Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences

Next Door to the Lion King

Conflicts between wildlife conservation efforts and rural communities in northern Tanzania

David Fridolin

Department of Urban and Rural Development
Master's Thesis • 30 HEC
Agriculture Programme – Rural Development
Uppsala 2014

Next Door to the Lion King

Conflicts between wildlife conservation efforts and rural communities in northern Tanzania

David Fridolin

Supervisor: Örjan Bartholdson, SLU,
Department of Urban and Rural Development, Division of Rural Development

Field Supervisor: Rolf Skogsberg, Vi Agroforestry

Examiner: Kjell Hansen, SLU,
Department of Urban and Rural Development, Division of Rural Development

Credits: 30 HEC

Level: Second cycle, A2E

Course title: Master's thesis in Rural Development and Natural Resource Management

Course code: EX0681

Programme/Education: Agriculture Programme – Rural Development

Place of publication: Uppsala

Year of publication: 2014

Online publication: http://stud.epsilon.slu.se

Keywords: Grumeti Game Reserve, Serengeti National Park, conservation, human-wildlife conflict, mode of production, lifeworld, collective action frames, ecotourism, neocolonialism

Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Faculty of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development

Acknowledgements

I want to express my gratitude to all informants in Hunyari, Kihumbu, Mariwanda, Mugeta, Tingirima, and Kyandege villages in Bunda District in Tanzania for taking their time to share their concerns with me. A special thank goes to the informants who, besides allowing me to interview them, also took much of their time to help me find other informants to interview in the neighborhood.

I also want to thank the entire staff at Vi Agroforestry in Mara Region for a friendly welcome and support. I would especially like to thank my supervisor at Vi Agroforestry, Rolf Skogsberg, and my guides in the field, Mr Gabriel Songa, Mr Christopher Jakoracha, and Mr David Magema.

I would also like to thank my supervisor at SLU, Örjan Bartholdson. Finally, I want to thank my friends who have given me input and support during the process of writing this thesis.

Abstract

Wildlife viewing safari ecotourism in African reserves and parks is a popular form of recreational travel among Europeans and Americans. This phenomenon means a welcome inflow of foreign currency for poor African states, and is supported by an abundance of Western conservation NGOs.

This thesis explores the phenomenon of wildlife conservation from the standpoint of rural communities neighboring these protected areas. Through an interview-based field study in six villages close to the Grumeti Game Reserve in northern Tanzania, I will attempt to shed light on how the locals view and cope with the game reserve, and how it integrates with their livelihoods and practices.

Some research has already been done on the subject, which I will connect my results to, in order to make sense of the material. In addition, the thesis contains a broad discussion on the incentives of nature and wildlife conservation in Africa as a postcolonial phenomenon, largely governed by the postindustrial Western ideal of a pristine African wilderness, and of nature in general as something inherently separate from human society.

Keywords: Grumeti Game Reserve, Serengeti National Park, conservation, human-wildlife conflict, mode of production, lifeworld, collective action frames, ecotourism, postcolonialism

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

> "I am personally not very interested in animals. I do not want to spend my holidays watching crocodiles. Nevertheless, I am entirely in favor of their survival. I believe that after diamonds and sisal, wild animals will provide Tanganyika with its greatest source of income. Thousands of Americans and Europeans have the strange urge to see these animals."
>
> -Julius Nyerere, the first president of independent Tanganyika, later Tanzania, 1961. Cited in Lekan, 2011.

A popular conception is that mankind is ruining the planet. The environment and its destruction or conservation is certainly one of the big political issues of our time. Rainforests are cut down to make room for soy plantations, coral reefs are laid waste in order to breed scampi, and the seas are being polluted by oil and garbage; affecting plants as well as animals. At the same time, our usage of fossil fuels is causing a climate change that is predicted to have a vast impact on ecosystems all over the world. In short, human interference with nature is causing the latter to wither and die (Green et al., 2013; IPCC, 2007; Kennedy et al., 2013). To combat this development, states have constructed laws and policies, for everything between agricultural emissions to hunting quotas, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's (UNFCCC) so-called 'Kyoto Protocol' (UNFCCC, 2013). Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) have tried to influence policy-makers, producers and public opinions, in order to encourage a political agenda to change practices to stop environmental degradation. Many private sector corporations have also embraced the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and various standards and certifications, and implemented policies that intend to mitigate the impacts on the environment by, for example, carbon compensation and donations to environmental charities (Brockington, 2009).

Wildlife conservation is one form of nature conservation and maintenance of biodiversity, and it is the subject of this master's thesis. Eastern Africa is a hotspot for conservation through protected areas, and Tanzania stands out even in East Africa, as a large portion of the country is incorporated in national parks, game reserves and other protection forms – partly a heritage from colonial days (Lekan, 2011). While the aim of this is to preserve wildlife in their natural habitat – and create a source of income from tourism – the picture is often more problematic, as we shall see, when one considers the effect of protected areas on local people. This thesis examines the perspective of local people living close to protected areas, through a case study of a local area west of Serengeti National Park and its buffer zone, the Grumeti Game Reserve, in northern Tanzania.

2 Aim and theoretical framework

The purpose of this thesis is to explore how people in the local communities of Hunyari and Mugeta Wards[1] in the Bunda District of northern Tanzania, experience and perceive the Grumeti Game Reserve and the Serengeti National Park. This is a case study, focused on discussing the phenomenon from the perspectives of the informants. The protected areas' economic, social, and cultural effects on the livelihoods of the informants will be explored. This thesis attempts to answer the following questions:

- How do local people in villages that border the Grumeti Game Reserve in Tanzania perceive the protected area?
- How does the protected area affect local people's livelihoods?

2.1 Modes of production

For the purpose of substantializing the livelihoods of the informants, I will apply the concept *mode of production* which emanates from Karl Marx (Wolf, 1982:73). It describes the combination of two properties of the material production of a society. First, there are the *productive forces* – referring to physical conditions of production, such as labor forces, technical knowledge, land for cultivation, and machinery needed for production. Second, there are the *relations of production* – referring to social organization within the concerned society, including for example property, and hierarchies (Wolf, 1982). Identifying the mode of production in the studied area enables me to theorize about political-economic relations and structure of the interaction of local people with the game reserve.

Marx defined the capitalist mode of production as when monetary capital is used to purchase labor for production. Those possessing the capital are also in possession of the means of production, such as land, machinery and tools, and any surplus of the production is added to the wealth of the capitalist (Wolf, 1982:77-79). Brockington and Scholfield (2010) bring to attention what they call the *conservationist mode of production*, which refers to the role of conservation NGOs in incorporating wildlife and nature conservation into the capitalist system, breaking new grounds for capitalism. This, they argue, is done through turning (in this case) African wilderness and wildlife into consumable tourism operations, wildlife films, etc. Garland (2008) also writes about conservation as a mode of production intertwined with capitalism. She claims that what distinguishes conservation from other kinds of capitalism is that the natural resources of wildlife are transformed into a symbolic capital, which, in this commodity form, is consumed by tourists and Western consumers (Garland, 2008:61-63).

Another mode relevant for this thesis is the kin-ordered mode of production, which describes a situation of low-technological, low-productive, and labor-intensive forces of production. Labor is recruited and organized through kinship relations rather than acquired

[1] More on wards and the Tanzanian administrative structure in section 5.

through monetary wealth, as in the capitalist mode. In the capitalist mode, the owner of the means of production buys labor from those who do not possess it. In the kinship-ordered mode, however, labor comes from kinship relations. Kinship is a term which is difficult to define, and it may in fact involve more than just the immediate family – more than *blood ties* (Wolf, 1982:88-100). In the Tanzanian context, it might be said that tribal identity comes into play in questions of how to organize labor since tribes still have an important role to play in the country (Shetler, 2003), even though the first president of independent Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, made a fruitful effort to unite the country on basis of nationality rather than tribes (Lange, 2008; Miguel, 2011).

2.2 Lifeworld

In order to answer the research questions above, I will make use of the concept of *lifeworld*. The lifeworld concept refers to the experienced reality of a human being – or a group of humans – and their everyday world; their lived experiences. It is the social context in which people live their lives, and which constitutes how they make sense of what is going on around them. The concept has origins in phenomenology, the philosophical and methodological school which emanates from the works by German philosopher Edmund Husserl, and was further developed by Austrian philosopher Alfred Schütz. Constituted through everyday interaction between individuals in a specific group, the lifeworld is socially constructed. It is commonsensical to the agents, who are continually and non-reflectively reconstructing it. The social reality and consciousness of the informants will be focused on, and how the non-reflective everyday life becomes subject of reflection when something taken for granted is challenged (Jackson, 1996:19). I will also be using the phenomenological terms, connected to the lifeworld concept, *everyday life* and *practical consciousness* (Inglis and Thorpe, 2012:86-87).

I am aware that the task of studying the shared lifeworld of a foreign society, will be suffering from the fact that I do not speak the language and use amateur interpreters. It will also be suffering from the shortness of time spent in the field; a mere ten weeks. However, I hope that this potential weakness is mitigated to some extent by the amount of empirical material gathered during the limited time in the field – and the fact that a lot has been written on the subject beforehand. I will not be groping in the dark.

2.3 Collective action frames

In order to analyze the motivational processes of the conservation movement, I will use the concept of *collective action frames*. The conservation movement is understood as the variety of civil society organizations, such as the WWF (WWF, n.d.), working towards the conservation of natural resources such as animals, plants, and ecosystems around the world, for the future.

Collective action frames, as put by sociologists Robert D. Benford and David A. Snow, "are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization" (2000:614). They allow social movements to construct a shared meaning for situations and occurrences they believe ought to change. Collective action frames motivate action and simplify and condense occurrences to make them understandable to individuals. Thus, collective action frames have the important function of rallying members and supporters for a cause. However, this is not only done on the individual level, but through interactive and discursive processes – even on a multi-organizational level (Benford and Snow, 2000).

Benford and Snow (2000:615-618) differentiate between three core framing tasks of collective action frames. The first core framings task is *diagnostic framing*, striving to identify and clarify a problem, and create consensus around its causes. Second, there is

prognostic framing. Prognostic framing determines possible solutions to the identified problems, or strategies on how to attack the problems. There is a connection between how the problem is diagnostically framed, and what alternatives are deemed reasonable in prognostic framing processes. The third core framing task is *motivational framing*. This is the agency-oriented aspect of collective action frames; it involves socially constructed vocabularies which motivate adherents of the movement in question to participate in collective action.

3 Methodology

In this thesis, the most important empirical source of data is interviews – and direct observations, which is also a source of data, though in a more unstructured and unplanned manner, and with the unspecific purpose of picking up new input as it comes along. The interviews make out the bulk of the empirical data – 59 formal interviews of varying lengths were performed. Observations were made sporadic. For example, I noticed that the house of an informant was relatively large and expensive-looking with robust construction with sun-panels for power generation, and followed up on this observation by asking the informant about it. The methods for gathering data, thus, were of a 'qualitative' nature.

3.1 The role of Vi Agroforestry

Vi Agroforestry is a Swedish NGO (Vi Agroforestry, n.d.). Vi Agroforestry has a specific relevance to this thesis. While it is not directly involved with the protected areas, it has activities in many parts of the Lake Victoria basin in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda. While planning the field work, I made an agreement with Vi Agroforestry regarding practical arrangements necessary for the thesis. These arrangements include everything from office space in their office in Musoma, the regional capital of Mara Region, to having their Field Officers assist me in the field by helping me find informants, and interpreting. Put frankly this means that without Vi Agroforestry, this thesis, or at least the field study on which it is based, would not have come into existence. Naturally, Vi Agroforestry has had a lot of impact on the outcome of the study. Vi Agroforestry's interest in this, and reason for agreeing to help me is, according to my supervisor from Vi Agroforestry, that the organization has a tradition of accepting students and helping them out. But he also emphasizes that, for Vi Agroforestry, students coming to them and getting a view of how the project works, means that word will spread about their work. He also states that a fresh pair of eyes can give new perspectives, and give something back to the organization. No exchange of money has taken place between me and Vi Agroforestry. Their expenses on me are limited to practicalities such as some transports, and the lending of personnel for helping me in my field work.

3.2 The interviews

The interviews were conducted mainly with farmers and pastoralists in the Chamuriho Division of Bunda District. Informants were selected with assistance from Vi Agroforestry Field Officers in Bunda District. Thus, the sampling cannot be said to have been random. These Field Officers also helped with interpretation from Swahili into English, as most interviewees were non-English speakers. One of them also acted as my driver, driving me between informants on a motorcycle.

I recorded the conversations at the same time as I took notes. The interviews were made in a semi-structured manner. This was because some structure is necessary to keep the

interview subjects somewhat on the desired track and make possible a comparison of the answers from different persons. Yet, allowing the interview subjects as much freedom as possible to provide their own stories may lead to spontaneous information, important to the interviewee, which might have been held back had the interviews been too structured and controlled. The aim was to entice interview subjects to engage in narrative interviews (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009), which was the desired form of interview for this field study. The narratives are – hopefully – stories from the interviewees' lifeworlds, and describe the phenomenon in their own words, as they view it. That is, translated into English from Swahili by my interpreters (see below).

As a researcher, I did not wish to control the interviews too much, but I still had to make the interviews keep to the subject. In order to maintain this balance; to give the interviewees' own versions of events and circumstances as much space as possible, I used ethnographical methods in the interview methodology; statements and potential inconsistencies of the interviews were not questioned directly, but sometimes compared to the actual behavior of the interviewees, based on my observations. The lengths of the interviews varied, depending on the interviewee and the circumstances. The general rule was, the longer the interviews the better. That way the informant has a chance to give an extensive account of his or her view of the issue, if the interview is open and extensive.

If the field study had not been limited to just two months in time, unstructured interviews would have been the preferred form of interview, as it allows the interview subject to open up more on their own terms, thus giving answers less influenced by the interviewer's choice of words (Bernard, 2011). However, with a total of ten weeks in Tanzania, such time-consuming methods were not possible. The limitations in time also meant that the data gathered was not sufficient to draw statistically relevant conclusions from. With 59 conducted interviews, some general conclusions can be drawn, however.

Coming from a radically different culture than the interviewees, it would be naïve to think that I could use my pre-understanding to directly and instinctively understand and correctly interpret the inner meaning of people's words. Adopting an attitude of respectful and polite curiosity, though, hopefully helped to make people open up.

3.3 Interpreters

I used interpreters in most interview situations. These interpreters were not professionals, and translated in sometimes mediocre English. Therefore, the informants' exact phrasing is not emphasized in the thesis. I cannot be certain that the way in which the interpreter chooses to put his words is really the same as the informants did. Neither can I be certain that the interviews express the same meanings and feelings when directly translated from Swahili into English. Better then, for validity, to focus on the contents of what the informants wants to articulate, and what is being emphasized in the informants' narratives, and how they chronologically tell their stories.

Worth noting is also that both my interpreters were well known to many in the studied area, and helped me find informants, sometimes with the help of knowledgeable villagers, and sometimes because they knew them from their work with Vi Agroforestry. Hence, informants were not randomly, but strategically chosen with the phenomenon being studied in mind (Teorell and Svensson, 2007). The interpreters have had a high influence over the empirical material in this thesis, and the suspicion cannot be dismissed that my interpreters sometimes chose interviewees with benefiting their own social network in mind, rather than only my research needs.

Interviewing with interpreters has some important implications for the quality and validity of the interviews. It is an advantage if the interpreter belongs to the same social group as those being studied, since the interpreter not only functions as an interpreter of strict linguistic matters; but also of relevant social and cultural implications that differ from

those of the interviewer. It is also desirable that the interpreter is knowledgeable in the subject of the interview, since it is important for a correct translation (Bragason, 1997). My interpreters were invaluable when it came to finding informants and properly introducing me, as well as communicating with local authorities.

3.4 Direct observations

Direct observations were conducted continuously in the field. By direct observations is meant actually watching, (when the language allows for it) listening to people, and even smelling and feeling, and then taking notes on people's actions and behavior, as well as other occurrences found noteworthy. Noting what happens can be a way to find new topics to ask interviewees about if something peculiar is observed, making possible new aspects and opinions for the enrichment of the fieldwork. Making running observations also allows for studying people's practices; to try to see how they act and how they interact with each other. What I hoped to see was whether what was happening correlated to what was being said – not to check the trueness of their statements, but to better understand the meaning of what they say. Apart from observing what people said (outside of interview situations) and did, I also tried to be observant on other conditions which could be helpful for determining how people live their lives in the studied area. The observations were not done as continuous monitoring. It was in a more random manner; observing things of interest as they came along. A rule of thumb, to separate what I mean by observations from interviews, might be that whenever I was not in a formal interview situation, and noticed something worth adding to my material, I was making an observation. However, sometimes during formal interviews, I would also observe something not directly connected to the interview – such as the apparent division of labor in the household. Preferably, the observations would have been nonreactive, meaning that the people being observed did not know that they were being observed. The aim of nonreactive observations is to not make people act differently than otherwise, knowing that they have an audience (Bernard, 2011). In this case, however, it seems unlikely that I was able to be around people in the villages without drawing attention and thus provoking a change in behavior, me being an obvious outsider and an object of curiosity. Usually, when arriving at a new place in the countryside, people would gaze with surprise, and children would flock around me and even touch my skin.

3.5 Reflexivity: participant objectivation

A concept developed by Pierre Bourdieu, participant objectivation is a way to be reflexive about oneself as a researcher, when doing anthropological fieldwork. It is important to emphasize that this is not oneself as a private person; but as a member of a certain scientific field, which projects certain theoretical and methodological dispositions, and indeed also affects the choice of subject to study. By this reflexivity of one's educational background, the researcher can objectify herself as a researcher, in order to always keep a vigilant eye on her own habitus, and frame of reference. Otherwise, the researcher risks projecting her own *scholastic bias* on those being studied, thus believing that they use the same rationality as the researcher herself (Bourdieu, 2003). In this study, I strived to include participant objectivation in my research methods, because I perceived that I was affected by my academic point of view on the research subject. In order to do this, I made myself reflect on my role as a researcher, and how people viewed me, every evening while in the field. I recalled the events and discussions of the day, and questioned how my academic background – and the fact that I have read countless articles on matters related to the study – might have affected my interpretations and follow-up questions during the day.

3.6 The results

The empirical material – the transcribed interviews – has been processed through systematically scrutinizing, coding and sifting through the material, organizing it into themes. These themes have emerged through interaction between the researcher and the material, with a focus on the chronology and priorities of the informants. During the process, I have continuously written ‘memos’ on my interpretations of the themes and their priorities and the relation between themes. This method of making sense of the material through coding and creating memos was inspired by *grounded theory*, a data-oriented method developed by Glaser and Strauss and with its roots in symbolic interactionism (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009).

4 Conservation, conflicts, and conceptions of nature

4.1 Conservation and ecotourism in the Tanzanian context

The colonial powers first instituted game reserves and national parks in Africa, taking after the American model of Yellowstone National Park (Lekan, 2011; Neumann, 1998:9, 24, 125). The British colonial administration established the Serengeti as a national park in 1951 (Brockington, 2002; Neumann, 1998:129-139). In 1961, Tanganyika became independent from Great Britain. Britain had colonized the country after the First World War, when it took over the colonial mandate from Germany, which lost the right to its colonial possessions in the peace negotiations after the First World War. In 1964, Tanganyika merged with recently independent Zanzibar, and changed its name to Tanzania. From the very birth of independent Tanzania, conservation and ecotourism has been an important economic and political ambition, as we can see from the quote from Julius Nyerere, in the beginning of this thesis. It is still an important source of income for Tanzania's government. Thus, independent Tanzania adopted the network of national parks originally instituted by the British colonial administration, and even vastly expanded the protected areas (Brockington, 2002). 14% of the Tanzanian land surface is instituted as national parks or game reserves (Lekan, 2011). According to one estimate, as much as 45% of Tanzania's land surface is under some sort of conservation legislation, and close to 80% of this was established before independence (Årlin, 2011). The tourism industry is a major source of income for the country. In 2011, tourism employed 434.500 people in Tanzania and contributed to 13.3% of the country's GDP (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2012). Knowles and Collett (1989) have claimed that African nations simply cannot afford not to set aside land for wildlife conservation, since they are often economically weak, and wildlife is a resource which can bring considerable economic benefits through tourism. Ecotourism is an important niche, and has been growing rapidly in later years, comprising billions of dollars yearly (West and Carrier, 2004).

In Africa, the demand for ivory, rhinoceros horns, and other big game trophies, have had a tremendous impact on wildlife populations. Elephant poaching in the Serengeti during the late 1970s and early 1980s resulted in a population drop from over 2500 individuals down to about 500 in 1986 (Walpole et al., 2004). In my interviews, I did not hear of this type of poaching, however. When asked, the person responsible for wildlife issues on the district level claimed that such poaching did not take place in the district.

In 2006, 11% of the world's land surface (16.8 million square kilometers) was comprised of national parks and reserves, and 4.7 million square kilometers of marine protected areas (West et al., 2006). Many of these areas are only formally protected, but the magnitude of the area shows the influence of conservation on global land use.

4.2 Human-wildlife conflicts in western Serengeti and elsewhere

Conflicts between the rural human populace and wild animals whose habitats overlap that of the humans, have existed since the dawn of the human species, and still exist in all parts of the world. In Asia, elephant crop raiding is a problem in some areas, and predators such as tigers, leopards, lions and snow leopards can attack and take down high numbers of livestock. In North America and Europe, wolves, bears, deer, wild boar and other animals kill livestock, damage crops and regenerating forests, and cause car collisions. In Australia, wild rabbits and kangaroos are considered a pest (Lamarque et al., 2009:3-4).

In Africa, the problem is especially widespread. Often, wildlife and humans are separated through the creation of national parks, game reserves and other types of protected areas. Naturally, the wildlife of the national parks will not abide by any rules put up by humans concerning where the park boundaries are drawn. The animals often wander outside of the park into the neighboring areas, where humans live on their farms. These farms are often subject to problems caused by wildlife, for example animals eating their crops and preying on their cattle (Lamarque et al., 2009; Walpole et al., 2004). In some places, fences are put up to mitigate these problems, as in Akagera Park in Rwanda for example (Kabeera, 2013); but fences are costly, require complementary methods, and are not always very effective (Graham et al., 2009; Gunaratne and Premarathne, 2006). Therefore, the wildlife of the Serengeti National Park can be seen as a natural resource with different implications depending on perspective. On the one hand, it provides a valuable contribution to the country's GDP from tourism, as well as a remarkable biological value, from the abundance of animals having their habitat there. On the other hand, the farmers whose lands are intruded on by large animals experience negative aspects of the wildlife. In Tanzania, apart from crops and cattle being lost, at least 563 people were killed by lions in the years between 1990 and 2004 (Lamarque et al., 2009:6).

A variety of problems are caused by wildlife in Africa. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (Lamarque et al., 2009), the most significant problems are; the killing and injuring of humans, destruction of crops, preying on livestock, and transmission of diseases from wild to domestic animals and humans through shared grazing areas. Human death and injury is caused by many different animals. Crocodiles, hippopotamuses, lions, and elephants, are examples of wild animals known to kill people in Africa. In my own empirical material, elephants and buffalos are mentioned as the most dangerous of the animals. The damaging of crops may be a less significant tragedy than human death, but crop destruction is the most extensive form of blight caused by wildlife in Africa. This is especially caused by elephants, but also many other animals (Lamarque et al., 2009). This is a relatively new phenomenon in the western Serengeti, but has during the last decade become a big problem in the area (Walpole et al., 2004). Lions, leopards and hyenas are the most common predators that prey on livestock.

Kideghesho et al. (2006) did a quantitative study of local people's attitudes towards conservation in western Serengeti. The study took place in the same area as the field study for this thesis; one village – Mariwanda in Bunda District – was included in both studies. Kideghesho and his co-researchers found that important factors affecting a person's attitude toward the protected areas included severity of conflicts, inadequate access to pasture and water, diseases spread by wildlife, participation in community based projects, and level of wealth and education. The study showed that people were generally negative towards the Grumeti Game Reserve – but not to the Serengeti National Park. When people have a negative attitude towards conservation, they might engage in hunting activities, despite the prohibition, and even shelter more 'professional' poachers (Shetler, 2007). An NGO in project form, Serengeti Regional Conservation Project (SRCP) – funded by Tanzania's government and the Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD) – was previously operating in seven villages in Bunda District (and seven in Serengeti District), one of which is also included in this field study; Mariwanda (see below). The community based project aimed to conciliate the goals of conservation with those of local communities,

in order to make the latter more positively disposed to conservation (Kideghesho et al., 2006; Shetler, 2007:226-227). The project, however, has come to an end. Several of my informants mentioned the project, and all but one claimed it had been a good thing. The one person who disagreed claimed that the villages earned too little money on it, for it to be worth it.

4.3 Aspects of conservation: globalization, neoliberal policies, and neocolonialism

Neoliberal capitalism has been increasingly dominant on the global arena since the 1980s, increasing the power and influence of multinational companies (van der Ploeg, 2010). Conservation of areas of nature stands in opposition to the logic of capitalism, challenging it and keeping the protected areas away from its reach. However, some – anthropologist Dan Brockington (2009), for example – argue that instead of restricting capitalism, conservation can actually provide another source of profit, through offering nature as a commodity to be consumed (Garland, 2008; Neumann, 1998).

Conservation through ecotourism can take the form of neocolonialism, according to some scholars (Garland, 2008; Neumann, 1998). If done properly and not just as a sort of 'greenwashing', there is a potential for local people to earn money from ecotourism, without ruining the environment that gives this opportunity in the first place. However, since ecotourism operations are often owned by investors from the developed world, profits from the ecotourism venture 'leak' out of the developing country which contains the targeted environment. Thus, little of the revenues accrue the local communities (McClurg, 2002). Only between 2-5% of the income from tourism befalls local population of western Serengeti, according to one estimation (Lekan, 2011:262). The reason for why outside actors can have such power is, according to Cameroonian philosopher Achille Mbembe (2001), because weak states in the global south often have a great need for resources from other countries. These resources might come from a foreign state, an NGO or a private company. The postcolonial state (or any other country in the global south) then partners with these organizations and combine goals, offering influence and the enforcing power of the state, in exchange for foreign money and other resources.

The tourism industry has invested money in African ecotourism operations. These are often owned by Western corporations, as with Grumeti Reserves (see below) and push for creating and preserving a pristine wilderness to maintain a high and growing demand for safaris from mainly European and American tourists (McClurg, 2002).

4.4 Visions of wilderness

There is a longing in the Western, postindustrial society for a refuge away from the stress and complexity of modern society (Årlin, 2011:32; Lekan, 2011). The ideal of a pristine nature, untouched by the destructive, industrialized hand of mankind, which they so often seen examples of in the news, make office workers and others long for the wilds. People have been fed the images of places where nature presents majestic landscapes inhabited by wild animals that have lived undisturbed by human influence since the beginning of time. This image is being presented to us since our early days with nature programs on television. One example of this, which applies specifically to the Serengeti, is the works of Bernhard Grzimek, German zoologist and the host of *Ein Platz für Tiere* (1956-1980), one of the most popular shows in the history of German television. One of the many films that Grzimek produced during his career was *Serengeti darf nicht sterben* (*Serengeti must not die*, 1959), an *Oscar*-awarded documentary film promoting wildlife conservation in the Serengeti (Lekan, 2011; Shetler, 2007:2). Grzimek disapproved of people living in national parks, and had much influence in the shaping of Tanzanian conservation policy, through his

friendship with Julius Nyerere (Lekan, 2011:234). Movies, both explicit fiction such as Walt Disney Pictures' *The Lion King*, and 'documentaries' in which wildlife is romanticized and pictured as something completely separate from the world of humans, reproduce the Western conception of 'Wild Africa' for new generations of wildlife tourists and supporters of conservation (Mitman, 2009). Wildlife film researcher Derek Bousé (1998) problematizes the status of wildlife 'documentaries', calling into question whether these can really be called documentaries, since they are often focused on creating an audience-friendly story of wildlife rather than reflecting realistic events and causalities.

To further problematize contemporary conservation agendas, Dan Brockington (2009) has examined the role of celebrities in conservation. Among other strategies, charities are often figure headed by celebrities, to raise money to for conservation. He concludes that these 'figureheads' of conservation in Africa – celebrities drawing attention to and promoting conservation efforts of, for example, NGOs – are almost all white and from the Western world. This is, allegedly, because there is a demand for 'heroic white figures' in the Western market, which is the target for these NGOs; it is indeed the market which forms the conservation ideals. Among many others, Brockington names Sir David Attenborough (British producer of wildlife films), the late Steve Irving (nicknamed 'The Crocodile Hunter', from his Australian television show with the same name), and Harrison Ford (American film actor and producer, vice-chair of Conservation International) as examples of celebrity promoting conservation in the Western market through their personal fame (Brockington, 2009).

Roderick Neumann (1998) discusses wilderness romanticism in protected areas, investigating the origins of the vision of natural, primeval landscapes. In Neumann's account, the ideal draws upon the European nineteenth-century romanticism in art, where human labor was removed from landscape paintings to construct more pleasing vistas. He refers to the work of Frykman and Löfgren (1987), who claim that the transition to the capitalist division of labor gave birth to a perception of two distinct types of landscape: the landscape of production, associated with *rationality and profit* (in a capitalist sense), and the landscape of consumption, associated with *recreation and contemplation*. Neumann argues that the banning of human activities in national parks:

> "… reflects the essence of the landscape way of seeing: the removal of all evidence of human labor, the separation of the observer from the land, and the spatial division of production and consumption. A national park is the quintessential landscape of consumption for modern society (1998:24)."

More recently, Camilla Årlin (2011:31) also explores wilderness idealism in her PhD dissertation about the creation of, and persisting problematic of the Tarangire National Park. She claims that:

> "… Tarangire becomes a distinct space discernible on any tourist map, firstly because from the late 1800s and onwards there is a growing wilderness idealism manifesting itself in the establishment of national parks in the United States of America …, these ideas then ripple across the world and are attached to spaces seen as worthy of protection. Secondly, from the early 20th century there is a growing group of highly influential and mainly aristocratic white men pushing for greater protection of the flora and fauna of 'the Empire' as they see this flora and fauna, or Eden, under the threat of extinction. …"

She then continues the causality chain by explaining how these aristocrats propagated for a strict separation of land in Africa into national parks; land which they wrongfully perceived as untouched by humans. For it seems that this notion of animals – rather than people – being the aboriginal inhabitants of the sites of nature conservation, comes from a mistake. Contrary to this belief, people had, in fact, been living on these lands, and had been shaping the landscape, for a long time. However, a number of factors largely arisen through colonial intervention – including famine, war, and epidemics such as the *Rinderpest* which killed cattle, and sleeping sickness, caused by *tsetse*-flies – depopulated

large areas and led these 'aristocratic white men' into thinking it was untouched wilderness (Årlin, 2011; Lekan, 2011).

The contrasting image is that of a land which people have inhabited for millennia, and in fact had more than a little to do with how the landscape and the ecosystem is shaped today. In the introduction to her book *Imagining Serengeti* (2007:1), historian Jan Bender Shetler writes about the region which today, partly, consists of the Serengeti National Park and the game reserves nearby:

> "One might see this western Serengeti landscape as nature at its finest, a last remnant of unspoiled wilderness where animals can roam free. Or one might see it as a landscape shaped by people who set fires to create openly spaced woodlands with productive grasses, tell stories about ancestors settling at Mangwesi Mountain, propitiate spirits at the nearby spring, and follow the paths of hunters, traders, and raiders that crisscross the land."

These two ways of seeing the land are of course subjective, and neither can be said to be objectively correct; however the former is historically incorrect due to the false conception that the land has been unused by human economic activities for a long time, if not indefinitely. The second, more fluid image is that of the peoples traditionally living in the western Serengeti. It had to give way to the conservationist view of the colonial administration, when the protected areas were formed (Shetler, 2007).

Western NGOs and other organizations concerned with biodiversity and conservation have a strong influence on conservation in Africa (Brockington, 2009). Different NGOs can have very different goals, strategies, networks and power (Fisher, 1997). To enlist the help of NGOs, a cause must be able to market itself. Otherwise, it will face a difficult time getting NGO support, because the NGOs are dependent on money from donors – and for a cause, be it social or environmental, to attract the help of Western NGOs, it must ultimately be appealing to the Western public (Bob, 2005). One way to do this, as discussed above, is by enlisting the support of celebrities wanting an air of goodwill, or being genuinely engaged in the issue being promoted (Brockington, 2009). Conservation of scenic landscapes and rich wildlife, apparently, provides a more attracting subject for involvement than do local populations who share the space of that which conservation seeks to preserve; most likely due to the idealized vision of African nature and wildlife in the mind of Europeans and Americans. A case that stands out is that of the Maasai. They are likely the most well-known East African tribe to the Western public (Briggs and McIntyre, 2013; Goldman, 2011). Though only one of over 200 tribes represented in Tanzania – and certainly not the only one having to face land conflicts – the Maasai have managed to gain acknowledgement from several Western NGOs for their land conflicts, including a recent online Avaaz (2013) petition called *Stand with the Maasai*, which at the time of my visit on the website had accumulated almost 1,8 million signatures from people around the world. The Maasai have managed to achieve what Neumann calls being "preserved as part of the natural fauna" (1998:18). In western Serengeti – as mentioned above – there was the SRCP; a government financed NGO in project form, which is no longer active. Apart from that, to my knowledge no NGO has shown interest in the situation for the people in Chamuriho Division with regards to conflicts with conservation schemes.

4.5 Conservation and human rights

In the effort to secure areas for conservation, governments have throughout history – often forcefully – evicted people living on and otherwise being dependent on the land marked by the state for nature conservation, in Tanzania and elsewhere (Bonner, 1993; Brockington and Igoe, 2006; Brockington, 2009; Goldman, 2011; Lekan, 2011; Nelson, 2010; Neumann, 1998; Shetler, 2007; West et al., 2006). The creation of Yellowstone National Park in northwestern US in 1872 – which was the role model for the colonial powers' creations of national parks in East Africa (see above) – was done by using military force to evict Native

American populations, as well as white settles, from the area and outlawing the traditional economic practices such as hunting, cultivation, livestock herding, and the gathering of firewood (Lekan, 2011; Neumann, 1998:30).

Looking at Tanzanian again, Brockington (2002) in his book about the creation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, describes how pastoralists were displaced by the state from the reserve. He argues that this was unjust as well as unnecessary, and that the decision was based on the mythical image of wilderness discussed above. Generally in contemporary Tanzania, he claims, land loss is common in rural areas, and losing land in Tanzania means impoverishment, since wage jobs are not commonly to be found for displaced small-scale farmers (Brockington, 2002:6).

Conservation displacement is not only evicting people from their homes. Restricting or prohibiting their access to areas they would otherwise use for their livelihood, must also be considered an *economic displacement* (Brockington, 2009) with just as serious consequences, as Michael Cernea (2005:48) argues:

> "There is ample evidence that their socio-economic effects end up being virtually the same as if they were physically forcibly displaced. Not being given alternatives, such groups soon revert to surreptitious, but now illegal, use of the restricted areas, undermining conservation objectives."

There is also the case of the Maasai, as mentioned above, who have been expelled on numerous occasions from several parks (Goldman, 2011; Lekan, 2011; Nelson, 2010). Possibly unique in Tanzania, the Maasai were guaranteed eternal right to live in the Ngorongoro after they were evicted from the Serengeti in the 1950s – a promise which has not gone unbroken (Nelson et al., 2009:302). Nevertheless, as we shall see below, I came across a few people who spoke enviously about the special treatment of the Maasai, although they certainly have had their share of conservation displacement. Displacement for conservation purposes in Tanzania is not only an issue of the past. In 2009, as part of a land conflict ongoing since 1992 between Maasai communities in the Loliondo area of Ngorongoro District in Arusha Region and the Ortello Business Corporation (OBC) – whose clients include the United Arab Emirates' royal family – 3000 Maasai pastoralists were forcibly evicted from the area they inhabited by government security forces. This action was allegedly followed by reports of rape, humiliation and beatings during the eviction, as well as the burning of homesteads (Feminist Activist Coalition, 2009; Just Conservation, 2011; Zuelch, 2011). This conflict culminated again in March 2013, as the Tanzanian government announced plans to set aside 1,500 square kilometers of Maasai land to the OBC for conservation (Anonymous correspondent, 2013; Philemon, 2013; Survival International, 2013). The eviction is an example of conflicts over land rights worsened by the weak governmental institutions that many African nations suffer from, in this case allegedly resulting in a disregard for local people's legal rights to land. Fred Nelson – Executive Director of Maliasili Initiatives, an organization dealing with community based natural resource governance in eastern and southern Africa – discusses the events in Loliondo (2010:238):

> "If the rule of law is weak, formal legal rights are circumvented when they conflict with other private or state interests."

At the same time, however, according to Brockington and Igoe (2006), if African states were stronger, and were to fully enforce their existing conservation legislation, displacements would become much more common. It is not surprising, then, that the relationships between protected areas and local communities are historically poor. In neighboring Uganda, people who were allowed to resettle an area from which they had previously been evicted, allegedly tried to kill the wildlife in the area, in order to eradicate any incentives for future evictions (Kideghesho et al., 2006). There are other similar cases where local people have destroyed wildlife and forests in order to avoid the area being protected (Brockington et al., 2006). In an attempt to mitigate the effects of conservation on local people, and provide them with an incentive to have a more positive view of the

protected areas, many community based conservation projects have appeared (Kideghesho et al., 2006).

5 The political structure of Tanzania and the protected areas

Tanzania is divided into 30 administrative regions, and 169 districts. The districts consist of several divisions, and each division of wards. A ward is a local authoritative unit headed by a chairman. In rural areas, a ward is further subdivided into several villages. The villages, in turn, are divided into hamlets. All field data for this thesis has been gathered in the Mara Region of Tanzania, more precisely Chamuriho Division in Bunda District, southern Mara. Most data has been acquired by interviewing local people in Hunyari and Mugeta Wards of Chamuriho Division, by going on a motorbike through the countryside with my guide and interpreter, who knew the area well from working there with Vi Agroforestry. In Hunyari Ward, informants have been selected from Mariwanda, Hunyari, and Kihumbu Villages, and in Mugeta Ward from Mugeta, Tingirima, and Kyandege Villages. The two wards and some of their villages border to the Grumeti Game Reserve to the south. Small scale farmers and local communities living near the boundary of the protected areas are the focus of this study. These are the people who have to deal with encroachment of animals from the park, and who pay the highest price for the creation of protected areas. Studies show that attitudes among local people in western Serengeti towards the protected areas vary depending on factors such as shortage of water and the magnitude of conflicts. However, attitudes seem to be generally negative (Kideghesho et al., 2006). Prohibitions against killing animals that threaten to destroy their crops, and lack of influence over park policy, has even led local people in western Serengeti to disobey hunting prohibitions and give shelter to poachers (Lekan, 2011). Poachers are a problem in many African national parks, and Serengeti with its surrounding game reserves are no exceptions (Walpole et al., 2004). In conflicts between wildlife and humans, the district authorities implement the laws set up to govern the rights and restrictions of local people towards the protected areas. This includes punishing poaching and other breaches of regulations, such as grazing cattle inside the boundaries of the protected area. It also includes paying token compensation to farmers suffering from crop destruction, according to the person responsible for wildlife issues at Bunda District Council, who I interviewed in his office.

Tanzanian politics have been dominated by the socialist party Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) since independence. During the reign of Julius Nyerere, the country saw strict government control over public life, and especially the economy. After Nyerere resigned his presidency in 1985, his successor, Ali Hassan Mwinyi, opened up for more liberal economic policies and a reduced government control (BBC, 2013; USAID, 2011). Tanzania is, today, a highly corrupt country according to Transparency International (2013). The Tanzanian government is of course a major stakeholder when it comes to wildlife conservation, and a driving force for expanding protected areas. Money from tourism connected to the national parks and conservation areas is an important source of income for the country. During my time in the country, and especially during interviews, I observed that the state appears to have central position in people's apprehension of the world outside

of their immediate surroundings. This was manifested by comments about how the government, rather than the leaders of the Grumeti Game Reserve, should take better care of the people. Also, the proper institutional channels seem to be inflexible when it comes to compensation and handling initiatives from farmers. Some informants complained that the chain of bureaucracy was long, and sometimes broken:

> "All issues start from the grassroots. From the villagers, to the hamlet leader, to the village executive officer, to the ward executive officer, to division executive officer, then to the district. When the people in the village initiate something; that the reserve authorities should do something because we have a problem from the reserve, this should be discussed with the district level. But somewhere the chain is broken, and the issue does not come to the attention of the councilors, and nothing happens. They were supposed to take it to a higher authority, but they didn't."

5.1 Serengeti National Park

The Serengeti National Park lies in northern Tanzania, east of Lake Victoria and west of Kilimanjaro and Arusha. It spans 14.763 square kilometers, and is home to vast numbers of different species of wild animals, including elephants, buffalos, lions, and baboons. The Serengeti National Park is one of the world's largest animal reserves, and the so-called 'Great Migration' of over two million ungulates goes through the Serengeti ecosystem. It is the oldest, largest, and most famous national park in Tanzania, and one of the most popular sites for tourism in the country (Briggs and McIntyre, 2013:289-295; Tanzania Tourist Board, 2013). The park owes much of its fame to Bernhard Grzimek (see above), who vigorously promoted the park (Brockington, 2009; Lekan, 2011:34) The Serengeti was first established as a reserve in 1929, and as a national park in 1951 under British colonial rule, displacing the rural population previously living in the newly established national park. Since then, no human settlements have been allowed within its boundaries (Brockington, 2002; Neumann, 1998:129-139). The park is governed by the Tanzania National Parks Authority (TANAPA).

5.2 Grumeti Game Reserve

The area of study borders the Grumeti Game Reserve to the south, a controlled stretch of land functioning as a buffer zone between the villages and the Serengeti National Park. The northern boundary of the game reserve, where it borders with the area of study, consists of the Robana River (sometimes spelled 'Rubana' or 'Ruwana'), which streams from east to west, and flows out into Lake Victoria. As we will see in section 6 of this thesis, the Robana River is an important source of water for the studied villages. The Grumeti Game Reserve is situated along the 'western corridor' of the Serengeti National Park stretching towards Lake Victoria. The reserve was upgraded from Game Control Area to Game Reserve in 1994, and functions as a corridor, or 'buffer zone', for the Great Migration of wildlife such as wildebeest, zebra, and Thompson's gazelles on its way north towards Kenyan Maasai Mara National Reserve (Kideghesho et al., 2006). In 2002, the Grumeti Community and Wildlife Conservation Fund ('Grumeti Fund') took over the management of the reserve, now a private concession, and created the ecotourism resort Grumeti Reserves. The Grumeti Fund is owned by Tudor Investment Corporation, whose manager, Paul Tudor Jones II, is an American multi-billionaire and environmental philanthropist (Brockington, 2009:104; Forbes, 2013; Poole, 2006). Later, in 2006, Singita, a private ecotourism operation, partnered with the Grumeti Fund (Arusha Times, 2006; Singita, n.d.). It is a luxurious ecotourism venture; in both 2011 and 2012, the website *Travel+Leisure* appointed *Singita Grumeti Reserves* the best hotel in the world (Zeveloff, 2012).

Before Operation Vijiji (see section 6.1 below), the reserve area was inhabited by rural Tanzanians of the western Serengeti peoples (Shetler, 2007), but the inhabitants moved out

in the mid 1970's during the village formation, according to my informants. Nowadays, no people live in the reserve, which is guarded against poachers and other trespassers by rangers. A few times during my time in the villages neighboring the reserve, I would see trucks of rangers going at high speed through the villages' main roads.

6 The rural communities of Hunyari and Mugeta, and tensions with the protected area

As we drove on my interpreter's motorbike through the countryside of Chamuriho Division from where we live in the village of Nyamuswa to Hunyari and Mugeta Wards, I had plenty of time to look around. The landscape was openly spaced, with acacia trees, the strange-looking so-called "giant cactus trees" (Euphorbia Candelabrum), and bushes for vegetation. It was dry and dusty, and dotted with large rock formations. We met with many locals going about their everyday business as we drove between villages: Children in clean school uniforms with briefcases on their backs, waving to us as we passed; women carrying baskets on their heads and infants on their backs, dressed in the colorful *kanga* dresses which are common in the African Great Lakes region; men and boys in worn pants and shirts driving herds of cows, sheep, and goats along the road with long sticks, forcing us to navigate between the animals, with the unmistakable smell of ruminant animals around us.

6.1 Livelihoods and mode of production

People in the area depend mostly on cultivation, often combined with livestock keeping. Most are small scale farmers, mainly producing food for subsistence. I interviewed the recently retired Ward Officer of Hunyari Ward, outside his home on a small farm in the ward. He was one of the few of my informants who spoke English well enough for my interpreter to be superfluous. A middle-aged woman in the household, whom I later interviewed as well, served us hot maize gruel in cups. According to my informant, most people are cultivating farmers, while some are livestock keepers. Production is low, he told me:

> "Actually, [people in the ward] are not farmers, more peasants./…/ They produce in small scale, just for food. Their production is very low, compared to farmers. Hand to mouth."

The main tribe in the studied area is Ikizu, who base their livelihoods mainly on cultivation, and some pastoralism. Many other tribes, such as the pastoralist Tatoga and other western Serengeti tribes like Ikoma and Nata, are represented in the area (Lekan, 2011; Shetler, 2003). Maize, cassava, millet, sorghum, and sweet potato are the main food crops, and cattle, goats and sheep are the most common livestock animals. Other means of income and subsistence include small businesses, such as shop keeping, poultry keeping, and growing cash crops such as cotton, sisal, and sunflower. During my time in Chamuriho Division, I saw countless fields being cultivated, but only once did I see a tractor. Thus, the level of technology in the area's agricultural system is very low; most work is done by hand, with hoes. Labor is recruited from family members and neighbors. In my interviews I came across farmers whose households had more than 20 members. I commonly observed children helping their elders on the field, or herding cattle. Through these observations of

forces and relations of production in the area of study, I conclude that the prevailing mode of production is a form of kin-ordered mode (Wolf, 1982:88-100).

Important to keep in mind, when assessing the relations of production in the western Serengeti, are the experiments with African socialism, or *Ujamaa*, conducted in Tanzania after independence by Julius Nyerere and the ruling party CCM. Among other elements, one feature of the Ujamaa was the village formation, or *Operation Vijiji*. Operation Vijiji was a collectivization of the agricultural production, forcing hundreds of thousands of Tanzanians to relocate and move together into larger villages in the mid 1970's. Several of my informants mention the village formation process of 1974 when discussing the reserve. The Village Chairman of Kihumbu Village claimed the following:

> "The Grumeti Game Reserve belonged to the people. People of this area used to live there. Then they moved in 1974 during village formation. After that, they still used the area. Then they were stopped from using the area."

As a result of Operation Vijiji, the administration and allocation of land is still confused in Tanzania (Lange, 2008:2-3; USAID, 2011). Many regard Ujamaa as an economical failure, since it has decreased production (Plaut, 2012) as well as purchasing power (Stapenhurst and Kpundeh, 1999:153-156). However, it did improve healthcare and educations levels (Briggs and McIntyre, 2013:15), as well as creating a Tanzanian identity rather than just various tribal identities, to unite the nation (USAID, 2011:1) and avoid the tribal conflicts, which is a problem in neighboring Kenya (Lonsdale, 2008). Tanzania's land tenure policies have since been changed to allow for more individual, rather than collective, land tenure, with foreign investors now being welcome to the country. Communal management of unsettled areas, especially for the purpose of preserving wildlife, is being kept (USAID, 2011:1). The situation for land tenure in Tanzania is unstable, and the rule of law is weak in the country (Transparency International, 2013), resulting – among other effects – in a very bad situation for women regarding access to land, even though the legislation grants an equal access. The reason for this seems to be lack of knowledge of laws on the local level. Customary laws and traditional practice can also stand in the way for the implementation of formal laws (USAID, 2011:2).

6.2 Human-wildlife conflicts

Wildlife, usually elephants, destroying crops is the phenomenon connected to the park that affects people the most. Apart from elephants, some have reported warthogs, buffalos, antelopes, and hippopotamuses to cause crop destruction. It is doubtless the most common problem reported by informants, and often the first thing people say when asked about how the protected area affects them. The problem with elephants and other wildlife is strongly connected to the people's opinions on the authorities; they feel that the authorities should assist them with these problems.

I arrived with my interpreter at a homestead on the outskirts of Mariwanda, on the road-less savannah only a few kilometers from the boundary of the game reserve. I could see a number of small houses made of wood and clay, and about a dozen people wearing worn clothes, working or standing and talking. As always when I arrived at a new place, everyone looked up from what they were doing and gazed curiously on me, talking and smiling. From a small hut, I could see smoke coming out. Through the opening I saw a middle-aged woman squatting next to a cooking pot standing on three stones with a fire underneath – simple, traditional stoves in Tanzania. I sat down under a mango tree with a man who looked to be around 45 years old. I was told that he is the hamlet leader, and from his manner – hitting the dogs with his stick whenever they come too close, telling the younger household members to bring out chairs and a table – I gathered that he is a person of authority here. Several members of the household sat with us, but it was only he who answered my questions. We came to interview him about a very sensitive matter. Only nine

days earlier, his son was killed by a buffalo when he was grazing cattle close to the Robana River. He suddenly came face to face with the animal after passing a bush, and the buffalo attacked and killed him. I asked my informant what happened afterwards.

> "… the body was taken here. [Then] the Village Chairman came around, and sent a report to the district authorities. Then [the game reserve officials] together with district officials came to see what had happened. They … filled some forms, and said that we would get feedback. That was on the eighteenth [September]. Until now, we haven't heard anything. … So we don't know what will happen."

He proceeded to tell me that the last time this happened in the village was several years ago, when a person was killed by an elephant.

> "That time, they came to see what had happened, and then after a few months, they sent a refund of 50 000 [Tanzania Shillings, about 30 US Dollars]. … that was all."

After the interview, I and my interpreter were treated to a meal with the males of the household; ugali (a thick porridge) and the head of a goat, roasted whole.

Later the same day, a group of people in another homestead nearby told me that a woman was killed last year as well, by an elephant while fetching water from the Robana River. The most severe aspect of human-wildlife conflicts is when humans are killed by wild animals. From the interviews, it appears to be infrequently occurring, but nevertheless, it does happen.

Predation of livestock is an issue which most people who keep livestock seem to have experienced, but compared to crop destruction and lack of pasture and water, it is of minor importance. Most need to be asked specifically about the issue before they mention the problem, although a few have mentioned it as one of the first things they come to think of when I ask them about how they are affected by the protected area. Most common seems to be hyenas preying on sheep and goats. Lions taking livestock is reported by some, but how frequent it is cannot easily be established. A few have mentioned it as big problem, while some say it is quite uncommon that lions attack. Elephants can also kill cattle if they happen to meet. Generally, predation is seldom mentioned as the main problem with living in the vicinity of the protected area. At first, during our interview, the Village Chairman of Tingirima Village even claims that this does not happen in the village, but changes his mind when specifically asked about hyenas, admitting that hyenas can cause problems.

Another problem from wildlife reported by some informants is disease transmission from wild animals to domestic ones, and sometimes to humans too. Some of these diseases are spread via ticks. Fungal diseases are spread directly from wildlife to cattle, and one informant mentioned diseases transmitted by tsetse-flies as a problem. A few informants also mentioned that when wildlife come in great numbers, they can pollute the village well, causing people to suffer from diarrhea. Rabies is also caused sometimes.

6.3 Less resources for an increasing population

Another important issue, challenging crop destruction for being the most prioritized problem caused by the game reserve, is exclusion from the grazing of livestock in the protected area and watering animals in the Robana River, which, according to many, is the main source of water for this area. Although lack of pasture and water are two different problems, they are closely connected and both have to do with the aridity of the region combined with not being allowed to cross the Robana. Therefore I treat them more or less as the same issue. This problem is constantly magnified by an ever-increasing population. The majority of Tanzanians (about ¾ of the population) are rural, and the rate of population growth is high, although decreasing (CIA, 2013). This leads to an ever-increasing pressure on rural resources like land and water, and the denser the population; the more likely human-wildlife conflicts are to increase (Lamarque et al., 2009). I met with the Village

Executive Officer of Mugeta Village, in his office. The office was small, with concrete floors and walls, but the man was well dressed in a suit. He explained that:

> "The effect [of the protected area upon people's lives in the village] is a shortage of land. The area used by the villagers before is nowadays prohibited to them for their activities like pasture and farming activities./…/ Earlier, people were living further from the Reserve. But nowadays, because of the increasing population, people are moving closer to the reserve. This is why there are problems./…/ The people need the reserve to be removed."

He later expressed the opinion that the boundary of the reserve should be changed back to its previous boundaries, when people could still use the Robana River and some land beyond the river for their activities. The opinion of this village official, thus, is that the reserve has many negative consequences. Nevertheless, he maintains that the relationship between the village and the game reserve is good, because of the community services provided by the game reserve. But he thinks that the help is not enough. Another informant in Mugeta Village stated:

> "There has been an increase of population. And the area that we can use for our subsistence has decreased. Since we depend so much on livestock keeping, we require a large area."

I visited another farmer in Mugeta Village, who was depending much on livestock. We sat down on plastic chairs in a large, empty room in his newly built guesthouse out on the countryside with 17 rooms and sun-panels on the roof, evidence of a relative wealth. My informant and three younger men were drinking beer – the South African Castle Lager. My interpreter confirmed my suspicion by claiming that he must have a large amount of cattle to afford such a house. Nevertheless, the farmer spoke of cattle dying from starvation:

> "The reduction of area for grazing affects us a lot since we depend much on cattle keeping. So we have been forced to sell a number of cattle. We depend on the cattle for our income. And because of lack of land for grazing, some cattle died from starvation. I have lost almost 100 cows."

I interviewed a 19-year-old woman in a homestead in Mugeta Village, not far from the Robana River. I was supposed to interview her elder relative, but she was away, and did not return home until the interview was all but finished. The young woman told me that there is a shortage of pasture for livestock, and a shortage of water for both livestock and humans. This is why they have to go to the Robana River, even though they are not allowed to:

> "We must, there's no other alternative. But if they catch us… We depend on the water from the river for our cattle, but we are not allowed to go there, that's a big problem."

In an interview with the Village Chairman of Tingirima Village (the village furthest from the reserve boundary of the villages comprised by this study), I had to ask specifically about shortage of pasture and water before he mentioned it as a problem. In all other villages, it had been spontaneously mentioned as one of the village's main problems. Then he told me that the villagers would be happy if the boundary of the reserve was pushed back 5-10 kilometers. "Then the pasture would be enough for our cattle", he concludes.

Another source of conflict is hunting, or rather poaching, as all hunting is prohibited by law. It was not always like that. Traditionally, hunting has been a part of people's livelihoods in the area. Now, the people only hunt in the reserve by sneaking into it. How common poaching is, is impossible to say. Almost no one I ask admits to hunting. Some say they used to hunt before the prohibition. When I ask my two interpreters about it during our lunch break, they start to laugh hysterically, and tell me what I already guessed; that people do not always tell the truth regarding this matter. Another of Vi Agroforestry's field staff tells me that hunting is quite common in the area, and is a way to secure extra income for people. He tells me that people sell the game meat to buyers as far away as Tarime, about 90 kilometers north of Bunda District, close to the Kenyan border.

Previously, according to an informant in Mugeta Village, the hunting practices of the local community would keep the animals from coming to the village. When they did come,

they were hunted. But with the hunting prohibition, the animals no longer fear to come to the village – and less can be done to scare them off. Also, because of the hunting prohibition along with the lack of contest from domesticated animals for pasture, the number of animals has increased.

It is possible to get a hunting permit. However, this is nothing that the villagers can generally afford, according to the Agricultural Extension Officer of Mugeta Ward. He also spoke of a connection between the amount of compensation and participation, and the likeliness of people resorting to poaching:

> "Those who hate game reserve authorities are the ones who don't get compensation when their crops get destroyed. Sometimes they are the ones who go there to the game reserve area to kill animals for their own consumption. Some changes must be done. … There are hotels there. They should pay people who work there more, to make them earn a living./…/ If they don't do it, there will be poaching. You will be encouraging poaching. Because they don't earn much./…/ So if you don't pay them well they are encouraged to cooperate with poachers."

Concerning hunting, many informants spontaneously mentioned the community based project SRCP (see section 4.2) and described their activities where the villagers participated in the hunting activities, and villagers were then allowed to buy the meat for a cheap price. The money was then used for community development. This project stopped several years ago, but many still mention it as a good initiative. A woman in Kyandege, however, disagrees. According to her, the SRCP were not providing enough money for the community services they need.

6.4 Conflicts with rangers

The lack of water and good pasture available forces people to defy the prohibition and enter the reserve with their animals. Many express that they have no choice but to take their cattle to the river for watering, and there is not enough pasture elsewhere. There are then often conflicts with the rangers of the game reserve, who confiscate livestock as soon as they cross the river – sometimes because the owner drives them across, and sometimes because the animals don't 'know better'. Sometimes the rangers also capture the people responsible for the livestock. They force them to pay high fines without a trial, in order to get their cattle back. If they refuse that, or cannot pay, they are taken to the court in Bunda.

Often, the allegations are made-up by the rangers, according to my informants. I interviewed a man in Kyandege Village, a 38-year-old farmer and livestock keeper, who used to be a butcher. He told the following tale, about an event that occurred on 1 April 2011:

> "… I went down close to the border of the reserve, with a friend, to buy a cow for slaughter. But then [the rangers] met us with their car. They took us into the car and brought us with them. When we reached the reserve, they took a dead wild animal – that they had killed – and brought it into the car, and said that we had killed it. They took us to the head office of the reserve. From there, they took us to Bunda, to open a court case against us. They tried their very best, but when the judgment fell, it stated they were liars, so they released us."

He then continued to explain how they were still in Kyandege Village when they were overtaken, and actually far from the actual border to the reserve. A few times when in the field, I met with the rangers on their trucks, going in high speed through the villages' main streets. Many informants have reported harassment of this kind, and worse, from game reserve rangers. There have even been allegations of lethal violence from the rangers. These allegations have been few, though. The day after, still in Kyandege, another 38-year-old farmer told me a similar tale. After he finished, I asked about the allegations of rangers killing people:

[Informant]: “Some years back, a young boy was looking after cows. [The rangers] chased him, and after catching him, they beat him, causing him to die.”

[Interviewer]: “They beat him to death?”

[Informant]: “Yes. People climbed trees, to see what was happening to the guy, and saw the beating. After his death, the game guards refused to admit that they had done it. They said that ‘we chased him in the reserve, and he ran into a tree and died’. But it’s not true. They try to change the truth in order to escape the law.”

In Tingirima Village, I interviewed a very talkative man of 52 years with a 15 acre farm. He spontaneously told me about how the rangers from the game reserve are violent to people who go to the reserve:

“People are caught by the game guards and beaten. Even women gone to fetch firewood are attacked. Even animals that cross the river are attacked. After attacking both people and livestock, you have to pay a penalty. If you don’t pay, you won’t be allowed to go back [out of the reserve]./…/ Some people have been killed. When their relatives go to the authorities, they are not listened to. It seems that, because the Grumeti Fund has money, the government leaders are not bothered about the people.”

Another man, in Kyandege, spoke of two people who were caught by rangers:

“One was brought to court, and they said: “You can go to jail for three years or pay six million.” And he paid, rather than going to jail. Another was caught, and the sentence was to pay 20 million, or three years in jail. He is still in jail.”

These allegations indicate a systematic abuse of local people by rangers. A reason why this is allowed to continue appears to be corruption, from what one informant claims. This claim gains credibility from the international anti-corruption organization Transparency International's (2013) assessment of Tanzania as a country with a high corruption rate, including lack of judicial independence.

6.5 Resentment, resistance, and exclusion

Some informants close to the protected area have explicitly stated that they feel that the government cares more for the wildlife than they do for them. This is a recurring theme when I have been interviewing people in the villages. The authorities have a policy of paying 100 000 Tanzania Shillings (around 60 US Dollars) per destroyed acre, but this compensating refund is seldom realized, according to the villagers’ statements. When the authorities do take action to mitigate the effects of wildlife, it is usually by coming to chase the animals away, back into the protected area. But they are often too late, especially since the animals often come by night. So the farmers are left to fend for themselves. Some try to scare them off by making noises. After waiting for a microloan organization meeting to end, I sat down talking to one of the members – an old male farmer – on the roots under a large tree in Hunyari. He told me that:

“We make noise to scare the animals away. Sometimes we kill those who won’t leave, even though the authorities don’t allow it.”

I then asked him whether they get punished for it.

“If we get caught. But we make sure we don’t get caught.”

A group of members of a household in Mariwanda, not too far from the Robana River, told me that when the elephants are coming, the people in the area have a habit of informing their fellows, then harvesting what they can before the elephants come to close. Then all they can do is to run away.

When the people still had access to the protected area they engaged in activities like grazing and watering livestock, hunting, and religious ritual. Especially livestock keepers

often expressed, during the interviews, the feeling of being excluded from lands where they have previously had their livelihood. A man in Kihumbu expressed that:

> "I was born here. I have lived here for so many years. Nowadays, the regulations are that we are not allowed to walk freely. People are prohibited – people who have lived here for a so long time."

His statement attests a feeling of being subjected to injustice, and exclusion from land rightfully belonging to the people now being excluded. Some informants have also mentioned graves of relatives within the protected area, which the villagers are nowadays prohibited from visiting. People draw connections to the village formation in the mid-1970s (Ujamaa). It was during this state driven process that people moved out of the area that today is the reserve, several informants claim. The retired Ward Officer of Hunyari Ward states:

> "That's the second problem, next to the elephants; shortage of pasture. The area is called Kawanda. Before [Operation Vijiji], there were villages there, back in 1974. The people were taken from there. They think that they had rights to that area, so they need to graze there with their animals."

Another statement, by the Village Chairman of Kihumbu:

> "People miss the area that they used before. Now, even reaching the river is prohibited."

The man whose son was killed by a buffalo about a week before our meeting, had the following to say on the issue:

> "We should be given the reserve area, and allowed to use it as pasture for the cattle. And in this area, there are graves left behind since 1974. So my opinion is that the game reserve area should be given back to us."

Many informants have expressed a demand for more assistance from authorities – both mitigation initiatives such as erecting fences, treating livestock diseases, and increased contributions for community development as the current sum of 2 million Tanzania Shillings (around 1250 US Dollars) per year and village is too small to make up for the problems caused. Also, there is a demand for increased reliability of refunds for property destroyed by encroaching wildlife. Today, the refunds are too small and very unreliable. According to most informants, they are seldom paid at all. It is apparent that people consider themselves entitled to assistance from authorities; both on the district level and from the game reserve.

There is a much stronger feeling of resentment towards the Grumeti Game Reserve than towards the Serengeti National Park. In fact, not one of the informants expressed anything negative about the national park; some even claimed that the villagers like it. The reason was claimed to be that the national park is so far away – on the other side of the game reserve – and thus nothing people are concerned with on a daily basis in the studied area. Another reason, not articulated by the informants, might be that the Serengeti National Park was established so long ago, while the Grumeti Game Reserve took its current form only some twenty years ago with changes made to its boundary as late as 2004, according to informants. Those who were alive when land for the Serengeti National Park was claimed as a protected area by the British colonial administration are not around any longer. Any resentment and anguish that may have been felt might have ceased after all the decades that have passed. One farmer had the following to say about the difference between the Grumeti Game Reserve and the Serengeti National Park:

> "We prefer the national park to the game reserve. The national park operates in a friendly way, compared to the game reserve. The game reserve is harsher."

As an example of this, he claimed that representatives from the villages Kyandege, Tingirima and Mugeta were discussing with the game reserve, and agreed to let the boundary change in 2004 after being bribed by the game reserve (see quote below).

Three times during interviews, I was confronted with the view that the people would prefer to be like the Maasai, who are allowed to be in Ngorongoro. “There is a close relationship between the authority of the National Park and the Maasai people”, as a man in Kyandege said. When speaking to a man in a restaurant I was told a story about how two Maasai allegedly murdered an Indian Tanzanian family they were working for in Musoma, and that since then people don’t trust the Maasai (information from a casual conversation). Whether this story holds any truth or not, it shows prejudice of smallholders in western Serengeti towards the Maasai – it could be that there is an envy of this alleged “close relationship” between Maasai and authority.

My informants have different desires for the future of the protected area. Only two informants out of 59 interviews – one in Hunyari Village and one in Tingirima – explicitly say they want the entire game reserve abolished. All but one – a farmer in Tingirima – of the interviewed farmers and livestock keepers expressed, when asked, that they want the boundaries of the game reserve to be changed in one way or another. Most common is a desire for the physical boundary of the game reserve to be moved to further away from the village, to allow for grazing and other activities in the reserve area. Some are satisfied with policy changes, if these allow the community to use the lands for their activities and/or improve the system for compensation for crop destruction. Several informants have expressed a desire to participate in the park activities for the benefit of the local communities.

According to one informant in Kyandege, the people did not usually kill wildlife which entered the village in the days before the game reserve. However, after the reserve came, they often killed such animals as a kind of resistance to the reserve for not wanting a good relationship with the people. Some also go poaching for this reason, according to a middle-aged man I interviewed, also in Kyandege.

I have mentioned fines and other penalties, which the villagers have been forced to pay for breaking the rules of the reserve. Generally, it seems people do not think much about whether a penalty is legal or due to corruption, since most do not mention the legal nature of the penalty. They just conclude that the penalties have a large impact on their lives. Some informants, however, do speak of corruption. According to one man, who I interviewed in his large guesthouse in the countryside of Mugeta Ward, bribes were used when the boundary of the game reserve was moved to the Robana River:

> “They took one person from Kyandege, one person from Tingirima, and one person from Mugeta, as representatives for the people, in order to discuss with them. They used some sort of bribe to convince them to agree to move the boundary. They were village representatives and [the game reserve] used money to bribe them.”

Although there are a variety of opinions in each village, some general differences between the six villages targeted by this study can be discerned. It is important, however, to keep in mind that these differences are not statistically ensured, but mere observations made by me.

Informants in Tingirima Village are less negatively disposed towards the game reserve. Also, in Tingirima they tend to have more varied priorities. Informants generally, when asked how the protected areas affect them, begin by mentioning crop destruction caused by elephants, or shortage of pasture. In Tingirima, the chronology of the statements of the informants is different. It is plausible to deduce that these differences are due to the fact that Tingirima is the village furthest away from the boundary of the reserve, and that the people of Tingirima thus suffer less from the negative effects of the reserve than the people of, for example, Mariwanda.

Mariwanda, the village closest to the reserve, seems to be the village which suffers most negative consequences. Informants in Mariwanda were very negative to the game reserve, and the Village Chairman asked me, after the interview, if I could help them with their problems. He told me of how the Stephen Wasira Primary School (named after a district level politician) on the outskirts of the village suffers a lack of teachers, because of fear of

the wild animals. Even people from other villages often take events in Mariwanda as examples of conflicts between the reserve and the villages, or of people being killed by wildlife. The conflict in Mariwanda is also reviewed in a newspaper article from January 2013 (Naluyaga, 2013).

Although most informants are largely critical of the game reserve, some have expressed that there are both positive and negative aspects. The Agricultural Extension Officer of Mugeta Ward, for example:

> "If any disaster should happen, we get aid from them … Sometimes if there is a drought, we can get aid from them. … malaria is a common disease in Africa. For malaria we sometimes get bed nets."

Not only officials speak of good aspects of the reserve. Some farmers and a few livestock keepers have expressed an understanding of the reserve's objectives. One positive aspect, which some mentioned that they would like to see more of, was that sometimes, young people from the villages have been employed by the reserve to work with the tourism industry. Many informants would like to see an increase in community development efforts. Some already speak of this as a positive aspect of the reserve, but most people who mention it want more of it. People in Tingirima, for example, spoke warmly of a water pump which had been financed by the reserve – even though it was of bad quality and had already broken without being fixed.

6.6 Summary

Since the individual perceptions of people are different, the view of one villager may not be shared by anyone else in the village. The interviews of the field study which this thesis is based upon have indeed seen some variety of views and opinions. A general picture has emerged; there are several ways in which the proximity of the protected areas affects people's lives. From the interviews, I have perceived the most important effects of the reserve, as perceived by local people. These are crop destruction (mainly by elephants), and lack of pasture and water (both for animals and humans). Harassment and abuse from game rangers – sometimes in connection to watering animals at the Robana River, or crossing it to get access to pasture – and sometimes with a fatal end – is another major source of frustration and anguish. There have been allegations of corrupt behavior from game reserve personnel. Many informants have expressed a demand for higher and more reliable compensations from authorities – either at district level or from the game reserve – when they suffer negative consequences from wildlife. This mainly means the destruction of crops, but sometimes much worse – human death. This appears to be sporadically occurring, and not very common, but when it happens it is of course the most severe consequence. The reserve is also described as something that withholds traditional ways of life. There is a tradition of hunting in the region, which is now prohibited; there are burial sites for some people's ancestors, which they are now prohibited to visit. There are other problems which have been less emphasized by informants. Sometimes, livestock is preyed upon by, for example, lions and hyenas. When livestock and grazing wildlife share pastures diseases spread through, for example, ticks.

7 Discussion

The aim of this thesis is to show how villagers perceive and experience their lives in relation to the protected areas and their respective modes of production. A number of main themes have emerged from the empirical material. Several topics have emerged, and appeared as generally important throughout the interviews. These themes have been reviewed above – from "the native's point of view", to quote Geertz (1974). In this section I will try to frame these views within an analytical framework.

7.1 A conflict of interests

At the heart of the issue is a conflict of interests. On one hand are the opportunities of conservation – mainly biodiversity and much-needed income from tourism – supported by the Tanzanian government, NGOs, and much of the public opinion in the West. On the other hand are the traditional rights and livelihoods of local people, who are paying the highest price for conservation without getting much back. This is a picture which applies to much of African conservation efforts in general, as we have seen in the background section of this thesis. Looking at the empirical material presented above, we see that it is valid for the situation in Hunyari and Mugeta as well. But the conflict is not necessarily bipolar. An opinion expressed by a few villagers, was that the reserve should remain as it is, or with some changes in policy, and that the villages should participate in the tourism operations through youth employment. That is, to let the young people of the villages earn a direct income from working with tourism as guides, in hotels, etc. Another way to participate in tourism operations which was mentioned was to allow the villages to run their own tourist operation. This indicates that, although there is mostly suspicion and resentment towards the reserve from villagers, the idea of integrating with existing conservation policies exists. Embracing the reserve's conservationist mode of production would mean a gradual transformation – at least to some extent – of the currently kin-ordered mode of production towards a capitalist mode of production, which the game reserve's model of conservation represents very well. This would most likely mean that traditional livelihood strategies, especially livestock keeping, would have to decrease due to the spatial competition between wildlife and domestic animals discussed above. The current conservation ideal, as reviewed in the background section, does not allow for an integration of livestock in the reserve. Most local people, however, express that they want to take part of the reserve's physical area and its resources rather than the tourism industry.

Many, and especially those who are highly dependent on keeping livestock, want to be allowed into the now prohibited areas to graze their animals, gather firewood, fetch water from the Robana River, or hunt. Most people concerned want to achieve this by having the boundary pushed back 5-10 kilometers. Some claim they would accept that they were only permitted to enter with their cattle: "If we were allowed to enter the reserve [for grazing] without any quarrel, we would be happy", as one informant stated. Many informants feel

that the authorities care more for wild animals than they do for people living outside the reserve. They believe that they do not receive the amount of compensation for wildlife problems, or the community development funds, which they feel entitled to. On top of this, harassment and corrupt behavior from reserve personnel adds to a feeling of unjustness. All of these issues contribute to the resentment of the protected areas due to the large impact it has on the livelihoods of local people. It indicates a frustration and skepticism towards the motives and methods of the reserve, and a reluctance to abide by the demands of the conservationist mode of production.

7.2 Framing conservation

A form of kin-ordered mode is the prevailing mode of production in Hunyari and Mugeta Wards. It is the productive reality of the smallholders in Hunyari and Mugeta, and an integrated part of how they frame their lifeworld – as people in all societies have shared ways of making sense of the world. The same would then be true for the other side of the conflict; the reserve's rangers. They act in accordance with the logic of nature conservation. The rangers and reserve administration frame the productive reality of the reserve according to the commonsensical, socially constructed understandings and motives of the conservation paradigm. The collective action frames of that movement are adopted by the philanthropic political leadership of the Grumeti Fund. Although the Grumeti Fund is owned by a large actor in the private, profit-driven sphere, they nonetheless work within the action-oriented diagnostic, strategic, and motivational framing of the conservationist social movement. They are a part of the same reality construction concerning nature conservation. These motives are then adopted by the rangers, and acting within the action frames of the conservation movement becomes their livelihood, and eventually, a part of *their* lifeworld.

The reserve operates by the conservationist mode of production; and its agenda conflicts with that of local people. The two frames of reference appear to be hard to reconcile. The local people are alienated by the intrusion of a different system, with a different logic which takes the livelihoods of the locals into little consideration, and even considers them to constitute a threat; diagnosing the villagers as a part of the problem they seek to solve. The problem – the alleged menace of human activities to wildlife populations – has been diagnostically framed within the conservationist paradigm. The solution to the problem has been created through prognostic framing processes within the same field. The reserve legitimizes its activities by the collective action frames of the conservation movement. That is, the sets of beliefs and meanings that motivate the actions of the reserve as a part of the broader conservationist agenda. Thus, there is a clash between the values of the shared conservationist frames of reference, integrated into a capitalist mode of production, and the villagers' kin-ordered mode of production, which makes them perceive the park in a different way.

7.3 Economic displacement: a lifeworld in transition

Many informants speak of having used the reserve area in the past for activities such as grazing livestock, hunting, and visiting ritually important gravesites of their ancestors – but nowadays they are prohibited to do these activities in the reserve anymore. As a consequence, people's livelihoods have been criminalized. Many traditionally used to earn an income from hunting in the reserve area. This has turned from a part of the mode of production in the area, into a criminal act. People have been turned from hunters to poachers; and poachers are not favorably viewed by conservationists. Or to use Brockington's (2009:116) words: "Violence against (certain types of) people is strangely tolerated, whereas violence against (certain types of) wildlife is not." European and American conservationists have supported and participated in violent forms of anti-

poaching activities in Africa, without it causing any considerable unpopularity for the conservation cause, according to Brockington (2009:116-120). Neumann (2004) claims that this often deadly violence is justified through a discursively created shift in how poachers and wildlife is morally viewed.

Livestock keepers lacking pasture since the Grumeti Game Reserve became prohibited, claim to have no alternatives to bringing their cattle to the reserve: "We must, there's no other alternative. But if they catch us…" as one young woman said. The last part of the quote – "but if they catch us" – refers to the fines and possible violence they are subjected to for refusing to abide by the rules. In different parts of the studied area, I came across reports of cattle drowning in large numbers – more than 100 animals on one occasion – after being forced back into the river after crossing. This event was also reported in an article in Tanzania Daily News (Mugini, 2013).

I argue that the people living in the studied villages in connection to the Grumeti Game Reserve are, in fact, subjected to displacement, as they are withheld from resources essential for maintaining their livelihood; i.e. economic displacement (see section 4.5). Economic displacement is a reality in the villages of Hunyari and Mugeta Wards as well as other areas also bordering the Grumeti Reserves, such as Robanda to the east (Poole, 2006).

The criminalization of livelihoods and economic displacement which afflicts local people outside of the Grumeti Game Reserve stands in opposition to the everyday common sense of local people's lifeworld. It challenges the taken for granted ways in which people could previously visit and use the Robana River and the area beyond. Before the area became prohibited, going there and using its resources was all integrated into people's practical consciousness. They did not have to reflect on whether or not they could do go there without consequence – they just went. They would, of course, need to plan their trip in other ways – what to bring, when to go back, et cetera – but there was no need to reflect on whether or not they would be overtaken by rangers and fined.

When the everyday life is being intruded upon by outside forces, the shared lifeworld of the people of Hunyari and Mugeta Wards is being shifted. The people can no longer take the same things for granted, and these previously non-reflected phenomena in their lifeworld are now being reflected on. Human-wildlife conflicts such as crop destruction are not new phenomena – but it has, allegedly, become worse, and people cannot act on them as they used to, by hunting animals that become too much of a threat. The harsh ways in which they are prohibited from using the reserve area for pasture, hunting, and visiting gravesites, is a new phenomenon, and something which threatens these very basic functions of the society. When the everyday is subject to radical changes, the practical consciousness can no longer handle situations in the semi-conscious was did when things were taken for granted. The lifeworld is being shifted in its foundation, and a new lifeworld is being produced based on the new circumstances. In the process of producing a new lifeworld, new things are taken for granted, and become a semi-conscious part of everyday life.

During my interviews, I often came across the view that things were better before the reserve boundaries were moved – so often that this seemed to be near consensus. This evaluation of how things were in the past is possible only because of the ongoing changes in people's lives. Suddenly, the things that were previously obvious properties of the everyday life are now possible to take out of their context and consciously reflect on.

7.4 Different ways of viewing the land

The conflict between the Grumeti Game Reserve, and farmers and livestock keepers in Hunyari and Mugeta Wards, is a product of the distinct world-views and frames discussed above (see section 4.4) of a pristine African wilderness separate from and opposed to all human activity. This helps to explain the apparent polarization between locals and reserve; the reserve personnel want to uphold the image of exotic wilderness for tourists, while local

people just want to go about their lives, which the reserve area is an important part of both materially, as a part of their livelihoods, and ritually, as a landscape where they have lived and buried their dead – whose graves they are now prohibited to visit. From a lifeworld perspective, it can be reasoned that the way many locals see the reserve – as an area formerly belonging to them, now invaded by higher authorities, for a cause which they have a difficult time identifying with – is due to the high degree of unfamiliarity with which they perceive the conservation goals and methods. Several informants, for example a group of farmers living very nearby the reserve boundary in Mariwanda, did express an understanding to some degree, claiming that they "like the wildlife, because it brings in foreign currency". Even this group of farmers has a very negative view of the reserve. And for most, the way in which the reserve intrudes on their lifeworlds – through taking away pasture, water, and generally causing them to be harassed for their way of life – is far from their shared common-sense way of seeing the reserve area; as a natural resource-rich area which is theirs to use, from heritage as well as necessity. These people see nothing of the alleged benefits of the reserve activities, only the hardship it imposes on their lives.

There are demands for a sufficient and reliable compensation for wildlife-related losses, an increase in community development efforts from the reserve, and a wish expressed by some to be able to take part of the tourism activities – most commonly by employing young members of the community. This can be interpreted as a sign of a shift in the views of the communities. If the reserve can legitimize its own existence in the eyes of the local communities, then people might be willing to adapt and let the reserve's existence become a part of their livelihoods. Thus, the reserve might not be – at least to some degree – entirely incompatible with the livelihood of the villagers. The problem is that most people are small scale farmers, whose livelihood has nothing to gain but much to lose from the reserve. In relation to the lifeworlds of these farmers the reserve institution is something inherently alien. This is laid plain when one contemplates the farmers' active noncompliance by continuing to hunt in secret, and sometimes bringing livestock into the reserve.

Issues resembling the conflict can be seen in most parts of the world, although with different ingredients. For further understanding of the resentment many locals have expressed towards authorities for seeming to care more for animals than for people, a comparison can be made to the constantly ongoing debate about wolves in Sweden. It is of a different scale, with different power relations, and (mostly) not about protected areas, but the core conflict is the same; the people living in close connection to, and interacting with, wildlife – versus the urban Western public's image of what nature ought to be.

The transition from earlier modes of production into the capitalist mode (Wolf, 1982) coincides with the appearance of the ideal of nature as separate from human activity. Both trace their prosperity to the nineteenth-century industrial revolution and colonialism (Årlin, 2011; Neumann, 1998). I argue that this is not mere coincidence, and that this supports the argument of a close connection between neoliberal capitalism and current-day conservation. Nature and wildlife conservation is tied the global capitalistic economic system of today, which seems contradictive since it is being marketed by indicating the opposite.

7.5 Pragmatic solutions required

Voices have been raised in later years to show how this conflict of interests, wherever it may occur, can be redeemed. In an interview about his book *Celebrity and the environment*, with George Galloway in his Press TV television show *The Real Deal*, Dan Brockington gives a good summary of the problematic situation of the contemporary conservation paradigm:

> "Conservation is a good thing, I should think. It has all sorts of good effects. But it distributes both fortune and misfortune. And the obvious case is setting up a national park or a game reserve in

> many parts of the world which can require the eviction, or economic displacement of thousands of people, tens of thousands of people worldwide (Press TV, 2009)."

Conservation, it seems, is not a bad thing, although the results of my field study might suggest something of the sort, from the point of view of affected locals. Questions concerning conservation include a complex mixture of stakeholders, motives, ideologies, and worldviews. Finding a middle ground where everyone concerned is pleased, is not an easy task. It can be argued that conservation evictions and economic displacement requires compromises and less idealized bases for decision making than today. Rather, decisions should be motivated by pragmatic ecological and social considerations, based on interdisciplinary research (Brockington et al., 2006:251). As it is today, different stakeholders argue from different 'versions' of history and reality, making consensus unlikely.

Worth noting is that not only is there a romantic Western conception of African wilderness – there is also a romantic idea of African small scale farmers and pastoralists, and that these deserve to have their traditional lives be preserved. Similarly to wilderness idealism discussed thoroughly in this thesis, this view of African agriculture runs the risk of making decisions based on idealistic rather than pragmatic premises. We can see examples of this in the writings of some of the sources used in this thesis to describe wilderness idealism. We can see evidence of this risk in Shetler's book *Imagining Serengeti* (2007) and in Goldman's article *Strangers in their own land* (2011), where the authors write romantically about tribes in western Serengeti and the Maasai of Ngorongoro and Lake Manyara, respectively.

During my time in Chamuriho, I came in contact with a man from the Tatoga tribe, who told me about a cultural center he was active in. This cultural center was working towards creating a tourism operation around his tribe's traditional way of life, which he described as being similar to the Maasai. While such an initiative is surely a progressive way to provide alternative sources of income for people, it also presupposes that traditional livelihoods be preserved for foreign audiences to be charmed by the 'exotic' traditional lives of the Tatoga. The Maasai of Ngorongoro Conservation Area, have a unique situation in this respect, being allowed to live their traditional lives within the boundaries of the conservation area. The Maasai life is romanticized indeed; so much that they are considered a natural ingredient in the landscape alongside the animals. It seems reasonable to believe that if they were to change their mode of production into something other than what is expected by tourists and park authorities, they would lose their legal right to live in the conservation area.

As a reaction on wilderness idealism, romanticizing about traditional rural Africans could prove to have just as unfortunate consequences as the former. In the worst case scenario, this risk could lead to people's livelihoods being locked in a kinship-ordered mode of production, where development towards a more technically advanced and trade-oriented mode is discouraged and even prevented. Thus, I argue that this must also be considered when making pragmatic policy decisions, to avoid trapping people in a livelihood situation in which they are expected to be traditional rather than to develop their livelihoods.

7.6 Conclusion

The Western construct of the wild Africa, though a largely false conception, is remade and spread through wildlife films, toys, scenic images, books, and more. It creates a demand for safari tourism, and also gives incentive to, and fuels the pathos of, the numerous conservation NGOs working to preserve wildlife and biodiversity. These, in turn, further reproduce the image through engaging celebrities to front commercials, galas, et cetera. The money from NGOs and tourism gives incentive to local power holders to provide conditions for maintaining and recreating the 'pristine' nature for new generations of nature

tourists by creating national parks and nature reserves. The natural capital of the protected areas become a symbolic capital to be consumed as a recreational activity, experienced live in Africa – in this thesis the western Serengeti – through safari tourism, or in Europe, for example, through wildlife films and other media. All the while, local communities have been deprived of lands and resources, without their consent and for reasons which they are unfamiliar with. This causes anxiety and resentment from locals toward the reserve, because the motives of the reserve authority do not appeal to the common-sense conceptions of the shared lifeworlds of the local people.

The conservationist mode of production – understood as a particular variation of the capitalist mode of production – which the Grumeti Game Reserve stands for, works to intertwine wildlife and nature with the capitalist system. This conflicts with the mainly kin-ordered mode of production which is dominating in the area being studied here; Hunyari and Mugeta Wards. The different ways in which the resources and property are viewed and handled, are not compatible. This leads to the conflict which is apparent in the empirical material which this thesis builds upon, and links to the overall land tenure problems which Tanzania suffers from.

There is little doubt that – as Julius Nyerere himself believed – Tanzania as a nation has much to earn from tourism on conserving wildlife. Also, there is additional value from the rich biodiversity that the Serengeti ecosystem holds, and it is reasonable to wish to conserve it for the future. However, the conservation policies presently being enforced in many parts of especially Sub-Saharan Africa, are based on a, from the days of colonialism, prevailing view of wildlife as something 'pristine', which must be kept separate from all human activity save that of recreational (and well paid for) activities. The Serengeti ecosystem was not formed without human interference, but pastoralists and their livestock had an integrated role in the formation of the landscape. Human economic activities such as grazing and moderate hunting, therefore, could be part of an "ecology of coexistence" (Brockington et al., 2006:251). The subject requires more research, both from ecologists and social scientists. Future conservation research should be interdisciplinary, and focus on how human economic activity can be incorporated in nature conservation. For this to be a fruitful endeavor, the recreation of the false Western conception of an African wilderness untouched by man since time immemorial, must cease.

References

Literature

Alvesson, M., Sköldberg, K., 2009. *Reflexive methodology: new vistas for qualitative research*. 2nd ed. SAGE, Los Angeles; London.

Anonymous correspondent, 2013. Maasai face eviction from ancestral lands to make way for Dubai hunting firm. *Christian Science Monitor*, [online]. 5 April 2013. URL http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Africa/2013/0405/Maasai-face-eviction-from-ancestral-lands-to-make-way-for-Dubai-hunting-firm (accessed 20 October 2013).

Arusha Times, 2006. Grumeti reserves facelift and re-introduction of black rhinos. *Arusha Times* [online]. Issue 00419, 13-19 May 2006. URL http://www.arushatimes.co.tz/2006/19/features_5.htm (accessed 25 October 2013).

Avaaz, 2013. *Stand with the Maasai*. [online]. Avaaz.org - the world in action. URL http://www.avaaz.org/en/stand_with_the_maasai_loc/?bUumLab&v=23734 (accessed 27 January 2014).

BBC, 2013. *Tanzania country profile*. [online]. URL http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-14095776 (accessed 30 January 2014).

Benford, R.D., Snow, D.A., 2000. Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, [online]. 26, p. 611–639. URL http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611 (accessed 11 March 2014).

Bernard, H.R., 2011. *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 5th ed. AltaMira Press, Lanham, Md.

Bob, C., 2005. *The marketing of rebellion: insurgents, media, and international activism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; New York.

Bonner, R., 1993. *At the hand of man: peril and hope for Africa's wildlife*. Knopf, New York.

Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Bourdieu, P., 2003. Participant Objectivation. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, [online]. 9, p. 281–294. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/3134650 (accessed 18 September 2013).

Bousé, D., 1998. Are wildlife films really "nature documentaries"? *Critical studies in mass communication*, [online]. 15, p. 116–140. URL http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15295039809367038 (accessed 17 December 2014).

Bragason, E.H., 1997. Interviewing through interpreters. *Newsletter 23*, [online]. Centre of Qualitative Research, Psykologisk Institut, School of Business and Social Sciences, Aarhus Universitet 1997. URL http://psy.au.dk/fileadmin/site_files/filer_psykologi/dokumenter/CKM/NB23/EGIL.pdf (accessed 18 September 2013).

Briggs, P., McIntyre, C., 2013. *Northern Tanzania: Serengeti, Kilimanjaro, Zanzibar*. 3rd ed. Bradt Travel Guides Ltd: Conneticut.

Brockington, D., 2002. *Fortress conservation: the preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania*. International African Institute in association with James Currey; Indiana University Press, Oxford; Bloomington.

Brockington, D., 2009. *Celebrity and the environment: fame, wealth and power in conservation*. Zed; Distributed in the USA by Palgrave Macmillan, London; New York.

Brockington, D., Igoe, J., 2006. Eviction for Conservation: A Global Overview. *Conservation and Society*, [online]. 4, p. 424-470. URL http://www.conservationandsociety.org/article.asp?issn=0972-4923;year=2006;volume=4;issue=3;spage=424;epage=470;aulast=Brockington;type=0 (accessed 17 September 2013).

Brockington, D., Igoe, J., Schmidt-Soltau, K., 2006. Conservation, Human Rights, and Poverty Reduction. *Conservation Biology*, [online]. 20, p. 250–252. URL http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00335.x (accessed 21 October 2013).

Brockington, D., Scholfield, K., 2010. The Conservationist Mode of Production and Conservation NGOs in sub-Saharan Africa. *Antipode*, [online]. 42, p. 551–575. URL http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00763.x (accessed 8 January 2014).

Cernea, M.M., 2005. "Restriction of access" is displacement: a broader concept and policy. *Forced Migration Review*, [online]. 23, p. 48–49. URL http://www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/FMR23/FMR2320.pdf (accessed 24 October 2013).

CIA, 2013. The World Factbook - Tanzania. *The World Factbook* [online]. URL https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tz.html (accessed 28 November 2013).

Feminist Activist Coalition, 2009. Pambazuka - Tanzania: Loliondo report of findings. *Pambazuka News*, [online]. URL http://www.pambazuka.org/en/category/advocacy/58956 (accessed 20 October 2013).

Fisher, W.F., 1997. Doing good? The Politics and Antipolitics of NGO Practices. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, [online]. 26, p. 439–464. URL http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.anthro.26.1.439 (accessed 13 January 2014).

Forbes, 2013. *Paul Tudor Jones, II*. [online]. URL http://www.forbes.com/profile/paul-tudor-jones-ii/ (accessed 25 October 2013).

Frykman, J., Löfgren, O., 1987. *Culture builders: a historical anthropology of middle-class life*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

Garland, E., 2008. The elephant in the room: confronting the colonial character of wildlife conservation in Africa. *African studies review*, [online]. 51, p. 51–74. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/27667379 (accessed 8 January 2014).

Geertz, C., 1974. "From the Native's Point of View": On the nature of anthropological understanding. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, [online]. 28, p.26–45. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/3822971 (accessed 4 March 2014).

Goldman, M., 2011. Strangers in their own land: Maasai and wildlife conservation in Northern Tanzania. *Conservation and society*, [online]. 9, p. 65-79. URL http://www.conservationandsociety.org/article.asp?issn=0972-4923;year=2011;volume=9;issue=1;spage=65;epage=79;aulast=Goldman (accessed 17 September 2013).

Graham, M., Gichohi, N., Kamau, F., Aike, G., Craig, B., Douglas-Hamilton, I., Adams, W.M., 2009. *The use of electrified fences to limit human elephant conflict: a case study of the Ol Pejeta Conservancy, Laikipia District, Kenya*, [online]. Laikipia Elephant Project, Nanyuki, Kenya. URL http://www.savetheelephants.org/files/pdf/publications/2009%20Graham%20et%20al%20The%20Use%20of%20Electrified%20Fences%20to%20Reduce%20Human%20Elephant.pdf (accessed 4 November 2013).

Green, J.M.H., Larrosa, C., Burgess, N.D., Balmford, A., Johnston, A., Mbilinyi, B.P., Platts, P.J., Coad, L., 2013. Deforestation in an African biodiversity hotspot:

Extent, variation and the effectiveness of protected areas. *Biological Conservation*, [online]. 164, p. 62–72. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006320713001195 (accessed 10 December 2013).

Gunaratne, L.H.P., Premarathne, P.K., 2006. *The Effectiveness of Electric Fencing in Mitigating Human-Elephant Conflict in Sri Lanka*, [online]. Economy and Environment Program for Southeast Asia (EEPSEA). URL http://www.eepsea.net/pub/rr/11502587381GunaRR11.pdf (accessed 4 November 2013).

Inglis, D., Thorpe, C., 2012. *An invitation to social theory*. Polity, Cambridge; Malden, MA.

IPCC, 2007. *Climate change 2007: synthesis report*, [online]. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Geneva, Switzerland. URL http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_ipcc_fourth_assessment_report_synthesis_report.htm (accessed 10 December 2013).

Jackson, M., 1996. *Things as they are: new directions in phenomenological anthropology*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Just Conservation, 2011. The corridor – Loliondo. *Just conservation*, [online]. 21 July 2011. URL http://www.justconservation.org/the-corridor-loliondo (accessed 20 October 2013).

Kabeera, E., 2013. New Akagera Park electric fence to mitigate human-wildlife conflict. *The New Times*, [online]. 7 September 2013. URL http://www.newtimes.co.rw/news/index.php?i=15473&a=70196# (accessed 4 November 2013).

Kennedy, E.V., Perry, C.T., Halloran, P.R., Iglesias-Prieto, R., Schönberg, C.H.L., Wisshak, M., Form, A.U., Carricart-Ganivet, J.P., Fine, M., Eakin, C.M., Mumby, P.J., 2013. Avoiding Coral Reef Functional Collapse Requires Local and Global Action. *Current Biology*, [online]. 23, p. 912–918. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960982213004284 (accessed 10 December 2013).

Kideghesho, J.R., Røskaft, E., Kaltenborn, B.P., 2006. Factors influencing conservation attitudes of local people in Western Serengeti, Tanzania. *Biodiversity and conservation*, [online]. 16, p. 2213–2230. URL http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10531-006-9132-8 (accessed 25 October 2013).

Knowles, J.N., Collett, D.P., 1989. Nature as myth, symbol and action: notes towards a historical understanding of development and conservation in Kenyan Maasailand. *Journal of the International African Institute*, [online] 59, p. 433–460. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/1159941 (accessed 19 February 2014).

Kvale, S., Brinkmann, S., 2009. *Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun*. 2nd ed. Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Lamarque, F., Anderson, J., Fergusson, R., Lagrange, M., Osei-Owusu, Y., Bakker, L., 2009. Human-wildlife conflict in Africa: causes, consequences and management strategies. *FAO Forestry Paper*, [online]. 157. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome. URL http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1048e/i1048e00.pdf (accessed 21 Augusti 2013).

Lange, S., 2008. *Land tenure and mining in Tanzania*. Chr. Michelsen Institute: Bergen.

Lekan, T., 2011. Serengeti shall not die: Bernhard Grzimek, wildlife film, and the making of a tourist landscape in East Africa. *German history*, [online]. 29, p. 224–264. URL http://gh.oxfordjournals.org/content/29/2/224 (accessed 17 September 2013).

Lonsdale, J., 2008. *Kenya: ethnicity, tribe, and state* [online]. openDemocracy. URL http://www.opendemocracy.net/article/democracy_power/kenya_ethnicity_tribe_state (accessed 23 January 2014).

Mbembe, A., 2001. *On the postcolony*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

McClurg, C.G., 2002. The international year of ecotourism: the celebration of a new form of colonialism. *McGeorge Law Review*. [online] 34 (1), p. 97–133. University of the Pacific 2002. URL http://heinonline.org/HOL/Print?handle=hein.journals/mcglr34&div=11&collection=journals&set_as_cursor=0&men_tab=srchresults (accessed 18 October 2013).

Miguel, E., 2011. Tribe or Nation? Nation Building and Public Goods in Kenya versus Tanzania. *World Politics*, [online]. 56, p.328–362. URL http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0043887100004330 (accessed 9 January 2013).

Mitman, G., 2009. *Reel nature: America's romance with wildlife on film*. University of Washington Press, Seattle.

Mugini, J., 2013. Tanzania: 100 Cattle Drown in Serengeti. *Tanzania Daily News*, [online]. 1 January 2013. URL http://allafrica.com/stories/201301020296.html (accessed 28 September 2013).

Naluyaga, R., 2013. Tension as Tanzania's embattled pastoralists fight to survive. *Africa Review*, [online]. 7 January 2013. URL http://www.africareview.com/progress/Tanzanias-pastoralists-fight-for-survival/-/1502374/1659602/-/v014x6z/-/index.html (accessed 18 September 2013).

Nelson, F., 2010. Conservation and citizenship: democratizing natural resource governance in Africa. *Policy matters*, [online]. 2010, p. 233 – 241. URL http://naturaljustice.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/conservation_and_citizenship_nelson2010.pdf (accessed 23 October 2013).

Nelson, F., Gardner, B., Igoe, J., Williams, A., 2009. Community-Based Conservation and Maasai Livelihoods in Tanzania, in: Homewood, K., Kristjanson, P., Trench, P.C. (Eds.), 2009. Staying Maasai? *Studies in Human Ecology and Adaptation*, [online]. Springer New York, p. 299–333. URL http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-0-387-87492-0_8 (accessed 28 January 2014).

Neumann, R.P., 1998. *Imposing wilderness: struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa*. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Neumann, R.P., 2004. Moral and Discursive Geographies in the War for Biodiversity in Africa. *Political Geography*, [online]. 23/7, p. 813–837. Elsevier Science Ltd: UK. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0962629804000678# (accessed 25 January 2014).

Philemon, L., 2013. Loliondo villagers frustrate Minister Kagasheki efforts to vacate for Ortelo. *IPPmedia*, [online]. URL http://www.ippmedia.com/frontend/?l=52669 (accessed 20 October 2013).

Plaut, M., 2012. Africa's bright future. *BBC World Service* [online]. 2 November 2012. URL http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-20171366 (accessed 3 January 2014).

Poole, R.M., 2006. Heartbreak on the Serengeti - National Geographic Magazine. *National Geographic* [online]. URL http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/0602/feature1/text3.html (accessed 14 January 2014).

Shetler, J.B., 2003. *Telling our own stories: local histories from South Mara, Tanzania, African sources for African history*. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands ; Boston.

Shetler, J.B., 2007. *Imagining Serengeti: a history of landscape memory in Tanzania from earliest times to the present*. Ohio University Press, Athens.

Singita, n.d. *Grumeti Reserves*. [online]. URL http://singita.com/regions/singita-grumeti/ (accessed 25 October 2013).

Stapenhurst, R., Kpundeh, S.J., 1999. Curbing corruption: toward a model for building national integrity. *EDI Development Studies*, [online]. 1. World Bank, Washington, D.C. URL http://econ.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64165259&theSitePK=469372&piPK=64165421&menuPK=64166093&entityID=000094946_99032505570349 (accessed 3 January 2014).

Survival International, 2013. Tanzania: Land Grab Could Spell "The End of the Maasai and the Serengeti". *Survival International* [online]. 28 March 2013. URL http://allafrica.com/stories/201303290873.html (accessed 20 October 2013).

Tanzania Tourist Board, 2013. *Serengeti*. [online]. URL http://www.tanzaniatouristboard.com/places-to-go/national-parks-reserves/serengeti/ (accessed 13 February 2013).

Teorell, J., Svensson, T., 2007. *Att fråga och att svara: samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Liber, Stockholm.
Press TV, 2009. *The Real Deal*. [TV Broadcast]. United Kingdom. URL http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lLdVqVK8QB8 (accessed 29 October 2013).
Transparency International, 2013. *Country Profiles* [online]. URL http://www.transparency.org/country#TZA_DataResearch (accessed 2 February 2014).
UNFCCC, 2013. *Kyoto Protocol*. [online]. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. URL http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/items/3145.php (accessed 18 December 2013).
USAID, 2011. *Property Rights and Resource Governance Tanzania* [online]. URL http://usaidlandtenure.net/sites/default/files/country-profiles/full-reports/USAID_Land_Tenure_Tanzania_Profile.pdf (accessed 3 January 2014).
Van der Ploeg, J.D., 2010. The food crisis, industrialized farming and the imperial regime. *Journal of Agrarian Change*. [online]. 10, p. 98–106. URL http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2009.00251.x (accessed 5 November 2013).
Vi Agroforestry, n.d. *Who we are* [online]. URL http://www.viagroforestry.org/who-we-are/ (accessed 10 December 2013).
Walpole, M., Ndoinyo, Kibasa, R., Masanja, C., Somba, M., Sungura, B., 2004. *An assessment of human-elephant conflict in the western Serengeti*, [online]. Mosaic Conservation, Canterbury. URL http://www.tnrf.org/files/E-INFO-FZS-WD-TANAPA-An_Assessment_of_Human-Elephant_Conflict_in_the_Western_Serengeti_Walpole_etal_2004.pdf (accessed 21 August 2013).
West, P., Carrier, J.G., 2004. Ecotourism and Authenticity: Getting Away from It All? *Current Anthropology*, [online]. 45, p. 483–498. URL http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/422082 (accessed 13 January 2014).
West, P., Igoe, J., Brockington, D., 2006. Parks and Peoples: The Social Impact of Protected Areas. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, [online]. 35, p. 251–277. URL http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.anthro.35.081705.123308 (accessed 21 October 2013).
Wolf, E.R., 1982. *Europe and the people without history*. University of California Press: Berkeley.
World Travel and Tourism Council, 2012. *Travel and tourism: economic impact 2012: Tanzania*. [online]. URL http://www.wttc.org/site_media/uploads/downloads/tanzania2012.pdf (accessed 18 September 2013).
WWF, n.d. *Our mission* [online]. WWF homepage. URL http://www.wwf.org/ (accessed 20 May 2014).
Zeveloff, J., 2012. A Safari Camp In Tanzania Has Once Again Been Named The Best Hotel In The World. *Business Insider* [online]. 6 July 2012. URL http://www.businessinsider.com/singita-grumeti-reserves-named-worlds-best-hotel-2012-7 (accessed 25 October 2013).
Zuelch, T. (Ed.), 2011. A non - governmental organization in special consultative status. *Society for Threatened Peoples* [online]. 14 March 2011. URL http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/session12/TZ/STP-SocietyThreatenedPeople-eng.pdf (accessed 20 October 2013).
Årlin, C., 2011. *Becoming wilderness: a topological study of Tarangire, Northern Tanzania, 1890-2000*. Ph. D. Stockholm University, Stockholm.

Empirical sources

59 formal interviews, conducted between 2013-09-09 and 2013-10-15.

44 interviews with farmers and livestock keepers, ages ranging from 19 to 75. Distribution by gender in each village:

Kihumbu: 8 males, 5 females
Hunyari: 3 males, 2 females
Mariwanda: 2 males, 1 female
Mugeta: 7 males, 2 females
Tingirima: 5 males, 2 females
Kyandege: 6 males, 2 females

15 interviews with official persons and representatives of civil groups:

Mariwanda Village Executive Group. Mixed age and gender.
Mariwanda Village Executive Officer with co-worker. Both males.
Women's group of Hunyari Ward. 12 women of different ages.
Responsible for wildlife issues, Bunda District Council. Male.
Retired Hunyari Ward Officer. Male.
Elected women's representative of Hunyari Ward.
Hunyari Ward Executive Officer. Male.
Kihumbu Village Executive Officer. Male.
Kihumbu Village Chairman. Male.
Mariwanda Village Chairman. Male.
Chamuriho Division Officer. Female.
Mugeta Village Executive Officer. Male.
Mugeta Ward Agricultural Extension Officer. Male.
Tingirima Village Chairman. Male.
Kyandege Village Chairman. Male.