

The Expansion of Ecotourism in Tanzania and its Implications for the Maasai

Honors Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation
with honors research distinction in International Studies in the
undergraduate colleges of the Ohio State University
by

Kathryn Hogan

The Ohio State University

June 2011

Project Advisors:
Professor Ed Malecki,
Department of Geography
and
Professor Dave Kraybill,
Department of Agricultural, Environmental and Development Economics

Table of Contents

Section 1.1: Introduction.....	3
Section 1.2: Historical Background of Colonization and post-Independence	5
Section 1.3: The Role of Tourism in present-day Tanzania	7
Section 2.1: Frameworks and Definitions for Ecotourism.....	10
Section 2.2: The Growth of Ecotourism in sub-Saharan Africa.....	16
Section 2.3: Challenges and Criticisms of Ecotourism	19
Section 2.4: How Does the Expansion of Ecotourism Impact the Maasai?	22
Section 3.1: Case Studies: Who Really Embodies Ecotourism?.....	23
Case Study 1: Dorobo Tours and Safaris.....	24
Case Study 2: Thomson Safaris.....	28
Case Study 3: Klein's Camp.....	37
Section 3.2: Case Study Analysis	41
Section 4.1: The Involvement of Tanzanian Government	46
Section 4.2: Response of NGOs and IOs.....	51
Section 5: Conclusion	53
Bibliography.....	57

Section 1.1: Introduction



Figure 1: Map of Maasailand
Source: Walter & Hamfler (2009)

For centuries the Maasai pastoralists have inhabited lands in sub-Saharan Africa. Today Maasailand spans across roughly 150,000 kilometers² of arid land in southern Kenya and northern Tanzania. The Maasai are commonly identified for their livelihoods dependent on cattle, and, the Maasai belief system stipulates that God sent all cattle to the Maasai. As this belief follows, all of the world's cattle belong to the Maasai, and the Maasai live their semi-nomadic lifestyle herding cattle across the Serengeti Plains.¹ But beyond herding cattle, who are the Maasai? To most Westerners, the Maasai are the tribal people of Africa who don red and purple garb and beautifully beaded jewelry. The Maasai may seem like a people that exist in a land far away, in a land unaffected by industrialization, untouched by modernity. In that view, the Maasai continue to live a traditional, primitive lifestyle. These assumptions are false and, ironically, Western

¹ This belief system was explained to me in by a group of Maasai women and men in 2009 during a study visit to northern Tanzania.

actions themselves in sub-Saharan Africa have created many of the difficult issues the Maasai face today.

The issue of land rights and Tanzania's Maasai has been a highly contentious matter for decades. Dating back to the colonial era, when British colonizers first aggravated land tenure issues with the Maasai, to the growth of the Tanzanian tourism industry today, the Maasai are all too familiar with land disputes. Maasai land rights were challenged when European powers established conservation zones and game reserves in Tanzania. Many Western voices called for the expulsion of the Maasai from these areas because they were thought to pose a threat to precious natural habitats. Eventually Tanzania gained independence, but the issues for the Maasai persisted. The socialist policies of the newly-independent Tanzanian government affected the Maasai, as these policies pushed for the growth of the country's tourism sector. The growth of the tourism industry has drawn more foreigners to the region, while simultaneously exacerbating land issues for the Maasai. The reality is that sub-Saharan Africa is becoming increasingly marketable as a vacation spot, and the targeted consumers are wealthy Westerners. Ecotourism, a growing area in the industry, is becoming more popular among these targeted consumers from the West. As ecotourism grows and becomes the most attractive option for many tourists, it is important to consider its implications for the Maasai. Many indicators suggest that the Maasai's historical struggle for land rights continues today, and their current struggles are rooted in the growth of Tanzania's tourism industry.

Section 1.2: Historical Background of Colonization and Post-Independence

The 19th century scramble for Africa affected many indigenous groups and divided many cultures, including the Maasai. Germany drew the boundary between present-day Kenya and Tanzania, dividing the Maasailand; however, despite the boundary line, the Maasai have always considered themselves one people (Honey 1999: 220). The European colonizers took an interest in the conservation of Africa, and in 1900 the first international conservation treaty was drafted in London. The Convention for the Preservation of Animals, Birds and Fish in Africa was signed by all of the colonial powers, and became the precedent for subsequent legislation laying out conservation areas, game reserves and national parks in Africa. In the case of Tanzania, the German colonists had established 13 game reserves by 1912, attracting Europeans to the area. After World War I, Germany was forced to surrender Tanzania (then known as Tanganyika) to the British, who also sought opportunity in the area. The territory drew in wildlife adventurers and hunters, but it also drew attention from international conservationists. These international conservationists advocated for sanctioned areas of conservation, and in 1951 the Serengeti National Park was established, followed by the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA), Arusha and Lake Manyara National Parks in 1960. These parks and conservation areas came with strict restrictions for hunting, often excluding Tanzanians from the sport entirely.² Some species were completely protected, and for those that could be hunted, an expensive hunting permit was required. This

² Big game hunting was permitted for other species, including lions, leopards and wild dogs. This conservation legislation excluded Tanzanians from participating in game hunting. In order to hunt in African conservation areas one had to obtain a license, which Africans could not afford. Africans were also prohibited from owning rifles by the colonial government's law. Africans typically hunted for food rather than for sport, and these laws prevented them from hunting for food or to protect their livestock as they had prior to colonial rule (Honey 1999: 223).

prevented Africans from hunting at all, as most of them could not obtain or afford a permit. Europeans were the only ones able to hunt. Although these parks enacted many regulations such as these, the Serengeti National Park allowed the Maasai to continue to live on the land- an allowance that only lasted for 7 years. Outcry from conservationists in the international community called for the protection of wildlife and ecosystems in the Serengeti National Park, expelling the Maasai from a portion of their ancestral lands. The National Park Ordinance of 1959 expelled the Maasai from the Serengeti and moved them to the NCA, where many remain today.³ In the conclusion of the Ordinance, British officials convinced Maasai elders to sign the document expelling them from their lands in the Serengeti, even though none of them knew how to read or write. After signing the document trucks arrived to remove the Maasai and their possessions from the Serengeti (Honey 1999: 220-224).

This seemingly coercive act of removal from their land did not occur arbitrarily. There had been much support from European and American conservationists and scientists to remove the Maasai from the Serengeti National Park. These individuals argued that the Maasai posed a threat to the natural ecologies of the Serengeti, and believed the solution would be to remove the Maasai from their ancestral lands. Louis Leakey, a British paleontologist, argued that the Maasai should have no legal right to remain in the Serengeti. Another individual, Bernhard Grzimek, director of the Frankfurt Zoo, wrote a book that passionately argued for the expulsion of the Maasai from the Serengeti (Honey 1999: 224). These voices were highly influential in the decision to pass

³ The Maasai are currently located in 'Maasailand,' which is comprised of roughly 150,000 kilometers² of land, split between southern Kenya and northern Tanzania, spanning across a large area of the Great African Rift Valley. The region is not autonomous and the citizens are governed by their respective governments (Homewood et al. 2009: 3).

the 1959 National Park Ordinance, which moved the Maasai from the Serengeti to the NCA. With little control over the decisions made by their colonizers, the Maasai were forced to move to the land assigned to them. The Maasai's land tenure issues did not end with colonization. Following colonization, the socialist policies of the newly-independent Tanzanian government continued to impede the Maasai's access to land rights.

The end of colonial rule did not mark an improvement for Maasai rights. In 1961 the newly independent government owned all land in Tanzania, allowing for centralized control over land tenure policies in the country. The Tanzanian government passed various land tenure acts throughout the 1990s, but these policies often contain contradictions or have yet to be fully implemented. One such policy, the Village Land Act of 1999, actually advocated for pastoral land rights, but unfortunately had limited efficacy and contained severe contradictions. One such contradiction was the Tanzanian law stipulating that pastoral rangelands were empty, and therefore open to reallocation at the government's discretion (Homewood et al. 2009: 7). Contradictions such as these have created many of the land tenure issues the Maasai face today.

Section 1.3: The Role of Tourism in Present-Day Tanzania

Believing that its colorful landscapes, exceptional wildlife, and rich culture would incite the growth of its tourism industry, Tanzania has aggressively sought to expand its tourism sector. The Tanzanian government believes the tourism sector has the greatest economic potential, as it currently accounts for fourteen percent of the country's gross domestic product (GDP), according to Tanzania's national website. In 1999, the government drafted tourism policies with an objective to promote the economy and

livelihood of the people, essentially poverty alleviation, through encouraging the development of sustainable and quality tourism that is culturally, and socially acceptable, ecologically friendly, environmentally sound and economically viable. In order to achieve its tourism policy goals, Tanzania wanted to improve its infrastructure, increase hotels and restaurants, improve services, market the industry domestically and internationally, improve coordination among tourism services, encourage local and foreign investment, and encourage the private sector to develop the tourism industry. Heading these initiatives would be the Tanzanian Tourist Board (TTB) (The United Republic of Tanzania National Website 2011).

As tourism expands in Tanzania, the phenomenon of ecotourism expands as well. Ecotourism is an alternative form of tourism that typically seeks to leave a minimal impact on the environment, promote conservation and positively impact local host communities. Since many of the prime tourist destinations in Tanzania are natural conservation areas, ecotourism has become a popular alternative for many tourists.

Ironically, the growth of tourism has shown to contribute to the land tenure issues faced by the Maasai. In its effort to expand the tourism industry, the Tanzanian government has sold land to foreign companies.⁴ It is often the case that the areas sold contain land in which the Maasai were living and herding cattle. Some tourism companies assume control over their purchased land and then deny the Maasai access. There have been reports of physical violence when the Maasai wander onto the privately-owned land, and many accounts suggest that these tourism companies are not creating

⁴ The government is able to sell land to foreign companies under the 1997 Tanzania Investment Act. The 1997 Tanzania Investment Act allows non-citizens to own land for the purpose of investment. The 2004 Land (Amendment) Act permits the sale of bare land and allows mortgage financing as a means of encouraging domestic and foreign investment (USAID 2011).

financial benefits for the Maasai as promised. If the Maasai are being denied land rights, access to water, financial benefits from tourism, or suffer physical harm as a result of these companies, then ecotourism is not actually being achieved. What's more, the Tanzanian Tourism Policy of 1999 stated that the tourism sector should "...promote the economy and livelihood of the people, essentially poverty alleviation, through encouraging the development of sustainable and quality tourism that is culturally, and socially acceptable, ecologically friendly, environmentally sound and economically viable" (The United Republic of Tanzania National Website 2011). It seems that both the Tanzania government and the private ecotourism companies pledge sustainable tourism that alleviates poverty and creates financial benefits for local communities, but does this include the Maasai? The Maasai have historically faced a plethora of land tenure issues, and certain indicators suggest that the tourism sector is helping to carry on that legacy today. As the tourism industry grows the violation of Maasai land and human rights increase. This issue is one that is complex and can be attributed to multiple factors.

This study explores the expansion of tourism, and more specifically ecotourism, in northern Tanzania and its implication for the Maasai. Both the government and ecotourism companies promise positive implications for Tanzanian livelihoods, which should include the Maasai, although this is not always the case. This study first explains ecotourism, an intricate concept that contains many nuances. There are multiple frameworks and definitions for ecotourism, and this study explores them in order to provide a clearer understanding of ecotourism. The manifestation of ecotourism in Tanzania is then examined, and criticisms of ecotourism are considered as well. An ecotourism framework has been developed to assess the impact ecotourism companies

have on Tanzania's Maasai. The evaluation of tourism companies with this framework is completed in the form of case studies. These case studies determine which companies truly embody ecotourism and how these companies impact the Maasai. The study concludes with an examination of the responses of the Tanzanian government, various non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and international organizations (IOs). The conclusion also puts forth further recommendations for ecotourism creating positive implications for Maasai. Essentially, this study provides a clear view of what ecotourism is and how it manifests itself in Tanzania, which companies practice ecotourism, and the implications of ecotourism for the Maasai.

Section 2.1 Frameworks and Definitions for Ecotourism

The international tourism industry has grown to include alternative types of tourism, one of the most popular being ecotourism. The global environmental movement of the late 1970s stimulated the growth of ecotourism, and by the 1990s ecotourism became one of the fastest growing alternative tourism industries. The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) estimates that ecotourism is growing globally at an estimated 20 percent annually, and is expected to grow swiftly over the next two decades (Mastny 2001). Ecotourism is becoming an attractive option for many tourists as it continues to grow.

Ecotourism is a relatively new idea and the way in which it is conceptualized varies between groups. Scholars, organizations and tourism companies have all sought to develop a framework and definition for ecotourism, but these frameworks and definitions do not always align. Martha Honey defines ecotourism as, "Travel to fragile, pristine, and

usually protected areas that strives to be low impact and (often) small scale. It helps educate the traveler, provides funds for conservation, directly benefits the economic development and political empowerment of local communities, and fosters respect for different cultures and for human rights,” (Honey 2008: 33). Her definition is multifaceted and encompasses various agendas. Honey’s definition addresses the environmental agenda, but also focuses on local culture and asserts that local groups should benefit from tourism.

TIES offers a much more succinct definition, classifying ecotourism as, “Responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people,” (TIES 1990: 6). This definition is more compact than Honey’s, but it addresses both the environmental agenda as well the agenda of the local people. Both definitions provide a foundation for understanding ecotourism, but further analysis is required to identify the finer nuances between the various conceptualizations.

Many groups have developed frameworks for ecotourism. While most contain similar principles to classify ecotourism, it is important to identify the differences and determine the most comprehensive framework for ecotourism. There are a plethora of NGOs, international organizations (IOs), nonprofits and tourism specialists that have developed principles to evaluate ecotourism; however, this paper will analyze five sources and their respective criteria for ecotourism in Table 1.

Joshua Reichert’s framework for ecotourism appears at the top of Table 1. He has used his framework to evaluate tourism companies and asserts that in order for a company to truly be considered an ecotourism company, it must encompass his four

criteria (Honey 1999: 63). Reichert is the managing director of the Pew Environment Group and has a strong background in international conservation.

Honey developed a workable definition and seven-point framework for ecotourism in the 1999 first edition of her book, *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Really Owns Paradise?* She maintains the same definition and framework in her 2008 second edition, suggesting that her original method for defining and evaluating ecotourism has stood the test of time. Ecotourism has evolved in the past decade as it gains a stronger presence on the agendas of IOs, NGOs, nonprofits and in public policy. Honey's ability to develop a definition and framework in 1999 that is still applicable today is a testament to her insight and expertise of ecotourism. Honey can certainly be considered an authority on ecotourism, as she served as director for TIES from 2003 to 2006, is the co-founder of the Center on Ecotourism and Sustainable Development (CESD), and has published multiple books examining ecotourism in the developing world.

The criteria of Russell K. Blamey of the Urban and Environmental Program at the Australian National University are also featured in Table 1. Definitions for ecotourism gained momentum and started to unfold in the 1980s. Blamey analyzes these first-stage definitions for ecotourism and their evolution into the 1990s. His framework provides a simplified version of ecotourism stemming from his analysis of the first definitions of ecotourism.

The Partnership for Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC) is analyzed because it has developed one of the most internationally recognized ecotourism criteria. Comprised of 40 organizations, the Partnership collaborated to develop a universal

standard for sustainable tourism practices. In October 2008 the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) launched the GSTC at the World Conservation Congress. In 2009 the Partnership and the Sustainable Tourism Stewardship Council announced that they would merge to form the Tourism Sustainability Council (TSC). The goal of the TSC is to provide universal tourism guidelines as well as international accreditations in order to protect the environment and local communities (TSC 2009). This showcases the progress ecotourism and its supporters have made towards achieving long-term international recognition and political adherence to a universal standard of ecotourism principles. It is backed by multiple organizations, including the UNWTO. The four basic criteria of the GSTC are analyzed for these reasons.

TIES also appears in the analysis of ecotourism frameworks. Established in 1990, TIES is one of the oldest and largest international ecotourism associations. TIES is currently working on a project geared towards ecotourism and indigenous communities, making its purposes for ecotourism very relevant to this particular study (TIES 2010: 6). For these reasons their framework, as it appears in the TIES *Travel Green Guide 2010-11*, will be analyzed.

Table 1 provides a chronological list of frameworks from these five sources. In Table 2, Honey's framework is used as a basis of comparison, as it is the most comprehensive and has remained steady through a decade of constantly-evolving definitions of ecotourism.

Table 1: Criteria for Ecotourism

Source	Ecotourism Criteria
Reichert 1994	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Designed, built and operated so that it leaves a 'soft imprint;' 2) Contribute financially to the local economy and local community services; 3) Contribute financially to environmental protection; and 4) Educate visitors and members of the local communities
Honey 1999	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Involves travel to natural destinations; 2) Minimizes impact; 3) Builds environmental awareness; 4) Provides direct financial benefits for conservation; 5) Provides financial benefits and empowerment for local people; 6) Respects local culture; and 7) Supports human rights and democratic movements
Blamey 2001	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Nature-based; 2) Environmentally and culturally-educated; and 3) Sustainably managed
Partnership for Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria 2008a	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Demonstrate effective sustainable management; 2) Maximize social and economic benefits to the local community and minimize negative impacts; 3) Maximize benefits to the cultural heritage; and 4) Maximize benefits to the environment and minimize negative impacts
The International Ecotourism Society 2010	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Minimize impact; 2) Build environmental and cultural awareness and respect; 3) Provide positive experiences for both visitors and hosts; 4) Provide direct financial benefits for conservation; 5) Provide financial benefits and empowerments for local people; and 6) Raise sensitivity to host countries' political and social climate

Table 2: How do the frameworks compare to Honey 1999?

	Reichert 1994	Blamey 2001	Partnership for Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria 2008	The International Ecotourism Society 2010
<i>#1 Travel to Natural Destinations</i>		✓		✓
<i>#2 Minimizes Impact</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>#3 Builds Environmental Awareness</i>		✓	✓	✓
<i>#4 Direct Financial Benefits for Conservation</i>	✓		✓	✓
<i>#5 Financial Benefits and Empowerment for Local People</i>	✓		✓	✓
<i>#6 Respects Local Culture</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>#7 Supports Human Rights and Democratic Movements</i>				✓

The five criteria contain differences; however, it is apparent that all the frameworks examined include some degree of both environmental conservation and involvement of local people. It can be concluded that a definition for ecotourism must include considerations for both the environment and for the local people in order for it to be an acceptable definition for general ecotourism. Both aspects, the environment and the local people, are essential when defining ecotourism.

There are other types of alternative tourism that deviate from the generally defined ecotourism. Examples include adventure tourism, cultural heritage tourism, indigenous tourism, nature-based tourism and sustainable tourism. Although this paper mainly examines general ecotourism, which acknowledges the environmental impacts and local populations, Table 3 provides brief definitions of other types of alternative tourism so that distinctions can be made.

Table 3: Alternative Types of Tourism

Tourism Type	Definition
Adventure Tourism	Usually a form of nature-based tourism that incorporates an element of risk, higher levels of physical exertion, and the need for specialized skills; often hybridizes with ecotourism and other forms of tourism
Cultural Heritage Tourism	Traveling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present. It includes historic, cultural and natural resources
Indigenous Tourism	Tourism activity in which indigenous people are directly involved either through control and/or by having their culture serve as the essence of the attraction
Nature-Based Tourism	Any form of tourism that relies primarily on the natural environment for its attractions and/or settings; incorporates ecotourism and substantial parts of adventure-based tourism
Sustainable Tourism	Tourism that meets the needs to the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs; more commonly perceived as tourism that does not negatively impact the environment, economy, culture and society of a particular destination; ecotourism can be a form of sustainable tourism

Sources: Weaver 2001, Zeppel 2006, National Trust for Historic Preservation 2011

Section 2.2 The Growth of Ecotourism in sub-Saharan Africa

There are several indicators that show the growth of ecotourism. Ecotourism has grown into a global industry with growth in four areas: ecotourism education, international recognition and regional support, international funding opportunities, and growth in tourism eco-certification and eco-labeling programs (Hawkins and Lamoureux 2001: 66). Ecotourism education has entered the tourism field of study, and in 1999 the Ecotourism Society compiled a list of universities that offer programs and courses specializing in ecotourism (Hawkins and Lamoureux 2001: 67). Ecotourism as an academic discipline validates its principles and invites analysis and development of the field. International recognition and regional support is another noted indicator for the growth of ecotourism. Ecotourism is gaining more attention in the arena of international

tourism. The UN declared 2004 to be the ‘International Year of Ecotourism,’ and ecotourism strategies can be found in many countries’ tourism plans. More businesses are developing partnerships with local communities and developing a line of communication between local communities and the tourism industry (Hawkins and Lamoureux 2001: 68). This recognition of ecotourism, both on the international and local levels, also allows ecotourism to progress as a viable option for both tourists and communities involved. The increased amount of international funding and aid for ecotourism also illustrates the growing international recognition for ecotourism (Hawkins and Lamoureux 2001: 69). The growth of eco-certification and eco-labels indicate the growth and validity of ecotourism as well (Hawkins and Lamoureux 2001: 71). Although there are many certification schemes and models, the presence of these certification programs and labels show that companies want to be identified for their adherence to ecotourism. These indicators help explain how ecotourism has grown into a global market. These supporting networks are present in Tanzania, suggesting that ecotourism is manifesting itself in sub-Saharan Africa, thus affecting local populations such as the Maasai.

Ecotourism education is present in Tanzania. The College of African Wildlife Management, also known as MWEKA, is located in Moshi, Tanzania and was established in 1963 to train and certify wildlife managers. MWEKA’s certificate in Wildlife Management provides students with training in the basic aspects of wildlife management and management approaches, and particularly in working with local communities (The College of African Wildlife Management 2011a). MWEKA also offers short courses, which offer training and skills to wildlife managers. One short course is titled “Project Planning for Ecotourism for Forest Project Managers,” (The College of

African Wildlife Management 2011b). The integration of ecotourism education into MWEKA's curriculum illustrates the value and growth of ecotourism in Tanzania. MWEKA's inclusion of ecotourism education and emphasis on working with local communities indicate growth in ecotourism in Tanzania.

Regional support and international recognition are other indicators of growth in ecotourism. Since the mid-1990s there has been strong focus on ecotourism by governments and NGOs in East Africa. The 2002 East African conference on ecotourism was hosted in Nairobi, Kenya, with 200 participants from community ecotourism ventures, NGOs, wildlife agencies, national parks, and the tourism industry present. The focus of the conference was ecotourism as a business involving communities and landowners, donors, NGOs, private investors, and the governments. The conference also focused on the impacts of ecotourism and the potential benefit to local communities (Zeppel 2006: 118). This conference is a testament to the growth of ecotourism in East Africa and the potential ecotourism has to positively impact local communities, such as the Maasai. The conference made it evident that regional support and international recognition for ecotourism is gaining momentum in East Africa.

Ecotourism education, regional support, and international recognition of ecotourism in East Africa indicate that ecotourism is spreading. This growth suggests that some tourism companies and NGOs in East Africa are beginning to acknowledge the value of ecotourism as a business model and as a sustainable approach to tourism.

Ecotourism can bring many benefits to the Maasai, and many believe ecotourism to be an essential tool for community development and empowerment in East Africa. (Zeppel 2006: 117). Ecotourism has the potential to positively impact local communities

such as Tanzania's Maasai, but only if ecotourism companies genuinely embody the principles of ecotourism and are held accountable to the standards of ecotourism.

Ecotourism is a relatively new concept that contains many complexities. This can sometimes make it difficult to determine which companies truly practice ecotourism. The case studies to follow this section will help determine which companies truly practice ecotourism, but identifying which companies are truly ecotourism companies is not the only challenge. The implementation of ecotourism may be hindered by certain obstacles. These obstacles have created many skeptics of ecotourism, and there are many who contend that ecotourism is better in theory than in practice. These challenges and criticisms must be considered in order to determine the feasibility of ecotourism benefiting the Maasai in Tanzania.

Section 2.3 Challenges and Criticisms of Ecotourism in Tanzania

Ecotourism is not free of criticism, as there are many arguments against ecotourism. There is much debate about the likelihood of realizing the promised benefits of ecotourism. Ecotourism has been said to be theoretically sound, but difficult to implement in practice. The nature of ecotourism calls for small-scale, sustainable businesses that generate benefits for local communities. Peter Björk, editor of *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, argues that this is often hard to achieve due to challenges such as weak capacity for development and the lack of coordination between stakeholders in ecotourism (i.e. local communities and tour operators) (Björk 2007: 24-25). This has definitely been an obstacle for some ecotourism companies operating in Tanzania. In an effort to uphold the ecotourism principle of involving and

benefiting local communities, some companies have negotiated land concessions directly with the Maasai. Unfortunately, it is often the case that villages lack the capacity to negotiate business arrangements such as land concessions (Buckley 2003: 27).

Björk's claim that a community's weak capacity for development can create challenges in implementing ecotourism practices may have some level of saliency; however, some companies have sought to overcome this obstacle by creating capacity-building initiatives. Ideally these initiatives would create the village's capacity to negotiate land concessions, handle earned revenue responsibly, and coordinate with tour operators. Dorobo Tours and Safaris raises funds so that capacity-building projects can be implemented in the villages where they have land leases with the Maasai. The goal of these projects is to create transparency in the handling of revenue from tourism and to strengthen the coordination between Dorobo and the villages from which they lease land for their company's tourism purposes (Buckley 2003: 27). Projects such as these could allow ecotourism companies to overcome the obstacles of weak development and lack of coordination, as outlined by Björk.

Another one of the greatest criticisms of ecotourism is that there are too many competing definitions. As previously discussed, multiple organizations and academics have endeavored to define ecotourism. Some argue that the lack of one concrete definition for ecotourism creates challenges. Björk argues "The major challenge of ecotourism today is not to present another better definition, but how to translate the meaning of ecotourism into relevant and usable principles (guidelines) and criteria. This is, without a doubt, a difficult task given that different areas, regions and destinations around the globe are unique in most respects" (Björk 2007: 25).

Others feel that while ecotourism is attainable, it will come with institutional challenges. One of the greatest challenges to achieving ecotourism is the development of national strategies and regulatory frameworks (Honey & Gilpin 2009). The development of national strategies is certainly relevant to this particular study, as the Tanzanian government's centralized control over land use has shown to impede the Maasai's ability to control their land. Regulatory frameworks for ecotourism are also nonexistent in Tanzania; therefore, ecotourism companies are not held accountable to their promised ecotourism policies. Ecotourism can be achieved, but it will be very difficult without the effort and support of the national government.

Ecotourism a multifaceted concept filled with complexities, and these complexities have certainly caused many to question ecotourism as a viable option for the sustainable development of tourism. Some feel that ecotourism contains lofty, unfeasible promises that are difficult to achieve. Weak capacity for development may also lead to poor coordination between stakeholders, creating issues for ecotourism companies. There are many ways in which ecotourism is defined, making it difficult to develop one universal framework for ecotourism that would be applicable globally, as Björk argues in the preceding paragraph. It may also be difficult for ecotourism to reach its full potential without government advocacy and regulation. These are all challenges that must be addressed but are possible to overcome. To begin overcoming these challenges, a framework must be developed in order to evaluate tourism operators in northern Tanzania. The framework will maintain the general conditions for ecotourism, but will place more emphasis on the Maasai and the way in which they are affected by ecotourism. A localized ecotourism framework will identify the level of ecotourism these

companies are practicing, as well as how these companies overcome the challenges mentioned above.

Section 2.4 How does the Expansion of Ecotourism Impact the Maasai?

The expansion of ecotourism could provide various economic opportunities for the Maasai; however, spurious ‘ecotourism’ companies pose a threat to the Maasai. Many companies advertise as ‘ecotourism’ companies, but it is questionable if they truly adhere to the principles of ecotourism. Some companies have purchased land from the government rather than directly negotiating with the Maasai, and some companies employ outsiders rather than local Maasai people. In these cases, ecotourism is not achieved, as the tourism companies are failing to contribute money to local communities and community services. These companies create challenges for the Maasai because community development is stagnated, land tenure is compromised, and basic human rights are threatened. These are some of the negative implications the growth of ecotourism can have for the Maasai.

As ecotourism continues to expand in Tanzania it is important to identify the implications for the Maasai. The actions of each company must be assessed in order to determine if the company truly emulates a standard of ecotourism that benefits the Maasai. There are a variety of frameworks and definitions for ecotourism as seen in section 2.1, but a framework that specifically analyzes the effects companies have on Maasai communities is needed. The ecotourism criteria featured in Table 4 has been developed in order to critically assess the impact tourism companies have on the Maasai in Tanzania.

Table 4: An Ecotourism Framework for the Maasai

	Criterion
1	The company provides financial benefits and empowerment to the Maasai;
2	The company respects the local Maasai culture;
3	The company embraces the human rights of the Maasai; and
4	The company leaves minimal environmental impact.

These criteria are the most important to consider when evaluating ecotourism companies and their subsequent impact on Tanzania's Maasai. A company must embody all four in order to be considered a true ecotourism company that works with the local Maasai.

Section 3.1: Case Studies: Who Really Embodies Ecotourism?

There are many tourism companies that offer safaris and adventure tours in northern Tanzania. Since these companies operate in 'Maasailand,' they will inevitably impact the Maasai. Ideally companies will adopt ecotourism models so that they can empower the Maasai, but this is not always the case. 'Ecotourism', 'responsible tourism', and 'eco-friendly' are a few of the labels that are liberally splashed across the websites and advertisements of many companies. It is often difficult to discern between companies that truly practice ecotourism from those that do not, and for this reason companies must be closely examined.

Three companies will be evaluated in the form of case studies. Since these safari companies service northern Tanzania and operate within close proximity of Maasai, it is important to analyze their effects on the Maasai. Each case study will include the history of the company and its owners, consumer reviews and ratings, analysis of the company relative to the framework in Table 4, and an evaluation of the extent to which the company empowers Tanzania's Maasai.

Case Study 1: Dorobo Tours and Safaris

Dorobo Tours and Safaris is a small tour operator company in Tanzania. David, Mike and Thad Peterson, the sons of American missionaries, spent their childhoods in Tanzania among the Maasai. Living close to the Maasai provided the Peterson brothers with an authentic understanding of their livelihoods and the ways in which tourism and

Tours and the village governments stipulated that in exchange for exclusive control of all tourist activities in the area, Dorobo would pay annual lease fees to the villages. The funds received were used for items conducive to community development, such as a truck, rehabilitation of boreholes and office buildings (Honey 2008: 240). The Peterson brothers' rich understanding of the Maasai and desire to operate a company that benefits the Maasai demonstrates their commitment to empowering Maasai communities socially and economically. Their initiatives result in a genuine experience for tourists, as they interact with the Maasai and experience Tanzania in a way that adheres to ecotourism.

Dorobo Tours' effort to maintain a business centered on ecotourism has been acknowledged by multiple customers and travel guides.⁵ *Lonely Planet*, a travel guide and travel information series, publishes a guide for East Africa. Committed to sustainable tourism policies, the *Lonely Planet* authors only include reviews of attractions, tours and accommodations that demonstrate an active sustainable tourism policy. Their travel guides also include a 'Greendex,' which lists tours and attractions that uphold sustainable tourism policies by fostering a greater understanding between travelers and local communities, by employing local people, and by preserving local culture and identity (Bewer, Firestone, and Fitzpatrick 2009: 662). Dorobo Tours and Safaris is featured in this Greendex, meaning that by *Lonely Planet's* standards, it is a sustainable ecotourism company. The 2009 8th edition of *Lonely Planet: East Africa* also includes a detailed review of Dorobo Tours and Safaris. The authors shine light on Dorobo's dedication to local communities, since they work in partnership with local communities and develop tours that benefit these communities as well as the environment (Bewer, Firestone, and Fitzpatrick 2009: 68). Dorobo being featured in a travel guide that only reviews sustainable companies validates it as an ecotourism company.

⁵ I performed an exhaustive search of reviews for Dorobo Tours and Safaris. The reviews are overwhelmingly positive and reaffirm Dorobo's commitment to ecotourism. I had much difficulty discovering a negative review for this company, although some feel that they are difficult to find since they do not maintain an official website. The Peterson brothers operate almost exclusively through word of mouth, which is not always favorable to customers.

Jim Selman, a writer for *The Huffington Post*, embarked on a two-week safari in Tanzania with Dorobo Tours and Safaris. He described his guide, David Peterson, and his staff as “...world-class experts on animals, birds, and most of the plants and trees, not to mention the history of the country, and most importantly the culture of the indigenous people” (Selman 2009). Selman also applauds Dorobo’s commitment to social justice for local populations and to preserving the environment. His positive review also reaffirms the Dorobo’s genuine commitment to the Maasai by operating a company based on the principles of ecotourism.

Dorobo Tours and Safaris was predicated on the principles of ecotourism, and it has remained committed to these principles throughout the years. The way in which they run their business exemplifies the ecotourism framework proposed in Section II. Dorobo Tours and Safaris embodies the first criterion, running a company that provides financial benefits and empowerment to the Maasai. The Peterson Brothers developed their company so that it would engage local communities and allow them to develop economically. The profits earned from the leases are funneled directly to the village, thus enabling the Maasai to exert control over their community development. The Peterson brothers’ also run the Dorobo Fund, an organization that channels philanthropic funds to local communities such as the Maasai, which shows their commitment to providing financial benefits to the Maasai. The Peterson brothers also strived to empower the Maasai by negotiating land leases directly with the Maasai communities. These negotiations empower the Maasai by giving them control over the decisions made for tourism operations in their villages.

The second criterion stipulates that the company must respect local Maasai culture, and Dorobo clearly embodies this criterion. One of driving principles in founding Dorobo Tours and Safaris was to create a tourism company that would respect the Maasai. The tours offered by Dorobo allow tourists to experience Tanzania in a way that is respectful to the environment and to the culture. Dorobo Tours and Safaris educates

visitors and members of the local communities. Their tours enable customers to make genuine, cross-cultural connections with the Maasai. One option offered by Dorobo allows customers to live in a boma with a Maasai host mother. Although this option is most popular among university students, it provides a unique experience that educates the customer, as well as the Maasai community member. These authentic home-stays provide an experience from which customers gain real perspectives. This type of tourism package allows visitors to genuinely learn and gain knowledge of the Maasai and their livelihoods, demonstrating Dorobo's respect for the Maasai and their culture.⁶

Dorobo Tours and Safaris also upholds human rights, maintaining the third criterion of the framework. Dorobo's efforts to secure land rights, employ local people, provide financial benefits, provide economic and educational opportunities for women, and maintain respect for Maasai culture demonstrates Dorobo's commitment to maintaining the human rights of Maasai through ecotourism.

Dorobo also leaves a minimal impact, which is the fourth criterion. Dorobo conducts walking safaris, utilizes tented accommodations, and disposes of its waste responsibly. These initiatives show Dorobo's ability to provide quality tours while leaving a minimal carbon footprint.

Dorobo also attempts to overcome some of the challenges to ecotourism that were discussed in section 2.3. Dorobo Tours and Safaris overcomes the obstacles by creating capacity-building initiatives. These initiatives create the village's capacity to negotiate land concessions, handle earned revenue responsibly, and coordinate with tour operators. Dorobo Tours and Safaris raises funds so that capacity-building projects can be implemented in the villages where they have land leases with the Maasai (Buckley 2009: 27). Dorobo has also attempted to gain the support of the central Tanzanian government

⁶In 2009 I traveled through Dorobo Tours and Safaris and completed homestays with Maasai women that Dorobo works with directly. I witnessed the respect Dorobo has for the Maasai firsthand through this experience.

in the ecotourism endeavors. Dorobo did petition Tanzania's Wildlife Division to end hunting concessions in areas near the Maasai so that ecotourism companies could operate more efficiently. Dorobo is a company that not only remains committed to its ecotourism principles, but actively works to overcome the challenges to ecotourism.

These aspects of the company make a strong case for Dorobo Tours and Safaris as an ecotourism company. Multiple sources have revered Dorobo as a company that is truly committed to ecotourism principles. It is also evident that Dorobo is a genuine ecotourism company because it embodies all four criteria of the framework provided in Table 4. The owners' lifelong familiarity with the local culture, direct involvement with local villages, and the company's embodiment of all four ecotourism criteria suggest that Dorobo Tours is truly an ecotourism company that generates positive implications for the Maasai.

Case Study 2: Thomson Safaris

Thomson Safaris⁷ is an American company based in Massachusetts and is co-owned and operated by Rick Thomson and Judi Wineland. Its website displays a large number of positive consumer reviews and a long list of awards from various organizations. Among the awards received by Thomson are "Humanitarian of the Year," "Tanzania Conservation Award" and "Tour Operator of the Year," all of which were issued by the TTB. In 2008 and 2009 Thomson earned the title of *National Geographic's* "Best Adventure Travel Company on Earth" (Thomson Safaris 2011a). Thomson has also donated sizeable funds to a non-profit, Friends of Tanzanian Communities (FoTZC), which finances education projects in Tanzanian schools. Thomson Safaris claims that their involvement with FoTZC aligns with the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)⁸ (Thomson Safaris 2011b).

⁷ Thomson Safaris is based in Boston, Massachusetts and is in no way affiliated with Thomson Tours, Safaris and Holidays based in the United Kingdom.

⁸ The MDGs are a list of 8 global goals developed by the UN in order to address the most pressing issues faced by the world's most impoverished. The 2000 UN Millennium Declaration called for the achievement

Thomson also advertises its sustainability efforts by shining light on its membership to Sustainable Travel International (STI), an organization that advocates for sustainable development, environmental protection, socio-cultural welfare, and economic prosperity. STI also offers eco-certification programs for tourism companies and businesses. Thomson's website proudly displays the STI logo and says: "We are active members and supporters of STI" (Thomson Safaris 2011b). Thomson's website features the STI logo; however, the appearance of the STI logo does not necessarily mean the company has been eco-certified by STI. STI also has a partners program in which companies can enroll, and Thomson is one such company enrolled in the program. Robert Chappell, Director of Standards Development for STI, explains,

"To be sure, Thomson Safari is not 'eco-certified' in anyway-what-so-ever by STI or through any of our associated certification programs. Thomson Safari is simply enrolled in the STI Partner Program, and as such, have not been required to submit evidence for verification to illustrate their level of sustainability" (Chappell 2011).

When asked for clarification on the details of an STI Partner Program membership, Chappell explained that companies that are enrolled in STI's Partners program are authorized to utilize the STI logo. He explained further,

If an organization wishes to make a public commitment to sustainable tourism, then they are welcome to join STI, participate in our introductory services, and post our logo. If they wish to be eco-certified, there is a great deal of work involved. This includes, at a minimum, a comprehensive sustainability policy; baseline measurements of environmental, social, and economic indicators; supporting evidence to support all claims; and verification of these documents by an independent assessor and/or STI certification board. (Chappell 2011).

of these goals by 2015. They include: end poverty and hunger; universal education; gender equality; child health; maternal health; combat HIV/AIDs; environmental sustainability; and global partnership (UN 2011).

Thomson may be a member of the STI Partner Program; however, as Chappell explained, this does not mean that the company is held accountable to ecotourism practices. A member of the STI Partner Program has access to introductory services and can post the STI logo, but unlike those companies that are STI eco-certified, the company is not required to undergo an evaluation or justify its practices.

Thomson Safaris' website portrays a company that respects local communities and promotes their best interests; however, numerous accounts tell a different story.

Various reports, detailed in the paragraphs to follow, suggest that Thomson Safari's business endeavors in Tanzania have created negative implications for the Maasai. The issue between Thomson and the Maasai began when Thomson purchased 10,000 acres of land from Tanzania Breweries Limited in 2006 for a reported 1.2 million dollars, and renamed the area the Enashiva Nature Refuge. Thomson's vision for Enashiva was a model of conservation and ecotourism (Hammer 2010). When Thomson assumed control over their purchased land, allegations of human rights abuses against the Maasai spread quickly. These accounts describe a horrific eviction of the Maasai, claiming that bomas were burnt to the ground, cattle were killed and Maasai women were raped. These reports also suggest that Thomson denies the Maasai grazing and water rights on land to which they previously had access, and Thomson security guards often assault Maasai herders who trespass (Martin 2010). Multiple accounts indicate that there are frequent confrontations between Maasai herders and Thomson security guards, who are often accompanied by local police. These confrontations can lead to the confiscation of the herders' cattle, a punishment for trespassing on the company's private property (Hammer 2010; Renton 2009). Thomson did attempt to employ local Maasai men as security guards, but after these confrontations began, many Maasai left their jobs due to the obvious conflict of interest (Renton 2009).

There is a long list of human rights abuse accusations against Thomson, but the company denies involvement in all incidents. The company even created a blog titled *Thomson Safaris sets the Record Straight*, in which they combat all allegations brought against them. The blog denies Thomson's involvement in human rights abuses, reaffirms that they purchased their land in Tanzania fairly, and asserts that Thomson has always been committed to sustainable tourism (Thomson Safaris 2011c).

The controversy between Thomson and Tanzania's Maasai has caught the attention of local NGOs, journalists, bloggers and international organizations. Although Thomson claims to embody ecotourism principles such as leaving a minimal environmental impact and providing financial benefits to local people, this image of the company has been challenged by multiple sources.

Many journalists, NGOs, and bloggers have made the journey to northern Tanzania seeking answers to the allegations circling Thomson Safaris. Carl Soderbergh, director of policy and communications for Minority Rights Group International, an organization dedicated to securing the rights of indigenous people worldwide, traveled to Tanzania in 2010 with a colleague to investigate. He and his colleague spoke with members of Maasai villages affected by Thomson Safaris. Soderbergh's blog details claims of violence and injustice faced by the Maasai in the Loliondo district. One member of the Maasai community described the eviction in which bomas were burnt and members of the community were injured. Soderbergh also met with two victims who claimed to have been beaten for wandering into Thomson territory. He also met with Thomson representatives who denied all the accusations of violence and claimed the rumors are the exaggerations of NGOs seeking political and financial gain. Soderbergh asserts in his blog that he does not buy Thomson's story not only because of the firsthand accounts he heard, but also because he noticed that each time young Maasai boys saw the

four-wheel vehicle he traveled in, they would run away instantly and hide in nearby bushes. He observed real fear from the Maasai boys and speculated that it was due to the past abuses committed by Thomson Safaris (Soderbergh 2010).

The presence of curious journalists seems to strike a nerve with Thomson Safaris, as there are many documented incidents in which journalists and organizations faced obstacles while researching the conflict in Tanzania. Alex Renton, a British journalist, traveled to Tanzania in 2009 seeking answers about the land dispute with the Maasai. Renton traveled to Thomson's Enashiva Nature Refuge to meet with Thomson's Arusha manager, Daniel Yamet. Shortly after arriving, Renton says he felt hostility from Yamet. Yamet refused to answer the journalist's questions or provide a tour of the nature refuge. Renton believes he and his colleague were invited to the refuge as a setup. Renton and his photographer left the refuge only to be stopped ten minutes later on the road by Tanzanian police. They were stripped of their passports and escorted to Arusha by an armed policeman for investigation. The district commissioner's secretary told Renton and the photographer that they were acting on a complaint from Thomson Safaris. After two days they were released with no charges. Renton says the situation was not surprising or uncommon for the area. He had been told by another journalist that he should work in secret and after dark, so as not to be arrested or threatened. In regard to the arrest of Renton and his photographer, Thomson fervently denies paying Tanzanian police or authorities, as it is not in their budget (Renton 2009).

Susanna Nordlund found herself in a similar situation when she traveled to Tanzania seeking the truth about the Thomson conflict. Nordlund is not a journalist or researcher, but is simply a concerned Swedish citizen who tracks this particular conflict

in her blog, *View from the Termite Mound*. Norlund went to Tanzania to interview members of the Maasai community about their experiences with Thomson. Unfortunately her visit was cut short when she was accused of working in the country while holding a tourist visa. She claims that she was not working and believes she was forced to leave Tanzania because she was investigating the issues about Thomson by interviewing members of the Maasai community (Nordlund 2010).

Perhaps the most alarming incident was the death of an international photojournalist from New Zealand, who was found dead in Nairobi. Trent Keegan was found dead in a ditch in May 2008, after suffering a brutal beating prior to his death. A spokesperson for the Kenyan police said it was initially suspected to be burglary, but friends and colleagues of Keegan are skeptical. Keegan's wallet with Kenyan shillings and his Visa card were still intact, but his external hard drive and discs were missing from his Nairobi apartment. An award-winning journalist, Keegan had been in East Africa investigating Thomson Safaris. Friends and family members had become increasingly concerned throughout the duration of Keegan's stay because his emails described concerns he had for his personal safety. According to Keegan's friends and family members, Keegan's emails said that Tanzanian police and Thomson employees approached him and questioned him about his work in northern Tanzania (Committee to Protect Journalists 2009). Keegan's family is convinced that his death is linked to the work he was doing in Tanzania at the time of his death. His sister Nikki claims that his family grew so concerned with his safety prior to his death that his family was phoning him daily (Laurent 2009). Documents indicate that Keegan's wallet with credit cards and cash were present when his body was discovered, making a weak case for burglary. Many

have speculated that Thomson played a role in the death of Keegan, although the company has denied any involvement in Keegan's death. Karen Schwartzman, a spokesperson for Thomson, stated in regards to Keegan's death, "Obviously it's a tragedy. But the fact this company has had its name associated with this nightmare is another tragedy." Thomson also denied ever meeting with Keegan or questioning him prior to his death. Schwartzman also denied any dispute between local people and the company. "We are aware there is one individual who takes issue with our purchase of a brewery. But the dispute is between that person and the Government. We have a very strong rapport with the community" (Taylor 2008).

Joshua Hammer, also a journalist, traveled to Tanzania and heard similar experiences from Maasai who claim to be victims of Thomson Safaris. He spoke with Maanda Ngoitko, director of the Pastoral Women's Council (PWC), who said bomas and cattle pens were burnt down during the eviction of Maasai from the land Thomson had purchased. She also described a confrontation in 2008 between Thomson security guards and a group of Maasai herders in which one Maasai man suffered a bullet wound. Hammer interviewed Thomson's co-owners who defended their company and its actions. They called the campaigns against them 'fictitious and malicious.' They believe that local NGOs are trying to reap financial benefits by using their company as a scapegoat. Thomson's co-owners find these allegations baffling since they have tried to give back to community. They claim that when they attempted to extend benefits to a Maasai community by building a school in the village of Mondorosi, the school committee refused to accept Thomson's offer because they saw it as a bribe rather than a philanthropic effort (Hammer 2010).

The accusations and controversies around Thomson delegitimize the company's claim that it embodies ecotourism. Despite the company's attempt to quell the rumors and the highly-publicized controversy with the Maasai, the allegations of various incidents persist. The accounts of accusations of human rights abuses and reported disrespect to Maasai culture make it difficult to conclude that Thomson truly runs a business that completely embodies ecotourism.

It must be noted that Thomson vehemently denies all the allegations of human rights abuses and disrespect. When asked about Thomson's involvement with the Maasai, the current general manager, Ina Steinhilber, stated,

"We have always, and will always support the people of Tanzania in any way we can. We have and will always work shoulder to shoulder with them, not against them. The huge majority of Maasai who have asked Tanzania Conservation Limited to stay, to continue supporting projects and even to expand efforts are not being heard because there is a smaller, far more vocal (and press savvy) minority who has used this land as a very successful way to draw attention to land rights and Maasai rights. It is hard to find fault with drawing attention to these legitimate issues; however, the accusing fingers are pointing at the wrong people. It is also important to note that the small group who accuse us are making considerable amounts of money by taking in donations from sympathetic (and misled) individuals as well as NGOs," (Steinhilber 2011).

Steinhilber also asserted that Thomson's goals are to improve education, improve healthcare and empower women. She also reaffirmed Thomson's commitment to funding school projects through its partner nonprofit, FoTZC, which funds community projects that can affect the Maasai. She also reiterated that only a small majority are critical of the company and that Thomson is committed to Tanzanians, including the Maasai.

Despite Thomson's efforts to derail the accusations against their company, its commitment to ecotourism remains questionable. In regard to the Ecotourism Framework for the Maasai provided in Table 4, with consideration of the large amount of accusations against the company and reported incidences, Thomson fails to completely uphold the first, second and third criteria. The accusations and reported incidences complicate Thomson's claim that it is an ecotourism company that genuinely gives back to the Maasai and respects their culture; therefore, it cannot be definitively deemed an ecotourism company based on the first three criteria of the Table 4 Ecotourism Framework for the Maasai. It may partially uphold the first criterion, as it does have its nonprofit, FoTZC, that funnels money into Tanzanian schools. The company did try to employ Maasai as security guards, as previously mentioned above but it was reported that many quit after the violent confrontations between Thomson guards and Maasai. These efforts may provide financial benefits, but do not necessarily empower the Maasai. For these reasons, this evaluation suggests that Thomson upholds part of the first criterion, as it does provide some financial benefits to local communities that could include the Maasai. The second part of the first criterion, empowering the Maasai, is not upheld by Thomson's business practices. Thomson may uphold the fourth, as it does attempt to leave a minimal environmental impact with its tented camps, carbon-free heaters, and attempts to recycle (Thomson Safaris 2011c). These efforts are not enough for Thomson to be deemed a company that upholds the criteria in Table 4.

Thomson's inability to uphold the principles of ecotourism is also maintained by the Greendex of the 2009 8th edition of *LonelyPlanet: East Africa*, which does not include Thomson Safaris (Bewer, Firestone, and Fitzpatrick 2009: 662). The authors

make it very clear that the Greendex only features companies that are considered to be ecotourism companies, based on their experiences and input from consumers. The exclusion of Thomson Safaris in the *Lonely Planet's* Greendex shows that those with valuable insight, such as the authors who compiled the Greendex, do not consider Thomson an ecotourism company.

Based on the customer reviews on Thomson's website, it seems that the company is able to provide high-quality tours in beautiful northern Tanzania. The reviews rave about the wildlife, the kindness of their guides and the beauty of Africa; however, not one review explicitly speaks to Thomson's commitment to the Maasai communities. For the consumers who seek the picturesque safari with African wildlife and gorgeous Serengeti sunsets and nothing more, Thomson will meet their needs. For the consumer who seeks travel with integrity and positive impacts for local populations such as the Maasai, Thomson is not ideal.

Case Study 3: Klein's Camp

Located on the corner of Serengeti National Park, Klein's Camp offers guests extraordinary opportunities to experience Tanzania's wildlife. The company offers walking safaris led by Maasai trackers, nighttime safaris, birding safaris and photographic safaris. Klein's Camp was named one of National Geographic's Top 50 Ecolodges in 2008 (&Beyond 2011a). Klein's Camp is owned and operated by &Beyond, a travel company established in 1991 with a vision of responsible tourism. In 1991 &Beyond, then called Conservation Corporation Africa, set out to develop wildlife sanctuaries and run a low-impact business, while allowing local communities to share the

benefits (&Beyond 2011b). Initially, Klein's purchased a land title for 25,000 acres of land, but the village of Ololoskwan disputed the purchase. In 1999 the village and the company came to an agreement for use of the land, allowing the village to lease land rights to Klein's for use of its tourism activities (Honey 2008: 241-242).

Much like Dorobo Tours, Klein's Camp works with the Maasai directly to negotiate leases for use of the land on which their company operates, and has done so since 1996. In 1996 they purchased a title of 25,000 acres of land from villages on the northwest corner of the Serengeti, but the community of Ololosokwan objected to this purchase. To remedy this issue &Beyond (then Conservation Corporation Africa) went directly to the community to contract an agreement. The village leased the land to &Beyond for use of Klein's Camp. The funds earned from this deal were used by the village to rebuild a dispensary, construct a nursery school, build a village office and pay for secondary and university school fees for students of the village (Honey 2008: 242). On the leased land Klein's Camp has safari cottages, while the Maasai graze cattle and often lead safari game drives and walks. The company and the local Maasai make a concerted effort to manage the land, and there is a joint committee made up of Klein's employees and local Maasai (Zeppel 2006: 144).

The Group Conservation Manager of &Beyond, Les Carlisle, describes the company's interpretation of ecotourism to be "Care of land, care of the wildlife and care of the people" (Carlisle 2011). Carlisle especially detailed the "people" aspect. He says that many of their staff come from local Maasai communities, and that many have been trained in different departments. Klein's Camp also offers guests excursions to Maasai villages so that they can learn about the culture directly from the Maasai. These

excursions cost fifty dollars per vehicle, and all that money goes to the host community. Guests can purchase crafts and jewelry from the Maasai women. The Klein's gift shop also sells beadwork produced by two different groups of Maasai women (Carlisle 2011).

In addition to creating financial opportunities for the Maasai, Klein's has implemented sustainable practices that positively impact local Tanzanians. The company purchases many of its vegetables and fruits from local markets. Klein's also purchases nectar and honey from a local honey production initiative, in which forty men and women have been trained to run a beekeeping business. The &Beyond Foundation, the company's nonprofit, also built a ten-room clinic and medical facility, two classrooms at the local school, and a kitchen and dining hall so that the school can offer proper nutrition to its students (Carlisle 2011).

Klein's Camp has been recognized by various sources as an ecotourism company that works to positively impact the Maasai. Honey, a notable expert on ecotourism, sees Klein's Camp as an ecotourism company. She especially focused on company's direct work with the Maasai to draw up land agreements. Heather Zeppel also noted Klein's as an ecotourism company in Tanzania. Joshua Hammer also said that &Beyond, which operates Klein's, manages a sustainable company. Hammer commended companies such as &Beyond for their efforts to work with the Maasai, saying "Companies such as Dorobo Tours, Sokwe-Asilia Group, and &Beyond have managed to avoid conflicts with the indigenous Maasai by basing their operations on contracts negotiated with villagers" (Hammer 2010).

In regards to the ecotourism framework in Table 4, Klein's Camp upholds all the criteria. Klein's Camp undoubtedly upholds the first criterion, providing financial

benefits and empowerment to the Maasai. As a result of the lease contracted between Klein's Camp and the community of Ololosokwan, funds were earned for community development. The revenue enabled the Maasai to reap financial benefits as well as use it as a source of empowerment. Klein's Camp also sells Maasai jewelry in its gift shop and purchase local products when possible. These initiatives surely allow the Maasai to share the financial benefits of tourism.

The second and third criteria are also maintained by Klein's Camp. The company clearly respects Maasai culture because it offers guests the opportunity to travel to Maasai villages and meet with Maasai people directly. The company and the Maasai also collaborate to manage the land through a joint committee. The development of this joint committee demonstrates Klein's respect for the Maasai culture. The human rights of the Maasai, criterion three, are also respected. The Maasai continue to graze on the leased land, providing them constant access to water. The maintenance of grazing rights is adherence to the human rights of the Maasai. Furthermore, unlike Thomson, there are no reports of Klein's Camp physically abusing the Maasai. For this reason, it has been determined that Klein's Camp upholds the third criterion.

It seems apparent that Klein's Camp also upholds the forth criterion, leaving a minimal environmental impact. The small-scale nature of Klein's Camp creates a minimal impact. The company also offers low-impact walking safaris and birding safaris, reducing its carbon footprint.

Klein's Camp's commitment to ecotourism has been recognized by other sources. As previously mentioned, Honey, Zeppel and Hammer all determined that Klein's Camp is genuine ecotourism company. The values of &Beyond, the company that oversees

Klein's, has also been recognized as one that upholds the principles of ecotourism.

Klein's Camp is an ecotourism company by the standards of Table. 4.

Section 3.2: Case Study Analysis

A few conclusions can be drawn from these case studies. These case studies confirm that ecotourism can successfully operate in northern Tanzania. Furthermore, these studies show that ecotourism, when fully embodied by a company, can deliver its goals to empower the Maasai and provide financial benefits. The case studies also indicate that companies can overcome some of the challenges of ecotourism mentioned in section 2.3, such as weak development and coordination issues. Finally, the case studies confirm that not all companies that claim to embody ecotourism actually do so. This research makes a strong case for ecotourism, as some companies have successfully operated in northern Tanzania while upholding the principles of ecotourism. Table 5 illustrates the results of the case studies. This table provides an easy breakdown of each company and the criteria that it practices.

Table 5: Case Study Conclusions

	Dorobo Tours and Safaris	Thomson Safaris	Klein's Camp
Criterion 1a: The company provides financial benefits,	✓	✓	✓
Criterion 1b: Company empowers the Maasai	✓		✓
Criterion 2: The company respects the local Maasai culture	✓		✓
Criterion 3: The company embraces the human rights of the Maasai	✓		✓
Criterion 4: The company leaves minimal environmental impact	✓	✓	✓

Upon completion of the three case studies, it became apparent that the first criterion needed to be divided into two separate criteria. This is due to the finding that a company can financially benefit a group, but this does not necessarily mean empowerment. Thomson provides financial benefits to the Maasai through its financial contributions to FoTZC. However, funneling money to community projects does not necessarily empower the Maasai. Dorobo and Klein's both empower the Maasai since those companies negotiated land leases with Maasai communities directly, rather than purchasing land from the government. It is true that Thomson purchased the area they now call Enashiva Nature Refuge; however, this purchase did not empower Maasai communities. The negotiation of leases allows the Maasai communities to exercise

control over their lands and the tourism activities that take place in them. The purchase of land limits the decision-making (and thus, empowerment) of the Maasai. Empowerment is a vague term, but for the purpose of this study, empowerment can be assumed to mean the inclusion of the Maasai in the decision-making of tourism practices on their land. By this definition, Dorobo and Klein's upheld the second part of the first criterion, and Thomson Safaris did not.

Ecotourism, as outlined in the Table 4 framework, can be achieved in Tanzania. Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp have taken the necessary measures to achieve ecotourism and create positive implications for the Maasai. By negotiating land leases with the Maasai directly Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp not only empowered the Maasai financially, but allowed the Maasai to take ownership over their land.

Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp have also gone the extra mile to overcome the various challenges of ecotourism in Tanzania, such as weak development and lack of coordination between stakeholders. Both the Dorobo study and Klein's Camp studies reveal that these challenges can be overcome. Both companies coordinate directly with the Maasai stakeholders. Dorobo Tours and Safaris has implemented capacity-building projects in the villages in which it operates in order to create transparency and strengthen coordination between stakeholders (Buckley 2003: 27). Klein's Camp also developed a joint-committee with the community members to overcome coordination issues. This joint-committee allows the Klein's and the Maasai to oversee tourism in the area together. Klein's Camp is also working to overcome the issue of weak development. By providing direct financial benefits to the Maasai they are empowered financially. Dorobo Tours and Safaris also works to overcome the challenge of weak development by raising

funds for capacity-building projects. The goal of these projects is to create transparency in the handling of revenue from tourism and to strengthen the coordination between Dorobo and the villages from which they lease land for their company's tourism purposes (Buckley 2003: 27). The ability of both these companies to overcome the potential challenges of ecotourism shines light on the level of commitment both companies have to operating under the principles of ecotourism.

The efforts of Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp to practice ecotourism have been recognized not only by the study, but by many other academics, travel guides and journalists (Honey 2008; Hammer 2010; Selman 2009; Bewer, Firestone, and Fitzpatrick 2009). These companies are blazing the trail for successful and genuine ecotourism, as they have worked to uphold the principles of ecotourism and have overcome its various challenges. In operating genuine ecotourism companies, Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp have created positive implications for the Maasai, such as financial benefits, community development, land tenure, women's empowerment, and employment. The companies have allowed the Maasai to share their culture with visitors, another testament to the respect both Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp have for the Maasai.

The Thomson Safaris case study show that false ecotourism companies do exist. Although Thomson Safaris advertises as an ecotourism company, it has not gone to the same lengths as other companies like Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp to achieve ecotourism. Thomson does provide some financial support to Tanzanians by endorsing the schools and by running its nonprofit FoTZC, but these efforts do not match those of the other case studies. The long list of allegations and reports of violence also make it difficult to regard Thomson as an ecotourism company.

The purchase of the land on which Thomson operates, the Enashiva Nature Reserve, was completely legal. Although the purchase was legal, it can be argued that Thomson did not go to the same effort as other companies to respect Maasai culture and include them in the coordination of its tourism endeavors. Negotiating land leases directly with the Maasai, rather than purchasing land from the Tanzanian government is not explicitly a requirement of ecotourism, but it certainly shows regard for local culture and a genuine desire to empower local communities financially. Thomson did not do anything that overtly violates the principles of ecotourism, but purchasing land from the government rather than negotiating leases with the Maasai shows less of a commitment to the Maasai. The negotiation of leases provides direct financial benefits to local communities, and Thomson did not do this. This suggests that Thomson's level of commitment to financially empowering the Maasai, an ecotourism criterion in Table 4, is not as great as other companies that operate in the area, such as Dorobo Tours and Klein's Camp. Thomson Safaris clearly does not maintain the same level of commitment to the Maasai as other companies, as demonstrated in its business practices and acquisition of land.

Thomson may have purchased this land rather than negotiating directly with the Maasai, but the Tanzanian government facilitated this purchase. The land was purchased from Tanzania Breweries Limited, a privatized company taken on by the government. By selling this land to a foreign company, and allowing the company to evict the Maasai, the government is also partially responsible for the troubles faced by the Maasai. Even more disconcerting, despite numerous accounts of abuse, the TTB has showered Thomson

Safaris with awards and positive recognition. Thomson may not deliver its promises of ecotourism, but the Tanzanian government has played a large role in this failure.

Section 4.1 The Involvement of the Tanzanian Government

Tanzania's contentious land laws and lack of support for small-scale ecotourism ventures indicate that the government may also be impacting the Maasai negatively. Tanzanian land policies have been a complex issue since independence in 1961. The government passed various land laws during the 1990s, but the promised benefits of these policies have yet to be realized. The complexities of the land tenure issues in Tanzania are the result of the conflicting agendas of the tourism sector, foreign investors, hunters, and local communities. It is these conflicting agendas that make it difficult for these policies to be put into practice.

Land allocation in Tanzania has a complicated and sordid history. Although the land policies of the 1990s were written to decentralize land tenure and to transfer control of land to local communities, many legislative acts affirm the power of the central government in deciding how lands are used (Pallotti 2008). These attempts to decentralize, however, do not help indigenous peoples such as the Maasai as much as would be expected, especially when considering the genesis of Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs).

The Tanzanian Wildlife Policy of 1998 calls for Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), a relatively new category for land in Tanzania. Game-controlled areas are areas that allow for tourist hunting on village lands. Currently, the Wildlife Division, a subdivision of Tanzania's Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (MNRT), manages

game-controlled areas. In theory, WMAs would replace the Wildlife Division as the managing force for these game-controlled areas. WMAs are community run and would allow local people to manage land and wildlife, as well as reap greater financial benefits from tourist hunting (Walsh 2006). Although the Wildlife Policy of 1998 calls for greater local control of lands and wildlife, this has yet to become a reality. The requirements for an area to become a WMA are complex and time-consuming (Nelson 2006). Many policy analysts speculate that the central government purposely enacted such complex regulations in order to stall the formation of WMAs and thus maintain centralized control of land through the Wildlife Division of the MNRT. Many policymakers, members of the international community, and academics believe the Wildlife Division still exercises control over the decision-making in regards to land tenure in northern Tanzania (Walsh 2006). Despite international pressure to further develop WMAs in Tanzania, both the central government and resident hunters resist. The central government resists this pressure because WMAs will come with the loss of centralized control of land, and the resident hunters resist this pressure because WMAs will come with greater costs for their hunting practices. For these reasons the potential of WMAs have not been realized in Tanzania, despite the advocacy for them in legislation such as the 1998 Wildlife Policy (Walsh 2006). WMAs, if implemented, would benefit local communities, including the Maasai.

Tourist hunting continues to be troublesome for the development of WMAs, as well as for the development of small-scale, minimally consumptive ecotourism. The Wildlife Division of the MNRT draws up land concessions with foreigners. Ideally, the development of WMAs would allow local communities to control these concessions and

benefit financially from hunting tourism. Unfortunately, the process for an area to become a WMA is difficult and, therefore, the Wildlife Division continues to maintain control over land concessions with foreigners. Tourist hunting has also proven to be a challenge to ecotourism ventures. For example, Dorobo Tours and Safaris' initial tourism ventures in the Loliondo village area of the Ngorongoro District were predicated on government support for operator-village agreements. The Wildlife Division provided support for these operator-village agreements; however, in 1992 the government abrogated this agreement when it granted the Loliondo area as a hunting concession to a wealthy member of the Dubai royal family (Honey 2008: 242). This allowed the royals of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) to assume control of Loliondo, and the Arabs clashed with the villages and ecotourism tour operators in the area. The Arabs made it difficult for companies such as Dorobo to continue its operations in the area, and as a result, Dorobo backed out of Loliondo for a few years. This situation was infamously named "Loliondogate" by the *New York Times* (Honey 2008:242). The Wildlife Division was able to allocate this land to the Arabs because it is in its jurisdiction to grant land concessions to foreigners.

The vague nature of the 1999 Land and Village Act, combined with the lack of success in developing WMAs, have culminated into the continued power of the central government to control land concessions and decision-making. Hunting concessions in Loliondo and elsewhere are lucrative ventures for the central government, making it difficult for the government to agree to relinquish control. A large amount of revenue is generated from wildlife tourism in Tanzania; however, studies show that a very small amount of this revenue makes it into rural Maasai homes. Essentially, wildlife ventures in

Tanzania bring very limited returns to the Maasai (Homewood et al. 2009: 395). Not only does the wildlife tourism compete with ecotourism and compromise the land rights of local people, but it brings very few benefits to the Maasai.

The central government has also been known to challenge ecotourism through other networks. The Ngorongoro District Council challenged ecotourism ventures, such as Dorobo's and Klein's, in 2000. The Ngorongoro District Council argued that the ecotourism companies operating in the area should pay the District Council rather than paying the villages directly (Nelson 2004: 16). The opposition of the district and regional governance clearly showed a dislike for operator-village contracts that many ecotourism companies, such as Dorobo and Klein's, pursue in the area. This attempt by the district to capture the village revenues was unsuccessful (Nelson 2004: 16). The conflict between safari hunting and ecotourism is essentially a conflict between the central government and ecotourism, since the Wildlife Division of MNRT is responsible for hunting concessions. This conflict shines light on the struggle of villages to exercise ownership over the decision-making of their land, as the central government is constantly challenging them when they attempt to develop and benefit from ecotourism.

The Tanzanian government has also been known to disregard the Maasai and provide them with little support. Honey asserts that the government views the Maasai as tourist attractions. Since the government has placed emphasis on wildlife tourism, interactions between visitors and the Maasai are rare. A few companies that practice true ecotourism provide highly informative tours, provide guests with books prior to their visit, and facilitate direct contact with Maasai villages. Unfortunately this is not the norm among most tourism companies in Tanzania (Honey 2008: 253). Overall, tourism in

Tanzania has extinguished the rights of the Maasai through extraction of land rights and opportunities. This can be attributed to the government, which spearheads the development of the tourism sector. The government's refusal to recognize the rights of the Maasai, to support small-scale ecotourism companies that draw up village-operator agreements, to create more revenue for Maasai households, or to foster the growth of WMAs all demonstrate failure on the government's behalf to support the Maasai. Rather than reinforcing the growth of ecotourism companies such as Dorobo and Klein's, the government chooses to support large-scale and perhaps more profitable companies such as Thomson. The government's decision to grant land concessions to foreign companies, despite the negative implications that may follow for the Maasai, suggest that the government has contributed to the land rights issues of the Maasai. This government failure contributes to the greater issue of the Maasai not reaping financial benefits of tourism or receiving sizeable amounts from tourism revenue.

Although the Tanzanian government's tourism policies state that the development of its tourism sector should be sustainable and benefit the livelihoods of Tanzanians, its actions suggest otherwise. The land policies of the 1990s are complex and difficult to implement. The administrative structure of Tanzanian land tenure is also complex and severely limits the power of local villages to make decisions. Government policies call for locally run WMAs, but this has yet to become a reality. Tanzanian land policies may call for local empowerment and WMAs, but until it relinquishes control of tourist hunting and transfers the management of it to local communities, the benefits of WMAs will not be realized.

The Tanzanian government not only supports tourist hunting and foreign investment at the expense of local people's access to land, but it also favors large tourism companies. The TTB supports Thomson Safaris and recognizes it for its humanitarian and conservation efforts. Furthermore, while Thomson denies the accusations, it has often been reported that Thomson security guards and local law enforcement work to evict the Maasai and to expel curious journalists from the area. Stated simply, the Tanzanian government supports Thomson Safaris, most likely due to the large amount of revenue the company generates for Tanzania. Unfortunately, in the cases involving small-scale ecotourism companies such as Dorobo and Klein's, the Tanzanian government was not as accommodating. This was seen in the 1994 when the Loliondo area was granted as a hunting concession to foreigners, straining ecotourism initiatives in the area. Until the Tanzanian government further develops WMAs and supports small-scale ecotourism the Maasai will continue to struggle. The Maasai are faced with many negative effects of the expanding tourism sector, including the sale of land to foreign companies and the hunting concessions. The central government's support for these investors only exacerbates the plight of the Maasai. WMAs and ecotourism development will generate positive outcomes for the Maasai, as well as for other local communities. However, the actions of the central government create daunting challenges.

Section 4.2: Response of NGOs and IOs

Multiple groups have responded to the controversial land tenure issues in Maasailand. A Tanzania-based NGO, the Pastoral Women's Council (PWC), addresses many of the Maasai's issues, including land tenure. The PWC's land rights initiative

works to make the Maasai more aware of their land rights status, as well as provide them with the skills necessary to manage natural resources and to benefit from them. The PWC works to accomplish these goals through capacity-building projects in the Maasai community (PWC 2011).

The Maasai's land tenure issues in northern Tanzania have also been acknowledged in the international arena. The UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination called on the Tanzanian government to inspect the controversies Enashiva Nature Refuge in 2009; the Tanzanian government did not act on the UN's request (Hammer 2010). The International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), an independent IO that works to protect the rights of indigenous groups, also called on the Tanzanian government and the African Union (AU) to address the challenges tourism has caused for the Maasai. In 2009, IWGIA sent a letter directing the president of Tanzania, Jakaya Kikwete, to address the alleged evictions and human rights abuses of the Maasai near Loliondo. The president has yet to respond to this request (IWGIA 2009).

These IOs and NGOs have called on the government to investigate alleged abuses in northern Tanzania. The situation in northern Tanzania with the Maasai is appearing on the agendas of multiple IOs and NGOs. As the Maasai's land issues gain momentum in the international issue arena, it will become more publicized to the global community. The emergence and exposure of the issue may effect potential tourists' decisions as they select an ecotourism company. Increased awareness of the plight of the Maasai and the effects of tourism are essential when seeking a sustainable solution in northern Tanzania.

The attention the issue is receiving from various IOs and NGOs is surely raising awareness among global tourists.

Section 5: Conclusion

Tourism is a highly-politicized issue in Tanzania. The stakeholders in this issue are the government, private tourism companies, ecotourism companies, local people, and NGOs, and all contribute to this multidimensional situation that exists in northern Tanzania. The friction between these stakeholders must be resolved in order to deliver the promised benefits to the Maasai. The principles of ecotourism promise positive implications for the Maasai, and Tanzania's tourism policies do as well. The Tanzanian government does not always support small-scale ecotourism companies, but if they did, more Maasai communities would be able to receive the financial benefits and empowerment from ecotourism ventures.

A potential solution must include an increased awareness among global tourists. Tourists must take it upon themselves to investigate an ecotourism company thoroughly before committing financially. It is also imperative for tourists to understand the importance of ecotourism to local communities, such as the Maasai. Endeavoring to further educate tourists about the value of ecotourism may prove to be difficult, but eco-certification programs could remedy this issue. Currently, some organizations offer eco-certification programs. For example, STI offers businesses the opportunity to become eco-certified. Chappell explained "If they [a tourism company] wish to be eco-certified, there is a great deal of work involved. This includes, at a minimum, a comprehensive

sustainability policy; baseline measurements of environmental, social, and economic indicators; supporting evidence to support all claims; and verification of these documents by an independent assessor and/or STI certification board” (Chappell 2011). The Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC) includes over 37 voluntary criteria a tourism business should adopt in order to maintain natural and cultural heritage (GSTC 2011b). These criteria are the result of a collaborative effort to develop universal guidelines for sustainable travel, but these standards are completely voluntary. Organizations such as STI or the GSTC offer eco-certification programs, but these certifications are self-regulated. The self-regulation and voluntary nature of eco-certification programs make it difficult for all ecotourism companies to be held accountable to the same standards, or to be compared relative to other ecotourism companies. A global standard may be too overzealous or too general to be adopted globally. Countries could possibly develop local frameworks and eco-certification criteria based on the needs of its specific culture. Ecotourism Australia is a nonprofit that evaluates companies for eco-certifications, provides tourists with a database of eco-certified tourism companies, and markets the principles of ecotourism in order to raise awareness (Ecotourism Australia 2011). Perhaps a localized eco-certification agency in Tanzania or East Africa would allow ecotourism to flourish and deliver its promised benefits to local communities, such as the Maasai. However, in order for this to be achieved both the government and tourists will need to provide support to the organization. Countries or regions may develop localized ecotourism standards for eco-certification, but until this becomes a reality it is the consumers’ responsibility to properly assess a company’s commitment to ecotourism.

In a United States Institute of Peace special report, Honey and Raymond Gilpin argue that tourism, although underestimated, can promote peace and sustainability by providing jobs, diversifying the economy, generating income, protecting the environment, and promoting cross-cultural awareness (Honey & Gilpin 2009).

Ecotourism embodies all of these things, meaning that it could bring about the positive outcomes listed above. However, ecotourism will not be actualized until it receives the institutional and structural support discussed in the preceding paragraph. Ecotourism has great potential to generate positive implications and promote peace, but until it receives consumer and government support, the benefits of ecotourism cannot be fully realized.

Ecotourism, in its most genuine form, would enable local communities such as the Maasai pastoralists to manage and benefit from tourism. Local communities should have a stake in tourism operations in their own countries, as it is their land and culture that is being utilized for the use of tourism. The Maasai have a rich cultural heritage. Their history is interesting, their livelihoods unique, their crafts intricate, and their familiarity with the wildlife and plants of the Serengeti invaluable. The Maasai ought to be provided with the ability to benefit from and manage tourism activities in their ancestral lands. As tourists we must make ourselves aware of the implications of our decisions when traveling abroad, for the precious cultural heritage of the Maasai pastoralists could be at stake. The ultimate solution to the question of ecotourism may be multifaceted, but it certainly starts with tourists' commitment to ecotourism. The host communities must be considered when traveling abroad, because it is ultimately their land and culture that provides the traveler with an enriched and colorful experience. If national governments, organizations, and travelers refuse to acknowledge the urgency of implementing

sustainable ecotourism practices, the fate the Maasai could be ominous. Tourism can oppress host communities, circumvent local economies, and perpetuate neocolonial practices. Alternatively, tourism has the potential to generate positive implications for the Maasai by bringing forth peace and development for Maasai communities in northern Tanzania.

Bibliography

&Beyond, 2011a. *Klein's Camp* [Online] Available at: http://www.andbeyondafrica.com/media/documents/reserves/brochures/kleins_camp_09_low.pdf [Accessed 2 April 2011].

&Beyond, 2011b. *About Us* [Online] Available at: http://www.andbeyondafrica.com/about_us [Accessed 2 April 2011].

Bewer, T., Fitzpatrick, M. and Firestone, M.D., 2009. *Lonely Planet: east Africa guide*. 8th ed., Victoria: Lonely Planet Publications Pty Limited, pp. 68; 662.

Blamey, R., 2001. Principles of ecotourism. In: D.B. Weaver, ed. *The encyclopedia of ecotourism*. Oxford: CABI Publishing, pp. 1-20.

Björk, P., 2007, 'Definition Paradoxes: From Concept to Definition', in James Higham (ed.), *Critical Issues in Ecotourism: Understanding a Complex Tourism Phenomenon*, Oxford: Elsevier Limited, pp. 23-46.

Buckley, R., 2003, *Case Studies in Ecotourism*, Cambridge: CABI Publishing.

Carlisle, L., 2011. *Klein's Camp and the Maasai*. [email] K. Hogan. Sent 5 April 2011.

Chappell, R., 2011. *Thomson Safaris STI eco-certification*. [email] K. Hogan. Sent 6 April 2011.

College of African Wildlife Management, 2011a. *Academics: short courses*. [Online] (Updated 2011) Available at: http://www.mwekawildlife.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=13:short-courses&catid=9:short-courses&Itemid=7. [Accessed 2 February 2011].

College of African Wildlife Management, 2011b. *Homepage*. [Online] (Updated 2011) Available at: <http://www.mwekawildlife.org>. [Accessed 2 February 2011].

Committee to Protect Journalists, 2008. *Journalist Killed, Kenya, Trent Keegan* [online] Available at: <http://www.cpj.org/killed/2008/trent-keegan.php> [Accessed 21 March 2011].

Ecotourism Australia, 2011. *About Ecotourism Australia*. [online] Available at: <http://www.ecotourism.org.au/aboutea.asp> [Accessed 10 May 2011].

Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria [GSTC], 2011a. *The Criteria*. [online] Available at: http://www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=58&Itemid=188 [Accessed 12 November 2010].

Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria [GSTC], 2011b. *Criteria background and history*. [online] Available at: http://www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=164&Itemid=348 [Accessed 12 April 2011].

Hammer, J., 2010. Last days of the Maasai? *Condé Nast Traveler*. [online] November. Available at: <<http://www.concierge.com/cntraveler/articles/503114?all=yes>> [Accessed 12 March 2011].

Hawkins D.E. and Lamoureux K., 2001. Global growth and magnitude of ecotourism. In: D.B. Weaver, ed. *The encyclopedia of ecotourism*. Oxford: CABI Publishing., pp. 63-72.

Homewood, K. Kristjanson, P. and Trench, P., 2009. *Staying Maasai? livelihoods, conservation and development in East African rangelands. Studies in Human Ecology and Adaptation Series*. Volume 5. pp. 1-42; 369-404.

Honey, M., 1999. *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?* Washington DC: Island Press.

Honey, M., 2008. Martha. *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?* 2nd ed., Washington DC: Island Press.

Honey M. and Gilpin R., 2009. Tourism in the developing world: promoting peace and reducing poverty. *United States Institute of Peace Special Report*. [online] Available at: <http://www.responsibletravel.org/resources/documents/reports/USIP%20Tourism%20in%20the%20Developing%20World.pdf> [Accessed 2 May 2011], pp. 1-3.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs [IWGIA], 2009. *African Union enters the fray on the Loliondo saga*. [online] Available at: <http://www.iwgia.org/sw39801.asp> [Accessed on 9 May 2011].

Laurent, O., 2009. Murder unsolved, *British Journal of Photography*, [online] Available at: <http://www.bjp-online.com/british-journal-of-photography/news/1645735/murder-unsolved> [Accessed 21 March 2011].

Martin, R., 2010. Land rights crisis in Tanzania, *Talking Stick*, [Online] Available at: http://www.african-initiatives.org.uk/media_files/Talking_Stick.pdf [Accessed 7 May 2010].

Mastny, L., 2001. Treading Lightly: New Paths for International Tourism. *Worldwatch Paper 159*. Washington DC: Worldwatch Institute.

National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2011. *Heritage Tourism* [Online] (Updated 2011) Available at: <http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/heritage-tourism> [Accessed 16 February 2011].

Nelson, F., 2004. *The evolution and impacts of community-based ecotourism in northern Tanzania: Issues paper no 131*. [online] London: International Institute for Environment and Development. Available at: <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9507IIED.pdf> [Accessed 20 April 2011], pp. 16.

Nelson, F. and Agrawal, A., 2008 Patronage or participation? Community-based natural resource management reform in sub-Saharan Africa. *Development and Change* 39 (4): pp. 557-585.

Nordlund, S. 2010. The Sukenya Farm conflict – what Thomson Safaris are up to in Loliondo and how I became a prohibited immigrant in Tanzania. *View from the Termite Mound* [blog] 18 March, Available at: <http://termitemoundview.blogspot.com/2010/03/sukenya-farm-conflict-what-thomson.html> [Accessed 20 March 2011].

Pallotti, A., 2008. Tanzania: decentralizing power or spreading poverty? *Review of African Political Economy*, [online] Available at: http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/learning/landrights/downloads/tanzania_decentralising_power.pdf [Accessed 2 May 2011].

Pastoral Women's Council [PWC], 2011. *PWC rights programmes: women's rights and leadership*. [online]. Available at: <http://www.pastoralwomenscouncil.org/RightsProgrammes.html> Accessed 9 May 2011].

Proud African Safaris, 2011. National parks, game reserves, regions and more. [online] Available at: <http://proudafricansafaris.com/tanzanian-african-safaris/explore-the-african-bush-tanzanian-african-safari> [Accessed 13 May 2011].

Renton, A., 2009. Tourism is a curse to us. *The Guardian*. [Online] 6 September. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/sep/06/masai-tribesman-tanzania-tourism> [Accessed 14 March 2011].

Selman, J., 2009. Back to the rhythm: 'inventuring' in Africa. *The Huffington Post*. [Online] 1 April. Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jim-selman/back-to-the-rhythm-invent_b_181037.html. [Accessed 13 February 2011].

Soderbergh, C, 2010. We have become squatters in our own home. *Minorities in Focus: personal accounts from the field* [blog] 16 December, Available at: <http://minorityrights.wordpress.com/2010/12/16/part-2-%E2%80%93-%E2%80%9CWe-have-become-squatters-in-our-own-home-%E2%80%9D/> [Accessed 14 March 2011].

Steinhilber, I., *Thomson Safaris Ecotourism*. [email] K Hogan. Sent 6 April 2011.

Taylor, C., 2008. Emails reveal murdered Kiwi's fear of the police. *New Zealand Herald*, [online] 29 June. Available at:

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10518877 [Accessed 23 March 2011].

The International Ecotourism Society [TIES], 2010. *Travel Green Guide 2010/11* [Online] (Updated 2010) Available at: http://www.ecotourism.org/site/c.orLQKXPCLmF/b.5207577/k.BF40/Travel_Green_Guide_The_International_Ecotourism_Society.htm [Accessed 14 February 2011].

Thomson Safaris, 2011a. *Our commitment to Tanzania* [Online] (Updated 2009) Available at: http://www.thomsonsafaris.com/th_cmt.shtml [Accessed 2 March 2011].

Thomson Safaris, 2011b. *Leaders in responsible, sustainable travel* [Online] (Updated 2009) Available at: <http://www.thomsonsafaris.com/sustainability.shtml> [Accessed 2 March 2011].

Thomson Safaris, 2011c. *Thomson Safaris sets the record straight: Thomson replies to online rumors. Get the facts here.* [blog] Available at: <http://thomsonsafaris.wordpress.com/> [Accessed on 14 March 2011].

Tourism Sustainability Council, 2009. *Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria* [Online] (Updated 2009) Available at: http://www.sustainabletourismcriteria.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=58&Itemid=188 [Accessed 14 February 2011].

United Nations, 2011. *A gateway to the UN system's work on the MDGs.* [online] Available at: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml> [Accessed 10 May 2011].

United Republic of Tanzania National Website, 2011. *Natural Resources: Tourism Sector* [Online] (Updated 2011) Available at: <http://www.tanzania.go.tz/naturalresourcesf.html> [Accessed 30 March 2011].

USAID, 2011. *USAID land tenure and property rights portal: country profile: Tanzania.* [online] Available at: http://usaidlandtenure.net/usaidltpproducts/country-profiles/tanzania/country-profile-tanzania#Tanzania_Land [Accessed 2 May 2011].

Walsh, M., 2006. The utilization of wildlife in Tanzania: key issues and experiences. *Paper prepared for BEES Consulting groups, Johannesburg.* [online] Available at: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/14563278/The-Utilisation-of-Wildlife-in-Tanzania-Key-Issues-and-Experiences> [Accessed 2 May 2011].

Walter, H. and Hamfler C., 2009. *Maasailand in transition: globalization reaches the African Savannah.* UCLA International Institute.

Weaver D.B., 2001. Ecotourism in the context of other tourism types. In: D.B. Weaver, ed. *The encyclopedia of ecotourism.* Oxford: CABI Publishing. pp. 73-88.

Zeppel, H., 2006. *Indigenous ecotourism: ecotourism series 3*. Oxford: CABI Publishing.