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ABSTRACT

The tourism industry is changing in response to globalisation and shifting power relations between governments, communities and the private sector. It is one of the largest sources of foreign exchange revenues and contributions to GDP for some of the world’s poorest countries. The emergence of discourses around sustainability, conservation and people-centred approaches are increasingly influencing the growing tourism industry. This paper examines community engagement with the private sector in the case of the Maasai in Tanzania’s Ngorongoro Conservation Area and the Makuleke in South Africa’s Pafuri Triangle near Kruger National Park. The goal is to explore the changing role of the private sector in engaging with pro-poor ecotourism in the framework of changing relationships and how its involvement can lead to benefits for local communities around ecotourism destinations.
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INTRODUCTION

In a world that is increasingly shrinking, travel and tourism are possible in ways that have been unmatched in history. The changing tourism industry poses new challenges and new avenues to engage various participants. With the growing emphasis within the international and national policy arenas on community participation in economic development, tourism is becoming a new paradigm for exploring the relationships between various stakeholders including government, the private sector and indigenous communities. The role of the private sector is changing in the face of people-centred approaches in tourism. Within the paradigm of pro-poor tourism, which ensures that community participation and poverty alleviation are central to the development of the industry, the private sector is renegotiating its role with communities and serves as both an opportunity and a challenge for the new tourism paradigm (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007).

The private sector is engaged more and more with the role of promoting sustainability, fostering conservation and working as a community partner, rather than a benefactor (Spenceley, 2003: 9). The challenge faced by developing countries that prescribe to economic liberalisation policies and open their borders to foreign investment, is to redress the inequalities that have plagued indigenous communities through histories of occupation, and through the negative impacts
left in the wake of mass tourism (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004: 71). The need for countries to work with the private sector lies in the ability of the private sector to access markets, to fill in the funding gap where public sector support falls short, and to provide infrastructure that developing countries lack, and direly need (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003: 19). The case of the Maasai in the Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania, and Makuleke case in South Africa’s Pafuri Triangle in Kruger National Park, present contrasting scenarios of community engagement with the private sector in ecotourism. These cases raise the questions of necessary preconditions that need to be present in order for community participation to be central to private sector engagement in ecotourism in developing countries including, but not limited to, land tenure issues, market signals and an enabling legislative framework. By the presence of these preconditions, the private sector becomes a community partner by changing the power structure from traditional forms of tourism to the newer pro-poor tourism discourses.

The Scope of this Paper

This paper will explore the role of the private sector as a participant in the changing tourism industry in developing countries and with the conception of new discourses. It will seek to explore the link between the private sector and pro-poor discourse in the tourism sector and whether the adoption of the pro-poor framework by companies can lead to economic growth for developing countries and address concerns about conservation and resource management. Two
cases of ecotourism ventures and their corresponding communities are presented: The Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania and the Makuleke Conservation Area of Kruger National Park in South Africa. This is followed by a comparative analysis of the role of the private sector in the tourism industry with emphasis on the role of policy and the community in negotiating relations to enable pro-poor growth. Finally, the paper examines the preconditions necessary to enable economic development in the tourism industry through the participation of the private sector.

The Tourism Industry Today

The tourism industry has grown at an unprecedented level (The International Ecotourism Society, 2006). It represents twenty five percent of the world’s exports (Hall, 2007: 1) and accounts for eleven percent of the world’s GDP (Roe, Ashley, Page, and Meyer, 2004: 6). According to the World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO, 2008), international arrivals topped 846 million and inbound tourism increased from 534 million in 1995 to 898 million in 2007. Tourism also represents the primary source of foreign exchange earnings for Least Developed Countries (LDCs), second only to oil production (Roe et al, 2004; TIES, 2006). Tourism is the principle export for 83% of LDCs and for 40 of the poorest countries in the world. It is predicted that tourism in East Africa and the Pacific countries will be the fastest growing in the next two decades (Kandari and Chandra, 2004). The growth of the tourism industry in most recent years can partially be attributed to the rise of non-western powers, and in particular the
countries of Asia. According to the UNWTO (2008), China and South Korea have replaced some European countries as the top spenders on tourism, with China spending 12% of its annual income on travel and tourism.

The dramatic restructuring of the world economy, including the shift to the service sector has also played a role in the growth of the tourism industry (Honey, 1999: 32). The establishment of the General Agreement of Trades in Services (GATS), as well as the impetus towards economic liberalisation, has led many traditionally protectionist countries to open up their markets, accept foreign direct investment and establish national tourism strategies (Honey, 1999: 86). The increased growth of non-western powers combined with the effects of globalisation, has led to the growth of the tourism industry and an increased reliance on it as an economic foundation for many developing countries in the world.

The Rise of “New Tourism”

Until recently, mass tourism was the main source of tourist activity and travel for many in developed countries (Honey, 1999). Mass tourism involved the traditional “sun, sand and surf” tourism, usually found in holiday packages including island resort holidays, and European cultural destinations (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 102). Through research on the impacts of mass tourism on the destinations and hosts, researchers discovered that mass tourism often led to overdevelopment, cultural disturbance, environmental damage, and in large part neglect of the people living in surrounding communities (Honey, 1999: 84).
Indeed, as most of the tourists were financially affluent, most tourism infrastructure built to attract their revenue, catered to their lifestyles, much to the detriment of the environment and the people surrounding these tourism hotspots (Robinson and Smith, 2006: 5). Moreover, “touristified” communities often suffered from the ravages of exploitation, loss of culture and lack of resources and representation due to the increasing displacement of traditional ways of life to make way for the developments for holidaymakers (Robinson and Smith, 2006: 5).

With the realisation that mass tourism was capable of extensive damage, came a new sensibility to explore “alternative” forms of tourism. Mowforth and Munt (1998) outline the rise of the new tourist class that delved into the destinations offering alternative forms of tourism that had until then only been the realm of backpackers (125). This new tourist class embodied a sensitivity to cultural symbols and sought to differentiate itself from the conventional “sea sand and surf” forms of mass tourism (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 125). The new tourist class also increasingly possessed social and ecological awareness, and demanded more out of their holiday experiences (Kirstges, 2003). The higher demands for alternative forms of tourism led to the development of several classes of tourism that brought the new tourists closer to the traditional cultures and people, in order to ensure that their travel experience integrated an authentic learning experience. These new alternatives included cultural tourism, adventure tourism and ecotourism (Eagles, 2007). The need to explore alternatives led tourists into seldom-visited places in the world, including areas that are
ecologically rich in biodiversity and endemism, and culturally unique (Honey, 1999). While at the same time that these alternative forms of tourism were becoming popular, there was the development of awareness about the sustainability of ecology and of the cultures of hosts and destinations. In an effort to avoid the phenomenon of mass tourism, sustainable tourism ventures and community inclusion garnered special attention (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 171).

“Greening” the Industry: Sustainable Tourism

As the awareness of the detrimental impact of mass tourism grew, there was increased motivation to “green” practices in development and in all forms of industry (Honey, 1999: 32). In the 1980’s, the World Conservation Strategy was established by international organisations. The WCS mandated that conservation area management be connected to the economic activities of local communities (Honey, 1999: 13). In 1992, the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro (better known as the 1992 Rio Summit) established Agenda 21, a commitment of member states towards sustainable development and the recognition of natural resource management as crucial to the continuation of the way and quality of life of local communities, and for the integrity of natural environments (UNWTO, 2008).

In its most broad form, sustainable development is defined as “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability for future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland Report, 1987 as cited in Mowforth and Munt, 1998). In the last few decades, international
organisations have undergone the process of “greening”: ensuring that activities that occur whether in the private sector or in the development field pay special attention to environmental concerns. The establishment of the Global Environment Facility by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) sought to facilitate and fund the environmental aspects of development projects and ensure that the protection of the environment was an integral part of development activities (Honey, 1999: 81). Most recently in 2007, at the Global Ecotourism Conference in Oslo, Norway member organisations restated the commitment to sustainable development in the ecotourism industry, outlining resource management, and support for ecologically sound enterprises as important components of their mandate and activities (TIES, 2007).

The notion of conservation has also undergone restructuring as the new framework and discourse around sustainable development has formed. It now involves considerations for community involvement, resource management and sustainability (Bushell and McCool, 2007; Honey, 1999). Traditionally, conservation was an exclusionist process that involved protecting nature from damage caused by people (Mowforth and Munt, 1998; Honey, 1999). Conservation largely meant the displacement of people from their traditional land holdings, and the eradication of their traditional livelihoods in the name of protection of ecology for the enjoyment of nature, untainted by human activity (Bushell and Eagles, 2007). The reconfiguration of the notion of conservation to ensure that it is aligned with the new sustainable tourism agenda, and is people-
inclusive also ensures that it is a priority when tourism involves nature-based attractions (Eagles, 2007: 38). Bushell and McCool (2007) outline several issues that arise out of using tourism as a conservation tool that need to be addressed. Firstly, tourism as a conservation tool has to be financially sustainable (13). As tourism is a main source of revenue for many developing countries, the high reliance on visitation can jeopardise conservation as areas seek to meet increasing demands. Secondly, tourism as a conservation tool must support sustainable use of resources (ibid: 16). This however, faces its own paradox, as will be outlined below. Thirdly, tourism as a conservation tool should have “established minimum impact guidelines” to ensure that the consequences of tourism on natural areas are reduced (ibid: 17). Finally, because of the exclusionist history of conservation practice, it is imperative that conservation works closely with the community, stakeholders and public to foster a “stewardship ethic” (Bushell and McCool, 2007: 19). As is apparent from the new paradigms of sustainability and conservation detailed above, there is an attraction towards people-centred approaches that foster respect for communities, and ensure that those countries relying substantially on tourism revenues are able to sustain the industry in future generations (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 172).

**Combining Paradigms: Pro-Poor (Eco)tourism**

The recognition that people-centred approaches and sustainability are crucial to fostering growth of the economies in the developing world has led to
the emergence of the paradigm of pro-poor tourism (Scherl and Edwards, 2007: 71). This paradigm offers a way of combining issues of sustainability and community participation as well as economic development in a cohesive manner. Pro-poor tourism is defined as tourism that brings the priorities of the poor to the centre of the tourism agenda, providing access to both economic and non-economic benefits (Ashley, Boyd and Goodwin, 2000, Para. 5). It is “tourism that generates net benefits for the poor” (Spenceley and Seif, 2003: 7). Benefits that accrue to the poor can be economic, cultural, social or environmental among others (Ashley, Goodwin and Roe, 2001, Table 1). Arising from a wealth of literature in the pro-poor growth field of study, pro-poor tourism draws from the neoliberal and alternative perspectives on development (Scheyvens, 2007: 129-130). It encourages less government intervention and the support for free markets, establishment of small-scale ventures and integration of the informal sector, where many of the poor make their living (Scheyvens, 2007: 130).

According to Scheyvens (2007), the pro-poor discourse arose from the failure of international structural adjustment programs to fill in the financing gap and adequately address the issues of debt and poverty. Similarly, Honey (1999) places it within the “stakeholder’s theory”, which maintains that the alleviation of poverty begins at the community level, and is not an effect of the trickle-down process that conventional development models follow. Pro-poor tourism can meet the criteria of sustainable tourism because people do not compromise the capacity of future generations to meet their own needs by doing so in the present
(Weaver, 1998). In this form, pro-poor tourism provides communities with the assurance that their own financial and non-financial needs are prioritised.

There are two central components to pro-poor tourism that make it a popular paradigm in addressing the inequalities between the developing and developed worlds, and a vehicle for economic development (Zhao and Ritchie, 2007: 13). The first of those components is the importance of community participation. Scheyvens, (2007) states that pro-poor tourism is about change in the distribution of benefits in favour of the poor. This also entails renegotiating power structures from traditional stakeholders such as the government and community elite in a way that makes the community the central driver of the economy and of sustainability practices (Stem, James, Lee, Deschler and Schelhas, 2003). It also claims to ensure renegotiation with the role of conservationists away from what Mowforth and Munt (1998) describe as “ecocolonialism,” the imposition of environmental policies on the poor (50). In an effort to illustrate the notion of community participation, Mowforth and Munt (1998) outline the typology of participation first created by Jules Pretty (1995). The typology outlines seven forms of participation ranging from what Pretty refers to as ‘Manipulative Participation”, where the community is only represented in token, but lacks power, to ‘Self Mobilisation’ where people retain control over resource use, and participate independently (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 240). In its truest form, pro-poor tourism falls on the latter side of the spectrum. Pro-poor tourism claims to epitomise the people-centred approach, where community representation and participation are the keystone of the decision-making
process. It is believed that having a community or individuals with vested interests in conservation and sustainability creates sufficient incentive for this behaviour to be replicated in the future (Nelson, 2003; Algottson, 2006). Furthermore, when communities feel that they are heard and accounted for, they are more likely to engage in practices that ensure that they continue to be represented in the future (Ashley and Wolmer, 2003: 4).

The second central component in pro-poor tourism is the idea of poverty alleviation. The way in which tourism is able to fit into the paradigm of pro-poor growth and become a strategy for poverty alleviation is because it is labour intensive, builds upon available capital and resources and serves to diversify participation of the community in the market and the economy (Ashley, Boyd and Goodwin, 2000; Chok, Macbeth and Warren, 2007). Zhao and Ritchie (2007) develop a framework for what they call “anti-poverty tourism”, an analogous term to pro-poor tourism. They state that there are three key factors in order to ensure that tourism works as a poverty alleviation strategy and ensures that benefits accrue to the community, and especially to the impoverished. The first factor is “destination competitiveness”. Mass tourism is still and will likely remain the main source of tourist activity in the future (Hall, 2007). However to ensure the viability of developing world tourism ventures, it is essential that destinations are competitive in order to gain a foothold in the world tourism market. According to Zhao and Ritchie (2007), this requires significant commitment on the part of the national government to build the necessary infrastructure and create the economic climate that attracts investors. The second factor is community
participation. As stated before, because of the increasing dependence of developing countries on tourism revenues, it is essential that communities are able to collect "rent" from the ventures in their own country. The authors assert that community participation fosters equality and representation as well as democracy. Induced or coercive participation has been the most likely form of community involvement in the past, and a shift the paradigm of participation to include all stakeholders is critical to ensuring the success of tourism as a poverty alleviation strategy (Mowforth and Munt, 1998). Finally, destination sustainability ensures that in the long term, communities can continue to benefit from the tourism activities. The two key components then, are critical to the idea of pro-poor tourism as it provides the framework for sustainable ecotourism in developing countries.

The growing interest in natural areas and in ecotourism adventures makes it one of the fastest growing industries in tourism (TIES, 2006). Honey (1999) summarises the characteristics of ecotourism: it involves" travel to natural destinations, minimises impact, builds environmental awareness, provides direct financial benefits for conservation, provides benefits and empowerment to the local people, respects local cultures and supports human rights and democratic governance. (21-25)" Ecotourism in developing countries can fall under the framework of pro-poor tourism because it provides direct and indirect benefits to local people, brings the consumer to the product, respects the cultures and supports democratic governance through community participation (Ashley, Goodwin and Roe, 2001, Table 1). At its most ideal, ecotourism allows
communities to use capital that already exists, uses their skills and knowledge and promotes sustainable resource use for the future (Honey, 1999).

According to The International Ecotourism Society (TIES, 2006), nature tourism is growing at a rate of 20% a year, and it is estimated that sustainable tourism could account for as much as one-quarter of the travel industry in the next five years. In 2004, ecotourism was growing three times faster than other forms of tourism. In contrast, the growth pattern of mass tourism has remained on a plateau (TIES, 2006). Consumer demand for nature tourism has changed, with more than two-thirds of American and Australian travellers and 90% of British travellers considering environmental protection and support for local host communities as a critical part of their choice of holiday (TIES, 2006). It is even more evident that the community and the natural environment are interdependent (Scherl and Edwards, 2007). As ecotourism continues to grow, dramatic increases have the potential of affecting the environment and leading to overdevelopment as communities strive to accommodate growing interests of travellers (Figgis and Bushell, 2007: 105). In a similar vein, developing countries are highly impacted by global trends and changes in demands (Figgis and Bushell, 2007: 105). Tourism is a highly variable industry that is dependent on product consumption (Weaver, 1998). This creates the dilemma of ensuring that product consumption continues, as a drop may mean the loss of livelihoods for communities in the developing world, pushing the poorest even further into poverty (Weaver, 1998). From the patterns outlined above, it is evident that ecotourism in developing countries increasingly caters to the demands of the
travelling public and serves as an important source of revenue. Consequently, communities have to carefully consider sustainable development and manage the influences, both positive and negative of tourism on their environment and populations (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 278)

The Role of the Private Sector

As consumers of holidays become savvier about their experiences and try to obtain more value from their ventures, the tourism industry continues to change in the face of shifting power relations between governments, communities and the private sector. Private sector investment in tourism ventures continues to grow as ecotourism ventures become progressively popular and lucrative (Honey, 1999). Indeed the economic impact of tourism is undeniable (TIES, 2006). However, the role of the private sector is evolving in tandem with the roles of communities as they increase their stake through participation and ownership of tourism ventures. In addition, the private sector is increasingly involved in supporting responsible tourism in response to consumer demand and community awareness (Spenceley and Goodwin, 2007: 149).

Spenceley and Goodwin (2007) found that the economic impact of tourism resulted in a doubling of people living above the poverty line in their study of a South African community adjacent to a large commercial investor, the Sabi Sabi Lodge (155). The shifting roles of the major stakeholders are facilitated by the new paradigm of people-centred approaches to economic and policy development (Mowforth and Munt, 1998). Pro-poor approaches are quickly
becoming fundamental not only in the field of development, but in best business practices and corporate social responsibility frameworks of the private sector (Spenceley, 2003: 9). Pro-poor approaches are thus framing the work of the private sector in a way where philanthropic handouts no longer suffice as a method of contributing to the local community (Ashley and Roe, 2003: 4). There is a move towards seeing the community as a partner rather than a beneficiary. Shifting paradigms and the salience of poverty alleviation and people-centred discourse makes tourism particularly important, as it is one of the largest industries in LDCs and private investment in tourism is thus magnified not only through economic contributions to the country but the sustainability and poverty alleviation frameworks in the development field. Involvement with the communities especially presents opportunities and challenges for businesses striving to extend their markets to include ecotourism in developing countries. Thus private investors are conscious that their business ventures are more than about just the bottom line; they are to have a positive lasting impact in the communities that they engage with (Ashley and Haysom, 2006: 268).

**Criticisms**

Like any field of academic study, tourism as a vehicle for development is not without its criticisms, many of which serve to illustrate the complexity of the paradigm and the consideration with which development theorists and other stakeholders must tread into unknown territories. Firstly, there is the notion that tourism is yet another “silver bullet” for development. Ecotourism is especially
viewed as an important tool to rebuild economies of fragile countries (Strong-Cvetich and Scorse, 2007: 1). Given the time and resources continually dedicated to tourism ventures, many international organisations and governments have come to view it as a panacea for what ails developing countries, as governments are encouraged to draw up comprehensive tourism strategies as part of their development frameworks (Hampton, 2005). Mowforth and Munt (1998) state that the fervent adoption of tourism as a development strategy has led countries to adopt documents such as Agenda 21 presented at the Rio Summit. In addition, Hall (2007) asserts that the tourism industry only brings small and specific benefits and misses the larger picture of institutional dysfunction. These criticisms place ecotourism in the conventional top-down model that may be too prescriptive and overlook larger structural problems that face developing countries.

Critics also emphasise that the simultaneous adoption of conservation policies hearkens back to the ideas of colonialism, where communities are instructed as to the best use of their resources (Bushell and McCool, 2007). The development of ecotourism at times is in direct opposition with the conservationist viewpoint, as conservationists see the growing tourism industry leading to the development of ecological “hotspots” (Bushell, 2007). In addition, there is the question of whether communities and the environment can withstand an industry that is largely the result of free market movement patterns (Chok, Macbeth and Warren, 2007). Furthermore, critics also raise the issue of who really benefits from the ecotourism industry (Honey, 1999). Given the profile of
the new tourist class, it is still only those who can afford the exclusive nature holidays that are able to benefit and that conservation practices are really for the enjoyment of the consumer (Mowforth and Munt, 1998: 153). Research has shown that trickle-down effects in other development strategies have seldom worked and that thus far the adoption of tourism as a development strategy has yielded at best, uneven growth patterns (Harrison, 2007).

Honey (1999) presents some of the issues that arise out of tourism as a development strategy. The first of these is power imbalances between traditional powerholders and the community (Honey, 1999: 84). As stated earlier, the new paradigm of tourism requires a deliberate reconstruction of power in favour of the poorer communities (Scheyvens, 2007: 125). Mowforth and Munt (1998) emphasise that in areas where community participation is important, some people may continue to lack access to resources (i.e. the very poorest, women or the elderly). Furthermore, competition within the community can lead to the establishment of the local elite, who may monopolise the resources in the community. Indeed Scherl and Edwards (2007) and Harrison (2007) assert that community does not imply homogeneity, which also means that some people may be able to reap the benefits of tourism ventures more than others. Developing countries are already plagued by a plethora of institutional and governance challenges and decentralisation of power to the community level is likely to prove to have its own set of challenges (Reed, 1997).

The role of the state within the new tourism paradigm faces its own challenges. Though internationally, the pressure appears to encourage
economic liberalisation and free market policies, developing countries have to work harder to negotiate the role of the state, particularly when there has been a history or regime change or upheaval (Honey, 1999). Furthermore, the liberalisation of the economy leads to the concern over economic leakage (Weaver, 1998). Many of the businesses of mass tourism have owners in developed countries and revenues are leaked back to the developed countries. This presents a challenge for developing countries as they struggle to retain the financial benefits of their industry. Coming from that argument is the need to balance the role of the private sector and of communities as well as the negotiation of power relations in order to make tourism a viable development stream in developing countries. Tourism as a development strategy is simultaneously paradoxical; in order to attract visitors and investment, some level of development is necessary. However, this development may lead to the destruction of the very environment that fuels it (Bushell and McCool, 2007).

Finally there are criticisms about engaging the private sector in the development of ecotourism outfits in developing countries. Some argue that the ecotourism industry is fragile and more suited towards small tourism outfits than large multinational corporations (Hampton, 2005: 745). In addition, Weaver (1998) cautions of the dangers of “dependency syndrome” that is, the dependence of developing countries on the developed countries where the culture of the West replaces indigenous cultures, often reflective of patterns of mass tourism. However smaller businesses vary in human and financial capital and in the face of economic downturn, are usually the hardest hit (Kirsten and
Rogerson, 2002). Moreover in the case where there is a heavy reliance on the tourism industry, small businesses may not have access to markets that large private investors do. Finally small businesses tend to be bypassed by public sectors, which concentrate their efforts on attracting steady sources of revenue from corporations (Kirsten and Rogerson, 2002: 33). This is not to discount the vital role of smaller businesses and local investors in contributing to the economy and indeed furthering the agenda of community inclusiveness, but simply to state that multinational corporations are also necessary partners to pro-poor tourism ventures and that the larger participants of the private sector are capable of adopting the pro-poor discourse as well (Harrison, 2007).
TOURISM IN THE NGORONGORO CONSERVATION AREA: THE CASE OF THE MAASAI

According to the World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2008), tourist arrivals in Tanzania doubled between 1995 and 1996, and tourism currently accounts for 35% of the gross domestic product (GDP) for the country. An estimated one quarter to one third of the land in Tanzania is protected, and is home to four World Heritage Sites (Honey, 1999; UNEP-WCMC, 2008). The Ngorongoro Conservation Area, which lies south of Serengeti National Park and across the border from Maasai Mara in Kenya is approximately 828,800 hectares of multi-use land and is home to 25,000 species of flora and fauna. In addition, it is home to rich archaeological and geological sites such as the Olduvai Gorge and the Laetoli site, as well as its star feature, the Ngorongoro Crater, the largest unbroken and unflooded caldera in the world (UNEP-WCMC, 2008). Between 1998 and 2001, approximately 562,000 tourists visited the NCA and it is estimated that one quarter of tourists who visit the safari parks of Northern Tanzania will visit the NCA (UNEP-WCMC, 2008). Furthermore, the NCA and surrounding area is home to 40,000 Maasai, the Maa speaking, seminomadic indigenous agropastoralists.
Maasai History under Colonialism and Socialism

The Maasai have been present in the NCA for approximately 200 years and have deemed rights of occupancy and ownership of grazing land in the NCA (Shivji and Kapinga, 1998: 5). The Maasai draw their traditional economy from cattle-herding, following a complex movement in interaction with seasonal changes and wildlife movement (Charnley, 2005). In times of hardship, they have been known to practice small scale subsistence farming to compensate for dropping livestock numbers, but this has traditionally not been their preferred method of subsistence (Charnley, 2005: 79). Under colonial rule in the early part of the century, the Maasai had lived in the NCA alongside the wildlife that migrated seasonally from the Maasai Mara and Serengeti National Parks. As the conservation movement under the colonial rule grew, it was believed that the Maasai were largely responsible for the destruction of wildlife because of their pastoralist practices that included some burning techniques, and movement of cattle to better grazing areas (Shivji and Kapinga, 1998: 5). As the conservation areas were established, the Maasai were displaced from their traditional land and moved to the periphery of the NCA (Shivji and Kapinga, 1998).

Tanzania's brief foray into socialism exacerbated the inequalities that had already developed under colonialism. In particular, the socialist policies of creating Ujaamas or villages in order to facilitate administration and bring cohesion to the loose federations of authority, further partitioned and displaced the Maasai (Honey, 1999: 225). Moreover, the villagisation removed power from the traditional village authorities and placed it outside of the community with a
central government, taking away the Maasai’s and other indigenous people’s rights to voice and representation (Honey, 1999). Because Tanzanian socialism relied heavily on self-autonomy, the borders with other countries were closed, sealing off the economy from the potential trading partners. Up until then, many tourists had been able to arrive in Kenya and drive with Kenyan tour operators to view Tanzanian national parks, thus keeping the revenue with Tanzania’s neighbour (Honey, 1999: 231). The closing off of borders allowed for the Tanzanian the domestic tourism industry to grow substantially. This was perhaps one of the few advantages that Tanzania was able to garner from the protectionist strategies of the socialist era. But despite this growth, the peripheralization of the Maasai continued and community-based practices of tourism were largely neglected (Honey, 1999)

**Governance of the NCA: The NCA Authority**

The NCA land is owned by the national government of Tanzania, but falls under the governance of the appointed Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (UNEP-WCMC, 2008). The NCA Authority has gone through several iterations in its history concerning conservation practices and land rights of the Maasai in the surrounding area. The NCA Authority was originally established under the colonial government as the overseer of the conservation area, under the Parks Ordinance. The Parks Ordinance preserved the rights of the Maasai to graze their cattle in the area, but the cultivation of crops and habitation on conserved land was prohibited, and compensation for the loss was promised (Shivji and
In 1959, the NCA authority was reorganised and given extrajudicial, enforcement and legislative powers, bringing it close to self-governance (Shivji and Kapinga, 1998: 12). The planning and implementation of any activities in the area was handed over to district development councils, decentralising power from the federal authority back to the district level (ibid.). The NCA Ordinance established earlier stated that the Maasai had rights of ownership to their grazing land, but later on, under the federal government’s Park Ordinance, this was not the case (ibid.). As customary rights to land were largely ignored, and any permission to cultivate on the land was prohibited, the Maasai were further marginalised. Moreover, compensation promised by the colonial government did not materialise (Honey, 1999). Under the current government, the NCA is deemed a multi-use land open to use by private businesses, local people and wildlife. Until 1992, there was a ban on agriculture, which was then temporarily lifted to compensate for the increasing poverty and food insecurity in the region. Though the power over the NCA was decentralised, there appears to be little evidence of the inclusion of traditional village authorities in dictating matters of land tenure, or collaboration over the use of land (Nelson, 2003: 4).

**Current Conditions and Connections to the Tourism Industry**

In accordance with the 1999 Land Act of Tanzania, the Maasai still have customary rights of occupancy to land (URT, 1999). These rights, however, are not formalised, which poses challenges to ownership that would have been
absent with the adoption of flexible tenure of traditional customary rights. However, displacement due to conservation has had many consequences on the Maasai’s ability to manage their land and their economy. Odgaard (2002) states that conservation is partially the reason for the “land scramble” in Tanzania (81). The increased “selling off” of traditional Maasai land causes high variability in the pastoral economy, and keeps the Maasai community sedentary (Thompson and Homewood, 2002: 110). The inability of the Maasai to follow their traditional transhumance (pastoral migration) patterns in order to accommodate their herds has led to the breakdown in the livestock economy of the Maasai (Johnsen, 2000: 152). Moreover, the Maasai are banned from using the Ngorongoro Crater for water and saltlicks for their livestock, further harming livestock herds. This shift to seminomadism has led to a decrease in heads of cattle due to communicable diseases. Because the NCA is a multiple-use land area, the migrations of wildlife still take place seasonally, further jeopardising livestock by allowing disease to spread from wildlife to cattle (Charnley, 2005). The disintegration of the pastoralist economy of the Maasai, has led to increased threat of food insecurity (Goodman, 2003: 110). Indeed, Charnley (2005) states that the Maasai in the NCA area suffer from higher rates of malnutrition compared with Maasai in other parts of Tanzania (80). A 1998 count on livestock revealed that Maasai livestock in the area were below the minimum count required to subsist (Charnley, 2005: 79). Combined with the growing human population, the dwindling livestock herds pose larger problems for the Maasai economy, vulnerability to poverty and diminished development opportunities.
The increasing shortage of food has led to pressure for cultivation, which the Maasai had traditionally relied on as a fallback strategy. However, the NCA policies do not allow farming in the conservation area. In cases where small-scale subsistence agriculture has been permitted, related activities such as the burning of land for farming has been prohibited (Charnley, 2005: 79). A comparison by Coast (2002) to the policies in Kenya show that the Tanzanian government policies are not built around the ability for the Maasai population to practice farming on a commercial basis or exploit economies of scale through mechanisms such as farmers’ associations, compared to their Kenyan counterparts (Coast, 2002: 99)

The relationship of the Maasai with the ever-expanding tourism industry shows that they are largely marginalised from that sector of the economy. According to the definition of pro-poor tourism and sustainable ecotourism presented above, the Maasai are largely excluded from resource management, sustainability practices, and being the centre of the tourism agenda through the involvement of the private sector. The Land Act of 1999 allows the Maasai to lease their land as needed to tour operators (URT Land Act No. 4, 1999). Few Maasai however, have been able to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the tourism industry. Moreover, the only legal form of tourism is hunting and companies that have participated in joint ventures with communities on non-hunting tourism have been told that they are participating in illegal activities (Nelson, 2003: 8). Some Maasai populations have been able to establish some form of cultural tourism (Nelson, 2003; Nelson, 2004). For instance, the
Ololosokwan tribe in the Loliondo Division has been able to secure contracts with private companies, has been able to secure some revenue from the tourism ventures (i.e. campsite funds, or entrance fees to game watching ventures), and is actively represented in the Joint Management Council formed for the purposes of their contract (Nelson, 2004: 10). A few other Maasai have been able to establish cultural bomas or Maasai living spaces. However, the Maasai face a significant barrier in accumulating revenue in that most of the entrance fees to the bomas are collected by tour operators upon entry and very little is left for the Maasai (Coast, 2002: 97). Some women are able to sell their beadwork to tourists through intermediaries, but the returns are small, and are not enough to respond to the economic needs of the Maasai population (Coast, 2002: 97).

Several analyses of the relationship between the Maasai economy and the tourism industry have revealed patterns of economic marginalisation. According to Coast (2002), 0.2% of Maasai over the age of 15 in the NCA area are employed in the tourism industry (97). Compared with the tourism lodges in Maasai Mara in Kenya, most staff at the private lodges in and around the NCA are non-Maasai (Charnley, 2005: 81). The Pastoral Council, an entity created to manage issues regarding the Maasai pastoral economy receives 10% of revenues from tourism. The indirect benefits do not compensate for the lack of financial resources. There are few community developments such as schools and clinics. According to Coast (2002), 9% of Maasai children aged 7-12 are enrolled in primary school compared with the 47% national rural average in Tanzania (99).
It is increasingly apparent that the Maasai, a romanticised archetype of African tourism continue to live with the consequences of colonial marginalisation and are not integrated as stakeholders in the development of the tourism industry in the NCA (Goodman, 2003). The main themes in the challenge lie within the policy spectrum concerning land rights, the role of the private sector and the conservation dialogue in the area. Because the NCA can call for a tender on land or infrastructure to attract private investment, there is little consultation with the communities that live around the NCA. Furthermore, the private sector, unless dictated by business model or practices on corporate social responsibility, is not obliged to consider the community in their business ventures. Goodman (2003: 113) cites that though there is an increasing body of literature and adoption of new methods of community participation, policies are still dictated as a top-down approach, and most often bypass the local population. This case is similar to the wildlife management policies that were established in Tanzania in 1998 (Songorwa, 1999). In order for the community to continue to have rights over the land the village council had to claim the land. This caused a shift in the mechanism of customary land tenure arrangements that are much more flexible than formal arrangements (Goodman, 2003: 109). If the land was not claimed, it could be put to tender for private purchase.

Issues of land tenure are critical when making decisions on land use, and are one of the challenges in participation for pastoral communities in Tanzania. Goodman (2003) states that the current Tanzania Land Act is still very much based on the 1923 Land Act and there is little provision for the local community's
role in managing land (108). Though there are cases where private companies and local villages have been able to sign agreements bypassing government, this is still not common practice (Nelson, 2004: 31). Because the Maasai have not been able to formalise their land claims, and still for the most part can operate on traditional and flexible land tenure, the government or the NCA Authority is able to use the land for its purposes, whether it is to extend the area into a conservation zone, or to sell it to private businesses. Their inability to claim land that is customarily theirs puts the Maasai at a disadvantage and at risk for further marginalisation.

Conservation policies are another key factor that makes the situation of the Maasai complex. Policies at the federal level do not build on indigenous knowledge nor do they make use of the expertise offered by the Maasai (Goodman, 2003). As illustrated with the wildlife conservation policies, the conservation approach also appears to be top-down in that it emphasises the necessity for training in conservation practices (Songorwa, 1999: 2071). Similarly, the tourism industry largely separates itself from the knowledge of the Maasai in their ventures. Private companies generally make their agreements with the NCA Authority and the Maasai often have to oblige. Despite their extensive knowledge of wildlife migration, seasonal variations, geography and ecology, the Maasai are not employed substantially in the safari and game ventures of the tourism industry (Goodman, 2003). There are a few attempts to use Maasai as walking tour guides to the Crater Floor, but these constitute a newer development in NCA tourism (Johnsen, 2000: 167). The Maasai still
suffer from high rates of poverty and unemployment (Coast, 2002; Goodman, 2003). A quick comparison with the Maasai in Kenya shows that Maasai who are employed in the tourism industry earn wages that are ten times higher than those engaged in commercial agriculture or other activities (Thompson and Homewood, 2002: 129). Furthermore, there is conflict between conservation and the hunting policies, where communal lands are concerned (Nelson, 2003: 8). Though the Wildlife policy supports community-based ventures, the government maintains centralised control over tourism activities, further constraining ecotourism activities such as wildlife viewing and walking safaris (Nelson, 2003: 9). This illustrates that tourism has great potential in alleviating poverty if community expertise is utilised to the benefit of the industry, but that for the large part, the involvement of the private sector has not benefited the indigenous communities of Tanzania's Ngorongoro Conservation Area. This has also not been facilitated by government legislation because issues around land tenure, wildlife management and the engagement of communities are largely unclear (Nelson, 2003: 10). Therefore, the role of the tourism private sector in engaging the Maasai community in the NCA has been largely ineffective.
THE PAFURI TRIANGLE, KRUGER NATIONAL PARK: THE CASE OF THE MAKULEKE TRIBE

The World Development Indicators state that tourism has contributed 8.3% to GDP in South Africa in 2008 (World Bank, 2008). Export earnings from travellers contribute 14.3% to the total export economy and tourism contributes to 7.6% of the population’s employment (World Bank, 2008). Though smaller than other developing countries, the tourism industry still contributes a substantial amount to the economy of South Africa.

Kruger National Park was the first park and conservation area in South Africa (www.sanparks.org, 2008). First established in 1898 as a game reserve, the area stretches some 7500 miles and contains cultural and archaeological sites such as the Thulamela ruins, and is home to a variety of species of plants and animals (SANParks, 2008). The Pafuri Triangle is located at the northernmost tip of Kruger National Park, bordering Zimbabwe and Mozambique, and lies between the Limpopo and the Luvuvhu Rivers. It is richly diverse, containing 75% of South Africa’s biodiversity and will be home to the Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA), a cross-border collaboration with neighbouring southern African countries that will allow for joint conservation efforts and expanded tourism and economic opportunity. The wetlands area within the Pafuri Triangle was named a Ramsar site (wetlands of international
importance to conservation) and the Triangle is known as Kruger’s best birding area (SANParks, 2008).

The Makuleke under Apartheid Rule

During the rule of the apartheid government, Kruger National Park was named a conservation area to protect the decreasing population of wildlife in the area due to hunting. The conservation movement at the time was structured around the notion that natural areas should remain pristine and free of human activity (Kepe et al, 2005b). The Makuleke people, an indigenous group that called the Pafuri Triangle their home, were displaced from the area as a result. The government believed that their economic activities such as the hunting of game would decimate the population of animals that were already in danger of extinction. In order to conserve what was left of the wildlife population, the Makuleke people were moved from the area (Ramutsindela, 2002: 16). Robins and van der Waal, (2008) also state that the Makuleke were an independent community, and self-governed through local tribal authorities (56, 58). This, along with the fact that they had a long history of cross-border interactions with other communities and immigrants in the area in economic and social life, posed a significant threat to the apartheid government, which wanted to control its population of black South Africans. In order to ensure that the national interests of South Africa were met, the government moved the Makuleke community from their home in the Pafuri Triangle to an area one-quarter its size outside the gates.
of Kruger National Park, with little compensation (Robins and van der Waal, 2008: 58).

At the end of the apartheid era, the new democratic government of South Africa set out to redress the burgeoning inequalities that had resulted from the policies of their predecessors (Reid, 2001: 137). One such method of redressing inequalities was to launch a land claims program, which would allow Black South Africans especially to appeal to claim land that was taken for commercial or conservation purposes or awarded to White South Africans. This allowed the Makuleke to lodge a land claim for the area of the Pafuri Triangle that they had lost in 1969 (Steenkamp and Uhr, 2000: 1). The Military also occupied the borders of the Pafuri Triangle as a security precaution against threats from its neighbours, Zimbabwe and Mozambique (Steenkamp and Uhr, 2000: 8). The military had granted commission to the Duo Mining Corporation to prospect for minerals and especially diamonds in the area. A Deed of Grant was given to the Makuleke for the 24,000 hectares in the Pafuri Triangle on the condition that the Makuleke would not inhabit the area, cultivate on the land, or allow for minerals prospecting and that the area would remain part of the conservation lands of Kruger National Park (Reid, 2001: 139). This was a significant and highly publicised land claims case in South Africa at the time because of the ability of the Makuleke to oppose and even succeed over Kruger National Park. In addition, the Makuleke were able to secure a significant victory and ensure the long term viability and security of their people against the Duo Mining
Corporation's financially lucrative, but short-term proposal of prospecting for alluvial diamonds in the region (Robins and van der Waal, 2008).

The Terms of Agreement and Current Governance

The Makuleke conservancy is now a contractual park, which is differentiated from a nationally owned conservation area like the rest of Kruger National Park (Reid, 2001). Though explicitly owned by the Makuleke people according to the Deed of Grant, the area is currently managed by South African National Parks (SANParks), a largely self-funded parastatal (Mahoney and van Zyl, 2001, Reid, 2001). SANParks has agreed to manage the area for a period of fifty years, after which management will revert back to the Makuleke community. SANParks does not however, concern itself with commercial or community development in the Pafuri Triangle. Any developments of this nature are left to the community to determine (Steenkamp and Uhr, 2000: 14). The land claims agreement has led to the formation of the Joint Management Board, consisting of members of the community, consultants and officials from the government to manage the implementation of the contractual agreement (Reid, 2001). The Communal Property Association oversees the holdings and management of the property in the area and ensures that the Makuleke are able to retain ownership of the area (Reid, 2001: 142). The Makuleke currently reside in three villages outside of the area, and some are employed within the Pafuri Triangle, and many still practice agriculture in the area outside of Kruger National Park.
Private Sector Tourism in the Makuleke Community

Since the successful land restitution settlement, tourism in the Pafuri Triangle has doubled (Mahoney and Van Zyl, 2002: 86). The Makuleke have successfully been able to engage with independent safari and tour operators that have allowed some benefits to accrue to the community. For instance, the Makuleke have been able to build a working relationship with Wilderness Safaris, a tour operating business, with camps and tour services throughout Southern Africa (Ashley, De Brine and Wilde, 2007). Wilderness Safaris has created a luxury 20 room tented camp in the Pafuri Triangle. In addition, since 2005, they have been able to bring R3.6 Million in income for lodge employees, R3.4 million in anti-poaching services and have contributed R1.2 million in park concession fees between 2005 and 2007 (Ashley, De Brine and Wilde, 2007: 36). Wilderness Safaris also sources local produce from Makuleke community farmers outside of the conservation area.

Wilderness Safaris has facilitated community development and capacity building and enhancement projects in the Makuleke Community. In partnership with Endangered Wildlife Trust, twenty students were trained in conservation and anti-poaching as well as hospitality practices and employed as full-time guides with Wilderness Safaris (Ashley, De Brine and Wilde, 2007: 36). In addition, in partnership with SANParks, the Makuleke have been able to establish a community cultural centre and home stay service, which allows travellers to experience the culture and way of life, as well as the history of the Makuleke people (www.makuleke.com, 2008). Plans are currently underway for an
indigenous knowledge centre to create eco-friendly and culturally valuable tourism services for travellers that visit the Makuleke village areas. The Makuleke also negotiated another lodge with African Safaris in 2005, known as the Royal Makuleke, and continue to grow their economy in the area (SANParks, 2008).

It serves to caution that one should not overstate the successes of the Makuleke community. The rate of employment is currently low and development of tourism and community ventures is also slow (Reid, 2001). Indeed Poultney states, “It is not possible for three villages settled some 100 kilometres away from the contract concession to become wealthy through a 52-bed lodge.” (Ashley et al, 2007: 37). However, the case serves to illustrate that tourism can serve to widen the benefits to the community by directly addressing the needs of the community through partnerships. In particular, Rogerson (2006) states that, community led local economic development widens the net to allow for the engagement of all areas of the community including the informal sector and small enterprises.

Capitalisation of the Tourism Industry in the Makuleke Case

Though the history of South Africa is unique in its circumstances, there are several lessons that can be learned from the ability of the Makuleke to capitalise on their assets. The Makuleke case fits well into the ecotourism definition because it utilises principles of sustainable resource management (through conservation), having the community at the centre of the tourism industry, and
promoting ecologically sound enterprises through the relationship with Wilderness Safaris. Firstly, the difference between the Makuleke case and other cases of community development is that the government role in enabling successful ecotourism ventures was crucial. After the end of apartheid, the new democratic government had to engage deliberately to redress the inequalities of the apartheid era (Honey, 1999: 344). Tourism served as the experimental grounds on which opportunities for the poor could be fostered.

Several policy directions enabled the government to empower local communities and in particular to alleviate poverty and create opportunity to engage black South Africans in the economy. Firstly, the Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policy meant that there was a conscious effort paid to include black South Africans in economic affairs (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003: 13). The Black Economic Empowerment initiative dictates the inclusion of black South African businesses in the stock exchange and on the executive committees and boards of local businesses (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003: 13). Though based on race more than class, and not directly applicable to the pro-poor movement, the BEE policy did set up a discourse and framed the activities of the government and the private sector as well as communities in way that made inequality in other forms a salient feature and one to be addressed with intent (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003).

The government of South Africa was also conscious in its consolidation of tourism guidelines and policies. The consolidation of the tourism industry in the White Paper on Tourism ensured that it was an endeavour that would was
"Government led, private sector driven, community based and labour conscious" (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, 2002 as cited in Spenceley, 2003: 6). Furthermore, the establishment of the Responsible Tourism Guidelines ensured that businesses and communities engaging with the tourism industry did so in a manner that was least harmful and most beneficial to the national economy (Spenceley, 2003: 8). The end of the apartheid era allowed for the rectification of many institutions. Because organizations like SANParks were undergoing transformation in the post-apartheid era, they were able to facilitate the involvement of communities and the active participation of many stakeholders as part of their new mandates (Steenkamp and Uhr, 2000: 17).

The government’s attention to land claim policies and the restitution of land also facilitated the Makuleke to be able to claim the Pafuri Triangle. The establishment of the White Paper on Land Policy in 1997 stated that there were three main components of the land policy: restitution, redistribution and tenure reform (Spenceley, 2003; Kepe, Wynberg and Ellis, 2005). Though some researchers believe that land reform was largely ad hoc, the framework was in place to enable the Makuleke to stake their claim and ensure their claim, ensuring their success (Kepe et al, 2005: 6). This has also led to the retraditionalisation of authority, where government at the village level is charged with the development of commercial and community opportunities, empowering local people to participate in the economy of their country in a way that is suitable to their means and needs (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003: 14).
The Government Balancing Act

The Government of South Africa was faced with a significant task of reconciling many interests of many stakeholders, including land reform, biodiversity, economic development and community participation (Kepe et al, 2005: 7). The new Constitution of democratic South Africa takes into account economic development and social justice as part of environmental policies (Kepe, Wynberg and Ellis, 2005b). In order to reconcile the interests and to further the agenda of poverty alleviation and community participation, some research purports that the parks and tourism industry became the social and economic core of new South Africa (Rogerson, 2006: 44).

As identified previously, the salience of the Rio Summit and its recency to the events marking the end of apartheid ensured that tourism would become a pro-conservation industry (Rogerson, 2006: 42). Subsequently, the national parks provided a venue where conservation can be practiced, the community surrounding the park such as the Makuleke can participate in its maintenance and the parks industry would continue to contribute to the economic development of the country. Moreover the notion of a “contractual park” ensured that even if land was divided up as part of the land reform movement, the ecological diversity and integrity of the land would not be dismantled (Reid, 2001). Indeed, this very notion served to address the concerns of SANParks, which believed that the loss of land through reform would lead to the eventual disintegration of Kruger National Park and that conservation would slip off the agenda as priority for the government (Steenkamp and Uhr, 2000: 17).
The push towards economic development has been significant. Ashley and Wolmer (2003) state that the South African government has been particularly adamant about creating an enabling macroeconomic framework in order to allow private investors to bring business to South Africa (7). The engagement with the private sector in the tourism industry is no different. The form of local economic development is facilitated by market-led approaches with a focus on policy for sustainable development and community participation. Cases such as the Makuleke contractual park serve to exemplify the South African government’s policies lean strongly toward macroeconomic stability and economic liberalisation. Furthermore, the commercialisation of the parks industry is framed by the need to allocate state funding for other uses such as healthcare and education (Ashley and Wolmer, 2003: 14). The investment by private companies in the parks and tourism industry allows the much coveted resources of the state to be diverted to other causes, leaving the tourism industry and the communities that participate in it in a stable condition (Ashley and Wolmer, 2003: 15).

The Makuleke land claim case has been celebrated as the model case of integrating community participation, economic growth and conservation under one cohesive banner that leads to nation building by contributing to the best interests and policy agenda of the new South Africa (Robins and van der Waal, 2008: 67).
CRITICAL ISSUES IN THE PARTICIPATION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN PRO-POOR TOURISM

The tourism industries in South Africa and Tanzania share similar characteristics that allow comparison. Firstly, both countries have long established conservation and national parks systems that are used as sources of attracting revenue, and especially foreign exchange. Both countries have a history of rule by other parties (colonial and apartheid), and have undergone regime change into democracy in recent history (though Tanzania’s independence was some decades before the end of apartheid in South Africa). Both countries have populations of indigenous people who had been displaced as a result of colonial rule. Both have tourism industries that make a similar contribution to the GDP and to employment (World Bank, 2008). South Africa and Tanzania had primarily relied on primary sector industries and are now slowly incorporating the service sector industries (Honey, 1999). The countries share a similar goal of enabling foreign investment and prescribe to the edict of economic liberalisation. And finally, both South Africa and Tanzania face significant challenges in addressing poverty and inequality in a post-occupation era. The government is tasked with the challenge of integrating the interests of various participants in the tourism industry including indigenous communities, the private sector, conservationists and government branches. Indeed, as
Spenceley (2003) asserts, the government has shifted in focus from the control and conservation of natural resources to the sustainable use of those resources.

**The Private Sector: New Development Experts?**

Ashley and Ntshona (2003) identify two classic models of private sector-community interactions (15). The first is through philanthropic activities of the private sector, where as a mode of acknowledgement, the private sector “gives back” and the community is a largely a passive recipient. The second is the model of the private sector on communal land, where the community gains some returns from the operation of the private sector on their land, but is not necessarily actively engaged. The role of the private sector has begun to evolve along with new discourses in development and in the tourism industry. Private investors that engage with pro-poor tourism are making internal changes to their company operations to align with a people-centred approach (Ashley and Haysom, 2006: 267). The private sector has taken on the role of the community partner, rather than a top-down donor (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003: 15). New forms of tourism, including ecotourism recognize that the community is engaged with the business side of the operation, and the private sector engages with community development, including responsibility for sustainability methods (Ashley and Haysom, 2006: 266). As stated, this has been facilitated by the recognition that in order to operate a successful business, the company needs to maintain good relations with the surrounding community (Mahoney and Van Zyl, 2002). Ashley and Jones (2001) outline what they refer to as a “joint venture”, a
“contractual partnership” that is built around the tourism industry between the private sector and the community (407). Joint venture management models are built around profit sharing, where the community provides the resource base, namely labour and access to conserved land in the case of ecotourism, and the private sector provides the funding (Scherl and Edwards, 2007: 79). The joint venture model is a partnership that includes more than a rent agreement; it sets up a framework around sustainability and community-centred initiatives (Ashley and Jones, 2001: 415). Indeed we can see the foundations of the joint venture relationship in the case of the Makuleke in South Africa, where the community has been able to ensure that their needs for sustainability in the future are met through the relationship with Wilderness Safaris (Ashley et al., 2007). Though the economic returns in terms of employment are not high, the community is able to use the returns from the concessions to build infrastructure, and support small business such as the homestay program, the Makuleke Cultural Centre and the Indigenous Knowledge Centre (www.makuleke.com, 2008).

In comparison, the Maasai are not able to exercise bargaining power through such a partnership. They remain on the fringes of a large industry. From examination of the case study, the Maasai are still participating in a traditional relationship with the private sector where the private sector is on communal land and the Maasai community is able to gain some benefits from their presence such as being able to operate cultural bomas or Maasai women being able to sell some of their beadwork (Coast, 2002; Charnley, 2005). While there are opportunities where small tourism outfits have been able to engage
with the Maasai community, such as with Loliondo village (Johnsen, 2000), this is largely lacking with larger corporations, which have not in a substantial way engaged the Maasai community in their business ventures.

**Critical Preconditions to Private Sector Engagement**

The Makuleke Model is not perfect, but it is currently hailed as one of the most successful in engendering community-private sector relations (Robins and van der Waal, 2008: 59). With the increasing attention paid to participatory models of community development, models such as the one employed in South Africa will come to be seen as highly beneficial to community empowerment. However, there are necessary preconditions that will facilitate private sector engagement and address the challenges it faces, as part of successful pro-poor tourism ventures (Ashley, Boyd and Goodwin, 2000, Strategy 4, 5).

One of the more discernable and critical characteristics in the case of the Makuleke and the Maasai is the significance of their relationships with the government, and with the private sector. In the case of South Africa, the Makuleke have been able to balance the power relations through their ownership of land. Ravallion and Datt (1999) reveal that rural poverty is often tied to access to land and resources. By gaining ownership of the Pafuri Triangle, the Makuleke have been able to secure their rights, and have changed the mechanisms of interaction with the private sector. Part of the reason that this has been successful in the case of the Makuleke is that the government has been able to address poverty through a framework that has been centred on the
poor (Mahoney and van Zyl, 2002: 84). The notion that the South African government has deliberately sought to redress inequality through mechanisms such as the land claims act has set up precedent for political empowerment that allows the community to make decisions of their own accord (Scheyvens, 1999). This has indeed been critical in the case of the Makuleke and their contract with Wilderness Safaris. The Makuleke have successfully been able to negotiate with Wilderness Safaris and in particular ensure that the needs of their community are met, along with some forward planning for the future. In turn, the role of Wilderness Safaris has changed from being just a philanthropic organisation to a community partner. The possession of land has been a critical factor in negotiating this relationship.

In comparison with the Maasai, even though the power is decentralised to the local authority level, mechanisms or policy frameworks to address land ownership are lacking or unclear (Nelson, 2003). Shivji and Kapinga (1998) and Odgaard (2002) emphasise the difference between customary rights to land and formal deeds. Where there is a discrepancy in land ownership, there is room for the manipulation of rights. From the literature, this indeed appears to be the case. The Maasai are at the mercy of the formal land rights movement. Though a perfectly valid and indeed necessary legislative policy, the land act is not constructed to address the needs of the marginalised such as the Maasai (Goodman, 2003). Rather, it re-emphasises the power of the Minister and the government authority in determining the distribution of land, through government issued certificates (URT, 1999; Shivji and Kapinga, 1998). In this way, the land
act does not allow for the Maasai to exercise their political will through possession of land, and there is little in the way of acknowledgement of customary rights (Shivji and Kapinga, 1998: 19-20). It is even more critical in addressing relationships with the private sector. As was presented earlier in the case study, the Maasai are not able to negotiate a position with the private sector and ensure that their needs, economic or otherwise are met. The private sector has been able to retain its traditional role, working away from the community and negotiating with the local authority where necessary. Where there has been some room for the private sector to engage directly with the community, legislation around the legality of tourism ventures has been constraining (Nelson, 2003: 10). As Reed (1997) states, the lack of institutions may ensure that traditional power holders retain the power in the newer tourism settings. One can take this argument further to state that the lack of acknowledgement of the community as central to institutional frameworks ensures that traditional power holders are able to retain their influence maintaining the status quo.

The centrality of legislative frameworks that are enabling effectively sets up the power relations between the community and other stakeholders, including the private sector. Reed (1997) states that community level policy arenas, which include decisions around the provision of land, are likely to garner participation from people whose livelihood is tied to development on the land (571-572). This is the case for both the Maasai, with their pastoral economy, as well as the Makuleke who were traditionally agriculturists. Land rights make up a significant factor in determining the participation and power balance of parties involved and
shaping the role of the private sector. It is especially important to tie together the needs of the community with the business models put forth by the private sector to ensure that there is security for both parties. Indeed, government legislation, and regulation are necessary components to help secure private investment (Harrison, 2007), but they are also crucial in securing the livelihoods of communities.

The second pre-condition that may facilitate the involvement of the private sector in joint ventures is the decentralisation of power to the community level. Reed (1997) states that in conditions where the community members are not able to gain from the benefits of tourism, there is less likelihood that they will be active participants. Songorwa (1999) in his case study of community wildlife management in Tanzania, found that the creation of new bureaucratic structures, and the perception that the benefits of wildlife management were only collected by the elite within the community, factored into the community’s lack or loss of interest and reduced the incentive for individuals to participate in resource management (2073). In situations where the conservation efforts are still very much prescriptive rather than a partnership, the community continues to mistrust the private sector. In order ensure the community partnership structure, power needs to be decentralised to the community level. This has been the case in the Makuleke land claim, where the community wields the power of decisions on commercial developments on their land. This decentralisation of power allows them to seek a fair partnership with the private sector, rather than take the passive place of beneficiaries. In comparison, the Maasai do not have that
advantage. Though the power has been decentralised to the regional level and now sits with the NCA authority, it is still a government structure that is exclusive of the Maasai. Furthermore, the NCA authority is an institution of the colonial era and has not changed much in order to meet the needs of the communities that inhabit the NCA (Shivji and Kapinga, 1998: 28) This form of decentralisation sets up the power structures that continue to exclude the Maasai because of their reduced bargaining power (Thompson and Homewood, 2002; Charnley, 2005).

Market power is yet another precondition that is necessary in attracting and establishing private sector ventures in the tourism industry in developing countries. When thinking of the private sector, it is necessary to ask the question of why the private sector would want to invest in an unstable climate, with uncertain benefits and lack of infrastructure that is likely to cost more than continuing to operate in places where the proper institutional framework exists. There are several reasons for this. Firstly, market power is an important determinant of whether private investors will establish business ventures in the developing world. As outlined by Ashley and Ntshona (2003) in their study of Wild Coast developments in South Africa, the ecotourism industry represents "underutilised economic potential" that can be unlocked if packaged in a way that is appealing to the private sector (18).

The tourism sectors in South Africa and Tanzania are greatly appealing to the new class of tourists that seek adventure and alternatives to the traditional form of mass tourism (Mowforth and Munt, 1998). This also allows companies to form "niche markets", and specifically high value markets as is the case with the
Makuleke site, where Wilderness Safaris has been able to establish a small and exclusive tourism operation, with large benefits to the community (Forstner, 2004). When paired with the unique travel experience and cultural products that only a local community is able to provide i.e. access to living in the village, the private sector can profit from their investment in community-centred tourism. Furthermore, the investment of the private sector often widens the market for the people that are able to participate in the economy. For instance, the emergence of the black South African middle class signals a potential new market for domestic tourism in South Africa (Ashley and Ntshona, 2003: 76). Market signals therefore serve an important precondition for private investors to contribute to pro-poor tourism markets in the developing world. Furthermore, the authenticity of the experience is enhanced through interaction with the local people. While it is possible for the community to gain through people-centred approaches, the private sector can also capitalise on the cultural presence of local communities, as partners. This also avoids the pitfalls of mass tourism, where cultural commoditisation becomes a defining characteristic of private sector engagement with tourism (Briedenhann and Wickens, 2004: 71).
CONCLUSION

The tourism industry is quickly coming to the forefront as one of the most important determinants of economic stability in the developing world. Ecotourism that is placed within the pro-poor discourse offers a unique opportunity to engage with stakeholders who have been involved in traditional mass tourism in new ways. As pro-poor discourse asserts, the importance of community participation and poverty alleviation have been central to the development field for many years. Integrating the private sector poses new challenges on the policy and program implementation front. As Bushell and McCool (2007) state, in order to prevent ecotourism from damaging itself, effective and clear policy and management is needed (13). The role of the community in decision-making is as important as recognising that there is a role for private business to contribute to the development of ecotourism in developing countries.

Pro-poor tourism is a newer area of study, and only newly adopted by developing country governments, and as such, much more research is required in order to establish a body of work and substantiate the impact of the private sector in new tourism arenas. This paper sought to illustrate contrasting links between the private sector and the community in new ecotourism models, and highlight the potential places where the two can work together. However, the data on the impact of the private sector on communities is still scarce, and this
paper does not establish definitive relationships that the private sector generally generates net benefits for the poor through ecotourism ventures. The case of the Makuleke merely identifies the possibility of harmonisation between community and private sector. More research is necessary; specifically, longer term studies on the effects of the private sector on economic and non-economic characteristics of indigenous communities in developing countries need to be established. As Spenceley (2003) states, the data on tourism are not standardised and hard to compare and until we know and understand the data, the study of tourism is reliant on case-specific examples. Furthermore, studies on the role of corporate social responsibility in development and the role on government policy on integrating private sector interests and community interests are necessary. As many countries are on the threshold of development, the effects of pro-poor ecotourism are yet to be determined at the full extent. However, it offers the potential for poverty alleviation, for movement into the service-based industry and for making people the centre of its development. The role of the private sector in engaging with communities and governments will see a shift as tourism continues to develop. Tourism offers room for interests to combine for the benefit of communities in developing countries and a new way of doing business for the private sector.
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