fitzpatrick, 187.
perfectly shows the transition from traditional into modern African life.”\footnote{Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB) (d), Ng’iresi Cultural Tourism Programme, (Arusha, Tanzania: no date added).} There are six different itineraries, depending on the length of time one wishes to stay at Ng’iresi and the preferred natural and cultural attractions. I visited the Ng’iresi Cultural Tourism Programme on August 3, 2006 (see Appendix 2 for photographs).

Through the Ng’iresi CTP initiative, I experienced the “Songota Waterfall Half Day Tour.” This tour consists of a welcoming at Mzee Loti’s (the village chairman’s) house, followed by a guided walking tour. Highlights of the tour include the village scenery, traditional Maasai Bomas,\footnote{A boma is an enclosure or small settlement comprised of a number of huts, which house families and their livestock.} and the Songota Waterfall. This waterfall is about 20 feet high and stands in a secluded location. The walking tour passes by some of the development projects said to have been completed with funds from the CTP program, including a secondary school and a biogas system.

During high tourist season (July through January or February), guides lead an average of four three-person tours per week.\footnote{Christopher.} The size of tour groups ranges from one to ten individuals. About half of the visitors take a half-day tour and the other half stay

\textbf{Map 3.2.} Location of Ng’iresi Village and Ngaramtoni Junction (Source: Lonely Planet Guide to Tanzania)
Conservation for Sustainable Development?

overnight. Most of the people who visit are between the ages of eighteen and thirty and come from the US, the Netherlands, the UK, Germany, and Sweden. Tourists learn about these programs through brochures on display at the TTB, articles that have been written in guide books (*Lonely Planet, Earth Foot*, etc.), and referrals from tour operators. These tours serve as a day-trip option for tourists on the way to or coming from extended visits to national parks.

Each visitor pays a flat fee of TZS 14,500 (~ USD 12) which is divided up among Guide fees (TZS 7,000 or 48.28%), program coordination fees (TZS 4,000 or 27.59%), and Village Development Fees (TZS 3,000 or 24.14%). This fee increases if visitors stay overnight or purchase food. Visitors pay at the start of the tour after signing a guest book and are given a receipt which details the division of the funds (see Figure 3.1). The village chairman, Mzee Loti, later reconciles the number of visitors in the guestbook, the amount of money that has been recorded on the receipts, and the money that has been received. Following this system of check and balances, the money from the Village Development Fees is distributed by the village council to poor families, widows, and for community development projects. The revenue collected from this program has the potential to affect members of Ng’iresi village in multiple ways. The effects of this program will be discussed below after reviewing the Osotwa Cultural Tourism Initiatives.
OSOTWA CULTURAL TOURISM INITIATIVES

Seventy years ago, the area that is now nine villages located 1.9km from the Ngaramtoni junction just below Mount Meru (see Map 3.2) was home to an abundance of wildlife, including elephants and other large animals. Because of population growth, the animals migrated to other areas as humans began to settle the region. Colobus monkeys used to inhabit areas much closer to the village, but have migrated to Sambasha Hill, an extinct volcano. These environmental changes were noticed by community members and the village government who decided to take action to mitigate some of the environmental issues in this area. As a result, the Osotwa Mt. Meru Community Based Conservation Organisation, “a legally registered charitable, non-partisan and non-governmental organization based in Arusha, Tanzania,” was founded in 2001. The CTP
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15 The villages are Shambasha, Kimunyak, Olmotonyi, Ngaramtoni, Olmuringirinda, Timbolo, Olkokola, Olturumet, and Lemanyata.
17 Osotwa Mount Meru Community Based Conservation Organisation, Osotwa (Arusha, Tanzania: no date added).
Osotwa Cultural Tourism Initiatives (OCTI) are co-sponsored by Instituto Oikos of Italy, a conservation and development organization that has sponsored a number of the CTP projects. The TTB brochure states that, visitors to this program can “take a walk up the slopes of Mount Meru via Maasai Villages [and...] meet people, enjoy the beautiful scenery and see how people live in this rural part of Tanzania.” Advertisements for this program emphasize the natural scenery and culture of these Maasai villages, made up of subsistence farmers who are shifting from agro-pastoralism to commercial farming. Promotional brochures emphasize that “the people on the slopes of Mt. Meru [are...] blessed with rich and diverse natural and cultural heritage.”

There are four itineraries that one can choose from, depending on the length of time one wishes to stay and the preferred natural and cultural attractions. I visited the OCTI on August 8, 2006 (see Appendix 3 for photographs and additional information from this tour).

On my visit with the Osotwa NGO, I experienced the “1/2 day walk, B.,” which was also called the “Culture Tour” by the organizers and guides of the program. Highlights of this tour include the village scenery, traditional Maasai Bomas, traditional Maasai dancing (normally performed at wedding ceremonies), the large fig tree, and a visit to the traditional healer. The walking tour also passes by some of the development projects said to have been completed with funds from the CTP program, including a primary school.

During high tourist season, the OCTI receives about twenty visitors per month, most of whom are American or British. About half of the visitors take a half-day tour.
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18 Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB) (e), Osotwa Cultural Tourism Initiatives (OCTI) (Arusha, Tanzania: no date added).
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
and the other half stay overnight. The Osotwa NGO also has a partnership with Global Service Corps (GSC), a nonprofit international volunteer organization providing service-learning opportunities for people worldwide to live and work abroad in Tanzania. Many of the visitors come through the GSC program, but there are also visitors who are on extended safari tours. This program is advertised along with the other CTP programs such as Ng’iresi through brochures at the TTB, guide books, and referrals from tour operators.

Each visitor to this program is quoted a fee at the TTB, but the actual cost depends on the sights which are seen on the tours. For example, although I was quoted TZS 14,000 by the TTB, the fee for my particular tour was TZS 17,000 (US$ 14.17) because I visited the traditional healer and the boma. This fee was in addition to the TZS 15,000 (~ US$ 12.50) I paid directly to performers of the dance. The fees are paid after completion of the tour, although a guest book is signed before the tours have begun, and no receipt or description of the division of the funds is given. The revenues are collected by the Osotwa NGO and are given to the village development committee of each of the villages, who decide how the funds should be distributed. The funds are often given to orphans and widows throughout the nine villages or are put towards larger conservation projects, including a tree planting project, which is “aimed at establishing natural forests around the villages in the interest of and for use by the local people.”21

Based on my observations, I will analyze the OCTI program and the Ng’iresi program to determine their effectiveness, taking into account the six principles of ecotourism laid out in Chapters 1 and 2 and in Table 3.1 above. The benefits and drawbacks of these programs for the relevant stakeholders will also be addressed.

21 Osotwa Mount Meru Community Based Conservation Organisation.
ANALYSIS OF NG’IRESI AND OSOTWA CULTURAL TOURISM PROGRAMMES

The following is an analysis of the two CTP programs according to the six ecotourism principles in order to determine how ecotourism manifests itself in practice.

Primary Focus of Natural Environment as the Attraction

The primary focus of the Ng’iresi tour was on culture. However, this program recognizes that environment and culture are not isolated from each other, since the village landscape is included in the attractions. Additionally, this program includes a distinctly natural attraction as the focal point of one of the itineraries, the Songota waterfall. Although culture is the priority in this program, the value of the natural landscape is highlighted on these tours.

The Osotwa program takes a slightly different approach to the program focus. This program explicitly separated “nature” from “culture” in the tourism initiatives by presenting a choice between two half-day tours labeled as the “Nature tour” and the “Culture tour.” The “Nature tour” consists of a hike to Sambasha Hill and a tour of the Eucalyptus plantation that is promoted by the Osotwa NGO’s tree planting project. Therefore, the OCTI does focus on nature although the program has multiple components.

Promotes Conservation

These programs both indirectly promote conservation natural resources by highlighting the landscape and environment as an integral element in the success of the project. The Osotwa program goes further by financing its conservation projects through the program revenue.
Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities

The economic impact of the Ng’iresi CTP was made visibly apparent by the inclusion of development projects in the itinerary. The projects that were supported by the revenues from this program included a biogas system at Mzee Loti’s house and the construction of a secondary school. Nine of the fourteen classrooms in the primary school in Ng’iresi were constructed with funds from the CTP program. In the OCTI program, the Emaoi School is one of the first attractions. Along with these visible indicators of increased economic capacity of the communities as a result of these programs, the guides also discussed the financial benefits they were receiving.

According to the receipt from the Ng’iresi program, tour guides receive about half of the revenue, while about a quarter of it is given to the village development fund that is meant to benefit the community as a whole. Since guides must undergo extensive training in order to lead tours, their increased compensation is justified. The Ng’iresi village chairman also helps to coordinate the project and has received visible financial benefits, including the only biogas system in the village. My guide for the Osotwa program, Olais Mokolo, resigned from his position as a village executive officer (a local government position) to become a tour guide in order to increase his income. This fact highlights that individuals are benefiting from these programs and do have an incentive to become involved in tourism.

Although individual benefits from these programs are apparent, even distribution of these financial benefits was not made clear from the information that I was given. At Ng’iresi, I paid, was given a clear receipt of my transactions, and signed a guest book before the tour had begun. The fee quoted by the TTB corresponded with the fee that
was paid on site. The division of the funds and the procedure for handling the funds was explained in detail. The OCTI payment procedure was much less transparent. Although I signed a guestbook at the start of the tour, I received no receipt, was not informed about the additional fee for the traditional dancing until after I agreed to witness it, and I paid more than I was quoted by the TTB. The OCTI program lacked transparency in identifying where and to whom these additional revenues were being channeled. This lack of transparency counteracts the stated goal of “allowing visitors to see how they contribute to the improvement of living conditions,”\textsuperscript{22} and therefore, addressing the management of these programs is essential for achieving the CTP’s goals.

**Encourages Empowerment through Community Participation**

Certain individuals receive monetary benefits from tourism, providing them with greater economic flexibility. The guide on my tour of Ng’iresi, Herry Christopher, originally wanted to be a doctor. However, due to the high cost of school fees and the scarcity of scholarships, he studied botany, zoology, and tourism in Nairobi. He explained that participating in tourism is a way to build on his existing knowledge of the village and skills in natural sciences while generating income.\textsuperscript{23} This is an alternative to common income-generating activities in the village, including finding employment in Arusha or selling cash crops. Serving as a guide also promotes education because guides are required to attend training schools. The two guides that I met at the Osotwa program, Olais Mokolo and Godfrey Jacob attended a year-long tourism training program in Arusha. Additionally, Godfrey learned French in addition to English and Swahili, so that

\textsuperscript{22} TTB (a).
\textsuperscript{23} Christopher.
he could take on additional groups. These language skills that were gained for the purposes of tourism will provide greater versatility in employment. Serving as a guide is a relatively lucrative and flexible job, which promotes empowerment through education and improved economic flexibility.

Additionally, these programs encourage the empowerment of entire communities by financing various programs. In Ng’iresi, various infrastructure projects, such as irrigation and biogas systems improve the livelihoods of locals. The construction of school classrooms in both programs promotes improvement in village educational systems. The Osotwa program also encourages community empowerment by promoting conservation projects that also benefit locals, such as the tree planting project.

**Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism**

These two programs are less intensive than other traditional tourism activities in Northern Tanzania (i.e., traditional safaris). These tours were conducted entirely on foot except for transportation to and from the village, and thus, negative environmental impact was reduced by keeping to marked and established paths.

**Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness**

The CTP program promotes cultural education and awareness on the part of the tourists because the purpose of these tours is to display the uniqueness of Wa-Arusha culture. However, villagers were put on display since there was a lack of authentic interaction between tourists and local community members. There was a performative nature to some of the attractions, exemplified when villagers presenting a traditional wedding dance donned Maasai *shukas* (blankets) and beads over their modern clothes.
This was truly a *performance* of culture, which changed the purpose of this dance that is reserved for special occasion, giving it a monetary value. Signs of modernization and globalization (televisions, coca-cola signs, etc.) were also downplayed throughout these tours and modern aspects of life were not discussed. This omission conceals certain aspects of contemporary Wa-Arusha culture, preventing genuine cross-cultural exchange.

Therefore, after analyzing the CTP programs and how they perform in relation to their initial goals, it is useful to reassess the principles of ecotourism addressed by these projects (Table 3.1), in order to determine if the theory of ecotourism translates into practice. Table 3.2 recasts these theories and concludes that in comparison to the explicitly stated goals of the CTP, the emphasis on nature as the primary attraction can be added and the reduction of negative impact from tourism may be promoted. However, this table reveals that education and awareness on both sides (tourists and local communities) is not necessarily promoted through these programs. This information, about the similarities and differences between the theory and practice of the CTP reveals various benefits and drawbacks from the programs for the significant stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Result:</th>
<th>Ecotourism Program:</th>
<th>CTP</th>
<th>Ng’iresi</th>
<th>Osotwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – “Nature” tour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Conservation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Community Empowerment through Participation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions about the Cultural Tourism Programme

The CTP program is growing throughout Tanzania and is gaining popularity and recognition by proponents of community-based tourism. Due to the generally small size of the tours and the personal connections that can be made with guides, the CTP programs can promote the fostering of cross-cultural awareness and understanding, adhering to some of the educational goals of the international standard of ecotourism. Additionally, many of the locations being visited do contain spectacular natural attractions which can also serve the goal of a focus on nature.

The varied nature of these programs, however, raises an issue that has been noted by critics of the CTP program, that “the modules unfortunately do not all offer a programme of the same standard and quality, […] allowing] organising agencies [to] complain that sometimes itineraries are not reliably kept.”24 The discrepancy between the transparency in the two programs demonstrates that these concerns are justified. In addition, although these programs have potential to achieve ecotourism’s goals, there is danger in equating all cultural tourism programs to ecotourism simply because they include local communities. The case studies downplayed the modern aspects of Tanzanian culture, leading to failure to meet the goal of promoting cultural understanding. It is difficult, however, to determine how and if these tours blur the lines between honest, cross-cultural interaction and the performance of culture, as shown through the wedding dance in the OCTI. This question merits critical anthropological, sociological, and historical analysis of the ways in which culture is presented in and influenced by these tours which cannot be included in this work.

In spite of these problematic aspects, the program promises myriad cultural benefits. It claims to reinforce the importance of local culture by presenting tourists with a unique view into Wa-Arusha life. The program also provides avenues to connect local communities with tourism institutions like TTB, providing a new source of income for the communities and product diversification for the tour companies. The CTP program requires very little inputs on the part of policymakers and tourism operators while still serving their individual goals. Therefore, the four significant stakeholders in Tanzanian ecotourism gain from this program despite the issues discussed above. The CTP program thus provides unique opportunities for the more marginalized rural areas of Tanzania to involve their communities in the international tourism market.

Chapter 4, *Case Study: Ecotourism Activities in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area* discusses how the managers of one of the most well known attractions in the traditional safari tourism market in Tanzania, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, are making efforts to establish ecotourism activities within this area.
Chapter 4
Case Study: Ecotourism in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the ecotourism activities in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), one of the most frequently visited sites in Tanzania. The NCA is home to the Ngorongoro Crater, which is the largest unbroken caldera in the world. Due to the large variety of wildlife that is found here, this area has an extensive history of nature-based tourism, mostly in the form of vehicle safaris. The NCA is unique in relation to other protected areas in Tanzania, because it is a “multiple land use area” in which local communities are permitted to live in close proximity to sites dedicated to tourism. The area is designed to jointly “promote the conservation of wildlife and other natural resources, interests of indigenous resident pastoralists, and tourism,” which can often be “a management challenge for protected area managers.”

Over the past fifteen years, tourist visits to the NCA have rapidly increased, causing concern about potential negative environmental impacts. In order to address these issues and to diversify tourism activities in this area, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) has implemented a number of initiatives to promote alternative forms of tourism as well as community involvement in tourism activities. In order to understand the historical context in which these ecotourism projects have emerged, this chapter briefly looks at the conservation history of the NCA. This chapter then analyses three NCA ecotourism programs: walking safaris, campsites, and Cultural Bomas. Using

1 The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, Walking Safaris Management Plan For the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD), Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, and the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, 2001) 1.
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observations from my field research, this chapter describes how each individual program is run and analyzes the benefits and drawbacks of each program. Finally, this chapter assesses these programs in comparison to the broader goals of ecotourism in Tanzania and internationally using Table 2.2 as a template.

**HISTORY OF THE NGORONGORO CONSERVATION AREA**

The area that is now the Ngorongoro Conservation Area is home to a large diversity of wildlife and has therefore been an important area for both local populations and tourists over time. Due to the potential for multiple uses of land in this area, there has been a turbulent history of conflicts between land use and human populations (a comprehensive summary of the history of the NCA can be found in Table 1 of Appendix 3). Pastoralists such as the Maasai, Hadzabe, and Dagota have inhabited this area for nearly two hundred years. These local residents were forced to either move out of the areas that they inhabited or to change their modes of subsistence following the creation of various protected areas during colonial times. As early as 1914, German officials placed areas in what is now the NCA under protected area status, forcing the removal of local residents. The NCA was established in 1959 and was designated as an area where local populations could live in opposition to the national parks (see Map 4.1). According to historical records, resident pastoralists were asked to vacate Serengeti National Park and move to the NCA under the conditions “that their interests would be protected in the new multiple land use area, and [that] different compensation schemes, […] such as…] water development for range improvement [would be provided].”² However, in 1974, the

---

² The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, 2.
Maasai were precluded from living on the crater’s floor and needed special permits in order to take their cattle into the crater at all. Prohibitions like those caused tense relationships between the state and the local communities. In 1975 the parastatal Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) was established to manage the area with the following objectives: 1) to safeguard the interests of the local

Map 4.1 Map of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Source: Tanzania Wildlife Safaris).
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community, 2) to encourage conservation, and 3) to promote tourism development.\(^3\) Proposed NCAA management plans have not been favorable to locals, who have been banned from various methods of sustenance, including cultivating crops, collecting tree resin, and burning grasses in the NCA.\(^4\) Struggles between the residents and the NCAA continued, as the number of tourists increased and caused conflicts between wildlife habitats, which support the main tourist attraction, and resident land use practices.

Today, the NCA continues to be a multiple land use area home to a number of indigenous groups. There are currently around 60,000 residents living in the NCA, including NCA employees and resident pastoralists, 97 percent of whom are Maasai.\(^5\) The Maasai people subsist on herds of cattle, flocks of small stock, and crop cultivation, although the degree to which cultivation is used by groups shifts according to health and the abundance of livestock. The Maasai believe in the idea of communal rights over land and communities are defined in terms of proximity and shared use of resources, although certain individuals are privileged over others based on gender and age. There are currently sixteen villages in the NCA, which are divided up into six wards. The local villages in this area are given minimal financial assistance by the NCAA, and often struggle for resources. Compared to other Tanzanian Maasai, the NCA Maasai have

---

3 Francis Kone, *Personal Interview* (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: Community Development Department, Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, August 10, 2006).


higher malnutrition, smaller livestock holdings, and smaller crop acreage.\textsuperscript{6} This situation is aggravated because only twelve percent of households in the NCA earn tourism income. Local residents have begun to seek other means of income, including selling handicrafts and posing for photographs in traditional dress.\textsuperscript{7} The NCAA has established some entities which aim to provide assistance to local residents, including the Community Development Department (CDD).

The CDD oversees all issues relating to the livelihoods of local residents, including food security, environmental education, and schooling.\textsuperscript{8} The liaison between the villages and the CDD is the Pastoral Council (PC), a legal entity. In addition to the village chairmen from each of the sixteen villages, each ward selects two councilors, one woman, and one youth to serve on the PC. The PC engages with the NCAA and handles the collection, distribution, and use of any funds received from the NCAA. According to NCAA statistics, in the 2005–2006 financial year, approximately 4.2 percent of the total revenue that the NCA collected (TZS 703 million; \$US 586,000) was given to the PC.\textsuperscript{9} Although this was an increase from the TZS 600 million (\$US 500,000) that was given to the local communities in the previous financial year, the PC and local communities would still like to receive up to half of the NCA income.\textsuperscript{10}

In addition to the increased population of resident pastoralists, the number of visitors to Ngorongoro has significantly increased (see Figure 4.1), especially since Tanzania’s economic liberalization of the 1980s and 1990s. In 2005, 336,591 people

\textsuperscript{7} Zeppel, 145.
\textsuperscript{8} Kone.
\textsuperscript{9} Simon Joseph Kalembo, \textit{Personal Interview} (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: August 12, 2006).
\textsuperscript{10} Kone, and Zeppel, 145.
visited the NCA, 238,174 (71 percent) of whom were non-residents. All visitors must pay a fee to enter the conservation area ($US 30/5 for non-Tanzanian adults/children and TZS 1500/500 ($US 1.25/0.42) for Tanzanian adults/children). Tourists typically visit the area as part of a ten- to twelve-day safari through Tanzania’s “Northern Safari Circuit,” including Serengeti, Lake Manyara, and other national parks. The average visitor stays in the NCA for two nights, visiting the Ngorongoro crater for one half to one full day. These visits to the crater take place in a large safari vehicle containing an average of five people who journey through dirt roads on the Crater floor to observe

Figure 4.1 Ngorongoro Conservation Area Tourism Trend, 1968 to 2005 (Source: Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, 2006)
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11 Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority Tariffs (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: 2006).
12 Charnley, 78.
animals, take photographs, and picnic.\textsuperscript{13} Vehicle traffic in the crater has increased as more people visit each year.\textsuperscript{14} Therefore, in order to diversify tourism activities and to limit crowding in the crater, the NCAA has introduced tourism activities that involve locals and provide increased benefits to resident individuals and communities.

**BACKGROUND OF THE ECOTOURISM ACTIVITIES IN THE NCA**

Ecotourism activities in the NCA were first conceived and initiated in 1994 when the NCAA was developing the first General Management Plan of the NCA. It was discovered that unplanned walking safaris were taking place in the NCA and that they could be an additional sort of tourism. Upon the establishment of a Walking Safaris Task Force, which included members from local communities, travel associations, TANAPA, the PC, and the NCAA, a management plan for walking safaris was established in 1994. This task force called for the identification of possible routes, the identification of limits of acceptable use, and the development of an appropriate management strategy. The identification of potential campsites was also included in this management plan, since the provision of resting accommodations was necessary for multi-day walking safaris. Also in 1994, representatives from the NCAA were sent to various wards to learn about the possibility of institutionalizing a program of cultural bomas (settlements) in the NCA. The NCAA and local residents were eager to broaden the reach of benefits from tourism activities. These three programs have been evolving since 1994 and persist as the main community-based tourism activities of the NCA.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, 1.
According to the NCAA, the overarching goals of these programs are: “1) to diversify tourism activities in the area thereby reducing the number of vehicles in the Ngorongoro Crater at one particular time, 2) to offer tourist’s [sic] with experience [of] different attractions and thus [to] increase their satisfaction, 3) to diversify income-generating activities of the NCA resident pastoralists by involving them fully in […] management an accruing income therefrom,”15 and 4) to provide a place for indigenous residents to educate visitors about traditional culture, lifestyle, and land-uses in a respectful way.16 Therefore, the goals of these three programs are in line with a number of the internationally stated goals as well as the Tanzanian concepts of ecotourism. The similarities and differences between these theories of ecotourism are shown in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1: NCA Ecotourism Activities versus Types of Ecotourism in Tanzania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecotourism Program:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Community Empowerment through Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The walking safaris program (and therefore the campsites program by association) focuses on nature as the primary attraction, while culture is the primary attraction of the cultural bomas program.
†The goals mention full resident pastoralist participation, but the focus is on income-generation rather than empowerment.
°The campsites and walking safaris are packaged as alternative forms of tourism, rather than opportunities to learn about local communities, while the aim of the cultural bomas is to expose tourists to local culture.

15 Ibid, vi.
STRUCTURE OF THE WALKING SAFARIS PROGRAM

On August 10, 2006, I was shown the starting points for one of the designated routes for the walking safaris in the NCA (see Map 4.2). Mr. Peter Makutian of the Tourism Division of the NCAA pointed out the route that runs for about 11km, just north of a Maasai village. Visitors embark on walking safaris on routes like these, originating from various locations throughout the conservation area. Some of the main attractions on these walks include the acacia forest, the view of Lake Eyasi, Olduvai (Oldupai) Gorge, the Laitole (Alaitole) footprints, migratory herds, and the waterfalls at Endoro River. Bookings for these tours are made in advance by tour companies. For multi-day tours, bookings must be made at least one month before arrival and for day hikes, bookings can be made upon arrival. For a guided walking safari, the fee is USD 20.00 per day per group for non-Tanzanians and TZS 5,000 (approximately USD 4.17) for Tanzanians.

There are also strict guidelines for appropriate operation of these tours. All of the guides who run these walking safaris are locals who are very well acquainted with the

---

17 The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, 15-16.
18 Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority.
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landscape. Most of the guides do not receive any training, although some attend a short course through the National Outdoor Leadership School. These guides are expected to communicate in English or another foreign language, be conversant with the area and its natural resources, and be knowledgeable in first aid. When embarking on waking safaris, groups cannot exceed eight visitors and are accompanied by a crew including the resident guide, a NCAA ranger, and members from a tour company. The ranger must carry a rifle for safety purposes, and the visitors must sign a waiver to indemnify the NCAA before departing.

Procedure for Distributing Funds from Walking Safaris

All revenue, except for tips, is collected by the NCAA. Upon collection, the NCAA in turn transfers fifty percent to the account of the ward where the safaris are taking place, which is enforced through a system of checks and balances. The Tourism Committees of each of the wards are in charge of making sure that the number of people who were taken on walking safaris corresponds with the amount of money received. Of the fifty percent that is given to the communities, a portion is given to the guides and the remainder is said to be devoted to community development projects. These projects include the building of schools, the construction of mobile hospitals with vaccination capabilities, and the building of dams for water facilities.

Structure of the Campsites Program

On August 10, 2006, I visited the Landana campsite and the Ilmisigiyo campsite with Mr. Makutian and Mr. Sanguyan Oledorop, a resident guide in this area (see map

---

19 The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, 17.
20 Kone.
4.2; and Appendix 4 for photographs). These campsites were operated by Hoopoe Safaris, a UK-owned safari company that operates tours across East Africa. Tour companies book the campsites for approximately three months at a time, bringing their own tents and equipment. These companies also aims to return the area as close to its original condition as possible upon vacating the space. The campsite fees are shown in Box 4.1.

These campsites are stationed at strategic points along the walking safari routes and provide an alternative means of accommodation in the NCA instead of the larger safari lodges. Visitors rest at these campsites for an average of two nights while they are embarking on six or seven hour hikes. Most of the visitors are from the US, the UK, France, Italy, and Spain. The campsites are staffed by local residents as well as employees from the tour company. Both sites contained five tents which could accommodate a total of eleven or twelve people. These tents were well outfitted, including flush toilets, showers, and solar-powered lighting. In addition, there was a mess tent where meals were prepared and served. These campsites offer visitors an opportunity to get a more intimate experience with nature in the NCA.

### Procedure for Distributing Funds from Campsites

The procedure for distributing funds from the campsites is very similar to the procedure for the walking safaris, and the revenues from the two programs are distributed together. All revenue for the campsites is collected by the NCAA. Fifty percent of this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tanzanian (TZS)</th>
<th>Non-Tanzanian (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of or above the age of 16</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 15 years</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Box 4.1. Fees for camping for a 24-hour period in the NCA**
(Source: NCAA)
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revenue is said to be given to the ward in which the campsites are located. A portion of this is given directly to those who staff the campsites (dishwashers and camp guards are typically paid TZS 5,000 (USD 4.17)\(^{21}\)) and the rest is devoted to community development projects mentioned above. The Tourism Committees of each of the wards are in charge of collecting the funds, making sure that the number of people who were recorded at the campsites corresponds with the amount of money received, and distributing the money throughout the ward. In the Ngorongoro ward for example, four people collect information on the campsites, by visiting the campsites periodically and recording how many visitors were there.\(^{22}\) This information is compiled and brought to the zonal coordinator and the ward coordinator of the NCAA who verifies the amount of visitors against the amount of money that has been received.\(^{23}\) Therefore, there is a system of checks to verify the amount of money that is received from the campsites and the walking safaris in each ward.

**STRUCTURE OF THE CULTURAL BOMAS PROGRAM**

There are currently three Cultural Bomas (CBs) that operate in the NCA. These are the Loongooku CB (located about 8km northwest of the crater rim), the Irkeepusi CB (located on the eastern crater rim), and the Seneto CB (located just shy of the eastern crater rim). On August 11, 2006, I visited the Seneto CB with Mr. Makutian as a guide and translator (see Map 4.2; and Appendix 4 for photographs). Bomas like these are replicas of Maasai homesteads, and are built strictly for tourism purposes. The NCAA urges that they “will not be, nor will they be presented as, authentic bomas where

\(^{21}\) DeLuca, 218.
\(^{22}\) Philemon K. Lemorog, Personal Interview (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: August 11, 2006).
\(^{23}\) On August 11, 2006, I witnessed the Chairman of the Tourism Committee of the Ngorongoro Ward, Philemon K. Lemorog, deliver and verify this information for the month of July with the Tourism division.
residents live. Rather, they will be cultural centers for interpretive demonstrations, exhibits, and sales of handicrafts, photography, and publications.” Residents of these bomas are selected by leaders of their home villages to live in the CB for up to one year. The NCAA General Management Plan stipulates that there should be a mix of youths, women, and elders in each CB. All of the revenue from the bomas is said to be given directly to the members of the boma and the villages from which they originate. Revenue is generated through a general TZS 20,000 fee (USD 16.67) charged to each car that enters, and through the sale of handicrafts. The revenue from the merchandise sales goes directly to the maker of the items. The revenue from the fees is collected by the leaders of the boma, (generally elder males) who are appointed by the boma members and the NCAA upon arrival to the boma. This revenue is then said to be divided up among certain groups within the village, such as young men, women, elders, and village leaders, or used for development projects. There was no clearly defined system of revenue collection, revenue distribution or checks and balances to ensure that revenue actually reaches the local community.

ANALYSIS OF ECOTOURISM ACTIVITIES IN THE NCA

The goals and the corresponding structures of the ecotourism activities in the NCA are in line with the various theories and models of ecotourism discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. These programs are relatively well managed, with communication occurring between local communities and the NCAA regarding the revenue accrued from these projects. However, transparency is lacking in some areas, most notably, in the collection

25 Peter Makutian, Personal Interview, (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: Tourism Division, Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority, August 10, 2006).
and distribution of funds from the CBs and in the allocation of funds by the PC. These issues in the organizational structure of these programs may hinder the efforts of these programs in attempting to reach their stated goals. Based on my observations, the following is an assessment of the success of the ecotourism activities in the NCA according to the principles of ecotourism listed in Table 4.1.

**Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction**

The walking safaris program focuses on nature as the attraction and allows a more intimate experience with nature in the NCA as compared to traditional vehicle safaris. The campsites program offers visitors an alternative experience to traditional safari lodges by allowing accommodation in campsites that provide direct experience with the natural landscape. This program is also linked to the walking safaris program, since visitors who embark on multi-day hikes stay at the campsites. The CBs program, on the other hand, focuses strictly on culture as the attraction. The argument should be made again here, however, that culture and environment can never be completely isolated from one another. The premise behind the attraction to Maasai life is the fact that the Maasai have been able to adapt to their natural surroundings through the creative use of their natural resources. The CB programs demonstrate to tourists how the Maasai use sticks, mud, and cow dung to construct their huts, how they sleep with smaller livestock in their huts to generate warmth, and how they use milk from their cattle; these are all innovative uses of natural resources. Therefore, although the emphasis of the CB programs appears to be on culture, environmental influences also play a role in the attraction of the program.
Promotes Conservation

These programs depend on the viability and the aesthetic beauty of the natural environment for their effective operation. Therefore, these programs promote conservation of the natural environment by emphasizing the natural landscape as the focal point of each program, although they do not provide direct revenue for conservation.

Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities

In 2005, the campsites and walking safaris in the NCA earned TZS 82 million (USD 68,333), half of which was supposedly given to the communities in which the campsites and safaris are located. This revenue was a significant increase from the previous year, when these programs earned TZS 40 million (USD 33,333). These funds allow the PC to undertake certain development projects which may otherwise not be feasible. These revenues are also given directly to guides, donkey porters, and campsite staff who directly benefit from these programs. The CB program similarly provides direct financial benefits to the local residents involved and the Seneto CB generally makes about TZS 45 million (USD 37,500) per year. It should be noted that this is seasonal revenue that is mostly accrued during the peak tourism season.

Although it is not guaranteed that the funds from these programs will be divided equally, there is a system of checks and balances in the walking safaris and campsites programs to minimize the possibility of corruption. Unfortunately, the Maasai are not benefiting as much as they could or should from the CB program because of corrupt practices on the part of some tour operators, who pocket most of the boma entrance fees.

---

26 Kalembo.
27 Makutian.
paid by tourists.\textsuperscript{28} However, it appears that local communities are receiving some monetary benefits from these activities, although the uses of and distribution of the revenue may be less certain.

Although these programs may increase the average income in the villages involved, the revenue is not distributed evenly. Only men currently serve as guides and donkey porters for these walking safaris or as watchmen or cooks at campsites and women do not directly receive any of the monetary benefits. Furthermore, only a handful of men from each village (average village population is about seven hundred people)\textsuperscript{29} can be employed, creating potential for social stratification. Since guides must have comprehensive knowledge, only those who have had access to extensive education can serve as guides. Yet, acknowledging that only a few individuals benefit from these programs should not affect the conclusion that the overall economic situation of the communities involve is likely to be improved from these programs.

Those who were involved in these programs noted that although increased revenue can provide opportunities for economic and social development, it also creates the issue of increased dependence on monetary wealth. Mr. Oledorop as well as members of the Seneto CB stated that residents have begun to beg on the roadside.\textsuperscript{30} Boma members also state that individuals have become more concerned with personal material wealth in what was originally more of a communal society. Therefore, although these ecotourism programs do provide monetary benefits for those involved, it should be noted that these financial benefits create social concerns as well.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{28} Charnley, 81.
\textsuperscript{29} Lemorog.
\textsuperscript{30} Sanguyan Oledorop, Personal Interview (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: August 10, 2006).
\end{footnotesize}
Encourages Empowerment through Community Participation

These programs are able to provide a source of economic income for a number of individuals in the NCA and they therefore encourage empowerment through community participation by providing individuals with greater economic flexibility. Revenue from these programs has also supported the construction of chekechea (kindergartens) within CBs, as well as the sponsoring of a few individuals to obtain a post-secondary education.\(^\text{31}\) Given the circumstances of limited land use in the NCA and the prohibition of farming, increased income also allows resident pastoralists the ability to purchase items for sustenance, providing for greater food security in this area.\(^\text{32}\) Communities can begin to decrease their reliance on the NCAA for basic services, allowing for community empowerment.

Unfortunately, these programs also have some aspects which also disempower communities. Some villages are unable to participate in these programs because of their distance from major tourist routes. Therefore, these communities are at a disadvantage simply based on their location. Additionally, due to the increased presence of tourists in the campsites and walking safaris, local people are discouraged from visiting certain areas that had previously been accessible. The management plan prohibits the stripping of acacia trees for rope-making to preserve the aesthetic value of these areas for tourists.\(^\text{33}\) Therefore, these programs limit the behavior of resident pastoralists.

These programs also marginalize certain groups and individuals who are unable to participate as frequently as others. For example, women rarely participate in the walking safaris and campsites programs. Also, certain villages involved in the CB programs must

---

\(^\text{31}\) Makutian.
\(^\text{32}\) Bruno Kawasange, Personal Interview (Ngorongoro, Tanzania: August 10, 2006).
\(^\text{33}\) The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, 20-21.
reorganize if a significant portion of the village departs for a CB for an extended period of time. Only a small portion of villagers can participate in the CB programs at one time and some villages do not participate at all. It has been estimated that approximately 1000 Maasai residents benefit from the CB programs per year, which comprises only about 2 percent of the NCA residents. Only a few dozen men are employed as guides or campsite staff. Therefore, the ecotourism activities in the NCA do not provide a substantial means of community empowerment, although certain individuals do benefit.

Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism

The environmental impacts from these programs are minimal in comparison to other viable forms of tourism in the NCA. Traditional tourism activities require intensive construction of infrastructure (concrete roads, large hotels, etc.) which have extreme environmental impacts. The ecotourism activities in the NCA are conducted on foot and rely on periodic, instead of permanent disturbances of the natural environment (day long hikes, semi-permanent camps, etc.). Thus, the environmental effects of these programs are mainly due to changes in soils and vegetation. The environmental effects of hiking include trampling, which leads to abrasion of vegetation, compaction of soil, and increased runoff and erosion potential. The environmental impacts of camping include the effects of trampling, loss of vegetation and damages to surrounding trees. However, the NCAA attempts to minimize the number of travelers embarking on walking safaris at one time, so as to minimize the negative environmental effects on trails. Additionally,

34 DeLuca, 207-208.
36 Ibid., 47-48.
campsites are only set up for three months at a time, allowing sites time to recover. Other mitigation measures include prohibition of camping near water sources, prohibition of burying trash, discouragement of the use of firewood, and the prohibition of generators so as to discourage noise and artificial light. Since very little permanent infrastructure is developed for the operation of the programs, these programs appear to have less impact than other types of tourism facilities and activities.

Although the NCAA has made efforts to require that these campsites lessen negative effects on the natural environment in their management plan, I neither saw nor heard any evidence of monitoring of sites. This may be due to the number of (around twenty) and distance between campsites in relation to the limited number of NCAA employees. Implementation of a monitoring program would be an advantageous development in ensuring successful minimization of negative impacts.

**Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness**

This principle mainly applies to the CB program, which aims to educate visitors about Maasai culture. It appears that tourists do indeed learn a great deal about Maasai culture from these programs, but some of their actions do not contribute to the fostering of cross-cultural understanding. Mr. Oledorop stated that some visitors do not respect the residents and have been known to throw food at them or take unauthorized photographs. Although these bomas were constructed specifically for tourism to avoid creating “human zoos” of people’s homes that occurred in Kenya, such disrespectful treatment can be

---

37 The Ngorongoro Planning and Research Unit, 10.
38 Oledorop.
degrading to members of the CBs.\textsuperscript{39} It also bothers some CB members to see European tourists purchasing and wearing Maasai handicrafts that were meant for ceremonial uses.\textsuperscript{40} Therefore, although these programs do provide tourists with an educational experience, tourists may not be aware of impacts on Maasai culture.

Table 4.2 recasts the principles of ecotourism described in Table 4.1 and concludes that the NCA programs are effective at achieving some of their explicitly-stated goals. However, this table reveals that education and awareness of tourists and local communities is not necessarily promoted and that only certain individuals or groups gain empowerment through these activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2. Goals of NCA programs versus Results of NCA programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecotourism Program:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Community Empowerment through Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCA activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking Safaris</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some more than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campsites</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some more than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Bomas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirectly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some more than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE ECOTOURISM ACTIVITIES IN THE NCA**

The ecotourism activities in the NCA effectively highlight how the theory of ecotourism is being presently being implemented in Tanzania. According to the models of ecotourism discussed in Chapter 2, namely community-based tourism and cultural tourism, these programs provide concrete examples of the various manifestations of

\textsuperscript{39} DeLuca, 197.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid, 209.
ecotourism in Tanzania. The walking safaris program could be considered as community-based tourism, since individuals from local communities are involved in tourism activities taking place on lands used by locals. The campsites program can be seen as community-based tourism as well, since locals are providing access to their lands and natural attractions in exchange for payment. The CB program can be considered as cultural tourism, since culture is the primary attraction. Description of these programs demonstrates how these models of ecotourism in Tanzania have diversified the tourism market. The operation of the programs also suggests that these categories of Tanzanian ecotourism can work together to provide benefits to multiple groups and individuals. For example, visitors camp at campsites while engaging in multi-day walking safaris that pass through various cultural bomas. Therefore, the programs encourage visitors to engage in more than one type of ecotourism.

Analysis of these programs also demonstrate how the four most relevant actors in Tanzanian ecotourism activities discussed in Chapter 2 gain and lose from ecotourism activities. In this case, the relevant policymaker is the NCAA, who, along with other groups, drafted the management plans for these programs. The NCAA benefits from instituting these types of tourism activities instead of others because little to no infrastructural inputs are required on their part to ensure the operation of the programs. Trails, campsites, and strategic locations must be identified, but it is the local communities and the tourist companies that provide the materials from there on. Tourism operators benefit by securing an alternative form of tourism for their guests and through increased revenue, but they experience one drawbacks, including the investment they must be made in camping equipment, if they are to be involved in the campsites program.
Tourists benefit because they are able to gain a more intimate experience with the natural environment of the NCA and also directly engage with local communities.

Local communities benefit through increased income and involvement in tourism activities in this area. Although these programs do have negative effects discussed above, they do provide a means of engagement in the tourism industry that is more conducive to the Maasai way of life than other forms of tourism employment. Through employment with hotels or as guides, Maasai people must leave their traditional ways of life, which normally consist of guarding livestock and cultivating plots. The working hours of traditional tourism jobs are not conducive to traditional Maasai life, which can be less regimented. Walking safaris and CBs are more culturally appropriate forms of engaging in tourism activities because Maasai people do not necessarily have to acquire additional skills to benefit from tourism. Walking safari guides transfer skills from their pastoral lifestyles such as the ability to track and avoid dangerous predators, knowledge of the stars, and ability to find clean water sources. CBs allow residents to continue their traditional ways of life, although removed from their original villages, while earning income. Through these programs, the local residents of the NCA can build on their existing skills and knowledge of the natural landscape while directly participating in income-generating tourism activities.

Analysis of these programs effectively demonstrates how implementation of ecotourism in the NCA through these programs may differ from some of the national and international ecotourism principles. For example, the CB program lacks an explicit focus on nature and it does not always promote education and awareness. This program is included in the roster of ecotourism activities in the NCA because ecotourism in

41 Ibid., 225.
Tanzania is often equated with any type of tourism that includes local communities (see Chapter 2), in order to differentiate community projects from the abundance of nature-based tourism activities that take place in the country. However, as shown in Table 4.1, this model, and the two other examples from this area are not always in line with the theories of ecotourism (both national and international). Analysis of the effects of these discrepancies is required to determine how and if variances in theory and practice of ecotourism effect the achievement of ecotourism’s goals.

Chapter 5, *Conclusions and Recommendations* synthesizes the observations from the case studies, discusses any discrepancies between the Tanzanian concept of ecotourism and the international standard, and provides conclusions about and recommendations on ecotourism in Tanzania.
Conclusions and Recommendations

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides findings, policy implications, and recommendations for the effective implementation of ecotourism. In particular, I address the following questions:

- How does ecotourism manifest itself in local practice in comparison to national and international theories?
- What is the value of an ‘international norm’ of ecotourism?
- Can actually be viewed as “conservation for sustainable development”?
- Are ecotourism activities worthwhile for those involved in planning and implementing projects (policymakers, tourism operators, local communities, and tourists)?

In addressing these questions, this section aims to determine if ecotourism in Tanzania is genuinely “conservation for sustainable development.”

ECOTOURISM IN TANZANIA

Many of the objectives of Tanzania’s National Tourism Policy are in line with the government’s definition of ecotourism as “purposeful travel to natural areas to understand the culture and natural history of the environment taking care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem, while producing economic opportunities that make the conservation of natural resources beneficial to the local people.”\(^1\) However, these objectives are not always achieved in practice. As seen in the case studies, some, but not always all of these objectives are being addressed through present-day ecotourism.

activities in Tanzania. Therefore, it is useful to look at Tanzanian ecotourism in comparison to the international standard of ecotourism in order to understand how discrepancies between the two theories affect the ecotourism sector.

**Manifestations of Ecotourism**

As seen through the case studies, the implementation of ecotourism in Tanzania is non-uniform. A comprehensive list of varieties of Tanzanian ecotourism activities would include at least contractual relationships between communities and private tour operators (through campsites, etc.), walking safaris, cultural bomas, and village tours. Each of the case studies fits into one of these models. Table 5.1 below combines the results found in Table 3.2 (page 62) and Table 4.2 (page 84) to demonstrate that the variety of ecotourism projects that exist in Tanzania today creates a situation in which individual projects reach a subset of the international goals of ecotourism that varies depending on the program structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecotourism Program:</th>
<th>Ng’iresi</th>
<th>Osotwa</th>
<th>Walking Safaris</th>
<th>Campsites</th>
<th>Cultural Bomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Focus on Natural Environment as the Attraction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes – “Nature” tour</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Conservation</td>
<td>Indirectly</td>
<td>Yes - projects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Indirectly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Financial Benefits for Local Communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Community Empowerment through Participation</td>
<td>Some more than others</td>
<td>Some more than others</td>
<td>Some more than others</td>
<td>Some more than others</td>
<td>Some more than others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Negative Impact from Tourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes Cultural Education and Awareness</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5.1. Comparison of Case Studies according to Principles of Ecotourism*
Theory versus Practice of Ecotourism in Tanzania

As seen in the previous chapters, ecotourism in Tanzania is both defined and implemented in a variety of ways. Table 2.2 (page 46) separated the individual definitions of ecotourism by Tanzanian actors according to the various ecotourism principles addressed. Although the differences between these definitions are subtle, the discrepancies allow for the Tanzanian models of ecotourism to take on different forms that are adapted to local conditions. A comparison of Table 5.1 and Table 2.2 demonstrates that there is heterogeneity in both the theory and practice of ecotourism. In Table 2.2, there was no criterion of ecotourism that all actors who provided definitions of ecotourism agreed upon, allowing certain projects to fall short of some definitions. For example, the Ngorongoro Cultural Boma (CB) program would not fit into Mr. Peterson’s definition of ecotourism, although it would fit others. Similarly, the walking safaris and campsites programs would not fit Mr. Ahham’s definition. These incongruities indicate that the way in which ecotourism is defined is indeed significant in relation to how projects are implemented. Table 5.1 also demonstrates that the five case studies have varying results for three of the global principles (primary focus on nature as the attraction, promotion of cultural education and awareness, and community empowerment through participation) while they all address the remaining three principles. Therefore, the case studies reveal that promotion of conservation, provision of financial benefits for locals, and minimization of negative impact from tourism are addressed by current ecotourism projects (at least indirectly) regardless of how ecotourism is defined on the national scale. Therefore, the comparison of the theory and the practice of ecotourism in Tanzania demonstrates that actual ecotourism projects systematically differ from but are also similar to the international standard of ecotourism.
International Ecotourism vs. Tanzanian Ecotourism

The fact that ecotourism is such a multi-faceted concept allows for the multiplicity of definitions on both the international and national scales. Tanzanian ecotourism differs from the international standard in that a variety of projects, including ones that focus on culture as the primary attraction, are labeled as ecotourism there while they may not be on the international scale. This difference reveals that Tanzanian stakeholders have creatively adapted the international standard to fit the national sector. An important difference between these two scales is the lack of inclusion of community empowerment through participation in the Tanzanian government’s definition. The government’s focus is on the financial benefits that ecotourism activities will provide for the local communities involved. As the case studies have shown, financial benefits do not always promote empowerment. Thus, this difference between the national and international standards creates a situation in which local communities, such as those in areas in and around national parks, can lose out on social benefits that they could, and by international norms should be receiving from ecotourism.

However, the fact that all of the case studies did address this omitted principle, even if the scale of empowerment is often unclear, indicates that the national definition of ecotourism may not be the basis for actual projects. The ideas of community empowerment and participation are included in other policies and ecotourism projects often bypass any interactions with the government. These facts support the hypothesis that the national definition may not carry as much weight in the Tanzanian ecotourism sector as other guiding standards.
Conclusions about the Theory vs. the Practice of Ecotourism

Many ecotourism projects do not adhere to all of the principles set forth in commonly agreed upon definitions. Therefore, some may question the utility of international standards. If the principles of ecotourism are rarely achieved simultaneously, then what purpose does an international standard serve? An international standard allows for projects carried out in different countries to share common features that differentiate ecotourism from other types of tourism. The international standard also demarcates a set of guiding principles which aid planners and managers of ecotourism in the development of projects. For example, despite the fact that community participation and empowerment are not explicitly included in the national definition, all of the case studies did address this principle. This finding supports the theory that documents like the Québec Declaration on Ecotourism, although not binding, can provide standards through which communities can be informed of their rights to a certain quality of ecotourism project, similar to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Especially in relation to the standard of promotion of local well-being and empowerment, which is excluded from the Tanzanian definition, international standards suggest guidelines that can benefit local communities.

This international conceptualization of ecotourism also gives ecotourism its place within the increasingly globalized tourism sector. ‘Ecotourism’ becomes a term of marketing that is used by the commercial tourism sector. This placement of ecotourism within a catalogue of tourism activities does not minimize the goals of ecotourism; it simply recognizes that tourism is a commercial sector which relies on marketing to draw in ecotourists. This placement also does not suggest that ecotourism should become a
form of main stream, mass tourism, because of the extremely detrimental effects that a significant increase in the number of ecotourists could have on the culture and environment of destinations. Those looking for an authentic experience in traditional communities that also aids in community development will be drawn to these programs through their advertising, which should not diminish the merits of these programs.

Although the international standards present the current consensus of what the “ideal” of ecotourism should be, one should recognize that these standards are not static. Over time, as more ecotourism projects have been implemented and more research on ecotourism is conducted, ecotourism’s main principles have been questioned. For example, TIES proposed to add a seventh principle to its list, which was not approve by is Board (see Chapter 1). Ecotourism is a burgeoning field and its principles are periodically discussed at ecotourism summits, conferences, and roundtables. As international circumstances change, it is possible that these norms of international ecotourism will adapt to new developments.

Due to this mutability, international standards should not be accepted without questions about whether the site-specific conditions in a certain area allow for the feasible implementation of the international concept. International models cannot be applied as a “quick fix” without adaptation to the unique circumstances of a specific area. Furthermore, international standards should not be given preference over local initiatives that innovatively and effectively interpret ecotourism but do not achieve some of the international goals. For example, although the CB programs do not strictly fit under the current international standard of ecotourism because of their focus on culture as the attraction, their merits should not be discounted if they are effectively operated. These
programs could also in turn inform the international norms, suggesting changes based on what is encountered locally. For example, based on the case studies, the international standards of ecotourism should include a primary focus on culture, because culture is linked to environment, in recognition that programs like these are a useful way to further involve local communities in tourism activities. Therefore, comparison of the theory and practice of ecotourism suggests that theory and practice should inform each other.

**IS ECOTOURISM A WORTHWHILE POLICY OPTION?**

In the face of multiple options for tourism and sustainable development, all parties involved in ecotourism projects often wonder if ecotourism is indeed an efficient and effective way of reaching the stated goals of ecotourism. As shown in the case studies, various actors lose and gain from ecotourism activities, making the success of ecotourism dependent upon whether the gains outweigh the losses.

**Gains and Losses from Ecotourism**

From my observations of Tanzanian ecotourism, it appears that policymakers use the term “ecotourism” more frequently than those involved in operating ecotourism projects. According to commentary received during interviews, these operators use other terms such as “cultural tourism” or “community-based tourism,” emphasizing that ecotourism is more a term of marketing.² Policymakers suggest ecotourism as an option for areas where conflicts exist between environmental conservation and local communities (such as the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA)) or in areas that are

---

² Jo Anderson, **Personal Interview** (Arusha, Tanzania: August 15, 2006); Thad Peterson, **Personal Interview** (Arusha, Tanzania: August 15, 2006), and Corbett Bishop, **Personal Interview**, (Arusha, Tanzania: August 1, 2006).
difficult to access and therefore are not conducive to traditional tourism activities.\(^3\)

Ecotourism allows policymakers another avenue through which certain governmental goals relating to the environment and community development can be promoted. In comparison to other types of Tanzanian tourism, ecotourism does not require a large input of government funding for infrastructure development and is therefore an attractive policy option. Policymakers, such as TANAPA, also promote and advertise Tanzanian ecotourism in international trade fairs and other venues to highlight local efforts towards conservation and sustainable development.\(^4\) Thus, using the concept of ecotourism is worthwhile for policymakers because it provides an alternative multifaceted policy option.

Tourism operators are involved in surveying areas for ecotourism development, organizing and maintaining functional projects, and advertising these programs to tourists. Ecotourism is also a niche within the larger tourism market, and establishing ecotourism projects draws an existing demographic of ecotourists as well as those in search of alternative tourism products. In order to attract visitors, most of whom are non-Tanzanian, tourism operators must create projects that are marketable to an international base of tourists. Establishing tours that aim to “maintain wildlife habitat, minimize wildlife/human conflict, foster sustainable and legal use of natural resources, and improve the socio-economic health of the participating local communities,”\(^5\) requires detailed planning, coordination, and cooperation with all groups involved.

---

\(^3\) Benjamin Andulege, *Personal Interview* (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: August 21, 2006).
Local communities are also affected, as shown in the case studies. When projects take place on community lands, local community members are inevitably affected, since they must accommodate visitors in various ways. Certain groups dance and produce handicrafts for tourists as seen in the CB programs. Including cultural practices within a tourism project attaches a monetary value to them, subsequently changing the function and purpose of the practices that were originally reserved for certain occasions. However, although the function of these practices is often changed, including these practices in ecotourism projects allows for increased involvement of locals in tourism activities by drawing on their existing skills and knowledge.

Communities also benefit through tourism revenue. Unfortunately, communities occasionally lose some of this revenue when tourism operators do not transfer an adequate amount of the monetary benefits to communities as seen in the case of revenue lost in the CB program. Therefore, local communities gain and lose from ecotourism. Significantly however, evidence from my cases shows that various stakeholders can take steps to ensure that losses are minimized and the gains are maximized, so as to promote the joint conservation and sustainable development goals of ecotourism.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Many groups and individuals have noted that “tourism is now viewed as Tanzania’s best hope for development, and ecotourism […] is widely hailed by government and tourism officials as the model Tanzania is pursuing.”\(^6\) Although Tanzania is performing well in the tourism sector, there is always room for improvement. Based on my review of ecotourism literature and my analysis of the case studies, I

---

propose eight recommendations for the relevant actors involved in the implementation of ecotourism in Tanzania. Although these recommendations are based on my experience of Tanzanian ecotourism, my reading of the literature suggests that they may have broader implications as well if the national and local contexts of ecotourism are considered.

1. **Ecotourism activities should provide environmental education and awareness programs for local communities involved.**

   In some projects, local communities have not been fully consulted about the effects that ecotourism activities can have on their environments. Environmental education and awareness programs will allow for an increased understanding by communities of what they should expect from ecotourism projects, so that they can plan accordingly.

2. **Tourism operations should increase the involvement of local communities in the planning and implementation of projects.**

   Local communities in ecotourism destinations may have their lives drastically altered due to various changes associated with tourism activities. Ecotourism activities are often initiated by groups and individuals outside a community, and thus, local communities should be involved in all stages of ecotourism projects in order to ensure that their interests are considered by all parties. Furthermore, locals should be given opportunities at all levels of management and operation of ecotourism projects.

3. **Opportunities for community-based ecotourism in protected areas and national parks should be increased by policymakers.**

   Local communities in areas in and around national parks and protected areas are not often included in tourism activities. Conflicts between local communities and conservation of
natural resources can be reduced if communities living within and around national parks and protected areas are given increased opportunities to participate in multiple aspects of ecotourism activities.

4. **Tourists should educate themselves about the areas that they are visiting before engaging in ecotourism activities.**

Tourists can often harm local cultures and environments of the destinations that they are visiting. Preparation to understand the cultural, environmental, and economic situations of the areas to be visited can allow for appropriate and respectful interactions to take place between visitors and locals. Information on destinations should be provided by tourism operators, travel agents, local and national governments.

5. **Policymakers should establish ecotourism monitoring and accountability programs to ensure that local communities receive appropriate amounts of revenue.**

Adequate financial benefits from ecotourism activities are often not given transferred to local communities. If systems of checks and balances are promoted and the accounting of various programs is monitored, then the provision of benefits from ecotourism to local communities can be ensured.

6. **Negative environmental impacts associated with travel should be mitigated by tourists, tourism operators, and travel providers.**

Since many ecotourism projects take place in the developing world and are visited by those in developed countries, travel to engage in ecotourism causes significant environmental degradation. Schemes should be promoted that aim to offset the release of carbon through air travel and other pollution caused from vehicle travel to remote areas (i.e., carbon trading, research into fuel saving technologies, etc.).
7. Ecotourism certification programs should be developed by the international ecotourism community with the consultation of local ecotourism actors. There are currently few programs that acknowledge exemplary ecotourism programs. Certification programs can allow for external bodies to reward programs that have been functioning efficiently, to alert tourists and tour operators about best practices, and to help to ensure ecotourism projects are being successful in relation to their initial goals.

8. Policymakers should propose ecotourism as a supplementary option for sustainable development. The benefits from ecotourism projects are unevenly distributed based on location, educational status, gender, and age. Moreover, tourism is a seasonal sector, with often unpredictable returns. As a result, ecotourism cannot be relied upon as a viable livelihood substitution for other activities. Therefore ecotourism programs should be supplemented with other methods of sustainable development.

These recommendations emphasize that although the concept of ecotourism has evolved over the past few decades, and has been successful in many cases, there is still progress to be made to ensure the development of a sustainable ecotourism sector. If these recommendations are considered, along with the many factors that go into ecotourism development, then ecotourism can become an improve means of achieving conservation for sustainable development.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ms. Rosada Msoma – MNRT, Tourism Division</td>
<td>7/24/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Corbett Bishop – Corbett Bishop Safaris</td>
<td>8/1/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Petro Ahham – MESO</td>
<td>8/2/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Fred Nelson – Sand County Foundation and</td>
<td>8/7/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Dr. James Kahuranaga – AWF</td>
<td>8/4/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Bruno Kawasaki - NCAA</td>
<td>8/10/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Peter Makutian – NCAA</td>
<td>8/10/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Francis Kone - NCAA</td>
<td>8/11/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Simon Joseph Kalembo – NCAA</td>
<td>8/12/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Jason King – CC Africa</td>
<td>8/15/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Joseph Kessy – TANAPA</td>
<td>8/15/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Jo Anderson – Jo Anderson Safaris</td>
<td>8/15/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Thad Peterson – Dorobo Safaris</td>
<td>8/15/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Benjamin Andulege – MNRT, Wildlife Division</td>
<td>8/21/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mrs. Blandina Cheche – NEMC</td>
<td>8/21/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Interviews / On-site Correspondences</strong></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Bakari Binamu – Madeira Tours and Safaris</td>
<td>7/27/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Herry Christopher – Ng’iresi CTP</td>
<td>8/3/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Olais Mokolo – Osotwa CTP</td>
<td>8/8/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Godfrey Jacob – Osotwa CTP</td>
<td>8/8/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Elias Ngunat - Osotwa CTP</td>
<td>8/8/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. silkiana – Hoopoe Safaris</td>
<td>8/10/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mr. Sanguyan Oledorop</td>
<td>8/10/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Research</strong></td>
<td>▪ Harvard University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ MESO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ AWF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2
Ng’iresi Cultural Tourism Programme Photographs

Figure 1. Mzee Loti’s House
Mzee Loti is the village chairman who is in charge of maintaining the program. His house serves as the welcoming point for visitors.

Figure 2. Cow Corral Connected to a Biogas system
Mzee Loti’s house is equipped with a biogas system that was funded by the revenues from the CTP program.
The way in which the villagers used their natural resources was an essential part of the tour. My guide explained that villagers plant and use banana trees for various purposes.

This waterfall is the main natural attraction.
Figure 5. View of the Songota Waterfall

Figure 6. Path to the Songota Waterfall

Figure 7. Secondary School under Construction
The construction of this school is being funded with revenue from the CTP program
Figure 8. Maasai Hut
Visiting a Maasai hut comprised the “cultural” portion of the tour.

Figure 9. Children in the Village
Throughout the tour, children in the village would call out to us and offer flowers.
Appendix 3
Osotwa Cultural Tourism Initiative Photographs

Figure 1. View of Shambasha Hill
This is the extinct volcanic crater that holds an abundance of Colobus monkeys. This serves as the focal point of the “nature” tour.

Figure 2. The Emaoi Primary School
The construction of this school was funded by the revenue from the CTP program and other programs through the Osotwa NGO.
Conservation for Sustainable Development?

Figure 3. In the Fields with Tour Guide, Olais Mokolo
Olais directed me throughout the village and commented on the village scenery.

Figure 4. The Fig Tree

Figure 5. A Church that Serves the Villages
Visiting a boma was the main focus of the “culture” tour, along with the fig tree, a visit to a traditional healer, and a performance of Maasai dancing.

I was told by my guide to pay TZS 15,000 ($US 12.50) after watching this dance.

Figure 8. View of Mount Meru.
Figure 9.
An Approximate Map of the Ngaramtoni area
North of Arusha, Tanzania
showing the main dirt roads and some footpaths
(Provided via email by Godfrey Jacob)

1 Kilometer approximately
### Table 1: Summary of NCA’s Conservation History


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forests Gazetted</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>The German colonial government gazetted forests in what is now the NCA for watershed conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Preservation Ordinance</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>This ordinance, created by the British administration, was the first comprehensive conservation legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crater Closed Reserve</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Ngorongoro Crater was declared a closed reserve by the British administration: hunting was prohibited except for sport hunting: two German settler farms remained on the Crater floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serengeti-Ngorongoro Closed Game Reserve</td>
<td>1929/30</td>
<td>The remainder of Serengeti-Ngorongoro was declared a closed reserve by the British in 1929; part of the Western Serengeti was added and the boundaries were greatly extended in 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Ordinance of 1940</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>The British ordinance established a National Park (which included not only the Crater and part of the present NCA, but also much of what is now the Serengeti National Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Ordinance</td>
<td>1948/51</td>
<td>In 1948 a new National Park ordinance was passed by the British administration with revised boundaries, but the legislation was not enforced until 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to National Park Ordinance</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>British administration prohibits all cultivation in the National Park. This was part of a series of increasingly restrictive regulations with regard to hunting, human settlement, and livestock movement despite the government’s promise not to interfere with resident Maasai rights to live and subsist in the Park. This brought about the first major overt conflict between wildlife conservation and human interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Modification of Park Boundaries</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>The British government proposed a modification of the park boundaries, releasing much of the Ngorongoro area from the Park. This created an uproar among European conservationists especially the Fauna Preservation Society. A Committee of Enquiry was appointed by the colonial government to study the issue and propose a new policy solution to the crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngorongoro Conservation Area Ordinance Number 14</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>A compromise was reached. The Park was split into two separate units: the western part (formerly called the Western Serengeti) retained the original name of the Park and was designated as an exclusive wildlife area, while the eastern part, including the eastern fringe of the Serengeti plains, the Kakesio-Endulen area (previously outside of the Park) and the whole of Ngorongoro Highlands came to form the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. The NCA was designated a multiple use area. In addition to conservation, there were 3 other land use interests 1) subsistence of the resident pastoralists and cultivators, 2) tourism, and 3) archaeology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First NCA Management Plan</td>
<td>1960/62</td>
<td>First NCA management plan was drawn up in 1960 and revised in 1961 by Henry Fosbrooke, Chair of the Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzanian Conservator</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>The First Tanzanian Conservator, Solomon Ole Saibull was appointed in 1965. Despite the fact that he was an Arusha Maasai, Ole Saibull treated the Maasai residents of the NCA quite harshly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Controversy</td>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>Tensions escalated between conservation and economic interests in NCA. Some members of the Ministry of Agriculture (the parent...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conservation for Sustainable Development?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of the NCA proposed the NCA be dissolved and handed over to the Masai Range Commission for livestock and agricultural development while Ngorongoro and Empakaai Craters along with the Forest Reserve would obtain National Park Status. In the end, the Conservator, Ministry of Natural Resources and international conservation agencies rejected the Ministry of Agriculture proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Conservation Ordinance</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Prohibited cultivation; Independent Tanzanian government sets up parastatal Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) to manage the NCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>UNESCO confers World Heritage Site status on Ngorongoro Conservation Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosphere Reserve</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Ngorongoro Biosphere Reserve in recognition of its international conservation value as a site where man and wildlife have existed in harmony for so long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ban lifted</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>The Prime Minister lifts the ban on agriculture (with the proviso that Agriculture was to be phased out after three years (McCabe <em>et al.</em> 1992).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Management Plan</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Includes numerous provisions for tourism projects intended to benefit local people including new cultural bomas and special walking safaris for visitors who want a more adventurous experience (NCAA Management Plan: 88).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haki Ardhi/Agriculture</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td><em>Maasai Land Rights</em> book by Shivji and Kapinga is published outlining legal history of land tenure rights as well as abuses committed against the NCA residents. President Mpaka announced that agriculture would continue in NCA with one acre of land per wife. Thus a married man may have several acres depending on the number of wives (Smith 1998: 25).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Ban</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>In a speech at Sopa Lodge, Prime Minister Sumaye declared the importance of the NCA as a World Heritage Site and suggests that cultivation be phased out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4

Figure 1. Mess Tent at Landana Campsite

Figure 2. Tents at Landana Campsite

Figure 3. Cooking and Supply Tents at Landana Campsite
Figure 4. View of Lake Eyasi from Ilmisigiyo Campsite

Figure 5. Tents at Ilmisigiyo Campsite

Figure 6. Welcoming at Seneto Cultural Boma (CB)
Figure 7. Welcome Dance at the Seneto CB
The CB members dance for all visitors who arrive before showing them around the boma.

Figure 8. Jewelry and Handicrafts on Sale at the Seneto CB
The CB members who makes these items (mostly women) stand beside their products and often haggle with visitors.