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Introduction

The neo-liberal policies introduced in Tanzania in the 1980s 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 The 1962 Tanganyika National Tourist Board Act was repealed with the introduction of the Tanzania Tourist Board Act 1992.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 established the Tanzania Tourist Board (TTB), whose function became that of promotion and development of all aspects of the tourist industry, i.e., advertising and publicizing Tanzania as a tourist destination; encouraging and developing amenities that would 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 in the industry. Besides promotion of private investments, the policy provided a framework 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 on 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 assistance.

1 Paper presented to the 2005 Gender Festival, (6th-9th September 2005), organized the Feminist Activist Coalition (FemAct) and Tanzania Gender Networking Programme (TGNP), at TGNP's Gender Resource Centre, Mabibo, Dar es Salaam. Theme: "popular Struggles Over natural Resources", co-organized by LEAT & HAKIARDHI. This paper is based on an extended study "Investments and Tourism in Tanzania: A Study of Social, Economic and Gender Relations", for GERA & TWN-Africa (Accra), by Prof. C.S.L. Chachage (Department of Sociology and Anthropology. University of Dar es salaam and Ms. Usu Mallya (Tanzania Gender Networking Programme, Mabibo, Dar es Salaam)." Members of TCT are: Tanzania Association of Tour Operators (TATO), All Africa Travel and Tourism Association (AATTA), Tanzania Association of Travel Agents (TASOTA), Hotel Keepers Association of Tanzania (HKAT), Tanzania Hunting Operators Association (TAHOA), Tanzania Air Operators Association (TAOA) and Tanzania Hotel Schools Association (TAHOSA).
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, 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, Britain, for example, had set aside funds under its Tourism Challenge Fund for International Development (TCFID) to match grants for projects to develop business and employment opportunities in developing countries and strengthen positive social and cultural effects. A Wildlife Policy was also introduced in 1998 aimed at clarifying land-use issues for communities as far as tourism purposes were concerned. The 1998 Policy adopted strategies that aimed at integrating rural development with wildlife conservation by establishing Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) on village lands as a means to effect Community-Based Conservation (CBC); promote legal use of wildlife and its products; introduce measures that would bring equitable sharing of revenue from tourist hunting to the rural communities; and, compel license dealers in wildlife based products to employ workers from areas where wildlife activities are conducted.

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 fetishized 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 (MacCannell 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, adventurers 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 a part of the pursuit of opportunity for trade and also leisure for aristocrats and the bourgeoisie since 18th 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 19th 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 exposed 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)

It was with the organization of package holidays by Thomas Cook and later on American Express in the second half of the 19th Century that even wives and children and eventually women traveling without a male companion in the tours, mainly adventurous middle class women who wanted to travel for pleasure were able to do so. By 1907, "the company's magazine, Traveller's Gazette, featured on its cover a vigorous young woman bestriding the globe." (Enloe op cit) It was with these cheap package holidays that travel for "pleasure was to emerge from a very different context altogether as working-class families sought to escape the grimy drudgery of industrial cities", in the form of development of sea-side resorts as working-class pleasure zones (Waters 1996). Increasingly the phenomenon turned into that of travel for pleasure and leisure activities. "Here 'holy days' were transformed into secular 'holidays' during which people became committed to having a good time,---breathing fresh air, eating sweet junk food, riding animals, taking walks for no reason at all, and playing carnival gambling games." (ibid) While the working class did so, the bourgeoisie in Europe and America established other pleasure zones away from these—ones associated with adventures and personalized transport, such as the winter sports in the Alps, the French Riviera or the Casino at Monte Carlo, (ibid)
At the turn of the 19th Century, Thomas Cook had become a huge company. Prior to the First World War, Thomas Cook was very much the market leader in organized trips, including those beyond Europe. Foreign travel was the domain of the middle class. Mass tourism in the form of foreign travel was beyond the means of most people. Package tour holidays had become a profitable commodity for some companies which were already acquiring an international character. Holiday camps were already established even in the colonies by 1930s. International tourism was to grow dramatically in the post World War II period, particularly with the expansion of air travel from the late 1950s. The immediate post-World War II holiday boom saw one million British tourists travelling abroad by 1950. It was Victor Raitz a Reuters journalist, who initiated the age of budget holiday travel for the masses. Raitz set up a new company, called Horizon Holidays in 1949. A number of companies followed his example. Raitz's name is synonymous with the 'Three S's" (Sun, Sand and Sex). Victor Raitz was also responsible for seeking to segment the holiday travel market by age by launching Club 18-30 which provided thousands of British teenagers with their first experience of unchaperoned travel.

§§§

Tourism in the form of the pursuit and killing of animals, which was the predecessor of other forms of tourism, had culminated in the development of ideological overtones expressed in artistic and literally production, was to play a very central part in the process of colonization in the 19th Century. (MacKenzie 1988: 8) Hunting was turned into a symbolic activity of dominance, whereby, "...the spoils of the big game hunter powerfully evoked the conquest and domination of exotic territories," observed Ritvo (1990: 254). "The connection between triumphing over a dangerous animal and subduing unwilling natives was direct and obvious, and the association of the big game hunter with the march of empire was literal as well as metonymic. By the beginning of the nineteenth century big game hunting was an integral part of the British administrative and military community...."

Although the Hunt was perceived as a promoter of supposedly distinctive male virtues, there were also women involved in it, perhaps in the spirit of Greek huntresses like Artemis identified by the Romans with Diana\(^3\) and Atalanta\(^4\) or even Queen Elizabeth I, who was well celebrated for her game hunting exploits. In sum, there were already middle class women who had turned foxhunting into a woman's sports after 1850s in England (MacKenzie op cit: 21-22). The British Mary Kingsley, who travelled to West Africa and, besides having been involved in 'exploration', trade and hunting, contributed greatly through lectures in the fashioning of the British ideology of imperialism. She made the women at home expand their 'knowledge' about the 'exotic' world and "enabled them to feel superior to colonized women". Other known names of the same period were such as those of Isabella Bird, Nina Benson Hubbard, etc. In the US, there were women adventurers like Delia Akeley and Diana Brodsky who became famous for their contributions to the museums (Enloe op cit: 24).

Intense penetration of European hunters and traders was to take place from mid-19th century, often on the pretext of abolishing slave trade to commercial advantage. By this

\(^3\) Artemis is the sister of Apollo in Greek mythology, a goddess of hunting and of the moon, who roamed the woods alone or with bands of female followers.

\(^4\) She is depicted as a famous hunuess in Greek mythology, She agreed to marry anyone who would outrun her, the penalty of failure being death to the wooer.
time, there arrived missionaries, explorers, prospectors, naturalists, big-game hunters, traders and adventurers in big numbers to seek excitement in the 'Dark Continent'. Besides the so-called explorers, 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 Scionsm1 who hunted in Southern Africa and Tanganyika in late 19th century and early 20th 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.

The intense penetration of Europeans in the mid- 19th century coincided with the expansion of European and American demand for ivory due to the growth in the manufacture of cutlery, pianos, billiard balls, combs and ornaments. The output of pianos in the United States of America, for example, rose from approximately 10,000 in 1850 to 370,000 in 1910; and from approximately 23,000 to 75,000 during the same years in Britain (MacKenzie op cit: 148). It is estimated that about two million pounds of ivory (60,000 to 100,000 elephant's worth) were annually coming out of Africa in the 1880s. A large share of this was coming from East Africa, since most of South African elephant population had been wiped out by early 1800 and Ivory Coast had hardly any ivory left by 1900. Ivory was an important source of revenue for the Europeans who colonized Tanganyika, together with animal products (meat, skins and horns) during the transition period before farms became productive. Most early developments (towns and railways construction, establishment of farms, etc.) were accomplished through the use of animal resources, with meat, for example, constituting an important part or substitute for wages. At the same time, ivory and skins were produced as a direct subsidy for conquest and settlement. Consequently, Germans introduced regulations by 1898, which excluded African hunters, since Europeans were blaming Africans for the destruction of game. Proclamation No 16 of 1917 and Game Proclamation of 1920 was to denied game licensing to any 'native', and Africans could only hunt after being given a special permission by the governor.

During the 1920s and 1930s, "Big game massacres and berserk drives" according to some of the colonial agents, was one of life's greatest sports (Reid 1934: 69). It was the "...old fashioned safari of white men in Tanganyika—that is, a leisure affair of porters, tents, and chops of boxes, where one covered a dozen or fifteen miles a day for weeks at a time,..." (Dundas 1924: 221). Some white women in the colonies also indulged in hunting whenever the occasion arose. The macho writer, Ernest Hemmingway, who visited Tanganyika in the early 1930s for a one month big game hunting expedition, fell in love with the unspoiled natural beauty of Tanganyika, the cool nights and the wonders of game hunting (Hemmingway 1935; 1975). For him, in the green hills of Tanganyika one could forget the cities and their neurotic inhabitants and instead plunge into the world of greater kudu hunting, campfires, books and lots of booze; and regain his manhood. Within this context, notions of conservation were to develop in the colonies, which deep down, were an expression of class, gender, ethnic and racial relations. For example, it is reported that one German Count Teleki, "who claimed the discovery of Lake Rudolf, emerged from the interior boasting that he had 'shot 35 elephants and 300 niggers'" (MacKenzie op cit: 161).

5 The Selous Game Reserve was named after him.
From the 1920s onwards, hunting and safari companies were mainly concentrated in Nairobi with a few in Tanganyika and Kampala, since the 'industry' grew as an East African one. There were also some European outfitting companies by then, some genuine ones and fake ones, mostly concentrated in Kenya with a few in Tanganyika, who benefited from this industry. Many of these companies had no experience in the 'industry' and simply cashed in because of the profits out of the industry. "Between 1926 and 1935 government sales of ivory in the three East African colonies (...) raised £ 665.400, while expenditure on game, departments totalled £ 292,290. The surplus off. 373,000 was no mean sum for struggling colonial economies". (MacKenzie op cit: 253) In these years: ...the sale of ivory by East African administrators had become a not inconsiderable part of their exiguous income. In the 1930s, when culling had become necessary, ivory sales helped to tide colonial revenues, particularly those of Uganda and Tanganyika, through the difficulties of the depression period. Thus the ivory subsidy was important to chartered companies, the campaigns of 'pacification', the personal finances of the conquistador e.s who became imperial officials, and the revenues of relatively impecunious colonies (ibid: 152).

While white hunters in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) charged STG 50 per month to lead six or twelve month safaris, "in East Africa 'white hunters' not fit to be gun bearers extorted (STG) 200- (STG) 300 per month to secure trophies...." (ibid: 161). In sum, wildlife and natural resources control in general was historically a major site of accumulation under colonial imperialism.

Both German and British colonial governments introduced legislations aimed at wildlife preservation and restricting Africans from hunting, in favour of 'sports' hunting by Europeans. Conservation measures in the colonies took the form of creation of forest and game reserves and later national parks on the basis of the land laws that were introduced. Germans had decreed the country an "ownerless crown land". Given the introduction of this decree, it was only settlers and companies that could own land since they possessed documentary evidence to the effect. Africans were given rights of occupancy. It was with such a decree that Germans were able to alienate land in any form that they desired, since the ultimate power over land was vested in the Governor.

The decree, under German rule, made it possible for the alienation of land for conservation measures in the form of 'forest reserves', 'game preserves' and 'sanctuaries' by 1890s under the pretext of preservation. These were introduced first in Moshi and Kilimanjaro districts in 1891, and finally extended to cover the whole colony by 1896. Two areas, namely, Rufiji (which is now part of Selous Game reserve) and the west of Kilimanjaro area, were declared game reserves in 1896. There were eight reserves, which had been demarcated by 1908, and their number reached 11 by the end of World War I. Beyond having alienated large tracts of land for 'preservation', by the eve of World War I some 1,300,000 acres of the best lands in northern Tanzania and the coast had been alienated to immigrants (Tanzania, United Republic 1994: 9).

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 and medium scale fanners). 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.

The British were able to extend the reserves to 13 (16,300 sq. miles) in early 1920s. Lake Rukwa and Usambara reserves were added in 1933. Serengeti and Ngorongoro were to be further extended in 1936. In Serengeti, the Wamaasai area was reduced to less than one-sixth of their former land area (Arhem 1985). The Southern Highlands areas (Idodi, Usagara and Iringa), Tabora and others were to be declared reserves in 1938 and 1939 respectively. When the Selous game reserve was created, for example, it initially covered 2,600 sq. miles. It was to be extended severally after 1931, only to reach its full extent in 1975 when it covered 21,230 sq. miles or 55,000 sq. km. (almost the size of Ireland). Serengeti National Park was created in 1951. This was after the passing of the 1951 Fauna Preservation Ordinance. Serengeti was to remain the only national park at the time of independence in 1961. In the process of creation and extension of this game reserve and national parks, rural dwellers were denied their rights of occupancy. With the acceleration of land alienation after World War II and early 1950's, the total area alienated under long-term rights of occupancy for European settlers rose from 788,038 acres in 1946 to 2,533,966 acres by 1958, a more than three-fold increase (Lyall 1973).

The post-colonial state, following the influence of conservation ideals that had been imparted by the international organizations, such as Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) led by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), was part of the launching of the African Special Project. The launching of this project was an outcome of the 1961 conference in Arusha, Tanzania, which proclaimed the Arusha Declaration on Conservation. The Manifesto which came out of the Conference, was read by Mwalimu J.K. Nyerere, but was actually drafted by members of the western
conservation organizations (Newmann 1995: 366; as quoted in Mallya 1999: 23) read as follows:
The survival of wildlife is a matter of grave concern to all of us in Africa. These wild creatures amid the wild places they inhabit are not only important as source of wonder and inspiration but are an integral part of our natural resources and our future livelihood and well being.

In accepting the trusteeship of our wildlife we solemnly declare that we will do everything within our power to make sure that our children's grand-children will be able to enjoy this rich precious inheritance.

The conservation of wildlife and wild places calls for specialist knowledge, trained manpower, and money, and we look to other nations to cooperate with us in this important task—the success or failure of which will not only affect the continent of Africa but the rest of the world as well.

Within the above legal and policy framework, conservation practices that were pursued during the colonial period were extended and accelerated after independence. The creation of more game reserves and national parks after independence was in response to 1960 U.N. Visiting Mission, which recommended development and maintenance of extensive game reserves and national parks. The UN Mission to Tanzania in 1960 had recommended further development of tourist facilities so as to develop the industry as one of the possible big foreign exchange earners in the future.

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 km² 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 per cent of the territory of which 3 per cent 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 a multi-ethnic trading town. 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 all tourist facilities were concentrated in Kenya during the colonial period. At independence, 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 more 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.

Tourism was being promoted because it had become the second largest industry in the world after oil. From a mere 25,000,000 arrivals of tourists from abroad who spent USD 2,100 million in 1950, it is estimated that there were 475,580,000 travellers in 1992 who spent USD 278.705 million. According to World Tourism Organization (1993), international tourism was growing at the rate of 3.8 percent annually by the early 1990s. The number of tourists by 1995 stood at 567 million and the income from tourism totaled at USD 372,000 million, in the latter year, Africa had a share of 18.8 million tourists who spent about seven billion dollars. It was huge multinational companies that actually controlled the industry internationally. Some of the huge multinational companies in tourism were such as the American Express, Transat A.T. Inc. Thomas Cook, Abercrombie, Fitch. First Choice, My Travel and TUI (formerly Thomson).

Britain had more than 700 tour operators by the end of the 1980s, selling more than 13 million package holidays annually worth more than STG 3 billion. In Japan, companies such as JTB and Kinki Nippon Tourist Agency had turned foreign travel into a USD 16 billion business (Enloe op cit: 30). By then tourism had become one of the areas of economic activity covered under the World Trade Organization's (WTO) General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The rules governing this body hardly reflected the interests of the small and medium enterprises of the Third World Countries, which did not have the backing of the International Financial Institutions, including European, American and Japanese banks and financial intermediaries such as Goldman Sachs and Merrill Lynch. Multinational Corporations (MNCs) such as "Gulf and Western or Castle and Cook" were converting "their large landholdings into resorts or" selling "them off to developers" (ibid: 31)

The world in the past three decades or so has witnessed a trend towards concentration of companies and less competition. TUI Northern Europe, for example, is part of TUI AG of Germany, the largest tourism and services group in the world, employing 80,000 people in 500 companies around the world. In 1999/2000 TUI AG's turnover was 22 billion Euros. The businesses within TUI Northern Europe comprise TUI UK, TUI Nordic, TUT Ireland, Specialist Holidays Group (including Austravel) and Teletext based travel agency, Team Lincoln. Under such circumstances, smaller, independent companies have had to struggle hard to survive. TUI Northern Europe owns many of Europe's holiday brands and has leadership positions in its airline, inclusive tour business and travel agency sectors. TUI Northern Europe employs 17,500 people in the UK, Ireland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland.

Worldwide, the industry itself is characterized by strong vertical integration. Thus the UK's biggest travel groups own the tour operators which put together holidays, the travel agency which sells the holiday. They also have strong links to car hire companies and to hotel chains. It is the tour operators who put holiday packages together, and decide which hotel, airline or car hire company to use. Tour operators are wholesalers who package transportation, ground arrangements and accommodation and sell the package to retailers—travel agencies—or market them through their own agencies. The major feature of the industry so far is the total concentration in the tourist-generating countries and only very little package is put together or in conjunction with the travel agencies in the tourist-receiving countries. Concentration has been on the increase in the past two
decades or so because of the increasing finance required for securing charter airline seats, hotel accommodation and large scale advertising of the industry.

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 travelling for the sun, sand and sex adventures (the triple "S"). This explains why the uneven distributions of tourists share worldwide and within Africa.

Indeed, in those years, North African countries that are closer to Europe used to receive 62 percent of tourist traffic in Africa. East and Southern Africa used to receive 22 percent, 11 percent went to West Africa and Central Africa received only 5 percent of the traffic. In those years, countries that stood at the top as far as this industry was concerned were Morocco, Tunisia and Kenya. It was the "mass" form of tourism, based on myths created by the youths of the industrial bourgeoisie and intellectuals, which was prone to infiltration of even the lower classes, which was most dominant in the 1960s and 1970s. The 5 960s advertisements of this form of tourism focused on the elegance, sophistication, fantastic view, superb cuisine, the sail boat, the big game fishing, the sophisticated beach girls, the sun, etc. African countries that were able to offer these were among those that received a higher number of tourists.

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 seventh 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.
Changing Trends in Tourism Activities

Pundits of neo-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 produce 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 dirtiest 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\(^6\)) (Munt 1994:1).

The old type of mass-packaged tourist holidays which were premised on travel for the sun, sand and sex adventures were increasingly being replaced by adventurous forms of tourism within which travelling, trekking, trucking, hunting, fishing, canoeing, aquatic sports, snorkelling, 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. This

\(^6\) Community-based tourism is supposedly a form of tourism which aims to include and benefit local communities, particularly so-called indigenous peoples and villagers in the rural areas of the developing countries. Projects in this type of tourism, it is claimed, are intended to give local people a fair share of the benefits/profits and a say in deciding how incoming tourism is managed. Villagers may host tourists in their village, manage a scheme communally and share the profits. In some instances, the community or the village works with a commercial tour operator.
new wave of tourism in the 1980s coincided with campaigns for environmental conservation. The new forms of tourist practices are viewed benevolently: there is hardly any criticism against them. In other words, the outlooks of the new western middle classes have been internalized even in the host countries. The role of these middle classes in the "new social movements" that have arisen especially around the notion of "other cultures and the environment and ecological issues" is hardly questioned (Munt. op cit: 50).

This trend in tourism was posing new challenges to established holiday destinations in Africa such as Morocco, Tunisia, Kenya, Zimbabwe, etc., since it involved new forms of discrimination. Holidaymakers who were better enlightened in environmental issues and were offered a wider choice of destinations, were spurning over-patronised resorts and seeking out new, safer and unspoilt locations. Countries like Kenya were increasingly becoming victims of this trend and its arrival figures began to drop. Between 1997 and mid-1998, for example, there was a closure of 15 hotels at the coast in Kenya for lack of business. Officially, the reasons for this were attributed to the so-called Likoni "tribal clashes" in the areas (although such "clashes" had always been persistent in Kenya without necessarily affecting the sector!) (The East African, 27.07-02.08.1998). Tanzania, ironically "lucky" to be a back-marker, began to increasingly get more tourists by mid 1980s. And thus, for example, there was a growing tendency among countries such as Tanzania to advocate for "quality tourism". It proclaimed openly that mass tourism is not necessarily a means to economic well-being; that what is required is a "selected market of more paying tourists as opposed to an uncontrolled influx of clients who could be disastrous to the environment" (Guardian 25.01.1996).

Underlying these shifts in tourism consumption was the consolidation of power of the "new capitalist classes" of 1970s, based in the media, finance, advertising, academia, merchandizing, international stock-exchange, etc., who had emerged then via the new speculative forms of accumulation based on finances and plunder and control of natural resources (land, forests, game reserves and national parks, etc.), rather than productive investments of the formerly productive "old capitalist classes". Investments in the industry in recent years have been taking place in the form of privatization of the tourist attractions. Globally, the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), a specialized World Bank Group, has recognized tourism as one of the most profitable industries in the developing countries. This agency has the mandate to encourage the flows of foreign debt investment in developing countries and transitional economies to fulfil its objectives by providing guarantees to foreign private investors against risks of currency transfer restrictions and expropriations. It is supposed to protect tourist foreign investors against war and civil disturbances in those countries where investments are taking place; and also facilitate public and private partnership.

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
Stock Exchange the bush in 1996. The company's turnover for 1996-97 was estimated to be STG 22 million. The Financial Director of the company, Martin Edge was to say: "We want to show real capital growth and dividend income to shareholders, But we also want to demonstrate that management of wildlife and the sustainable use of national resources in Africa can be profitable." The company was involved with a British entrepreneur Stephen Boler who had bought a 60,000 hectares game park in Kalahari Desert, which was managed as a safari lodge. The head of field operations of the company quipped: "The future is with eco-tourism. We want to make it clear that wildlife is a viable investment." (The Observer (UK) 21.07.1996)

In 1998 the reporter Martin Plant was to report for the BBC that a South African company had plans to take over a string of national parks throughout Africa. The scheme was a brainchild of a Dutch multi-millionaire and nature conservationist, Paul van Vlissingen, and it had won the support of an extraordinary range of groups and individuals, including former South Africa President Nelson Mandela, the US State Department and even the World Bank. The Dutch tycoon, whose family runs the Makro chain of wholesalers, came up with an initiative designed "to save Africa's ailing game reserves". The scheme was to found a private company, African Parks Management and Finance Company, to take them over. Accordingly, "The state could bring in expertise, scientists, animals from other national parks and land, and I could bring in management expertise and the drive to make it go." Marakele National Park, which the company was running north of Johannesburg, it was claimed, had been a success, with a number of rare species having been well established.

In hunting safaris, the dominant influence in wildlife policies in most African countries was and remains Safari Club International (SCI), an elitist hunting club of the USA with deep roots in the US government and Congress. This is because by 1980s, the US government was already rendering financial support to hunting groups and companies through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). USAID had also become instrumental in funding programmes such as the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) in Zimbabwe and similar programmes in other countries, including Tanzania. Between 1989 and 1999, SCI had committed USD 6.5 billion for such programmes, as a way of promoting hunting and companies involved in elite hunting. SCI has been one of the big financiers of political parties in the US and its members include former US president George Walker Bush, Norman Schwarzkopf, head of NATO forces during the 1990 Gulf War and more than 20 members of the US Congress in 2004.

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,
Tanzania received 103,363 tourists in 1985 and earned USD10 million. By 1989, the number of tourists stood at 137,889, earning the country USD 60 million. This figure rose to 627,000 in 1999 only to slightly fall to 525,000 in 2001. Officially, it is claimed that that tourism's foreign exchange earnings grew from USD 27 million in 1986 to USD 259.4 in 1995. The number of tourists visiting the country stood at 575,000 in 2002 and 576,000 in 2003. Accordingly, the claim is the country earned in USD 730 million and USD 731 million in foreign exchange from tourism in these years respective (See Appendix 2). By 1995, it is claimed, the sector directly accounted for about 7.5 per cent of the GDP and about 25 per cent of the export earnings. Accordingly, earnings per tourist had increased from an average of USD 970 in 1996 to USD 1,182 in 3998. Officially, the sector recorded an average annual growth rate of 11 per cent by the end of the 1990s. The sector was directly supporting some 198,000 jobs in tourism and associated activities by 2003, a figure supposed to be higher than in any other non-agricultural branch of the economy. By this year, it was contributing about 16 percent of the GDP and nearly 25 percent of total export earnings. Revenue from game hunting tourists was also on the increase in the above mentioned years as part of the foreign earnings from tourism in general (an average of about 3.5 percent of the sector's earnings).

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 Centre (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 Aga Khan Fund for Economic Development (AKFED), co-financed by 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 110 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 night clubs in existence by then. Ownership patterns were divided between foreign 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 notwithstanding, 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 where 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 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 1992/93 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 car-hire companies, such as Hentz, had also entered the Tanzanian 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 suppliers 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 the 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, alter 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 no 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). The 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 promotional and marketing activities. The TTB receives some USD 1.75 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 Appendix 2); 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 for 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 from 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 the 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\(^8\) exports accounted for 19.5 percent (i.e. USD 222.7 million) and non-traditional\(^9\) exports (with mining being the leader) accounted for 80.5 percent (i.e. USD 919.7 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 county USD 548.3 million (48 percent of total exports), with gold contributing USD 499 million or 43.7 percent of total exports).

As far as other non-traditional goods are concerned, industrial goods contributed USD 99.9 million or 8.8 percent; fish and marine products contributed USD 136.2 million or 12 percent; and, horticultural products (vegetables and flowers) contributed USD 13.7 million or 1.2 percent. Figures for tourism were not indicated at all! When the figure are disaggregated in terms of export of goods and export of services, the latter's contribution for the same year stood at USD 685.3 million, a figure which is below the purported USD 731 million contributed by tourism. The economic survey (ibid) indicated that within the export of services, the major contribution by ranking was from

---

\(^8\) Coffee, cotton, sisal, tea, tobacco, cashew nuts and cloves.
Minerals, industrial goods, fish and marine products, horticultural products (vegetables and flowers) and tourism
transportation (of goods to neighboring countries and the use of the harbor),
communication and tourism. In The 2001 Tanzania Tourism Sector Survey (BOT et al op
cit), the government admitted that for a long time it had been unable to measure correctly
the contribution of the tourism sector in the economy, partly because of the broad
definition which covered the activities. It also admitted that even the System of National
Accounts of 1993 did not show tourism as one of the economic activities; instead, it was
bundled together in activities such as agriculture (in hunting sub-sector); trade, hotels and
restaurants; transport and communication; financial and business services; and public
administration and other services. Despite this admittance, the Survey's figures more or
less vindicated the previously government popularized figures!

What, in reality, is tourism's contribution to official export, earnings, then?
Tanzania National Parks (TANAPA) records show that visitors (residents and non-
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 nonresidents 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 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 while 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' 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 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 731 million 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 or are linked to airlines, own or are linked to chains of hotels, lodges, camps, tour companies, car 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 72 per day. However, a study conducted as early as 1990 revealed that the average total costs of a holiday of a package tourist were USD 5,143 and an overland tourist 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 agents from where the tourists originate.

Gazelle Holidays is a European family business, which came to southern highlands of Tanzania in the 1950s. An all inclusive price of a one week safari with Gazelle Holidays starts from STG 995. It includes flights and time on the beach depending upon time of the year. The tour operator, iExplore Exclusives of USA offers an 8 days trip with a day by day itinerary of guided tours for those who want to visit Tanzania for "cultural exploration" or Safari. Their prices, it is claimed, makes the tourist save up to 30-40 percent. Their lowest price is USD 2,699 (for an individual traveler). These are package tours; and there are also some customized to meet specific needs of an independent traveler with varying prices. The starting prices average at USD 3,499 per person for the Gold trips (a 4 to 5 star cultural experience appealing to the luxury market) and USD 2,499 per person for the Silver trips (a 3 to 4 star experience for the middle-upper market).

What happens in hunting tourism is illustrative of question of the possible amounts of foreign exchange revenue generated by industry. Hunting tourism earned the government a total amount of USD 45.5 million between 1999 and 2004. It earned USD 8.8 million in 2003 and USD 9,000,271 in 2004. In this year, there were 46 hunting
companies which were licensed to hunt in 146 blocks. Some 1,376 clients were recorded in 2003. Revenue from the sale of trophies was Tshs 155.7 million, Tshs151.2 million and Tshs 162.1 million in 2001/01, 2001/02 and 2002/03 respectively. There were 221 professional hunters and 1,654 clients who visited the country in 2004. 45 percent of these came from the USA, 15 percent from Spain and 9 percent from France. Annual fees paid to the Wildlife Division for a hunting block is USD 7,500. With the 146 blocks in 2004, the government received USD 1,095,000 as fees.

To use the quotation of the African Safari Consultants of Montecito (Santa Barbara) California (Appendix 3) 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, etc (for details, see Chachage 1998). Nor does it include the so-called contributions that are supposed to be paid by the companies for community development. As it is shown in Appendix 3, most fees and taxes including, Community Development tax (10 percent on the amount of trophy fees), Tanzania Government 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.

Assuming that the number of all 576,000 in 2003 foreign visitors were tourists, and the average earning per tourist in hotels/lodges was USD 1,169 (given that the average spending of a tourist per day was USD 173) (see Appendix 2 for details), it means, gross earnings for the hotels/lodges was USD 673 million. The remaining USD 58 million is the money that could have been used in the curio and souvenir shops, restaurants, night clubs, bars, etc. Therefore, whatever the percentage of this amount that accounted for overheads; those general, continuing costs of running a business enterprise, such as rent, tear and wear, furnishing, lighting, taxes, insurance, office expenses, material expenses, labour expenses; etc., a large amount of the foreign exchange finds its way back to the origin of the tourist supplying countries and companies, or was
repatriated as profits. What is involved in this industry, given the dominance of foreign concerns is not simply a question of leakages, but that of companies making superprofits, without benefiting the people and the country in general.

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 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 is in fact indicative of the facade 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 throw-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).

A total of 13 hotels were lined up for rehabilitation, but earmarked for these funds were: Lake Manyara (Tshs 4 billion), Ngorongoro Wildlife (Tshs 2.9 billion), Lobo Wildlife Lodge (Tshs 2.9 billion), Seronera Wildlife Lodge (Tshs 2.9 billion). Among the hotels that were doing well were: New Mwanza Hotel, New Africa Hotel, New Safari, New Arusha, Kunduchi Beach Hotel, Equator and Morogoro Hotel; while the list of those that were not doing well included Bahari Beach Hotel, Savoy of Morogoro, Mikumi Lodge and New Moshi Hotel (see Appendix 3 for geographical position and star ranking). The rehabilitation was to be undertaken under the management of Lodges Limited of Mauritius, and not a Tanzanian firm. Hotels that were listed as performing well were: New Mwanza Hotel, New Africa, New Safari, New Arusha, Kunduchi, Beach Hotel, and Equator Hotel and Morogoro Hotel.

Significantly, majority of the hotels that were listed for rehabilitation or were not functioning well 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 were underway.

Privatization of state firms since its commencement has meant spending huge sums of money as fees to consultants. The government has been setting aside a fund for privatization, which for example in the budget year 2001/02 stood at Tshs 22,692,900,000 (about USD 22,692,900) (Economic Research Bureau June 2003: 69). Western donors have been churning out funds in the form of grants for the exercise of divestiture of public firms, and at the same time making sure that it is their home countries' firms that are involved in the execution of the task. DfID entered into contract with Adam Smith International worth USD 1.4 million for consultancy fees in support of the public relations unit of PSRC between 1999 and 2003. At the same time, the value of DfID contracts to the same company between 1998 and 2003 had reached USD 62.4 million.

Privatization of public firms has over the year been a condition for debt relief under the Heavily Indebted Countries facility administered by the World Bank and the IMF. According to the Economic Survey report of 2003 (Tanzania, United Republic of 2003), up to 2003, Tanzania had received debt relief under HIPC from multilateral institutions amounting to USD 26.6 million; from Paris Club members (except Brazil and Japan) a sum amounting to USD 749.7 million; and from non-Paris Club members a sum amounting to USD 52.8 million. The main beneficiaries of privatization contracts are foreign companies, leading in the list of privatization contracts world wide being PriceWaterHouse Coopers (193) and KPMG (153). Others were, Diloitte Touche Tohmatsu, Ernst & Young and Arthur Andersen. Huge sums of funds are dished to consultants with the blessing of the World Bank and the IMF. For example, Price WaterHouse Coopers scooped total net revenue of USD 11.7 billion for the fiscal year 2003 worldwide, a figure that was greater than the GDP of any country in Sub-Saharan Africa, except Nigeria and South Africa (The East African 18-24.10.2004).

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 Serengeti Conservation Project; and, it is in the process of working out modalities for construction/improvement of the road from Makayuni 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; and, the National Council of Technical Education (NACTE) started the registration process of technical training institutes geared towards provision of courses that are related to tourism by 2002. There were also some higher learning institutions which were planning, together with MNRT, to introduce courses in tourism in their commercial curriculum. By 2003, the government was in the process of construction of a National Tourism College (dubbed "an ideal hospitality and tourism college"), with a grant worth Tshs 6.6 billion (Euros 4.7 million) from the government of France through its development agency—ADF (Sunday News 26.12.2004; Tanzania, United Republic of 2002: 23).

§§§

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 tourist companies and hotels/lodges pay taxes and fees of various types per annum. The government also gets revenues from tourism through visa charges, a number of taxes and levies, charges of one form or another (e.g. hunting, trophy, etc), 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."
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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 million to various community projects. But as pointed out above, these amounts are paid by the tourists through the companies. As Appendix 3 shows, 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 an annual fee of USD 7.500 per annum per hunting block. These companies have been willing to pay the contributions 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 that 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 housekeeping 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 providers possess 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 fielwork operations—tour guide drives, motor vehicle mechanics, campsite attendants, mountain guides, trackers and porters, who are in most cases not as highly educated as those in the offices. Although
these are lowly paid too. they get some extra income from the clients in the form of tips and make some savings from the imprest funds given to them when on safari. It is reported that while their wages stand at around USD 50 per month, they are usually able to make up to USD 300 per trip (depending on the number of days). That’s they are able to receive higher income that the 'senior' staff, who are mostly women—those who are in sales, marketing and hostess duties.

Management in the hotels/lodges is basically in the hands of men. The exceptions are very few. In this cadre, it is usually foreigners (i.e. non-Tanzanians from Europe, Africa and else where) who dominate. Even some of hotels/lodges that are locally owned sometimes employ foreigners in such positions since it is chic to do so given that the targeted market is foreign tourists. Expatriates, it is claimed have better skills as far as this industry is concerned, even though this in most cases is not necessarily the case, as the 4 demonstrates. These positions include such as those of managers, heads of departments and supervisors. Even when Tanzanians occupy those positions, it is mostly those from other areas of the country and not those from the localities. None of the foreigners are employed as service staff. The highest concentration of employees from within the county or tourist localities is in the lowest cadres of employment structures. That is in those menial, unskilled jobs—waiters, room cleaners and kitchen keepers. These jobs do not require skills/training. And these are also the lowliest paid jobs.

In the hotels/lodges, the front offices—i.e. reception of customers, room sales and bookings, hotel communication, public relations (where they exist—in big hotels), almost 65 percent of the employees are women and the remaining are men and the sections are dominantly headed by men. These are workers with secondary and sometimes post-secondary education. The numerical dominance of women in the front offices is due to the belief among employers that customers prefer to be received by women than men; that their attractiveness, tolerance, politeness and charm is part of what entertains customers, especially male ones. These women are expected to dress in an 'attractive' manner, to look beautiful (i.e. slim, young and pretty) and even to 'play along' with sexual harassment by customers. In sum, they are supposed to be friendly smiling women, fitting certain standards of attractiveness; waiting to submissively serve the customer's every wish.

Souvenir vending and handicrafts sells are not informal activities, as it is often claimed by economists and those who espouse the virtues of the 'informal sector' or 'self-employment', since, just like the big shops, they involve the renting of the area for conducting business, obtaining a license, a substantial amount of investment for purchasing their merchandise from the artisans, craftsmen and other producers of products that may attract tourists and employment of one or two workers as sales people—mostly women and children. Most of the owners of these small enterprises are male, while a substantial number of employees mainly consist of female because there is a belief that they are fairer in their negotiations than men. Big hotels/lodges have their own curio shops which sell souvenirs. Villages such as Mto wa Mbu have kiosks for sale of souvenirs, curios, camping supplies, and operate guesthouses and restaurants. The latter are mainly for tour guides and drivers. Workers who are employed in the lodges live in such villages.

In areas like Mto wa Mbu, generally the Maasai youths are not employed even in the few non-skilled jobs provided by the few small enterprises including guest houses.
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/hotels to dance 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 spears, belts and other traditional things. In recent years the Tanzania Tourism Board (TTB) has been promoting and coordinating cultural tourism programs called tourism modules (as an addition to a safari tour) in the villages near major tourism areas as a form of promotion of local 'peoples participation' for their own benefit in 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 traditional food and dances, identification of potential areas for tourism and 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 handicraft, 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 40 years, with the majority being between 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 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 meetings. Sex workers are often very well informed about the various meeting and events taking place in the various towns. Most delegates are usually people in high positions in various organizations, including the government and local and international organizations and institutions (governmental and non-governmental).

Sex workers frequenting these tourist hotels are more or less indirectly employed by these hotels in that they provide a commodity demanded by a certain type of their clientele. Most of the hotels and lodges would rather have them around than lose their customers. In Mto wa Mbu, the main clientele of the sex workers are mainly the tour guides, tour drivers and other people who transit in this small town, such as those on government and other official missions from their organizations, including donor sponsored projects and NGOs. In Bagamoyo, it is mostly women from Dar es Salaam who during season time, conferences or holidays patronize these hotels. Often than not, the affluent—business people, project workers in donor sponsored projects, local and foreign NGO executives, etc—from Dar es Salaam are the main clients, accompanied by their girlfriends, concubines (nyumba-ndogo) or even sex workers. Dar es Salaam is the main city with booming sex-industry (hetero and homo or even child) for tourists, seamen, expatriates, conference and meetings delegates and other local people.

"Flycatchers" (unlicensed tour operators) who prowl around hotels, bus terminals and airports in search of tourists who need cheap services, have emerged over the years as a category of the so-called self employed operators, although, most often, they are used by licensed tour companies which are weak in international connections. For many tour operators and travel agents in Arusha and Moshi, "fly-catchers" are considered to be a necessary evil since business has become very tough because of stiff competition. These "fly-catchers" work for both small time and a few big companies (some honest, others not) informally and get a commission. Together with the flycatchers, emerging is another group, though not so conspicuous, of dealers in tourism: these are holiday-home owners, mostly expatriates or well positioned people in various levels of authority, who offer their villas and bungalows for the budget tourists.

**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.

In fact, there is ample evidence to demonstrate that the East Africa of the 19th Century was "not the wildlife paradise which is today approximately one-fourth of its land area set aside as national parks and game sanctuaries in Tanzania alone." In Serengeti, agriculturalists had been subduing the wildlife by the time of colonization, and wildlife was

http://www.safarilands.org
only abundant in the 'jungles' and 'badlands' that were not contested for human settlement and existed in the margins of the community lands (Kjekshus 1977: 70). These were the 'sanctuaries' that existed by then, and the number of wild animals was "kept down to levels co-existent with human expansion and economic exploitation". Besides Serengeti, Ngorongoro Crater and Lake Manyara were also thriving with human communities, with many settlements and game harboring in the neighboring forests in the former and with no traces of animals at all in the latter.

It was due to Rinderpest, which devastated the Wamaasai and their cattle that these people moved temporarily from the Crater. On their return, they found their rich pastures and almost the whole Crater floor had been taken over by a German settler who wanted to start an ostrich and cattle ranch. The Wamaasai were prevented from returning to their land. The area was sold as an enemy property after World War I to an American Millionaire, who kept is as a hunting lodge for his friends; and gradually turned to a game reserve in 1928. The evacuation of the people in the Serengeti plains was undertaken in the beginning of the 20th Century. After their removal, they were settled into reserves and hence, from an "old grazing area of more than 40,000 square kilometers the tribe was restricted to a mere 6,000." (ibid) This was also the case with Selous Game Reserve, where the well settled 40,000 Wangindo had to be driven out of their rich cultivation land in 1937; Lake Rukwa; and many other areas, where communities had to be forced out to for the sake of animals (ibid 71-75). The creation of Gombe Stream National Park, with its 52 km² at the shores of Lake Tanganyika, involved the removal of a whole community and resettling it by force elsewhere in order to protect a family of some 50 chimpanzees. The same process was involved later in the creation of another sanctuary, the current Mahale Mountain National Park with an area of 1,000 km² in the shore of Lake Tanganyika. In the case of the creation of Rukwa Game Reserve, people were incorporated in it only to be removed later.

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 decade being the 1969 one between the Wamaasai and the government. In fact, Arusha region has experienced intensified periodic conflicts over land and natural resources starting from mid 1970s, with the 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.

Since 80 percent of the people in Arusha Region, for example, depend on agriculture and livestock, competition for land resources between crop cultivation, livestock and wildlife has been the main feature of the region. Over the years, the government has alienated land of the pastoralists and agriculturalists for conservation purposes. In some instances, it has even arbitrarily expanded the borders of the national parks and game reserves, whenever human activities have been considered to be detrimental to the survival of the fauna and flora. This is what happened in Serengeti, for example, in the 1970s. Liberalization policies of the 1980s resulted into the increase in the
number of large, medium and small scale "investors" (local and foreign) in land and other natural resources, who acquired large tracts of lands mainly through government allocation, as exampled by the massive alienation of land in Arusha Region, Coast Region and many other regions. The government acknowledged that there was growing land and resources tenure conflicts, which were caused by "haphazard" allocation and extensive exclusion of rangelands for large scale agriculture. The main victims in this process were pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, hunter-gathering communities and those communities in or bordering tourism attractions and developments (Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development (MLHUD) paragraph 7.3.0).

That is not all: another feature of the 1980s was increased harassment of communities in and around the wildlife sanctuaries and other reserves, as typically demonstrated by the events which took place in 1989. In this year, the government launched what it called Operesheni Uhai (Operation Life), aimed at dealing with the problem of poaching and "illegal" utilization of wildlife resources. It deployed the military force throughout the country to "disarm and punish" villagers who were alleged to be involved in such activities. The government spent Tshs 700 million for this expedition, which at the end of it resulted into harassment, beating, humiliating, illegally detaining and finally cowing down the rural dwellers. It was one of the most violent actions of the state after the villageization programme of 1974/75, which also employed brutal force to collectivize rural dwellers.

By late 1980s, the Wahazabe who inhabit the area near Lake Eyasi in Arusha, Shinyanga and Singida regions and are primarily hunting and gathering community, whose livelihood depends on wildlife and other forest products, were under pressure because of the expansion of game hunting tourism. Majira (18.06.1995) reported that this community was on the verge of extinction, because of denial of rights to own and use land in the area they occupy. The government had displaced them, divided their area into three blocks and granted hunting licenses to Tanzania Game trackers of Mr. Robin Hurt, a Kenyan British. Soon after that, 20 people were tortured, beaten persecuted and harassed by the company owners for trespassing or hunting in the area. There were others who were jailed under the pressure of the company owners, and allegedly two died in jail, (ibid) Other communities that were affected by the move were: the Wandorobo, Wabahi, Waisanzu and Wakimbu. By 1990s, there were stories such as that of Ndiama Mkoko who was castrated by hunters (Daily News 24.02.1997). Mkoko, it was reported was one of the many victims of harassment in the hunting blocks. In 1992 "...a [Maasai] community leader was run over by a hunter's truck as he sat under a tree and lost his leg. Two Maasai elders were shot dead" (ibid).

The villagers have no right whatsoever to kill animals, even if they have destroyed life, their crops and property, and often than not, they do not get any compensation when this happens after reporting to the authorities. It is only the game personnel who can kill animals which are reported to be dangerous to the people. Beyond the protected area, wildlife is also found in forest reserves, on village land and in general land, which serve as corridors, migratory routes and dispersal areas for the wildlife. These areas are also managed by the Wildlife Department. Numerous studies have evidenced that wild animals constitute a menace to the rural people in these areas as they raid animals and kill their livestock. Therefore, people in these areas, especially women and children, spend most of their time in crop protection against animal raids. These crop raids have invariably caused
food shortages and even hunger among some households in and around conservation areas (Severe 2003: 9).

In one case, for example, Legumka and Kilinga villagers who border the Arusha National Park were prevented from using a short-cut foot path between the two villages which cross the Arusha National Park, since its being declared a national park. The villagers asked the authorities in 1995 to allow them to use the path, but their application was rejected on the pretext that it is not suitable to allow people to cross the park on foot, since it is contrary to the law. and that it might hamper its conservation efforts (Arusha Times 01-15.10.1995). TANAPA had instituted a set of penalties against villagers in order to protect animals, although it did not have a provision for compensating villagers when their crops are destroyed by wild animals. A member of parliament opined: "when a cow enters into the park we have to pay a fine of 1,000/=; a dog 3,000/=, a goat 500/=, a human being 1,000/=; and if one is found with apanga he has to pay an extra 500/=" (ibid). The villagers had used the path for decades without destroying the animals before they were prevented from using it. the villagers told TANAPA, but their being prevented from using it had not saved the rhinos and other species.

The government attempted to grant 381,000 acres of land in Monduli and Kiteto Districts (Arusha) to a foreign investor, Mr Hermanus Phillip 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 Wamaasai 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 Wamaasai 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 Wamaasai 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 Laws No 14 of 1975 which set the area for conservation and pastoralism purposes. The NCAA 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
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Sheikh, Brigadier Mohammed Adulrahim Al-Ally of United Arab Emirates for hunting purposes through Ortello (a Kenyan based hunting company, with secret powerful interests locally). In this case, 25 Wamasai villages were affected.

Mkomazi Game Reserve in Kilimanjaro region borders over 30 villages in the western side. The Reserve was established in 1951, when most of the villagers were already living there. The Wamaasai were permitted to continue using the land for pasturing. The government embarked on a project to reclaim and protect wildlife and re-introduce the depleted species, mainly the rhinoceros and the African wild dogs in the game reserve in 1988, and within the process, rescinded the 1951 agreement, with the commencement of the project. The government evicted the Wamaasai and other people bordering the reserve, and invited the London based George Adamson Wildlife Preservation Trust (GAWPT) and the Tony Fitzjohn/George Adamson African Wildlife Preservation Trust (TF/GAWPT) to run the project. At the same time, the Royal Frontiers Tanzania Ltd was allocated two hunting blocks in Mkomazi. Among the company's directors were the brother of the then Minister of Natural Resources, Tourism and Environment and the Director of Wildlife's son. There were convoys of hunters by the second half of 1990s hunting lions, leopards, onyx and several other endangered species.

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 grabbers had acquired land in the area through some dubious means and resulted into 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 Waanchari) 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.

In Bagamoyo, the expansion of the boundaries of Saadani Game Reserve and its elevation to the status of a national park in 2003 has had implications as far as the people living in and around the protected area are concerned. When it was gazetted as a game reserve in 1964, it had an area of 250 km² (from Wami River in the south to Mlingaji River in the north, with the Arusha-Moshi railway line as the western boundary. It was expanded from 250 km² in 1964 to 470 km² in 1997 and finally 1,000 km² when it was upgraded to a national park under TANAPA in 2003. By this time, the boundaries were expanded to include the land north of Mlingaji River up to Mkwaja and south of the Wami River up to Zaraninge forest reserve. The total protected area now covers over

11 Both Trusts are run by people with political influence and connections in the media and film industries. In Britain, the trustees include senior ecologists, a Member of Parliament, journalists and distinguished conservationists. In America they have strong links to entertainment industry and the cream of California Society. Their supporters include the wealthy and well-connected individuals in Europe and the USA. Annual celebrations in London are reported in Hello! magazine; fundraising galas in California are held at Rodeo Drive. The work is supported by film stars such as Clint Eastwood and Sylvester Stallone, while corporate benefactors include Tiffany's, Carder and British petroleum.
1,000 km², and it extends to Pangani District in Tanga Region, where there are already in existent three lodges, namely, Argovia Tented Lodge, Emanyani Beach Lodge and the Tides Lodge.

Saadani Game Reserve was declared by the Wildlife Conservation (Game Reserves) Order of 1974. With the demarcation of the boundaries thereafter, there was loss of cultivation land, since there was prohibition of cultivation on any area of the reserve. Many coastal settlements had declined or disappeared, including those that were involved in fishing of prawns, lobsters and other types of species by late 1990s. Villagers are not permitted to enter the national park and wild animals constantly threaten people and the little that they are able to cultivate. At the same time, the foreign vessels licensed to fish prawns and other fish species in the coast have made fishing for local communities at a sustainable level really difficult for them.

Saadani National Park aside. land disputes related to tourism development have over the years become very common in Bagamoyo district generally. There has been allocation of beach plots by the government for hotel construction, since the entire coastal area has been declared to be an area for tourist hotel development. With the development of the more than 10 tourist hotels in Bagamoyo town, local peoples land has been bought off or simply reallocated. The result of this has been the limiting of local peoples' accessibility to the seafront and activities related to it. Along the coast itself, there are instances whereby even mangrove areas have been allocated to investors for hotel construction (See Appendix 5). Speculation in land is rife: farmers are selling land cheaply so that they can at least earn something for fear that with the developments that are being promoted they could lose their land through privatization (meaning allocating it to large investors). Rich Tanzanians buy the land, title it and eventually resell or enter into joint ventures with foreigners.

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, the since 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 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 holders, 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 a 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, endo-development, etc.

These adjectives that were tucked 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.

Within the context of tourism, while talking about tourism being a fortune to developing countries, the major concern was the damaging potentialities that the industry has on the areas' social, cultural, and economic environment. The issue became that of how to introduce effective management of tourism and wildlife. Thus in this particular area, what were developed were conceptions about how to make the local communities and other "stakeholders" participate in the planning process and the management and protection of the attractions. The UK was among the first countries to acknowledge the potentials of tourism in alleviating poverty. It developed a "Pro-Poor Tourism" strategy as an integral part of its foreign aid policy.

Under Tourism Challenge Fund for Development, UK began to make available up to STG 100.000 in matching grants for projects to develop business and employment opportunities for the poor in developing countries and strengthening positive and cultural impacts of tourism. This was in recognition of the fact that without peace in the destination country, there can be no tourism. It was claimed that peoples understanding of the inherent societal values of the environment and the need for sustainable development were key to achieving the goals of tourism. The President of the Wildlife Conservation Foundation of Tanzania is former French President Giscard d'Estaing, and the Patron is President Benjamin Mkapa. These have been involved in a drive to raise money for conservation of wildlife, as example by the gala that they were involved which raised Tshs 70 million (about USD 7,000) in November 2004 (Daily News 25.11.2004).

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 and "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 programmes. 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 pans 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.

Community Conservation Services is an approach that was developed by TANAPA as a means to develop good neighborliness with people living adjacent to the national parks, TANAPA spent Tshs 2,060,294,000 (USD 2 million) between 1999 and 2003 for this programme. This money has been used to support villages in activities such as construction of schools, dispensaries, water, construction of feeder roads, etc. TANAPA has also assisted villagers to establish curio shops to serve tourists, as a means to create employment and provide alternative sources of income for the local people. In 2004, TANAPA donated Tshs 2.2 million (about USD 2.1) to villages surrounding the Saadani National Park for flour and educational materials to ensure that villagers continued to benefit from tourism and conservation, as the parks Conservator, Domenicien Njau put it. He presented 4.25 tonnes of maize flour to two villages, Mkaramo and Mbulizagwa to the Pangani District Commissioner. These two villages had been facing food shortages (*Business Times* 01.10.2004). At the same time, all the revenue collected by TANAPA, KINAPA and NCAA is used for running the national parks and pay the personnel, since these are parastatals.

The government also ploughs back 25 percent contribution from tourist hunting fees to the villages where hunting takes place, through their respective district councils. Between 1998/99 and 2002/03, it is reported, 42 district councils earned a total of Tshs 1,608,964,548.91 (about USD 1.6 million). Additionally, hunting companies are also supposed to contribute to the "alleviation of poverty" by contributing to the development efforts in the areas where they conduct hunting. Hunting companies are supposed to have contributed Tshs 6,608,023,266 (about USD 6.6 million between 2000 and 2002 for village projects as those mentioned above. Villagers are also given an animal quota by the Director of Wildlife Division, to sell to resident local hunters (Severre op cit: 14). More than 60 percent of the contributions to villagers, according to a survey, it is claimed by Severre (ibid), the Director of Wildlife Division, as part of their participation in tourism has been used to improve education and health services. But in reality, the real beneficiaries of the revenue generated from tourism and hunting are the various business enterprises involved in tourism, who take all the profits and the parastatals managing the national parks and the Wildlife Division, which collect and spend fees and taxes for managing the attractions.

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 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 Windros e 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.

Resistance continued in many of these areas, because people were increasingly becoming more aware of their rights. They were even aware of the fact that some of these companies had tax exemptions. During this time, some of these companies were enjoying duty and sales tax exemptions—discretionary, statutory or under the Investment Act. Some of those which were enjoying such privileges in 1995, for example were: Robin Hurt Safaris (T) Ltd., Oliva Camp Ltd., Kudu Safaris Ltd, Wingert Windrose Safaris, etc. No local company had exemptions. The village elite may be enjoying some of these benefits through corruption in these villages. The same may be the case with some of the officials in the district councils. But as far as the ordinary people are concerned, their lives are getting worse, because of these activities.

In 1992/93 and 1996/97, famine in Arusha forced most of the Wamasai people to move out of their areas, since they could not graze in the allocated blocks. These hunting companies did not come out with famine relief assistance as was the case with some of the international donor organization, which took up the issue on humanitarian grounds. Even in 2004, When Northern Highlands region of Tanzania had some 180,000 people in need of food aid, while thousands more required seeds for the upcoming planting season to help avert further food shortages, as per an assessment by the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), it was the UN part of the office, Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN), which was appealing for international aid for an area that had tourism and hunting companies flourishing. The FEWS NET food security report called for approximately 19,000 metric tonnes of maize-food aid and 1,400 metric tonnes of emergency seeds (IRIN News, Nairobi, 22 Oct 2004).

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. Ultimately, those who benefit from these remain to be the hunting companies and some few powerful individuals within the villages (Mbilinyi 2002).
Villages in various areas around the game reserves and controlled areas consider the government actions contradictor). Some villages in Arusha, as exampled by many in Simanjiro District have complained to the government that outfitters shoot and kill wildly under-graded animals or those that the\(') were not given in the quota and then bury them and then use the same permit to kills graded ones. Villagers allege these companies violate the regulations with the full knowledge of government officials, because they have been able to manipulate and corrupt them. While all this is happening, residents bordering the game reserves and controlled areas are being barred from undertaking agricultural activities, fishing or taking their livestock to drink water. Villagers even complain about the extent of the availability of employment that these companies create, since their activities are seasonal. Moreover, the local people are the lowest paid category of all the workers in the industry. The professional hunter and most other workers in the administrative sections are mostly foreigners. African workers are mainly employed as cooks, tent keepers, skinners, gun bearers, drivers and watchmen.

The Semiotics of Tourism

It has already been pointed out that the neo-liberal pundits of tourism tend to view the tourism industry in terms of its positive and negative impacts, and how the later can be overcome so as to maximize on the benefits. The fact that these two sides of the impacts are dialectically interlinked, and not simple dualities, is ignored or at best wished off: it is assumed that all that one requires is to simply remove the negatives to attain the best of all possible worlds. Part of the reason for this anomaly lies in the fact that these studies are devoid of the trends in aesthetical production—trends that would allow one to grasp the surface and depth on which the social and economic relations are embedded—in societies promoting tourism (origin and destination).

A study of such trends would mean one has to premise the analysis of tourism and its related activities on the fully understanding of creation of cultural empires and power relations on a global basis, within which multinational tourism corporations (such as Thomas Cook, Abercrombie, Fitch. First Choice, My Travel and TUT) and the corresponding global extension of economic, military and male domination are its real expression. It would mean a critique of the very system under which tourism operates, and pose questions such as: Why are tourist attractions in terms of animals and wildlife, women, the primitive hunter-gathers, pastoralists, fishing communities, peasants, memorials and tombs? Or for that matter, what is so attractive to tourists as far as the mustard guns, military tanks and machine guns, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Dresden, Dachau, Robben Island, the slave markets of Zanzibar and Bagamoyo, Goree Island, etc. are concerned?

It is with semiotic understanding of the signs and significations of the various aspects in the industry that one is able to grasp the underlying essence of the "sights and sounds" of the industry and the dialectical existence of its impacts. Semiotics is a general science which studies various signs of cultural conventions that enable human actions to signify meaning and hence become signs. In this regard, central to in the production of signs is language. Language itself is an expression of social relationships, since it categorizes the environment and society. Thus, within this context, thinking is a process of (re)production of society and the wider environment. This science is very important as far as the study of tourism is concerned. This is because, an understanding of aesthetic and cultural production
in general is central, because tourism it is an avenue through which "world-views" are shaped and concretized by multi-media experiences (travel reviews, travel programmes, travel brochures, travel documentaries, advertisements, etc.). These sell what the tourists as consumers want, and they also shape the way the provider of the products should present the attractions.

The first thing to note as far as tourism is concerned is the fact that the industry has always functioned within particular forms of class, race, ethnic and gender relations of production and exchange that entail particular forms of ownership and control of land, natural resources, labour and various attractions and products. Tourism industry is premised on certain ideas and their enforcement, about pleasure, travel, escape, gender and sexuality, experience, nature and people in the societies of departure and destination. Tourists are sightseers, hunters, adventurers, mainly middle class who trot the glob in search of experience.

The consultants who prepared the Ten-Year Tourism Master Plan of 1971 come to the conclusion that ruins or the Olduvai Gorge were not fancy for the camera strapping tourists, since the aesthetical tastes had been radically changed with the forms of consumerism that were becoming dominant in those years among the middle and upper classes in Europe and America. They were of the opinion that Tanzania could become a major tourist destination and tourism could become a major industry, if it strived to develop the infrastructure that was geared to promotion of nature based tourism. One of the consultants of Arthur D, Little Inc, an industrial research firm since 1886 of Cambridge Massachusetts, Mr. Gordon M. Fair, pointed out that surveys in USA, Europe and Japan had shown that the most sought products by tourists were: the "intangible things"—"the mystery of Africa, the exotic and unknown"; the animals; and, the people, hi the latter case it was mainly the "most primitive in their most primitive state" (Shivji 1973: 92). The latter aspect was of course objectionable to most African countries, the consultant admitted.

That was in the 1960s and 1970s, when nationalist sentiments and anti-imperialist ideals were still reigning high. By the 1980s, these had been considerably eroded: the forms of presentation of tourism attractions that were formerly eschewed were increasingly being exalted. Increasingly, Munt (1994: 56) noted that: "hi many of the brochures representative of the new tour operators, wildlife and natives are synonymous. Passive, they are to be discovered, sighted, viewed and ultimately 'shot'". Accordingly, "Wide-scale repression of human rights, deeply rooted racism and intense class political struggles are null and void in the brave world of adventure travel" (ibid: 57).

It is not just the multi-media: even prominent politicians in Africa refer to animals as "our cultural heritage" This what was observed by the travel writer from the Caribbean Islands who visited Tanzania and some other African countries in 1977. According to him, by then:

The obsessive concern with wildlife leads insidiously to the denigration of the human population. In the eyes of the beholder, the more backward the tribes become more adjuncts to the animals.... Indeed they are often treated, if they are sufficiently exotic and sufficiently primitive, as their equivalents. Side by side with all the lavishly produced books describing the animal population, are the no less lavishly produced books describing the human fauna of the region (Naipul 1978: 170-71).
The above merely points to the fact that tourism ethos, as developed historically, relate to a long tradition of social relations, to environmental and ecological ideas of the 19th and early twentieth centuries: those colonial notions about settlement patterns and the need for conservation. Tourism is part of a global complex network of economic, social, racial, legal and cultural relationships.

Exactly, how are the Tanzanian attractions presented and advertised? To start with the abode for the tourists, since this is the first marker of the sign of belonging—the kind of comforts and luxuries they should expect. The Maivaro Plantation Lodge, 10 km east of Arusha town, in coffee plantation advertises itself in the following manner: "Public areas are comfortable, being centered around a large colonial style verandah, with rooms being self contained bungalows set amongst plantations. The Dutch owners Gijs and Manila and their wonderful, friendly staff are there to take care of you." (Emphasis added and so are the other italics in the rest of the quotations, unless indicated otherwise) The Ngara Sero Mountain Lodge, at the slopes of Mount Meru on the edge of Arusha National Park, in a similar manner describes its lodge as a "fine German farmhouse, set in some of the most spectacular landscaped gardens in East Africa." These are lodges that are in the outskirts of the town.

There are others in the bush, such as the Grumeti River Camp or the Kirawira Camp, western Serengeti. The latter is described in the following terms: "This luxury tented camp is a stylish evocation of the Victorian colonial period. Guests have all the comforts that colonial travelers would have taken on safari, supplemented by more modern luxuries...." Here, it is the colonial setting which is the attraction to the tourists. These memories are cherished by those who sell and buy this product with relish in this brave world. Those inside the town have other ways of presenting themselves. The Arusha Crown Hotel at the centre of the town "is a newly constructed modern hotel fitted with the latest amenities of international standards... designed to meet the requirements of traveling executives and leisure tourists". The Royal Palm in the centre of Dar es Salaam "Brings you some of the independent national and international hotels, resorts and accommodation in Europe, Middle East, USA, Canada and the Caribbean." Furthermore: "From five Stars to the big five".

The brochures and other media outlets reproduce racial and gender imageries of the master-servant colonial type relations that reduce local people to a cartoon caricature of people who are wretched, poor and destitute, and the tourists being there to spend their money to help them earn a living for the betterment of their lives. These forms of representation of social cultural trends, much as they dehumanize and humiliate human beings in the name of promoting tourism, they are also an expression of real relations of domination, exploitation and oppression. Neo-liberal promoters of tourism do not even bother to address these forms of presentation of people and nature, since they consider this to be part of the attributes as far as tourism promotion for increased economic gains is concerned.

Women and men feature with different roles being assigned to them in the advertisements. The covers and other advertisements in many of the brochures produced by the Tanzania Tourist Board are splashed with photographs of Maasai, Tatoga, Barbaig and other girls sometimes with their children; coastal girls leaning on a coconut tree with a smile full of warmth and seduction; women tourists swimming, walking along the beach with their lovers or sitting watching the sunset. In the case of Zanzibar, as demonstrated by
the brochures produced by the Zanzibar Commission for Tourism, and the coast (mostly
done by the tourist board and the touring companies), women in veils or khangas figure
most, seemingly inviting the tourist to explore what is behind the veil or the kanga.

Images of Tanzanian and African women in the brochures and websites depict
beauty', warmth, affection, and hospitality of the country awaiting potential
customers. These advertisements aim to lure the male customers. They aim at producing
the effect of the fantasized "Emmanuel a" of the movies of the 1970s—"Yellow
Emmanuela" and its sequels. Most advertisements simply depict women as sex objects:
they exploit women's sexuality and their physical appearance. The covers of Tanzania:
the Bradt Travel Guide and Zanzibar: the Brad! Travel Guide are colored by covers
depicting women. The former has a picture of a Maasai woman and three young girls at
seashore; and the latter has a coastal girl garbed in khangas from the head, peeping from
a traditional Zanzibar door.

Only in Africa can you find the spectacle of wildlife in its rawest exuberance,
amid an incredible diversity of landscapes. Here in Tanzania are some of the
greatest game lands on earth....We journey through areas that have witnessed
the adventurous footsteps of great 19th century explorers like Livingstone,
Stanley, Burton and Speke, as well as the infamous passage of slave caravans
from the dark interior to the coast. Over 120 tribes, including hunters and
warriors like the Masai and Sonjos, live within Tanzania's borders, and we
travel through many of these tribal lands to some of the remotest parts of
Tanzania. We explore the vast plains and wild bush country, the great game
parks, and the native villages (Explorer September 1994).

A Tent with a View Safaris, a tour company operating A Tent with a View Safari
in Sadaani (Bagamoyo) and Selous Game reserve, which claims to support cultural
tourism programme for the benefit of the poor has the following description of the
Bagamoyo beach resorts in its advertisement: "The beach that stretches to either side of
Bagamoyo is every one's idea of a tropical paradise. In its days thousands of slaves were
shipped on a regular basis. Resort hotels are fully equipped for water skiing, big game
fishing and scuba diving. One can observe activities of local fishermen." Even the
Tanzania Tourist Board, a government body for promotion of tourism, not to be left
behind in this new way of selling tourist products, advertised in the same manner, at
times in cruder terms. In one of the 1995 brochures the Board, beyond mentioning the
various attractions, proclaimed that these:

  evoke images of the early European adventurers through virgin African--
  David Livingstone, Henry Stanley, and Johannes Rebman and before them
  the Chinese, Arabs and Persian traders. With a rich cultural heritage of more
  than 120 tribes and an abundance of wildlife living in natural habitats,
  Tanzania today is reputed as the last frontier of the enchanting Africa of the
  last century (Karibu Tanzania 1995).

Wengert-Windrose-Safari Ltd, through Dr Lechner. Jagd International World-Wide
Hunting (of Germany) described Tanzania in a brochure in 1995 as the "Best Bongo area
in Africa. There is no comparable hunting ground in Africa with a similar diversity or
number of species or where such staggering game populations still exist in a wilder,
more primitive, and still to a large extent, unspoil. It is the greatest hunting paradise left
on earth."
In an advertisement on cultural tourism in Arusha it is stated that a tourist can cycle to a Maasai Boma (kraal) to watch them, the most convenient time being early in the evening when cattle and goats are returning home from grazing, as a learning path because one can watch on the way a variety of plants and birds and learn their importance in the wilds of Africa lifecycles. Cultural presentations by the Maasai can also be provided at the lodge for the guests to enjoy and even participate in if they choose. The tourists are invited to learn the meaning of beads as bodily adornment, embroidery and currency; the carving motifs, the traditional music and musical instruments, the fertility dolls and their meaning during puberty; figurines used for visual teaching during rites of passage and their meanings, masks and stools and their essence, etc. In others, advertisement is done through showing how the tourists are assisting the poor, wretched Tanzanians. That is, the philanthropic gesture on the part of those who are satiated to those who do not have clean water or a milling machine in the village. The media in general, beyond the advertisements are notorious for this type of presentation, with their tantalizing and captivating sub-titles: "Tourism Contributing to Poverty alleviation."

The new middle class tourists sound like latter-day missionaries or explorers. No wonder that even the spirits of Livingstone and other explorers and those of the colonial agents have to be invoked to ""assist in hedonistic discoveries" and attract these tourists. "It is the colonial emphasis on discovery and expropriation that has been rediscovered within nee-colonial tourism" (Munt op cit: 53). There has been a re-emergence of luxury safaris of the colonial travel and holidaying type such as "Classic Tanzania", which are described by World Wide Journeys & Expeditions,, "An escorted private safari in the old-style tradition"; "In the great tradition of 'old-style' camping safaris....the unforgettable experience of life in the bush under canvas, in this case a series of luxurious appointed mobile tented camps in some of the most spectacular locations...." It is the mythological attributes of the classic aristocratic adventurous model, which are being upheld: the big game hunting, fishing and photographing and various types of adventures. It is women, animals, subservience nature of people, their poverty, wilderness in its primitiveness which is the language of selling tourism. Alongside those pictures of women, are also animals and other natural attractions. These advertisements provide racialised sexual fantasies, particularly for those men who are fascinated by so-called black sexuality (supposed to be 'untamed' and 'primitive') (Davidson 1996: 42) This, of course, is reflection of the very nature of advertisement in Europe and the USA. Munt (op cit: 8) quoted a presentation in a Sunday newspaper in Britain, which presented the beauty of Spain as a destination: "The Mayan, Spanish speaking .bird-like women, all married at 14, all giggly and happy with hordes of children—to the Garifuna—'matt black' with sharp and strong Indian features, and a reserved ungiggly manner...."

Men (European) mostly figure in these advertisements as filming roaring lions and other dangerous predators from a roof of a Land Rover or some other four wheel drive vehicle; tourist hunters with a team of African assistants posing for a photograph with a carcass; white tourists climbing a mountain, fishing, ballooning, sea diving; and, a Maasai warrior, elegantly standing on one foot and a spear in his hand, etc. Beyond class ideologies, sexist, patriarchal and ideologies dominate in the promotion of tourism, whereby particular images of women and men, Africans and non-Africans, the rich and the poor and the modem and the primitive are perpetuated. The internet has numerous articles,
notes and diaries of tourists narrating their experiences and impressions. In most cases, they reinforce the very images that have been created by those who sell the products.

**Conclusions**

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 centred 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.

In Tanzania, the famous Meru land case (1951-53) and the fear of land alienation were the force behind the mobilization of Africans against colonial rule and the formation of the nationalist movement, Tanganyika African National Union (TANU). This Case attracted international attention and contributed significantly to the emergence of the nationalist movement. In 1948, the Colonial Office had approved proposals for land alienation in Meru (Northern Province) at Engare Nanyuki and Liguruki, in order to create a block of European ranching between Meru and Kilimanjaro. The Meru (Freemen) Citizens' Union had resisted this attempt up to 1951 when government forces came into the area and drove their cattle away, removed or burnt their household goods and movable property and razed to the ground their houses, cattle pens and storage sheds. The Meru people opposed the evictions passively by refusing to move out and to accept compensation. 25 people were arrested in this incident, and two died. Hostility between Africans and Europeans escalated. After collecting funds, the Meru people sent representatives to the U.N. Trusteeship Council to petition against this incident in 1952. A protest was also sent to the colonial Office. Kirilo Japhet and Earle Seaton went to New York as representatives. The former was a leader of the Meru Citizens Union and secretary of TAA branch in Meru, and the latter was a West Indian lawyer. Kirilo Japhet was the first Tanganyikan to address the Trusteeship Council.

The 1954 UN Mission pointed out that land and its use and tenure comprised among Africans "the outstanding political and economic issue of the day...." (Londsdale 1972: 20) The rural protests began to have an impact at governmental level from this period. The Mission acknowledged that the Meru Case was very important throughout the country, as a result of the doubts which their cause had "raised as to the whole meaning and intention of non-African, especially European, settlement in the territory". Due to the case, political fears and suspicion had been created throughout the country where political leaders had a following (ibid). Where ever the leaders of Tanganyika African Association (the predecessor of TANU) went in Dodoma, Arusha and Mwanza "Land, and the ownership of land, stuck a sympathetic chord in African peasants" (Listowel 1965: 214). Politically, the reflection of these conflicts found their expression in J.K. Nyerere's critique of those Europeans and Africans who stood for "multi-racialism" in 1956. Their views were denounced for wanting to substitute the color bar with the money bar—

12 In November and December 1951, 1,000 men, women and children were removed; 492 huts and stone houses were burnt or destroyed; and 400 cattle and 1,200 sheep were impounded and removed.
perpetuation of minority domination over the majority. Their land reforms proposals which stood for recognition of individual rights and the purchase of land by all persons of all races (in the footsteps of the case which had been pushed forward for individualization of land ownership by the East Africa Royal Commission (1953-55)) was rejected.

According to Nyerere, it was only the immigrants with money and backing from overseas who would afford land. Very few Africans had money to spend on land: "Our customs of land use and transfer are based not on buying and selling and speculation manipulated by those with money, but upon the actual primary needs and usage of each head of a family with his wife, children and other dependants within his clan" (Nyerere 1969: 54). It was these views on land ownership which became part of the independent government policy. When the colonial government proposed to move towards freehold system of land tenure which would include the process of titling and registration in 1958, TANU rejected the policy. The government had coached its arguments for freehold in terms of considerations of efficiency, whereby land would become marketable and be transferred to the efficient users and also provide security to the users. Here was an attempt by the government to abandon the policy of land alienation which was proving catastrophic and substitute it with a policy of land deprivation based on the tenurial system. It was an attempt by the colonial government to resolve a crisis it had created.

In Tanzania, and elsewhere in Africa (Zimbabwe, Kenya, South Africa, Mozambique, etc), the same issues are resurfacing, despite the fact that "globalization" seem to have thwarted all forms of nationalist struggles in the world. The nationalist ideology was produced by the colonized as a response to the imposition of an administrative state on them. The nationalism of the past had its limitations in that it carried the seeds of its own demise, since it was based a masculinized humiliation and masculinized hope of the male elites, despite the fact that it was the struggles of ordinary men and women that made it possible to defeat colonialism. "The goal of 'nationalists' was... to take power at the centre and remove the colonial rulers,...[I]t was the Western-educated African male elite which made all this possible, held it together, and made it nationalism. The same elite group was also responsible for transporting and translating Western ideas or ideology central to the whole movement". (Geiger 1997: 7)

Basically, those nationalist notions were intimately linked to the idea of a centralizing state, making claims to universal truths about nationalism. They were masculinized, elite centred and Eurocentric, to the extent of rendering the position of the working people (poor men and women, peasants, workers, pastoralists, etc.) to that of mere recipients or bearers of nationalism. Susan Geiger (ibid: 13) posed the following questions:

For example, how do we explain the fact that whatever else its characteristics. Tanganyikan nationalism has remained remarkably devoid of the symbolic objectification of women? What are the implications of the fact that much of TANU's cultural work was undertaken by TANU women? How can we account for the fact that nationalism in Tanzania has manifested itself as a reactionary impulse or a calculated product of elite control or 'the state'?

In sum, the nationalist ideology and identity of the past was mainly grounded on issues of racial equality and was devoid other variables such as class and gender. In the process, the question of control and ownership of productive and reproductive resources were
relegated to the background. Instead of independence, which they fought for, the nationalist elite offered them illusions of development and economic growth.

Today, the interventions of MNCs, IFIs and armies in some circumstances mobilize nationalist energies at a very different level. It is a nationalism arising from an increased grasp of international economics and politics. Increasingly, the struggles involve the re-imposition of controls on capital movement, and the issues are posed in terms of the extent to which people are able to control their productive and reproductive assets. The tendency is towards the quest for massive redistribution of wealth and power internationally to challenge the inequalities brought forth by international capitalism—so called globalization. Popular forces, rallying around the question of land and control of natural resources are seeking to genuinely transform the states everywhere so as to democratize them and make them more responsive to popular needs.

Democracy, in the manner it is being posed by the nationalist democratic forces currently, goes beyond the neo-liberal precepts of multipartyism. To cite Mafeje (1995: 26), democracy in the present African conditions can only refer to two things:

First, the extent to which the people's will enters decisions which will affect their life chances; and second, the extent to which their means of livelihood are guaranteed. In political terms the first demand does not suggest capture of "state power" by the people (workers and peasants) but it does imply ascendancy 10 state power by a national democratic alliance in which the popular classes hold the balance of power. The second demand implies equitable (not equal) distribution of resources. Neither liberal democracy, imposed "multi-partyism" nor "market forces" can guarantee these two conditions. It transpires, therefore, that the issue is neither liberal nor "compradorial" democracy but social democracy (ibid).

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 of peace, justice and understanding among the people in the world. The latter can only be 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, students 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 defence 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.

Appendix

APPENDIX 1: CATEGORIES OF WILDLIFE PROTECTED AREAS IN TANZANIA (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Wildlife Protected Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Game Controlled Area</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90,965.02</td>
<td>37.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Reserves</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>104,012.50</td>
<td>43.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38,428.00</td>
<td>15.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,300.00</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>241,605.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wildlife Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism 2004

APPENDIX 2: NUMBER OF TOURISTS AND FOREIGN EXCHANGE EARNINGS: 1990-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Tourists</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Foreign exchange earnings (US D mil.)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>186,800</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>94.73</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>201,744</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>120.04</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>230,166</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>146.84</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>261,595</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>192.10</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>293,834</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>258.14</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>326,192</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>322.00</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>392.41</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>482,331</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>570.00</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>628,188</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>733.30</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>501,668</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
<td>739.10</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>525,122</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>725.00</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3: TROPHY HUNTING SAFARIS IN TANZANIA WITH CLUB FAUNE SAFARIS Safari Prices (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price of the safari per person</th>
<th>7 hunting days</th>
<th>16 hunting days</th>
<th>21 hunting days</th>
<th>28 hunting days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Hunters x 1 Guide</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hunter x 1 Guide</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>5,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The price of the safari includes:
- Reception and assistance at Arusha Airport,
- The transfer from Arusha to the hunting area (and back) by car (3 hours),
- The organization of your safari with professional hunter, 4x4 vehicles (fully equipped), trackers, porters, skinners,
- Full board and accommodation in the hunting area,
- Field preparation of trophies.

The price of the safari does not include:
- Any air fair or travel costs to Arusha.
- Trophy fees (see below),
- Community Development tax: 10% on the amount of trophy fees.
- Tanzania Government Conservation fees: 100 USD per hunter per day, 50 USD per observer per day,
- Hunting licenses: 450 USD for 7 days, 600 USD up to 28 days,
- Importation of fire arms: 120 USD per fire arm,
- Packing and forwarding charges for your trophies: 800 USD for 7 days, 1200 USD for 16 days and 1500 USD for 21 days and 28 days,
- Meals and overnight stays at hotels which might be necessary outside the contracted time of your safari,
- Insurances fees,
- Visa fees, drinks, personal spending money and tips.
TROPHY FEES MASAILAND AREA (MTO WA MBU) (Quoted in Euros)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Type</th>
<th>Trophy Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Kudu</td>
<td>1,300 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>2,000 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>2,000 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>600 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Buffalo</td>
<td>720 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Buffalo</td>
<td>840 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke's Hartebeest</td>
<td>370 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson's Eland</td>
<td>840 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kudu</td>
<td>1,170 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Eared Oryx</td>
<td>870 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyena</td>
<td>190 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson's Gazelle</td>
<td>190 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant's Gazelle</td>
<td>220 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dik Dik</td>
<td>170 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbuck</td>
<td>440 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedbuck</td>
<td>290 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipspringer</td>
<td>720 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</td>
<td>150 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostrich</td>
<td>740 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>590 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushbuck</td>
<td>340 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td>240 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog</td>
<td>320 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushpig</td>
<td>190 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td>150 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboon</td>
<td>90 Euros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Animals allowed on a 7 days safari license.
** Animals allowed on a 16 days safari license.
*** Animals allowed on a 21 days safari license.

Trophy fees can be modified without notice by the local authority. The full trophy fee is payable if animals are wounded and lost. Please note that it is prohibited by the Tanzanian Government to prohibit the shooting of elephants with tusks less than 20 kg or less than 170 cm, and leopards smaller than 120 cm from the tip of the nose to the end to the root of the tail.

TROPHY FEES FOR SELOUS GAME RESERVE (Quoted in Euros)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Animal Type</th>
<th>Trophy Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>2,000 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>4,000 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>2,000 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>600 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Buffalo</td>
<td>720 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>840 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenstein's Hartebeest</td>
<td>370 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Kudu</td>
<td>1,170 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African's Eland</td>
<td>840 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dik Dik</td>
<td>170 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippopotamus</td>
<td>840 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyasaland Wildebeest</td>
<td>320 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbuck</td>
<td>440 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedbuck</td>
<td>290 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steenbok</td>
<td>150 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebra</td>
<td>590 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impala</td>
<td>240 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushbuck</td>
<td>340 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warthog</td>
<td>320 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushpig</td>
<td>190 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackal</td>
<td>150 Euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baboon</td>
<td>90 Euros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Animals allowed on a 7 days safari license.
** Animals allowed on a 16 days safari license.
*** Animals allowed on a 21 days safari license.

Trophy fees can be modified without notice by the local authority. The full trophy fee is payable if animals are wounded and lost. Please note that it is prohibited by the Tanzanian Government to prohibit the shooting of elephants with tusks less than 20 kg or less than 170 cm, and leopards smaller than 120 cm from the tip of the nose to the end to the root of the tail.
APPENDIX 4: "'EXPATRIATE' HOTEL BOSS CAUGHT WITH FORGED CERTIFICATES"

In fact, in many ways, the claim that foreigners have better skills is a myth. Informants working in some of the hotels attested to this fact. As far as they were concerned, the whole issue had something to do with the colour of the expatriate, and the belief that foreigners can do better. Even some of the so-called International Schools/Academies believe that parents will have faith in a school if there is a white person among the personnel. There are numerous cases of expatriates being found to lack the qualifications of the jobs they were employed for. In the *Family Mirror* of 10-16.02.2004. the following story was reported by Benjamin Thompson of PST:

"Even after government's declaration of an all out war against fake academic certificates, the problem seems to gain ground in Tanzania as days pass by,...

"The vice seems to spare nobody, not even those in the managerial posts.

"The recent scandal of forged certificate involves an expatriate (name withheld), alleged to have used fake documents to secure a job at the New Africa Hotel in Dar es Salaam as one of the managers.

"His fabricated documents enabled him to get a working permit and a good paying job, with other entitlements, such as a posh car and a luxurious residential house.

"Sources within the New Africa Hotel said that the expatriate was later discovered having fake documents and have ever since changed job.

"...New Africa Hotel staff indicates that he has got a job in one of the five star hotels in Dar es salaam.

"The expatriate purports to have studied at Darham College Canada where he was conferred with two year hotel management degree. However correspondence with the college has revealed that the said expatriate was not a student there.

"...the college's manager of continuous learning division. Ms Liesje Beburger, said that apart from the fact that they had never enrolled such a student, her college did not offer hotel management studies...."
APPENDIX 5: BEACH HOTELS, BUSINESS COMMUNITY AND LAND OF THE POOR

The big tourist hotels along the beach are a big attraction for the rich and seminar and conference organizers....This is a blessing for the business community but also a curse for the people. There are several types of tourists who visit Bagamoyo, one official who preferred anonymity opined. There are those who come to learn about Tanzania.... Others come here to enjoy "privacy", while others are land speculators. The latter group is posing a big threat to those who depend on land for their sustenance. What is happening is that some settlers who were chased out of Zimbabwe are looking for land in Tanzania, and one of the destinations is Bagamoyo. Bagamoyo offers an ideal opportunity for big commercial farmers, and its proximity to the DSM harbor adds value. Coupled with beautiful beaches Bagamoyo is indeed a prey for the wolves!

[At Kitame Hamlet] What is happening is rich, clever Tanzanians buy land cheaply from farmers who fear that their land will be privatized....These local prospectors acquire title deeds and resell the land to foreigners or pretend it is a joint venture. But the majority uses it as collateral to get loans from banks and don't develop it. I was also told verbally that most of the beach land is reserved for investors, although I was not shown the policy paper or seculars.

______________________________Marie Shaba, Field Notes, 2004
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