

# **TOURISM AND DEVELOPMENT IN TANZANIA: MYTHS AND REALITIES**

**Geofrey Chambua**

## **Introduction**

The neo-liberal policies introduced in Tanzania in the 1980's created economic, political and ideological conditions for promotion of private economic activities in all sectors, including tourism. From a previously ambivalent stance on the role of tourism in development, the country came out with a comprehensive tourism policy which more or less accorded with these new changes in 1991. The 1962 Tanganyika National Tourist Board Act was repealed with the introduction of the Tanzania Tourist Board Act 1992. This Act and development of all aspects of the tourist industry, i.e., advertising and publicizing enhance the attractiveness of the country; undertaking research; fostering an understanding of the importance and economic benefit of tourism to the country; and, collecting and disseminating tourism information.

The government of Tanzania produced a Tourism Development Master Plan with the assistance of foreign private consultants and representatives of tour agents in 1996. The National Tourism Policy was revised in 1999, followed by the setting up of the Tourism Confederation of Tanzania (TCT) to represent the interests of the private sector. The Plan set out incentives and special benefits to companies based in neighboring countries and especially Kenya, and to overseas operators by providing tax holidays and exemptions and creating conditions for vertical integration of tourist activities under foreign control (Tanzania, United Republic of 2000). It also provided additional incentives to foreign companies that could mobilize large investment packages and establish a dominant position for environmental conservation (including the so-called participatory conservation methods) and consumer protection.

Being one of the economic activities covered under the World Trade Organization's (WTO) General Agreement of Trade in Services (GATS), donor agencies (such as the European Union-EU and International Financial Institutions (IFIs-including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund-IMF) anxiously provided technical and financial support to help develop and promote the sector. For the donor countries and IFIs, tourism had an important role to play as a powerful force in integrating countries such as Tanzania in the global economy; since any country that prioritized tourism as one of its major 'development' sectors had to accept and be willing to meet the expectations, needs and interests of tourists, multinational and transnational companies.

Being one of the economic activities covered under the World Trade Organization's (WTO) General Agreement of Trade in Services (GATS), donor agencies (such as the European Union-EU and International Financial Institutions (IFIs-including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund-IMF) anxiously provided technical and financial support to help develop and promote the sector. For the donor countries and IFIs, tourism had an important role to play as a powerful force in integrating countries such as Tanzania in the global economy; since any country that prioritized tourism as one of its major 'development' sectors had to accept and be willing to meet the expectations, needs and interests of tourists, multinational and transnational companies. Henceforth, from policies that previously promoted agriculture and industry as the basis of social and economic development in the 1960s and 1970s, with agriculture being viewed as the "backbone", tourism was being promoted as one of the major engines of economic growth.

Tourism, it was claimed, had become an industry that could offer an alternative to traditional export commodities (coffee, tea, cashew nut, cashew nut, cotton, sisal and cloves) dependency. According to the policy papers, tourism had become one of the options to diversify the economy and supplement a declining agricultural sector; create jobs in both rural and urban areas; and, offer entrepreneurial opportunities for small and medium enterprises as well as community cooperatives. In promoting it, the country could earn the badly needed foreign exchange and the government could increase its tax revenues (Tanzania, United Republic of 2002 :7).

It was claimed that tourism is sector with significant linkages to other sectors such as agriculture, fishing, retailing and arts and crafts; and that it had economic spin-offs into other sectors such as communication, education, energy, construction and the general development of the infrastructure thereby benefiting the economy as a whole. In the process this could lead to enhanced living standards, economic well-being and human, social and cultural development. Overall, the sector was elevated to an important position in policies geared towards "poverty alleviation" among women, youths, "indigenous people" and the poor in general. After all, donor countries such as Britain, Netherlands and Scandinavian ones had developed "Pro-Poor Tourism" strategies as an integral part of their foreign aid policies.

**This paper analyses the social, economic and gender context under which tourism development is taking place and provides a critique of the potentials it has as a tool for development in Tanzania. Specifically, it aims at analyzing foreign investments in tourism and the fundamental relationship between social life of the populace and the social, economic, gender, cultural and political transformations taking place in areas where tourism has become a major activity.** Fundamental issues problematized are those related questions of overcoming exploitation and domination based on gender, class, race, age, and ethnicity. What finally becomes apparent is the fact that promotion of tourism as one of the globalizing elements and the edifice of the euphoria of globalization itself, are based on fetish zed systems, which dehumanize and dissocialize relationships, and reinforces domination, oppression and inequalities. The paper is based on two case studies: The former Arusha Region (Before division into Arusha and Manyara) and Bagamoyo District, Coast region.

### **Imperialism and Tourism**

Tourism has historically evolved as a leisure industry in the past 300 years or so, reflecting social structural differentiation-social classes, life styles, racial and ethnic groups, gender, age sets/grades (the youth, the aged), political and professional groups- and the mythic representation of the past and the present (MacCannel 1989:11). During medieval era and also the transition to capitalism in Europe, leisure was mostly associated with rituals, feasts, carnivals and holy days. These involved the putting away of days or even weeks for such activities, but were not associated with travel because work and leisure could not be separated from home in space. Any travel that was undertaken by then was mostly by explorers, crusaders, pilgrims, adventures and others-basically those with aristocratic backgrounds. These were regarded as courageous and manly. Masculinity, by then, was associated with travel, while femininity was defined in terms of sticking close to home (Enloe op cit).

Travel was more or less part of the pursuit of opportunity for trade and also leisure for aristocrats and the bourgeoisie since 18<sup>th</sup> Century, when they began for the first time organizing what were to be popularized by Thomas Cook in 1840s as the 'Grand Tour'. Tourism by the 19<sup>th</sup> Century was already crystallizing in the form of an ideology for empire-building. This is because alongside the development of tourism as an industry was the development of museums, fairs and travel lectures, which expose people, including those who were unable to travel, to the "other" parts of the world. "it is estimated that in the United States alone, close to one million people visited world's fairs between 1876 and 1916.

World's fairs were designed to be more than popular entertainments; they were intended by planners to help the public image an industrializing, colonizing global enterprise". ( Enloe 1990:26)

Intense penetration of European hunters and traders was to take place from mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, often on the pretext of abolishing slave trade to commercial advantage. By this time, there arrived missionaries, explorers, prospectors, naturalists, big-game hunters, traders and adventures in big numbers to seek excitement in the 'Dark Continent'. Besides the so-called explores, such as David Livingstone, Henry Morton Stanley, Richard Burton, Joseph Thomson, Speke, Krapf, Rebman, etc during the pre-colonial era, East Africa had drawn hunters such as Frederick Selous who hunted in Southern Africa and Tanganyika in late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Selous had his own trophies museum in England. Selous acted as adviser to many hunters and collectors, including the future British Prime Minister W. Churchill, the ex-US President Theodore Roosevelt (Who killed 512 heads of big game and many more other species in a single expedition in 1909 which was sponsored by Smithsonian Institution in Washington and the National Museum in New York), Baron Lionel Rothschild and many others.

Under British rule, game reserves such as the Selous, Ngorongoro, Serengeti, etc. were to be confirmed under the Game Preservation Ordinance of 1921. But it was the land law introduced after that the real impact of the various colonial activities became obvious. The British colonials introduced the Land Ordinance of 1923, which was to constitute the basic grounding of all the subsequent legislations even after the country's independence in 1961 (Tanzania, United Republic of 1994). With the 1923 ordinance, all land was made public and the Governor was granted powers to make land grants and leases if he deemed it to be for the benefit of the 'public' interests. There were two sets of law introduced by this Ordinance and subsequent legislations: these were for statutory and customary forms of land tenure. Statutory law governed lands which had been granted by the government (such as the lands held by private companies, state farms, large scale farmers). These rights were also known as "granted rights of occupancy". Customary law governed all untitled lands under small holder production, i.e. Africans. These were to be known as "deemed rights of occupancy" from 1928 (Chiderzo 1961:223).

Given such a law, what was created was a dual structure of land tenure, with title deeds being granted to foreigners in urban areas and rural areas and Africans being limited to customary tenure under a system of informal law. In the latter case, land occupancy was usufructuary - that is, provable on use. This law made it possible for the economically powerful classes in urban and rural areas and the state itself to dominate large-scale properties and restrict the majority of the people – Africans to small scale landed property. It also justified the confiscation of lands belonging to Africans who were not putting land to

“proper” use meaning to commercial activities. The law was basically interventionist. It gave specific powers to the government and was vague about African rights so that any shift of policy was easily justified by a reinterpretation of the law.

Therefore, land policy was left to administrative and not legal control. This colonial land law was used to exclude Africans from legal land ownership and at the same time alienate their land without compensation on the pretext that individual proprietary land rights were unknown among Africans and for them, land had no monetary value.

**Four new national parks were proclaimed immediately after independence, namely, Lake Manyara, Ngurdoto Crater ( now called Arusha National Park), Ruaha and Mikumi. From only one national park in 1960, the number of national parks increased to seven by 1970. By 2002, out of the total area of 938,676 km<sup>2</sup> Tanzania had set aside nearly 26 percent of its territory for wildlife conservation. This included the categories shown in Appendix 1 plus over 8 percent other *de facto* wildlife protected areas such as corridors buffer zones etc. There were also 570 Forest Reserves, which covered nearly 25 percent of the territory of which 3 percent overlapped with other areas devoted to wildlife conservation and one marine park.**

**Tourism in general in Tanzania after 1920s had developed as part of East African industry even when viewing tourism began to develop in the 1940s’, it was mainly facilitated from Nairobi and Mombasa, which had more developed** tourist infrastructure than Tanganyika. Tourism business interests were quite developed in Kenya by the 1930s, the result of which it became the headquarters of the East African Publicity Association, which was formed in 1938. It was to be succeeded by the East African Tourist Travel Association ( EATTA) in 1948. As it turned out, most tour and hunting companies were to be stationed in Nairobi and Mombasa. The majority of tourists visiting East Africa were to stay mostly in Kenya for its facilities, then finally come to Tanganyika. 70 percent of international tourists in East Africa entered through Kenya by 1956. It is estimated that by the same year, 79 percent of tourist time and 75 percent of tourist earnings were spent in Kenya (Ouma 1970:11).

Most tourist activities in Tanganyika by 1960 were concentrated in the Northern Province (encompassing Arusha Region). It was mainly Arusha town which grew as the main centre of European interests, including tourism, during colonial period. By the end of the colonial period, there were settlers of mixed nationalities in this town: British, Greeks, New Zealanders, Germans Afrikaners, etc. The town was a polyglot westernized town more than any other in the country, with its European amenities that it could offer including proper European shops, European hair dressing salons, safari shops, centres for catering for tourists with European hunters and guides, hotels and restaurants etc.

**Up to 1961, Tanzania's number of tourists was smaller compared to Kenya because tourism facilities in Tanganyika were extremely poor to the extent that hundreds of tourists had to be turned away in 1963 for lack of accommodation. Despite this, by early 1960s, the sector was the fourth largest foreign exchange earner after coffee, cotton and sisal. It was within this context that a three-phase construction programme to bring the total beds to about 4,000 was designed, with the hope that Tanzania would be catering for over 100,000 tourists by 1970. Most of these facilities were to be operated under the government-owned National Development Corporation in co-operation with private investors. This was mainly through equity funds, budget allocations and loans. Kilimanjaro Hotel was opened in 1965. The government was also to own Lake Manyara lodge and lease the Ngorongoro Crater Lodge from the Conservation Authority;; it participated in the financing of Mikumi Wildlife Lodge; and, planned to build lodges in all national parks, besides investing in hotels in some of the major urban centres.**

**During 1967-68, there were construction and expansion activities of new lodges at Ngorongoro Crater, Lobo Lodge in Serengeti, Seronera Wildlife Lodge, Mikumi Lodge, Mafia Island Fishing Lodge, Bahari Beach Hotel in Dar es Salaam Kunduchi Beach Hotel in Dar es Salaam, New Africa Hotel in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania Wild Safaris Ltd and a beach hotel in Zanzibar. By 1971, several hotels in private sector had been completed or were about to be completed. In Dar es Salaam these were Africana and Skyway, while in Arusha there was Tanzanite Hotel, New Arusha Hotel, Tarangire National Park Hotel and Ikoma Port Lodge. The Second Five-Year Development Plan (1969-74) introduced the idea of building a new international airport in the Northern Circuit to attract tourists away from Nairobi, in the hope that this would open up air charter and increase days of stay for tourists. The new hotels and the new international airport in the Northern Circuit had become fully operational by 1973.**

These investments made it possible for Tanzania to abandon the East African base of tourism in the 1960s. EATTA was disbanded in 1965 and overseas promotion of tourism was fully organized on a national basis by this time. Tourism acquired a ministerial position in 1964 with the formation of the Ministry of Information and Tourism. It was under this Ministry that a Tourist Board, which was to open offices in London a year later, was formed. The number of tourists had begun to increase by 1968, with the drive to increase tourism facilities. The industry was expected to expand further in the 1970s (Shivji 1973). A licensing system for tour operators was set up in 1968, which was to

mark some changes as far as tourist policies were concerned. The changes were based on the recommendations of the World Bank country mission of 1967, which recommended a state sector tourism corporation. It also proposed that the government should ensure stability for private and foreign capital. The World Bank further recommended that East African Airways should introduce cheap fares so that tourists can enter the country; and that beach tourism should be introduced because of its spectacular expansion internationally. The Ten-Year Tourism Master Plan of 1971 envisaged that Tanzania could become a major tourist destination and tourism could become a major industry. In sum, the government since the early 1960s promoted a form of tourism development which encouraged competition between state sector and foreign capital and between state sector and non-state sector.

Therefore, although countries such as Tanzania could take an independent action, like expanding accommodation or marketing itself as a tourist destination, as it tried to do so in the 1960s and 1970s, the inflow of tourists was determined by the actions of the trans-national/multinational companies in the countries where tourists originate. It is these companies which either invest directly or enter into contractual arrangements with firms and enterprises in the destination countries. It was European and North American destinations that were getting the largest share of tourists in these years, given the nature of historical variation in vacation consumption. In the 1960s and 1970s tourism expanded in response to increasing demand of certain types of leisure activities, namely, indulgence in fun, food, frolic and exotica. It was that tourism, which was premised on traveling for the sun, sand and sex adventures (the triple "S"). This explains why the uneven distributions of tourists share worldwide and within Africa.

Thus, despite the expansion of tourism internationally, the favorable policy framework nationally and the drive to expand tourism facilities in these years, tourism's contribution to foreign exchange earnings in Tanzania dropped from forth position of the early 1960s to seventy by mid-1970s given the nature of the industry and the kind of products that were sought by tourists by then (Green 1979:82). This was because beach tourism, which was the most popular form of tourism by then, was the most undeveloped compared to other neighboring countries – Kenya and Mozambique. The number of tourists fell from 235,000 in 1976 to around 80,000 by the end of the decade. It was within this context that by early 1980s, hotels, lodges and access roads had started deteriorating due to severe shortage of foreign exchange for the necessary inputs. Only 84,021 tourists came to the country in 1980 earning the country USD 18 million. Thus, although Tanzania made several efforts to turn Tanzania a direct tourist destination by putting on the ground investment (including the building of an international airport and establishing several hotels, including beach hotels), up to mid 1970s, most visitors still came to the country via Kenya, since most

multinationals operated from there. The majority of these came only on one-day excursions to the Northern Circuit game parks. With the break-up of the East African Community and the closure of the Tanzania-Kenya border in 1977, there was a sharp fall even in this type of tourism.

Pundits of ne-liberal policies claim that tourism development in Tanzania prior to mid 1980s was stymied by the policies of those years that promoted the state sector at the detriment of private sector. Therefore, tourism began to pick up in the mid-1980s because of the economic liberalization policies (Kulindwa et al 2001; Ranja 2002; Luvanga & Shitundu 2003). What is not taken into account in such a view is the fact that a tourist is a consumer of commodity (leisure), which is differentiated in time and space. It exists outside of a daily social space, and like all other commodities, it has value as a social sign in the mind of those who produced it. The economists' assumption that commodities merely satisfy needs is insufficient: they also have a function of social signification. They have the value of an ideological reference. There are hierarchical indications revealed by conspicuous consumption. It is the dominant classes that define for other classes and sub groups the model of vacation consumption.

In actual fact, it was the changing nature of tourism industry and consumption patterns that changed the fortunes of tourism in Tanzania and some other countries. Mass tourism was under heavy attack by the 1980s. Since it had become a "mass" phenomenon with the decreased price of transportation and accommodation, this model of tourism was increasingly becoming unstable as it tended towards the destruction of the previously consumerist aristocratic model. The latter model had remained in the 1960s and 1970s, but since the social distance between various social groups had been blurred, of necessity, new destinations had to be sought for the middle classes. The Mediterranean resorts were declared to be among the dirties in the world because of huge amounts of polluting elements in the sea and air. The same was being said of most beach areas in the world.

Mass tourism attracted trenchant criticism as a shallow and degrading experience for the host nations and people. The new tendency was to uphold with high esteem environmental beauty and ecological diversity. It was in this context that the new middle classes in the Atlantic world began to promote travel to third world countries "as a means of preserving fragile ecological landscapes and providing an 'ethnically' enhancing encounter" (so-called eco-tourism and community-based tourism<sub>6</sub>) (Munt 1994:1).

The old type of mass-packaged tourist holidays which were promised on travel for the sun, sand and sex adventures were increasingly being replaced by adventurous forms of tourism within which traveling, trekking, trucking, hunting, fishing, canoeing, aquatic sports, snorkeling, ballooning, bicycling, mountain climbing, hang gliding, river rafting, etc. were becoming the principal activities.



Most of these reflected the exciting and adventurous life style of the new middle class: it was a resurrection of the aristocratic model of the old adventurous 'heroic' conquistador. What was on the increase was flexible packaged, individually oriented tourism, which claimed environmental and cultural sensitivity (cynically called ego-tourism or eco-terrorism). The result was the diffusion of tourist markets all over the world and search of new forms of tourist consumption.

Since 1980s, tourism had become one of the most profitable sectors for the well financed and highly technologically endowed multinationals, which actually control the industry. Ideologically, these have been compelling governments that have decided to depend on tourism for development and servicing of foreign debt to be internationally compliant, by privatization of the attractions and facilities and being willing to meet the expectations of foreigners and foreign companies in terms of their needs and demands. In Namibia, for example, a safari company, Conservation Corporation Africa, which was 70 percent owned by South African Pension Fund, Hambros Bank and Getty family, and managed 300,000 hectares of "African bush" with wild animals floated on the London.

Over the years, Tanzania has ratified a bilateral investment agreement with the United Kingdom and has signed similar agreements with the Governments of Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Finland, Italy, etc.,. Which cover areas such as : Promotion and protection of investments; transfer of principal, returns, proceeds, payments, compensation and earnings; expropriation and compensation; compensation for losses; settlement of disputes. The assumption has been Multinational Enterprises (MNEs) contribute to development through employment, increased government revenues, transfer of technology, capital formation, introduction of advanced managerial and organizational skills and advanced state of the art technologies.

Thus, from 84,021 and 92,000 tourist arrivals in 1980 and 1981 respectively, earning the country USD 18 million and USD 20 million for the respective years.

The re-opening of the border with Kenya had impacted the sector in that many foreign companies, which were operating or based in Kenya, were able to open subsidiary offices in Tanzania, especially in Moshi and Arusha towns. The passing of the Investment Promotion Centres (IPC) Act in 1990, which liberalized the conditions of investments as far as foreign companies were concerned, accelerated further the expansion of foreign operations in the country. As a result of this there were 63 tourism investment applications in 1992/93 of which 43 were approved by the IPC. This was an increase of 133 percent compared to 1991/92. At the same time, the government decided to transfer responsibilities to the private sector through partnership the tourism facilities under Tanzania Hotels Investments Ltd. (TAHI). With the changed policies, TAHI became a co-owned body by Tanzania government and ACCOR Group of Hotels of France.

ACCOR, which owns and manages over 2,000 hotel units world-wide (including some in Kenya for many years) became a co-owner of Novotel Mount Meru in Arusha and five lodges in the national parks. ACCOR took over these in recognition of the fast expanding market in hotel industry. The monopoly of TAHI began to be broken by 1993.

Henceforth, a chain of other international hotel investments came into stream starting with the Kenyan based Consolidated Tourist and Hotels Investments Ltd. (CTHI) opening three Sopa lodges in Serengeti, Ngorongoro and Tarangire between 1992 and 1995. The opening of the Sheraton, built by Skanska Jensen of Scandinavia, in 1995 in Dar es Salaam followed it. Tourism Promotion Services, a subsidiary company of the Commonwealth Development Corporation, International Finance Corporation (member of World Bank Group) and Tanzania's National Provident Fund, opened three Serena Lodges at lake Manyara, Central Serengeti and Ngorongoro Crater in 1996 (besides one in Zanzibar). It also opened a luxury camp in Serengeti. Other hotels that came into stream are the chains of South African Protea hotels in Dar es Salaam, Coast Region, Kilimanjaro and Arusha. Holiday Inn chain of hotels also opened a hotel in Dar es Salaam. There were over 1110 camps in the country by 2003. A number of long-term resident European expatriates (mostly Dutch and some Germans), over the years had entered in the industry in camps, 'farm-houses', hunting and eco-tourism markets both in the northern and southern circuits and also on Mafia island.

The Hotel Keepers Association of Tanzania (HKA) had registered approximately 235 hotels and lodges by 2003, but according to the National Bureau of Statistics, there were 469 hotels/lodges by this year. More than 30 percent of these facilities were located in Tanzania's northern tourism circuit. There were also about 20 casinos and several investors and Tanzanian investors. Local communities did not administer any hotel or lodges. The hotel and lodge industry can be divided into three segments based on price. The top market charging more than USD 200 per night, the middle market which charges USD 50-200 per night and the lower market which charges less than USD 50 per night.

There were also hundreds of cheap guest houses, lodgings, restaurants and bars in Arusha, Dar es Salaam and other towns.

There were 244 registered hotels and lodges and 212 ground tour operators in the country by 1998. Beyond the number of hotels/lodges and restaurants, there were 27 tented camps with 565 rooms by 1995. Their number had risen to 112 by 1999. According to Tourism Division statistics, the number of hotels has increased from 208 in 1994 to 321 in 1999, representing a 51 percent expansion in room capacity. Most of the tour operators and accommodation providers had direct foreign connections or were directly foreign owned. That is, most local

tour operators and accommodation providers were selling their packages to a whole seller abroad who in turn sold the programmes to would be visitors or intermediaries. The large number of tour operators in Tanzania not with standing, Abercrombie & Kent, Leopard Tours, Ranger Safaris and a few others accounted for well over 50 percent of the business.

In 1965, when the country's wildlife population was higher than it is today, the country had only 47 hunting blocks. By 1997 this number had increased to over 140 through subdivision of the same blocks because of the increase in the number of companies. There were nine private hunting companies and one state owned in 1984, when private companies were allowed to carry out hunting tourism. The number of these companies rose to 21 and 31 by 1988 and 1993 respectively. The figure of these companies stood at 33 and 39 by 1996 and 1999 respectively. The state owned Tanzania Wildlife Corporation was eventually privatized in 2002. In terms of ownership of the hunting blocks, 15 foreign hunting companies had a total of 68 blocks (53 percent of the total blocks); 15 local companies had 39 blocks (30.7 percent of the total blocks); 4 joint venture companies had 14 blocks (11.0 percent of the total blocks); and, one parastatal company (which was privatized in 2002 had 6 blocks (4.7 [percent of the total blocks) by 1996/ The French Gerald Pasanisi of Gerald Pasanisi Safaris and Chairman of Tanzania Hunting Operators Association (TAHOA) and his son and nephew who manage Tanganyika Wildlife Safari, for example had a total of 14 hunting blocks by 1996.

At another level, beyond this, there were 23 charter airline operators who applied to operate within the country by this time. These increased to 26 by mid-1990s, with 168 registered aircraft. Of these, 75 percent were listed under public transport. International airlines increased their flights from 25 flights per week in 1991/92 to 31 flights in 1992/1993 and around 50 flights by 2001. There were airlines from Europe, such as KLM, with daily flights or British airways with three flights a week to the country by 2000. Besides catering for the European markets, these were also the main connections with the North American markets. South African Airways had also become an important player in tourism in Tanzania. Besides bringing in tourists and businessmen from South Africa, it also acted as an important link with the Americas. Other important airlines were the Emirates and Ethiopian Airline. A number of foreign care-hire companies, such as Hertz, had also entered Tanzania market.

Visitors from Europe and North America predominate as far as tourists who visit the country for holidays are concerned. In Europe, European tour operators are increasingly selling Tanzania as a stand alone destination unlike in the past, when they sold as an add-on to a Kenya programme. In the year 2000 , for example, within Europe, the main supplier of tourists by ranking were Britain, Scandinavian countries, Italy, Germany and France. These account for 70 percent of the tourists from Europe. Secondary suppliers were Switzerland, Benelux and Spain. They account for 19 percent of tourists from Europe.

According to a survey which was conducted among 41 reputable tour operators in the UK, USA, Italy, Germany and Netherlands in 2003, Tanzania was pegged in the third position in tourist awareness and appeal in East and Southern African states, after South Africa, and Botswana. According to the survey, all the 41 tour operators were selling South Africa, while 35 were selling Botswana and 34 were selling Tanzania in those countries (Financial Times 17-23.03.2004).

### **Tourism Growth: Deception and Reality**

There is not doubt that there has been an increase in the number of investments in tourism through buying of existing facilities, leasing and direct investments. But, an examination and comparison of the figures of the trends in exports for the country and those of tourism sector specifically makes one cast doubts about the claims made by the government officials, policy makers, politicians and even some academicians who have researched on the sector, on its contribution to the economy, "poverty alleviation" and development in general. It is clear that because the international politics of debt and debt relief have since 1990s been linked to the question of liberalization of the economy and promotion of foreign investments, these policies must be presented in such way that they are made to look as if they are succeeding (Enloe 1989:32). Tourism is presented in such a way that its contribution is vital for servicing debt and promotion of the welfare of the poor. Official data furnishes mystified facts to the ideological canons of neo-liberalism, and results into the demeaning of the central role and value of more important sectors such as agriculture, livestock, fishing, mining and industry, by claiming that tourism is one of the leading growth sectors of the economy.

In terms of promotion of the industry itself, the country has been participating in various international and national tourist trade fairs. In 2004, Tanzania participated in fairs in the United Arab Emirates, India, France, China, Canada, USA, Japan, Spain, Russia, the UK and South Africa, at international level. At local level, it participated at Karibu Travel Fair in Arusha and the Dar es Salaam International Trade Fair (Saba Saba).

Minister for Natural Resources and Tourism reported towards the end of the year that the TTB spent a total of Tshs. 1.2 billion (about USD 1.2 million) for its operations annually, including salaries and overheads. All this expenditure is justified by what is considered to be the sector's contribution to the economy. As pointed out above, the government claimed that tourism earned the country USD 725 million and USD 731 million from 525,122 and 576,000 tourists in 2001 and 2003 respectively, for example (see Appendix2); and, that the sector was contributing nearly 16 percent of the GDP and 25 percent of the exports. What is the reality as far as the data presented is concerned?

The Tourism Master Plan showed that of the 502,000 people who were categorized as tourists in 2000, under half of these were holiday makers, 25

percent business visitors, 12 percent came to visit friends and relatives, 10 percent came from conferences/meetings and the rest for other types of visits. Africans (including Tanzanian residents abroad) accounted for approximately 40.5 percent of total arrivals in 2001, followed by Europeans (30 percent) and Americans (9 percent). Out of the total of those who visited the country in 2000, 118,000 tourists came from Europe and 31,000 from North America. It was estimated that 83 percent and 80 percent of tourists who come from Europe and North America respectively visited the country for the wildlife (safari)/bush experience; 28 percent (from Europe) and 12 percent North America for beach tourism; 17 percent from Europe and 12 percent North America for combination of holidays; 10 percent from Europe and 12 percent North America for trekking; and 17 percent from Europe and none from North America visited the country for cultural experience and encounter. Majority of the holidaying tourists (47 percent) were in the age-group of 18-35 years followed by that of 35-55 (39 percent); and 54 percent and 46 percent of the total tourists were females and males respectively (Tanzania, United Republic of 2002: 10-13). Furthermore, a 2001 Survey showed that 37 percent of the tourists traveled with friends and relatives, 30 percent with spouses, 17 percent as loners and 10 percent with spouse and children (BOT et al 2004).

If it is true that the industry earned the country USD 731 in foreign exchange, i.e. 25 percent of the exports in 2003, then exports for country should have stood at USD 2,920 million. But data from the Bank of Tanzania and the Bureau of Statistics do not show thus. According to the Economic Survey for 2003 and the Bank of Tanzania, total exports in 2003 stood USD 1,142 million. Of this amount, traditional exports accounted for 19.5 percent (i.e. USD 222.7 million) and non-traditional exports (with mining being the leader) accounted for 80.5 percent (i.e. USD 9191.7 million) (Tanzania, United Republic of Tanzania 2003). Assuming that the 25 percent claimed to be tourism's contribution to foreign exchange is true; then the sector's contribution is supposed to have been USD 393 million. But this again was not the case at all: minerals, whose figures were clearly indicated, earned the country USD 548.3 million (48 percent of total exports), with gold contributing USD 499 million or 43.7 percent of total exports).

**What, in reality, is tourism's contribution to official export earnings, then? Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) records show that visitors (residents and no-residents) in all the national parks (excluding Kilimanjaro which is under Kilimanjaro National Parks (KINAPA) and Ngorongoro which under Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) stood at 475,600 in 2001/02. Extrapolations show that non-resident tourists who visited the national parks as tourist were not more than 120,000. There are other non-residents who might have visited these national parks as part of an excursion while attending meetings/conferences. The revenue generated from these tourists as fees for**

TANAPA was USD 19,791,765. KINAPA earned around USD 7 million for the same year. In 2001, NCAA was able to generate USD 6.76 million. The earnings by the government from tourist hunting for the same year were USD 9,021,960. In other words, the country earned around USD 42.6 million only from tourism. The fact is, even Kenya, which received 750,000 tourists in 2002 earned only USD 285 million (*The East African 24-30.11.2003*). In the same year, Tanzania received around 570,000 tourists and, it was claimed that the sector's contribution to foreign exchange was around USD 750 million (*Business Times 05.03.2004*).

Of significance, is the fact that the ministry for Tourism and Natural Resources is supposed to be the main source of all data on all sectors under it, this is so for other sectors, except for tourism. The Ministry itself is using data generated the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and not the Ministry itself! NBS's data, is based on the number of all visitors (including those that are not tourists), and included in these calculations is money exchanged in the banks and bureau de change - by anybody, including those who receive money from abroad, expatriates, etc. It is in this way that the figure of USD 731 million or even above that as "contribution" of tourism to the economy is reached. Even *The 2001 Tanzania Tourism Sector Survey's* Tourist Expenditure Model could not avoid this pitfall, because, unlike other commodities that have to be consumed in the importing country, tourism is commodity which is consumed in the country that is exporting it. This has implications as far as the question of foreign exchange is concerned and the actual amount and the actual amounts retained by the country that is depending on tourism. In this case, if the basis for the calculations is the amount of money and days spent by types of visitors, then legitimately, the USD 731million foreign exchange earnings could be true. The question is: why are those amounts not recorded as part of the total official foreign earnings income?

The obvious answer is tourism has a leakage factor in that substantial amounts of money earned from the sector leaves the countries of destination to pay for the imports consumed by the sector or in terms of repatriation. This is because the economies are not diversified so as to allow the tourism facilities to be constructed, equipped and supplied largely from local resources; and tourists expect to be treated in such a way that they are at home, away from home". There is also the other fact that vertical integration in tourism is the main feature of this sector, especially, given that there are monopolies that dominate it. Various multinationals which supply tourists run our are linked to airlines, own or are linked to chains of hotels, lodges, camps tour companies, care hire companies, and food and beverage suppliers: and, supply to the developing countries 'skilled managers' , equipment, etc. AS shown above, for example, despite the large number of tour operators in Tanzania, Abercrombie & Kent, Leopard Tours, Ranger Safaris and a few others account for well over 50 percent

of the business. In this case, the so-called locally owned small and medium enterprises are more or less part of the international links as junior partners.

The fact is, even the calculations based on the average number of days spent by the tourist is misleading. This is because generally, official data is very unreliable and extremely contradictory, depending on the source of information. While the Ministry of Tourism and Natural Resources has figures mainly collected by the Wildlife Division, TANAPA, KINAPA, NCAA, TALA and other authorities under it, the Immigration Department in the Ministry of Home Affairs has different ones. The officially popularized figures actually underestimate the really earnings from this sector, if one is to follow the calculations made by Leijzer (1990). The average tourist earnings per visit per tourist by 1991, according to the government (Tanzania, United Republic 1996) were USD 95 million for 187,000 tourists who spent an average of USD 5,372, while of non-organized tourist were USD 5,572. These included other expenses such as an air ticket, etc. Overall, the study showed that overland tourists spent up to USD 1,800 of their total costs of their holiday directly in the country, an amount slightly higher than the package tourists. Even with these 1991 figures, it is obvious that companies in Tanzania must have been earning more than five times the official foreign exchange from the sector. With improvements in technology recently and the cheapening further of air transport, the expenses are lower than in those years. Still the advertised prices by some of the European and American companies are indicative of the money that is paid in the companies or agent from where the tourists originate.

To use the quotation of the African Safari Consultants of Montecito (Santa Barbara) California to extrapolate the incomes of the companies: if it is assumed that all the 1,654 were single hunters and each spent 16 days in the country and paid USD 25,600, then the companies had a gross income amounting to USD 42,342,400 or an average of USD 920,487 each. This figure does not include the illegal activities which take place in this industry, including non-registration of some of the hunters and the trophies Conservation fees (USD 100 per hunter per day and USD 50 per observer per day) and hunting licenses (USD 450 for 7 days and USD 600 up to 28 days) are paid directly to the company by the tourists separately.

The set up and the links that exist between 'local' tour operators and foreign ones; and the fact that vertical integration in the industry, to the extent that even Euro Car and other European ground transport companies are well established in the country, makes one conclude that between 75 and 90 percent of money paid for a holiday in Tanzania is either paid in the country of origin of the tourists or leaks out of the country. The major hotels that have their own ground transport to cater for their clients works to marginalize the local transport and tour operators. Moreover, as much as 50 to 70 percent of the earnings from hotels and tourism in general go to acquiring imports of goods that the sector

demands-mostly exotic imports. The dominant position of the foreign operators means that profits are ploughed back home, leaving very little revenue in the destination country. Package tourism is quite notorious for funneling away tourism revenues. With package tourism, tourists pay for the whole vacation in their home countries bringing only pocket money to buy souvenirs and incidentals. Even the local entrepreneurs plough out most of the foreign exchange, given the nature of the arrangements in the industry.

According to the conservative estimates of the Governor of the Bank of Tanzania, Tanzanians had more than USD 2.5 billion outside the country by 2003.

The country is not only losing money in terms of foreign exchange and leakages, but also in terms the amounts of money it has been compelled to use from taxes and loans for privatization of facilities, sustenance of incentives for investors and creation of infrastructure to service tourism. An important facility for tourists is accommodation at the destination, in the form of hotels/lodges, motels, guest houses and camps, which are created to suit their different tastes and budget. As it has been shown above, most of the large enterprises in accommodation are foreign owned or operate in partnership. Some of these enterprises in accommodation are foreign owned or operate in partnership. Some of these have been acquired through buying from the government at a throw away price, rather than a process involving the coming into stream of new investments. There are instances whereby the government has spent a lot of money to face-lift the facilities before privatizing them. Even after privatizing those facilities, in some instances the government has had to inject funds for upgrading them or intervening so that they do not cease to function.

The privatization of hotels and lodges in fact indicative of the façade behind the success story of the industry or even the HIPC debt relief, and what price the country has to pay to sustain it. As stated above, most of the facilities being privatized were sold at a thro-away price. The Tabora Hotel (renamed Orion Tabora Hotel after privatization) was sold for USD 80,000 in 2003. The Executive Chairman of the Parastatal Sector Reform Commission (PSRC) announced in early January 2004 that privatization of TAHI Hotels and Lodges had been completed with the selling of Mafia Island Lodge at USD 500,000. PSRC, according to him, had plans to set aside at least Tshs. 12 billion (USD 11.3) million to be spent on expansion, rehabilitation and upgrading several privatized tourist hotels and wildlife lodges (*Daily News 30.01.2004*).

**Significantly, majority of the hotels that were listed for rehabilitation or were not functioning well and were ones situated in the National parks, rather than those that were in business and conference centers or operating casinos. Beyond the heavy investments, the government, in a bid to create an enabling**



environment, has been giving tax exemptions to investors. Over the years, investors whose investments were approved by the TIC have been enjoying a tax holiday of five years as part of the incentives. For this matter, many enterprises have changed hands before the elapse of the five years to allow another investor to enjoy the same. For example, the Sheraton became the Royal Palm in 2001, just before the five years had expired; and by 2004, it was announced that plans to sell Royal Palm to another investor – the Swiss based Movenpick, succeeded.

Finally (although not last), the government has been spending huge sums of money to improve infrastructure and social services for the tourism sector. The 70 km Dar es Salaam – Bagamoyo road has become an all-tarmac road with the development of beach hotels in Bagamoyo. It had by 2003 also constructed an all tarmac road between Makuyuni and Ngorongoro; constructed 1,753 km and rehabilitated 2,756 km of roads for the game reserves and protected areas; constructed five new airports; and was in the process of rehabilitating 17 other airports. The government also invested heavily in the improvement of roads within Serengeti National Park under the European Union funded construction/improvement of the road from Makuyuni to Mwanza in a bid to eliminate non-tourist traffic through Serengeti. In the Southern Circuit, the Kilwa and Songomnara historical sites were rehabilitated in order to establish a link between the coast and the Selous Game Reserve. The African Development Bank (ADB) funded road development in the Selous Game Reserve. The rehabilitation of the Dar es Salaam-Mtwara road as the main link to Selous Game Reserve also took place.

The country has also invested heavily in training facilities geared to serve tourism. Besides the government owned Hotel and Tourism Training Institute (HTTI) at Bandari College in Dar es Salaam, which was under improvement, there has been a mushrooming of privately owned institutes and colleges in most of the major towns. The Vocational Education Training Authority (VETA) introduced a curriculum to meet the standards for five tourism trades.

**Given all the above, the question is: what do Tanzanians actually benefit from tourism?**

The government claims that besides foreign exchange earnings, the sector generates money in the form of taxes, creates employment and self employment, assists in “poverty alleviation” through contributions to the provision of social services in areas around the attractions and stimulates growth in other sectors such as agriculture (through supply of products) and construction (roads and facilities). A critical examination of these claims shows that although these claims are based on certain facts, the reality is different.

What is not concealed behind these claims is the fact that the sector is premised on the destruction of other sectors-such as agriculture, livestock keeping, fishing and other rural and coastal and marine based resources – by encroaching on resources that are indispensable for the survival and prosperity of the rural dwellers. Moreover, the exploitative and dehumanizing working conditions of those employed in the sector are not considered at all.

**Tourism, in the final analysis, panders on human misery and perpetuates structural inequalities and discrimination,** as it is so obvious in the case in of employment patterns or in “cultural Tourism” and “Eco-Tourism”. In the latter case, as it will be shown below, the poor are supposed to participate in the industry through making impoverished modes of livelihood a show case, for the world to experience the “authentic Tanzania”. The very existence of community based tourism is dependent on the existence of poor people! Community-based tourism’s most popular image is that of a rural village far from the beaten path. It is about conservation of large tracts of virgin rainforest, reforestation work and organic agriculture. Travelers are supposed to support this work through their visits. It is some kind of a romantic notion mainly limited to poor rural settlements. And tourism is supposed to be the **“Band Aid” to help “alleviate poverty”**.

**As far as the fees are concerned, investors,** tour operators and tourists pay various fees and taxes to the parastatals that manage the national parks. These include gate entry fees, resident permits, motor vehicle permits, filming and photographing, hotel concession fees, hire of motor vehicles, landing fees, camping fees and leather craft sales. This is what constitutes the direct income of the government. **The tourists companies and hotels/lodges pay taxes and fees of various types per annum. The government also gets revenues form tourism through visa charges, a number of taxes and levies, charges** of one form or another (e.g. hunting, trophy, etc), which are paid to various authorities including the MNRT itself. However, only some of the taxes are paid because of tax evasion or under-declaration of profits. Even the Master Plan (Tanzania, United Republic of 2002:40), noted that, with such an array of taxes “ its effect is probably offset to some degree by certain inefficiencies in tax revenue collection.”

Most of the money collected by the authorities that manage the national parks and game reserves is spent by the authorities for management and conservation purposes. A lot of money is also poured by USAID, GTZ, WWF and other nature conservation funding organizations into the Ministry and these authorities for the same purpose. Some amount of money is donated to the villages in and around the national parks and game reserves, as a form of “benefits” for improving their social services, and this is meant to promote “good neighborly hood” and their “participation” in wildlife conservation. It is in this way that tourism is viewed as a vehicle for poverty alleviation. Between 2001 and 2004, TANAPA spent USD 2,060,294 to support different village development activities, including schools,

dispensaries, water, construction of feeder roads, etc in villages bordering national parks. The government also ploughs back 25 percent of the hunting fees to villages where hunting takes place, through respective district councils. This money is supposed to be used for providing social services like the ones provided by TANAPA. From 1998/99 to 2002/03 fiscal year this scheme earned 43 districts a total of around USD 1.7 million (Severre 2004).

Hunting companies are also supposed to contribute to the development of the villages in the areas they operate. From 2000 to 2002 hunting companies contributed a total of about USD 6.6 millions to various community projects. But as pointed out above, these amounts are paid by the tourists through the companies. community development fees, conservation fees, hunting licenses and firearms licenses are paid by the tourists, and they are not part of the safari prices. The hunting company simply pays the government and annual fee of USD 7,500 per annum per hunting block. These companies have been willing to pay the contribution happily, in the presence of politicians and government officers whilst drawing the attention of the media organs, because the stakes in the form of profits which are mostly ploughed out of the country are extremely high.

**It is claimed that among the benefits accrued directly to people are employment opportunities. Official figures show that the sector employed about 157,000 workers by 2001. what is not pointed out is the fact that working conditions in tourism are notoriously exploitative and humiliating, given the low wages in the sector as it is difficult to have viable unions in the face of dominance of seasonal, unskilled and casual labour and outsourcing of some functions. The conditions** involved are those of “flunkeyism” of opening and closing car doors, with humiliating subservient ‘memsahib’ and ‘sir’ attitudes... that accompanies the necessity to create a hospitable climate for the tourists...” (Shivji 1973: 35) A key characteristic of many jobs in the tourism sector is their employees are paid to perform their duties as well as display positive emotions as part of their job performance, even in difficult circumstances. This is known as ‘emotional labour’ and is a major contributor to stress in the tourism industry. This is exacerbated when the difference between the emotion felt and the emotion one has to show is increased.

Too often tourism only creates a few permanent paid jobs, and even these are very lowly paying. Wage levels are determined by the grade of the restaurant or hotel, whereby workers in five star hotels command higher wages. Tourism is by nature a seasonal industry and all hotels, hunting companies, travel and tour agents employ casual or part time staff at certain times of the year to perform some core services. Employment of casuals is particularly common in out-sourced services (laundry, cleaning, security, etc). Out-sourcing often means lower wages, loss of benefits and retrenchments. Some players in

the industry use so-called 'free-lancers', that is non-employed people who **receive no wages at all, but just rely on tips**. This, combined together with the high levels of unemployment in the country, and the policies of retrenchment has in most cases led to lower levels of trade union membership and an erosion of worker power. This allows employers to pay no overtime, sick benefits or pensions.

Workers on temporary contracts (casual) or no contract are vulnerable to exploitation and unfair dismissal. Two main reasons for low wages are the weakness of union organization in the sector and the emphasis on keeping costs down (usually wages) in order to sell holidays at the cheapest possible price. Hotels and tour operators justify the low wages by the existence of tips and service charges. Service charge is a compulsory charge added to the bill and intended to be used to remunerate staff and these are discretionary. In some instances, service charges are also methods of hotels/lodges to generate untaxed income. During peak season, income from service charge can be over 500 percent more than the basic wage; but when tourism is bad, besides some being retrenched or forced to go on unpaid leave, the workers live on their wages, which cannot meet their basic needs and those of their families. Very often, it is the workers in the food and beverage department who take the lion's share of the service charges or get the tips.

**Within the structures of the sector, women's occupations and positions resembles the ones in the labour markets in general. As in many other sectors, there is a significant horizontal and vertical gender segregation of the labour market in tourism. Horizontally, women and men are placed in different occupations - women are employed as waitresses, chambermaids, cleaners travel agencies sales persons, flight attendants, etc., whereas men are employed as barmen, cooks, gardeners, construction workers, drivers, pilots, etc.**

**It is in the food and beverages section (kitchen, restaurant, bar and banquet) where the majority of men (about 60 percent of all men in an enterprise) are employed in most hotels/lodges. Incomes in this department are relatively higher than in house-keeping and front office departments. Apart from the basic wage and service charges, waiters are sometimes 'tipped' by the customers. Moreover, employees in this department are given high priority in terms of training. About 80 percent of women employed in the house-keeping activities – cleaning, laundry and in some instances, gardening. These are jobs which do not require higher levels of education or training. The workers in this category are the lowliest paid. Vertically, the typical 'gender pyramid' is prevalent in the tourism sector – lower levels and occupations with few career development opportunities being dominated by women and key managerial positions being dominated by men – many of them being foreign. However, unlike in many other sectors women in tourism face harassment not only from their bosses, but also from colleagues and clients.**

The tour operators and hunting companies are organizationally divided into two major departments, namely, administration and finance; and one that deals with sales marketing and actual ground work. In these companies, more than 80 percent of women are employed in office duties. These, leaving aside those who make tea are employed as secretaries and customer services provider's posse's secondary and post-secondary education certificates. They are lowly remunerated and have no other source of income, unlike their male counterparts, who are engaged in fieldwork operations – tour guide drives, motor vehicle mechanics, campsite attendants, mountain guides, trackers and posters, who are in most case not as highly educated as those in the offices.

**The Maasai people and their culture are used to attract tourists while benefiting lowly. There are some Maasai dancing groups, which consist of young boys and girls between the age of 12 and 18 years who are hired by the lodges/hostels to done for tourists in the evening. This practice is commonly done in Serena Safari Lodges, Sopa Lodges and Crater Lodge, where youths** often dance until mid-night depending on the tourists needs. Women mainly make and sell crafts while men make and sell spars, belts and other traditional things. In recent years the Tanzania Tourism Board (TTB) has been promoting an coordinating cultural tourism programs called tourism modules (as an addition to a safari tour) in the villages near major tourism activities. There are nine (9) modules in northern Tanzania. TTB in collaboration with village governments organizes for cultural based tourism investments like preparation of tour guides for the identified tourism points in the village.

Village cultural centres (bomas) have been established in the villages bordering the national parks and game reserves. Before establishment of these bomas, youths used to wait for tourists on their way to the national parks where they could dance, get photographed and talk about their culture and traditions on an agreed amount of money, which was quite paltry. According to the NCAA, some of the tourists tended to take photographs of naked people depending on their demands and the amount of money paid for each type of service. In those times, tourists used to pay these youths between one and five US dollars for their services. NCAA and villagers organized for a way of providing these services in specific areas where tourists can pay reasonable amounts to "benefit the whole community". Cultural bomas were therefore established for tourists to visit and pay both entry fees, fee for services like dancing, photographs and crafts.

In the case of Bagamoyo, the few souvenir small kiosks that exist (about 10) are clustered along the road in the northern part of the town where most of the hotels are positioned. These are owned by individual men, and hardly have

employees as in the case of Arusha. There are also some individuals who roam the hotels with their merchandise. Also in locations such as Magomeni and Dunda in Bagamoyo, activities such as handcraft, tour operating and tour guide and paid employment in the hotels are quite significant. 'Cultural tourism' is also becoming very significant in the town itself and also in places like Sadani. A Tent with a View Safaris Lodge claims to support the cultural tourism programme by arranging visits to Saadani village. Tourists are taken to see "a typical Swahili coast village, its fishing activities and the environment surrounding it." Walks through the village are organized by local guides. On special request meals are prepared by the villagers for the tourists as a form of income earning. With these visits donations are made to the Village Development Fund by the company.

**It is in commercial sex that women are mostly found. These visit the tourist hotels in varying numbers depending on season and the events in Arusha, for example. These are women between the age of 17 and 25 years. In Arusha, these visit specific tourist hotels, especially those with resident bands playing live music or discos. Most barmaids also depend on sex work as far as their incomes are concerned, since they are paid around USD 30 per month and their incomes and employers expect them to make it up through hooking customers. Besides tourists, the main clients of the female sex workers are people who visit for business, conferences, workshops, seminars, board meetings, study tours and other types of meeting.**

### **Human Tragedy and the Creation of Attraction**

Game reserves, sanctuaries, national parks and other tourist attractions in the history of Tanzania were often been built on human tragedy in the form of alienation of lands and natural resources. **The history of wildlife conservation in Tanzania and Africa generally has been that of alienation, brutal persecution,** harassment and abrogation of rights of land from users - tillers and pastoralists. The creation, expansion and maintenance of conservation and other attractions, such as beach areas, have always resulted into conflicts between the state and the rural dwellers, since the process has always deprived people of resources and means to subsistence. Land, wildlife and other resources that support rural people are critical to small holder agriculture, animal husbandry, subsistence hunting, fishing and other economic activities.

**Even before Serengeti's elevation to a national park, there were major conflicts over ownership and control of land between the Wamaasai and the government between 1941 and 1951. These continued after that. They occurred in 1953, 1955-57, 1959 and 1969.**

They still persist to the present (sporadically). The 1951 Ordinance had outlawed the rights of the Maasai to graze and water their animals within the reserves and national parks. From 1959, human rights were excluded from the national park. With further expansion and acceleration of the creation of the national parks after independence, conflicts between the government and the people continued sporadically, the most significant in the first region has experienced intensified periodic conflicts over land and natural resources starting from mid 1970s, with recurrence of famine due to lack of economic land to farm or graze as a result of land being taken over by large scale land owners, state farms and expansion of the conservation areas.

The government attempted to grant 381,000 acres of land in Monduli and Kiteto District (Arusha) to a foreign investor, Mr Hermanus Philip Steyn in 1994. The investor had formerly been declared a *persona non grata* by the government in 1983. The land which he was being granted is inhabited by pastoralists and other communities, and it also covered Simanjiro Game Controlled Area and Tarangire national Park wildlife migration routes. The investor was expected to abide by the Wildlife Conservation Act, but he could, of course kill animals within the land in protection of life and property; surrender trophies to the government; and, expel out any animal which would be found in or entering the land under the Right. Simanjiro is the area where the Laibon (spiritual leader) of the Waamasai in East Africa is based. It is in this area where En'donyo O'llmorwaak (the holly area) is situated. The area was taken from the Waamasai during the colonial period. All the efforts of the Wamaasai to regain the area have proved futile up to now. Their case has been known by the state house since 1984, and the more than 29 Waamasai communities have tried to push the issue even at parliamentary level through Pastoralists Development Association, to no avail. Meanwhile, Somali and other commercial farmers have not been prevented from taking over these lands.

When the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) Ordinance (cap 413) came into effect in 1959, the Wamasai, who had been moved to Ngorongoro from Serengeti national park a decade after its formation in 1940, were allowed to remain in the area as pastoralists. The Watatoga and Wahadzabe whose home was also Ngorongoro, were not allowed to return. While being moved from Serengeti, the government had promised the Wamaasai that they would be allowed to cultivate, since their diet (meat, blood and milk) had been greatly altered. About 70 percent of the Wamasai's food requirements come from cereals. Cultivation was prohibited completely in the area with the amendment in of the Game Parks Law No 14 of 1975 which set the area for conservation and pastoralist purposes. The NCA moved all those who were cultivating to Loliondo, at the same time it promised to provide cheap foodstuffs to the inhabitants, but this was only possible for a short while. Those who went to Ngorongoro had to confront other problems. In 1992, the government granted a lease of over 4,000 sq. km of Loliondo game

reserve secretly to an Arab hunting Sheikh, Brigadier Mohammed Abdulrahim Al-Ally of United Arab Emirates for hunting purposes through Otello (a Kenyan based hunting company, with secret powerful interests locally). In this case, 25 Wamaasi villages were affected.

In sum, the examples of the marginalization of the people in the country resulting from the promotion of these policies are numerous, and they have often resulted into problems spilling into other parts of the country, and even resulting into the problem of cattle rustling, which has often caused violent conflicts between communities. In December 2000, 30 people were killed in Kilosa district as a result of clashes between agriculturalists and the Maasai pastoralists (some of them recent migrants to the area) over the control and ownership of land. The rich urban land shortages among the pastoralists in the district. Although under different circumstances, by August 2001 there were reports that 10 people had been killed and 4,000 had fled to Kenya as two clans/"tribal" (Warenchoka and Waachari) clashed over the question of land and bhang growing in the area bordering Serengeti national Park because of land shortages (Guardian 22.08.2001). It was reported that some of the big bhang farms belonged to people in authority, who were at the same time quite influential.

Land grabbing by people with authority and wealth, alienation and allocation of village lands to the rich and dubious land allocations by government officials had become the norm in the 1980s. These land grabbers were doing so for either future security purposes or speculation and not necessarily for investment purposes. They were speculators who titled their lands, given that it had become easy to strike deals with village leaders who controlled and administered village lands (Tanzania, United Republic of 1994). The state had alienated massive areas in the country for the establishment of state farms in the 1970s. In Arusha Region, it happened in Mbulu and Hanang, where the government alienated massive tracts of land for state wheat farming with sponsorship of the Canadian government. This land was never returned to the people, despite their attempts to take it to court. Instead the state was planning to privatize these farms.

In sum, since the 1980s, land disputes have been escalating, and conflicts have been especially marked in those areas where tourism is being promoted. When these conflicts have taken an open political character in some instances, they have ended up in incidences such as those that took place in 1998 in Arumeru (Arusha Region), Mbeya Region and Sumbawanga (Rukwa), where people refused to pay tax – so-called development levy. In one of the villages in Arumeru, people beat up the council tax collectors, put on fire the Council Chairman's house and forced the Chairman to resign. The demands centered around the question of the usefulness of paying tax and the redistribution of land



that was held by the large scale holder, who were mostly absentee land owners or by the state itself. The people wanted to know how their taxes were being spent (Arusha Times 16-31.03.1998).

### **Neo – Liberal Accommodation of Conflicts**

**Arguments that promote tourism and the foreign investments are couched in terms of economic growth and poverty alleviation. The concept** of development itself has been quite elusive, in it has been transformed from modernization, as that transformation of 'traditional' societies to 'modern' ones (i.e. western) to sensibilities of "development as management of a promise" (Pieterse 2000) - of economic growth through adopting commodity-based forms of production with accumulation being the overriding logic and possibilities of the outcomes of the benefits trickling to the poor. In these conceptions of development, 'class' antagonisms were on the main hidden and emphasis was on the existence of shared 'values' - progress, universalism, conquering of nature, quantifying rationality, etc.

'New' conceptions of development emerged in the late 1970s, at a time when SAPs were being promoted by the IFIs. Alternative Development or another Development, which focused on the lack of popular participation were among the first ones; and, Human Development which focused on the question of the need to invest in people followed after that. These conceptions were taking up challenges that were posed by the Dependency School, ecological critiques and eco-feminism (Frank 1967 & 1969; Mies 1986; Shiva 1988; Sachs 1992). Within this context, a multitude of development conceptions emerged: self-reliant development, endogenous development, participatory development, integrated development, autonomous development, popular development, equitable development, sustainable development, local development, micro-development, endow-development, etc.

These adjectives that were tacked to the conception of development did not necessarily alter the fundamental logic of the process – i.e. accumulation and commodity (market) based forms of production. In all these instances, attempts were being made to deal with what were considered to be the bad effects of development (or so-called mal-development), by involving issues of culture, nature, gender, and social justice. Development had increasingly become a qualified process – human, social, political, engendered, etc. Sustainable development, for example was launched in the Rio Conference in June 1992, in the midst of implementation of SAPs in the third world countries and the triumph of neo-liberalism throughout the world. Here, the most important mythology that was created was: development did not only concern the South countries but also the North. Behind this myth, was the same economic logic commodity based forms of accumulation.

With governments in both North and South countries having been put in position whereby they were unable to deliver social services and other amenities,

some business leaders increasingly began to involve themselves in philanthropy, through funding NGOs that were involved in education, health and environmental initiatives. What was being promoted was the myth that the greater the access to foreign investments and influence, the more possibilities for human rights to become a reality. At the same time, philanthropy was a safety valve, in case of jeopardy, for their investments. In 1997, Ted Turner, the US media billionaire pledged to donate USD 1 billion to the UN for causes that relate to the environment, children, population control and women's projects. He was quoted having said: "My main concern is to be a benefit to the world ... control population, to stop the arms race, to preserve the environment" (Hertz 2002: 211). Numerous business leaders have followed suit all over the world.

It was necessary to forge a compromise to enable the poor to "benefit" from the resources, since unequal sharing of power and resources usually resulted into conflicts in many countries of the world (Severre 2003:9). To protect wildlife, tourism an "alleviate poverty", the government of Tanzania adopted policies and strategies that aimed at integrating "rural development" with wildlife conservation. Issues of "cultural tourism", supposedly one of the ways to involve people in tourism and enable them to benefit, have been discussed in Charter Five. Here, what are discussed are the other programmers. With the 1998 Wildlife Policy, the government set out to establish Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) on village lands in order to effect what it termed Community-Based Conservation (CBC); measures to enable rural communities to share revenues from tourist hunting; compelling enterprises to employ people from areas where wildlife is utilized; working in partnership with rural communities; and, encouraging formation of authorized associations for "sustainable management of wildlife outside the core protected areas.

**Given these policies, the government proclaimed in its Rural Development Strategy that tourism was a key tool in rural poverty alleviation, that "the rural economy is linked to the new engines of economic growth, particularly tourism",** in order to stimulate "pro-poor growth" (Tanzania United Republic of 2001) The Tourism Master Plan of 1996 advocated for developing Community-Based Tourism (CBT) on village lands in the northern parts of the country, in an attempt to promote tourism outside protected areas for the "benefit of the communities". CBT is widely practiced in Ngorongoro, Simanjiro, Monduli, Babati, Nbulu and Karatu districts. These activities are supposed to provide the rural people with communal incomes through tourism joint ventures as well as provide some employment to some people and open a market for local goods.

The most quoted example by those in the authority, as far as contributions to the villagers is concerned is the Cullman Wildlife Project. Tanzania Game Trackers Safaris, Bundu Safaris, etc. Have Similar Projects. Such projects are in Arusha, Mpanda, Kigoma, Maswa, Rungwe etc. The government claims that,

these companies help villagers directly by provision of water pumps, wells, dispensaries, schools, desks and sometimes school materials. Here again, Robin Hurt is often cited, especially in the case of Monduli. But these so-called contributions are mere palliative. All these companies claim to be helping communities in the alleviation of poverty", like in the formulation of all donor financed projects in the country and Africa, targeting those activities that have direct impact on women and children – the social services. In the name of women and children, policies based on the dishing out of arms are condoned to provide a justification for the continued existence of the liberalization policies on the ground.

Loksale and Kitumbeini villages in Arusha, for example, lodged complaints to the District authorities against Winger Windrose in 1995. Claiming that the company had promised to contribute a mere Tshs. 200,000 and corrugated iron sheets for school projects. According to them this was not enough since the company was reaping more. This conflict continued in 1996. There were many villages, which were tempted to receive assistance from the hunting companies in the early 1990s, but their number increasingly dropped by 1994. Most villages were already complaining that they were being cheated and were refusing to collect the so-called contributions. It was only with the introduction of the new regulations that their contributions increased to some extent.

Given all these problems, people around these hunting areas are extremely bitter with the government and the hunting companies. Beyond issues on land, they are aware of the corruption involved in the sector. They consider the whole campaign for environmental protection being mere deception for the sake of other people's benefits, and especially foreigners. As far as the so-called creation of WMAs is concerned, they are of the opinion that this is simply another means of encroaching on villagers lands by the government, since the land where WMAs are being introduced belongs to the village. Above that, the formation of the associations as envisaged, will be an exclusionary move, since only villagers who are powerful (in the village governments), who are in many instances accused of corruption and collusion with the companies, who will actually benefit. In fact, these WMAs have been condemned by the rural dwellers in uncertain terms, since what is involved is further encroachment of the government in village lands in the name of developing CBT.

## Conclusion

It is clear that the question is not whether tourism is beneficial or not beneficial to the economies of African countries. The more pertinent question is that of the extent to which issues of social justice, equity, equality, rights and fairness are addressed in the discourses on human development and transformation. This is vindicated by the historical experiences of struggles for

independence in Africa and Tanzania in particular in the 1940s and 1950s. Currently, there is complete historical amnesia of these struggles, which were centered on the control and ownership of land and natural resources. Some of these struggles during colonial and post colonial era have been pointed out in this study. In fact, it was such struggles which gave rise to nationalist struggles.

Central to this conceptualization of nationalism are the questions of redressing imbalances, inequalities, relations of domination, exploitation, etc.

Tourism in its current forms, is reinforcing the old age colonial relations, rather than unleashing the emancipatory tendencies which may be inherent in it, in terms of promotion possible when tourism is grasped from a democratic angle with a sense of social and political determinism rather than economic determinism. The issue is how the differences between workers and bosses, peasants and merchants, student and teachers, men and women, youths and elders, Moslems and Christians, Africans and Asians/Arabs/Europeans, majority and minorities, people and state, etc are resolved/treated.

One of the most important issues in considering tourism, within this context, should be the question of a social project in terms of the possibility to conceptualize the type of society people would like to build. Pertinent questions which must be dealt with are: What is the motive force of society (intellectuals? Bureaucracy? Economic forces?, social struggles? Etc?) In which way is production organized? Who is producing, and who is appropriating the surplus? **What forms of accumulation are taking place? Who is demanding for promotion of tourism and land tenure reforms? Why tourism and issues of land and natural resources treated technically and not socially and politically? Is such a technical treatment a defense of oppressive relations? In what way do people want their societies/communities organized? Debates on tourism can only make sense if linked to the whole question of restructuring social relations so that individuals, groups and people in general are able to pose the questions of land and natural resources control and the issues of social and political emancipation** more sharply.

To correctly appraise issues on land reforms and natural resources control, it seems, we have to move away from the much abused concept of economic growth as development to that which takes into consideration (a) the satisfaction of human needs of the majority (the marginalized, oppressed and exploited), focusing around the question of eradication (not alleviation) of poverty. (b) Integrated economic activities which ensure a self-centred process of capital accumulation. And, a social project which focuses on the question of redressing

imbalances, inequalities, oppressive and exploitative relations: in sum, a project which aims at restructuring relations among people. In this case, projects which increase those forms of inequalities are fundamentally oppressive.