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STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Chapter 1 provides an introductory discussion on the economy, population and social trends in Caprivi. Because of the complexity of community-based programmes and the very nature of communal societies, I define concepts and terminologies used locally and also in this thesis. This chapter also gives a background context of the research area. In Chapter 2 I discuss the research problem and the theoretical framework of the study. I provide a discussion of current theories in tourism development. Throughout this report, tourism and conservation are considered not as separate concepts but as concepts and activities that are interwoven. Hence in the context of Salambala and many other developing countries, these two concepts are in practice promoted as complementing each other. Research methodology and fieldwork arrangements are also discussed in this chapter. Chapter 3 reviews two natural resource management approaches. I also discuss the evolution and focus of the CAMPFIRE and CBNRM programme approaches in detail. While presenting the objectives and aims of the Salambala Conservancy, I also outline a brief analysis of tourism in independent Namibia.

An assessment of Salambala Conservancy the study area in eastern Caprivi, for the period 1998-2001 is discussed in Chapter 4. This assessment consists of an evaluation of the problems and benefits of the Conservancy. The section is mainly about what the situation in Salambala has been after three years of operation and it is analysed against the CAMPFIRE approach. Chapter 5 focuses on the future of Salambala Conservancy with or without the application of CAMPFIRE. In addition, the role of NACOBTA in Salambala and the potentials, challenges and prospects in the Conservancy are evaluated. Chapter 6 concludes with a discussion on eight major assumptions of community-based tourism. Future research issues and policy implications are also discussed in this chapter. It should be noted that all scientific names of animals are from Dorst and Dandelot (1986). Though some of these names are now outdated, the animals remains the same!
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INTRODUCTION

Besides colonialism and liberation, the history of southern Africa has been that of too-familiar phenomena such as wars, drought, deforestation, floods, corruption, poverty and disease. Little has been known about development success and sustainable efforts thereof. In more recent years, the population has been increasing parallel to the rise in HIV/AIDS occurrences. Alongside these phenomena, the requirement for more land and land use has equally been on the increase. Regrettably, the human dependence on nature has threatened the very existence of wildlife. Indeed it is not surprising that this situation has generated debate and has brought about the concept of sustainable use. Hypothetically stated, CAMPFIRE’s reasoning of natural resource use provides a platform for economic growth and conservation alongside tourism. My research question is ‘How applicable is the CAMPFIRE model for Namibia?’ In this part of Africa, including Namibia, the availability of water, space and food influences the presence and survival of not only human beings but also wildlife. The resulting situation has forced governments to engage in conservation and land-use management approaches. Both human beings and animals have to compete for resources which nature alone provides.

Caprivi Region is home to a lush wilderness area of riverine forests, flood plains, swamps and woodlands, contrasting sharply with Namibia’s typically arid landscapes. According to NACOBTA’s Internet page, despite the isolated political incidents in some parts of Kavango and western Caprivi, eastern Caprivi is steadily gaining a reputation as a retreat for bird-watchers, nature lovers and discerning travellers. NACOBTA also states that there is no other region in the country that offers such a variety of wildlife and vegetation types as Caprivi. Although the human population is high, game is easily spotted and includes elephant *Loxodonta africana* (Blumenbach), hippo *Hippopotamus amphibius* L., lion *Panthera leo* L., Cape buffalo *Syncerus caffer* (Sparrman), and the rare sitatunga (marshbuck) *Tragelaphus spekei* (Scalter). In comparative terms, Salambala Conservancy is the eighth-largest Conservancy in Namibia. The Conservancy has an estimated registered membership of between three and four thousand people (DEA Internet page).
When commercial hunting began to replace ‘hunting for the pot’ towards the beginning of the twentieth century, new legislation was deemed necessary by the colonial government to replace African traditional law. An institution responsible for policy formulation in Caprivi was called Khuta (similar to national assembly) headed by a Ngambela (Prime Minister), while the chief (Mulena) presided only on very important hearings. Caprivi, with its abundant and diverse game in those days, attracted hunters and traders from neighbouring countries. Unlike in other British-administered colonies, Caprivi was in relative terms politically unaccounted for. Considered by the Barotseland Kingdom in Zambia as King Lewanika’s game reserve, Caprivi was supposed to be administered by the British. Under the Berlin Agreement, however, it was Germany that had to have political authority over Caprivi, but because the Germans had not yet occupied it and the local people had fled the country upon rumours of invading forces, ‘Caprivi became a lawlessness region’ (Fisch 1999a, 45).

In the face of diminishing game and other land-based resources, a proclamation for conservation was instituted, making hunting, including traditional hunting, effectively illegal. The proclamation meant that land was to be set apart, especially for conservation purposes. However, in the period between 1906-1980 (74 years) no specific places were established as conservation areas in Caprivi. The way in which the need of conservation land was carried out by the colonial regime led to rural communities being subjected to forced resettlement and subsequently denied access to gathering, animals, and land that had once belonged to all the people. Wild game inhabiting the communal areas became state-owned property. While trying to save the decreasing number of wild animals, the aspect of human dependence was ignored. People lived from nature rather than from a controlled modern economic system. Not long thereafter, poaching created a dilemma that has remained at the centre of controversy between NGOs, wildlife managers and rural communities to this day.

Following independence in 1990, ways were sought to solve this dispute in Namibia. Botswana, Zambia and South Africa opted for a ‘shoot on sight’ policy. Such a policy was carried out by killing on the spot anyone found hunting illegally in a conservation area. Namibia and Zimbabwe chose an ‘arrest and send to jail’ policy but in practical terms they operated like the neighbouring countries. As one local put it, "if your family member is injured or killed by a wild animal, weep, bury him/her with dignity, but if an
animal is killed be prepared to lose the hunter anyway… (Interviews). Animal life was more valuable than human life. The Government of Botswana still pursues this policy. In some countries this hard-line approach is changing.

In the midst of continued enmity between local communities, wildlife managers and accusations from NGOs, different countries instituted NGO-sponsored wildlife management projects. Salambala Conservancy is part of this ongoing search for a solution that is expected to be sustainable and further impact the livelihoods of local communities positively. Zimbabwe’s Communal Areas Management Programme For Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE), Zambia’s Administrative Design Management for Game Areas (ADMADE) and Namibia’s Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) are a result of the ongoing debate. Both CBNRM and CAMPFIRE are discussed in Chapter 3.

In Caprivi Region, and Namibia as a whole, the relationship between nature conservation managers and local communities has often been characterised by a somewhat oppressive style, lacking communication with the communities concerned. Among the academia, the situation has brought about two schools of thought. One advocates strong uncompromising conservation (no use of wildlife), and the other emphasises sustainable use of resources (controlled use of wildlife). In real terms, the problem has centred around the impact that animals have on communities and/or the impact that communities have on wildlife, with little acceptance of the economic situation in which the communities find themselves. This thesis is part of the ongoing discussion concerning whether people and animals can share the same land and whether they are compatible with each other.

Salambala Conservancy in the Republic of Namibia is one such place where resource management approaches are being sought. The area is divided into two parts; one being a core area and the other being a buffer zone. The core area is the fundamental breeding ground of animals in which the law forbids human settlement, and the buffer zone is the area surrounding the core area, where the communities within the Conservancy are able to carry out agricultural activities permissible by law. CBNRM is the current approach in Salambala. The word Salambala is derived from a combination of the female name Nsala and the male name Mbala. Presumably it was a place where the couple that
carried the names lived. There are many such places named after couples in eastern Caprivi. Nonetheless, nobody has fully accounted for the origin of Salambala as a place name. Neither did my field respondents know how it came to be called so.

1.1 Concepts and definitions

The concept of Conservancy is a relatively new term developed and used in southern Africa. It is particularly used in Namibia and South Africa. A Conservancy is defined as an area within communal land set aside for a community within a particular geographically defined area (DEA Internet page). Such communities are accorded the right to sustainably manage, conserve and utilise wildlife and other natural resources within these areas. A Conservancy is instituted by a proclamation of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. This proclamation is necessary to enable the community to have de jure rights. In the context of the proclamation, the term community includes those people who are members of a specific tribal group and even individuals who are not normally resident in the particular communal land (Corbett and Daniels 1996).

As the word suggests, communal land is by its nature land that is geared toward non-commercial agriculture, commonly referred to as subsistence agriculture (Adams and Werner 1990). Communal land (or native reserves) was a result of the Odendaal Commission, which was appointed in 1962 by the South African Government to make ‘recommendations on a comprehensive five-year plan for the accelerated development of the various non-white groups of South West Africa’ (ibid., 91). Instead, the report emulated an aspiration to cement territorial apartheid, which resulted in a division of the Namibian land and widened the economic gap between the rich and the poor. As a result, according to Namibian justice systems, communal land refers to land over which modern courts do not have jurisdiction to prosecute on land matters and to land currently outside commercial farmland (private farms).

However, the justice system is under review for repeal in the national assembly. The intention is to integrate the traditional court system with mainstream law enshrined in the national constitution. In other words, communal land is land that is currently recognised as ‘state owned’ while the community holds the user rights, which
presumably upon appeal will transpire into de jure rights within traditional court systems. Nonetheless, there are three central features in communal land. The first is that there is no land tenure system, and secondly, there is no tenure under which communal land residents can legally describe land to be theirs. Finally, no single specific individual owns land for exclusive purposes but they have exclusive user rights for their own purposes.

In principle, the state recognises communal land as traditional land on which the state has to seek permission from the traditional legislature Khuta in order to do construction work or build roads, for instance. In the event of people being resettled, the state is not required by law to make recompense, while the opposite holds true on commercial farmland. The traditional authority is the institution that is responsible for legislation, law and order in a geographically defined communal area. Their powers are limited to the ethnic groups to which they belong. Commercial land is owned and managed by either an individual or commercial entities with tenure and proof of ownership documented by a legal body. The documentation provides legal protection before and after any transaction is effected. As a result the state is required by law to make recompense to the owner should the government desire to do construction work or mine a resource from such commercial farmland.

Even though the concept of community may refer to a group of people or an institution aspiring for one specific goal, it is not a homogenous construct. It is rather a heterogeneity with a diversity of products, processes and characteristics that are marked by social, sectoral, ecological and spatial dependence, construction, and discontinuity of identity. Because a community shares different values, traditions and practices within a geographically defined area, different characteristics occur on a temporal or permanent basis depending on different ongoing processes within such a community. For that very reason what is a benefit to one in a particular place at one point in time is likely to be a cost to another (Carter 1997).

In this thesis the concept of community is defined in spatial terms ‘as groupings of people who physically live in the same place’ (IIED 1994, 4). While a community may denote a rural or peripheral area it does not refer to or imply the economic standing of a particular group of people. Rurality is defined from a functionalist perspective with
elements such as land use and economy, settlement pattern, and the structure of society evident in day-to-day activities (Cloke and Park 1985). This definition is rooted in the fact that land use in rural areas is extensive and is dominated by agriculture; the settlement pattern is low in density, with small yet isolated homesteads, and the sense of community is stronger than in some urban areas.

Over a decade ago, the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987, 9) defined sustainable development as a ‘process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investment, the orientation of technological development and institutional change are made consistent with future as well as present needs’. According to Hugo et al. (1997, 176), sustainable development is not a destination but rather a journey. As far as they are concerned, human greediness and consumerism are the real issues that must be addressed. In their view, the Earth can carry more people, provided efficient use of resources is made a high priority.

This supposes, for example, ‘cutting back on waste and pollution; adding value to the environment through…multiple land use i.e. tourism to farming, and proper pricing of resources’, they argued (ibid., 177). The world’s major environmental problems stem from the inefficient utilisation of resources and not from population increase, they concluded. Despite all these shifting definitions, in this study sustainability is about fulfilling the needs of today’s rural community while maintaining the life support system of future rural residents. Thus, if employed properly, it should permit the use of natural resources without diminishing the potential local resource base and or without negatively affecting the rural socio-economic system.

In sustainable tourism, community participation is heralded as one of the great principles. Although being heralded as such, the issue of equity and community participation is least successfully implemented in rural development projects (Cole 1997). Participation in this thesis means ‘empowering people to mobilise their own capacities, be social factors, rather than passive subjects, [but people who] manage the resources, make decisions, and control the activities that affect their lives’ (Cernea 1985). Participation is not the same as consultation of affected parties, interest groups and stakeholders. It is the ongoing process of resource appraisal, mediation and implementation together with all other parties in a specific area. Therefore, participation
should not be taken as having the same meaning or connotation as either consultation or public hearing. Participation is about ongoing processes and mediation steps taken as each need arises.

Package Tourism is a concept coined recently. It is tourism in which tourists travel in groups and are brought to one or more destinations, such as national parks, in an ordered but uncontrolled manner. This tourism usually involves major companies; such as airlines, cars hire agencies and safari enterprises. Furthermore, package tourists often buy a package of services such as travel, accommodation, meals and day trips. Little effort is put into preventing environmental and social side-effects at the host place or destination.

Sustainable ecotourism, on the other hand, is tourism in which the natural environment is the main interest of the tourist; it is tourism that is considered not harmful and destructive to the environment. Some critics argue that it may indeed be ecologically based but not ecologically sound (Carter 1992). Idealistically, ecotourism may be defined as travel in the pursuit of the world’s amazing diversity of natural life and human culture (cultural tourism) without causing damage to either. Moreover, this kind of tourism is assumed to be environmentally friendly in practice and it is marketed using images of rare and beautiful ecosystems.

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) is defined as tourism that is based and sourced in rural communities, in the periphery of a country. Such tourism is managed and planned by the community in a particular rural area. Community-based tourism refers to the activities and initiatives of local people in a specific rural destination where the local residents are catering for tourists’ needs. The concept of household is a very fluid one in Caprivi (Naeraa et al. 1993). Presently and in this text the concept of household is defined as a home comprising of one or more people living and sharing meals together. It therefore includes people (grandmothers, grandfathers, uncles and so on) who actually have their own houses but take their meals together with those whom they see as part of their household (GRN 1999b). In many instances in Caprivi and Namibia, the head of the household is the owner of the property and is often a man.
In principle, CAMPFIRE is a philosophy of sustainable rural development that enables rural communities to manage and benefit directly from indigenous wildlife. Essentially, CAMPFIRE is an entrepreneurial approach to rural development because it is based on deriving profitable income from the available wildlife. Wildlife is the base that permits rural people to meet many of their material and spiritual needs. While the programme mainly applies to areas of the country in the periphery and under communal land, its crucial resources are the local people and wildlife (IIED 1994, 92-3).

1.2 Caprivi from a historical perspective

Historically, Caprivi has endured more changes in governance than any part of present-day Namibia (Appendix 2). Caprivi is Namibia’s farthest region from the central government, stretching about 1323 km from Windhoek, the national capital city. The area’s location may be seen as good for tourism and regional cross-border co-operation. Regardless of the region’s own internal problems, the location also make the region vulnerable to the political and economic instability in the neighbouring countries. The situation in Angola, instability in Zimbabwe, and economic depression in Zambia are but a few examples. Political upheavals are a major factor in tourism (Gamage et al. 1997/8 on the Sri Lanka case; Okorafor 1995 on Nigeria) and undoubtedly affect Caprivi’s economic potential.

In as much as four rivers surround Caprivi, (Zambezi in the north, Chobe in the east, Linyati in the south and Kwando-Mashi in the west) it is also bordered by four other nations, i.e. Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana (see map of Caprivi Figure 1). Of the four, Zambia and Botswana are served with border posts; to reach Zimbabwe one has to travel through one or the other; and the border with Angola has no official entry/border points with Caprivi. In this capacity, Caprivi serves as a gateway to other countries. A significant number of Namibians who fled the country to join the liberation war in other neighbouring countries used Caprivi due to its location but mainly because it contains dense forests, which made it difficult for the security forces to conduct effective patrols. Therefore, the neighbouring countries were seen as ‘enemies’ of the governing regime for a long time. In fact, people experienced terror from the frequent
incursions that the South West Africa Territorial Forces (SWATF) and South African Defence Forces (SADF) conducted at the time.

Heterogeneous Bantu-speaking ethnic communities reside in the region, namely the Masubiya, Mafwe, Yei, Totela, Mbalangwe, Mbukushu, San and Lozi people. Despite being one of the earliest places where the liberation war was launched (Bruchmann 2000), even after independence Caprivi continues to have its own political challenges. In the 1970s, ethnic tension and rumours of war lingered between the Mafwe and the Masubiya ethnic groups in the region. These were perpetrated by the governing regime at the time. It was part of the ‘divide and rule’ policy of apartheid South Africa. In the early 1990s the tensions turned into violence amid the transition of governance from an Administration for Caprivi (Homeland Government) to the Government of Namibia. In some circles, the recent secessionist attempt (in 1999) was seen as part of the long struggle to self-determination. See Fisch (1999b) for a detailed discussion on the secessionist movement in Caprivi.

Caprivi communities are predominantly patriarchal, and previously were more polygamous. Unlike in other Bantu communities, e.g. in the Okavango region, no women have served as Chief, King or Headmen in Caprivi. For many years, the cultures have maintained that women should take a more differential role in society especially when relating to leadership and power. Men, on the other hand, are seen as the individuals with rights and consequently are heads of households. Women often have difficulties in managing the natural resources within their reach. Traditionally, a husband has legal control over any agricultural or forest products his wife generates. This means that divorcees lose all rights to the resources or products they produced during their marriage, along with their rights to live on their husband's property. Rapid cultural change has significantly altered the customary system of relations.

Research by several newspapers point to the fact that domestic violence has increased over the last ten years. The customary law that applies to the majority of Namibian women negates them from property rights while men’s rights to inherit property and land are still significantly high. Under communal/traditional law, widows also have no legal rights over their late husband’s resources. If, however, a widow has adult children, she is likely to remain in charge of the family’s production. In spite of this, sons will
assume responsibility over the resources and the produce of their families. They take charge in terms of ownership while sisters are reluctantly given such authority. This is because of the belief that sisters will get married anyway, settle on their husband’s lands and not return.

Secondly, despite being the main collectors of fuel wood, fruit and vegetables, and being the most present people and most active members of households, women are less represented in decision-making bodies in many rural development programmes. Decision-makers tend to ignore women’s activities and how they would be affected by the decisions made without their consent. In fact when electric fencing was introduced in some of CAMPFIRE’s projects in Zimbabwe it was later found that this decision to fence areas made wood collection very difficult for women. They had to walk even longer distances (Metcalfe 1994). During fieldwork some inhabitants of Salambala were also in favour of electric fencing. Gender issues that surround the question of land-based natural resource use relate to equity, equality and civil rights and needs to be investigated. Lastarria-Cornhiel (1998) acknowledges similar customary property rights, family structures and status of women in traditional Albanian societies.

According to GRN (1995), rural communities in pre-colonial times had a well-established conservation ethic and placed high value on natural resources. Considering the fact those Namibian communities up to now have greatly relied on natural resources, there are no doubts about the Ministry’s findings. The Ministry further suggests that such ethics were based on religious and cultural beliefs as well as the respect for traditional law and authority. Many natural resources bear a utilitarian value for the community, i.e. medicinal purposes, food, and spiritual ceremonies, and therefore ensuring their sensible use was undoubtedly a matter of concern to traditional authorities.

At the end of the First World War, the British administration took over Caprivi and instituted legislation that called for the establishment of conservation reserves and subsequently strictly forbade hunting in Caprivi. Hunting of animals was allowed for people of non-African descent, and these were predominantly senior regional and national government officials. National parks or conservation reserves were, however, not created until in the 1980s, e.g. the Caprivi Game Reserve. After independence in
1990, Mudumu National Park, where 620 bird species have been identified, and Nkasa/Mamili National Park, being Namibia’s largest protected wetland and the last stronghold of the remnant population of puku *Kobus adenota vardoni* (Livingstone), were established in Caprivi (Katz et al. 1993).

On the Internet page of ‘newafrica.com’ tourism marketing company, it is claimed that Namibia became the first country in the world to include the protection of the environment in its constitution. Article 95 (i) of the Namibian Constitution states ‘The state shall actively promote and maintain the welfare of the people by adopting policies aimed at maintenance of the ecosystems, essential ecological processes and biological diversity of Namibia and utilisation of living natural resources on a sustainable basis for the benefit of all Namibians both present and future’ (GRN 1990, 54). Supplementing and inclusive of what was already proclaimed, 13.6 per cent of Namibia’ surface is protected as either a nature or game reserve, as a recreation area or as their combination. Thus far, many of the protected areas are attributable to the environmental sensitivity of the previous regimes. The diamond area is also part of the Namib-Naukluft Park and the Skeleton Coast National Park.

In Caprivi, according to Mendelsohn and Roberts (1998), there were five national parks, one forest reserve and two conservancies. However, after the 1998 regional and constituency decommissioning, the region now has three national parks and four conservancies (DEA 2001). A total of 34.6 per cent of land in Caprivi is set aside for conservation, 7.5 per cent of land as state forest and the remaining is either communal land or inhabited areas. When considering tourism facilities in Caprivi, in 1996 there were 12 amenities offering accommodation, each with a capacity of between 127 and 295 beds (Mendelsohn and Roberts 1998, 12). All of these establishments are located along the Rivers Kwando, Chobe and Zambezi. Several reports from *The Namibian Newspaper* (available online) show that many of the lodges have now retrenched their staff due to the political instability of 1998/9. This fact shows that tourism is not immune to other factors and that it does not influence its own destiny, something regrettably ignored by the government (see also Gamage et al. 1997/8 on the Sri Lanka case; Okorafor 1995 on Nigeria).
After the establishment of the Caprivi game reserve (the strip between the River Okavango and the River Kwando), due to the reserve’s proximity to and the continued civil war in Angola, wildlife officials never took managerial authority of the reserve. Under such a situation, poaching by the security forces and frequent poaching by UNITA (a rebel movement in Angola) insurgents may have occurred during the period. The game reserve was first used by SADF and SWATF troops until independence and now is occupied by the Namibian security forces. Nevertheless these parks have traditionally been the prime attraction for tourism in Caprivi. It is also important to mention the game ‘magnet’ of Kasikili Island (east of Katima Mulilo in the middle of the River Chobe), which is now (since 1999) under the sovereignty of Botswana (ICJ 1999).

Rothe (in Fisch 1999a, 34-56) estimated that in 1904 there were about fifty hunters and each killed well over 300 animals in every season. Each pocketed a profit amounting to 4000 German marks, mainly from selling ivory, hides, meat and wild ostrich feathers. In this process, residents were uprooted in the sense that they lost their economic power base. The traditional leadership role and their socio-political and spiritual systems were threatened and disrupted. For instance, in the sacred forests of Impalila Island and Ngoma district (Masikili) (the spiritual seats of the Masubiya) in the late 1970s the army destroyed the clay pots used for spiritual ceremonies by the Masubiya people. In addition, as a result of the lawlessness that emerged, rural communities were either forced into slavery or lost their livestock through theft by the Anglo-Boer War survivors and the Lozi people north of the River Zambezi (ibid., 44-50).

Based on earlier population censuses and aerial photographs, Mendelsohn and Roberts (1998, 15) give an account of the population since the beginning of the last century. According to them, there were about 5000 people in eastern Caprivi in 1909, 15,000 in 1946, 25,000 in 1970, and about 47,000 in 1981. According to the 1991 population census, Caprivi’s population amounted to 90,422 (GRN 1992). Therefore, Caprivi’s population has rapidly grown only during the last few decades. It has to be mentioned, however, that the lower population before independence was due to the high number of people who fled the country, and the returnees have subsequently increased population.
The National Planning Commission’s recent figures from the 1996 Demographic Survey put Caprivi’s population at about 107,900 (GRN 1997). Mendelsohn and Roberts’ aerial counts of households suggested a total population of about 110,700 in 1996. Of the total, 51.2 per cent of Caprivi’s population were women. Of the whole region’s population about 15 per cent live in the region’s capital, Katima Mulilo, while 85 per cent live in rural areas. Like in most developing countries, the majority of Caprivi’s population (43 per cent) is under the age of 15 years, indicating an annual growth rate of about 4 per cent. According to Mendelsohn and Roberts’ estimates, by the year 2010 Caprivi’s population will be 190,000 and well over 6 million by the end of the century. Regardless of the HIV/AIDS epidemic that is estimated to be the highest (33 per cent) in relation to the total population of a region in Namibia and an increase in education levels, it is claimed that the population will grow immensely.

At current estimates of life expectancy (54.1 for women and 40.9 years for men), Caprivi’s population is unlikely to grow as significantly as estimated. However, more land will have to be cleared for cultivation as many people depend on land-based activities for their livelihoods. Nonetheless there may be a need to control and lower population growth. Vast areas of land continue to be cleared for residential and agricultural purposes, especially along the Katima-Ngoma road. This increase can be explained by the availability of infrastructure along the road, such as tarred roads, electricity and telephones. Moreover, the regional capital has almost quadrupled in size and population since 1995. The major reason may be attributed to rural-urban migration and the relative growth in the local economy. The number of financial banking institutions, for instance, increased from one in 1995 to four in 2000. Another reason is due to the recent increase in the number of security personnel in the region.

Caprivi’s settlement pattern is such that people have residential homes in town and cattle posts and farmhouses by the bank of rivers where soil fertility is high. Once again, it is the natural presence of water and food that influences people’s settlement pattern. It is unlikely that Salambala residents’ pressure on land will lessen, owing to the settlement pattern and people’s loyalty toward agriculture. In 1906, some 40,000 head of cattle were observed in Caprivi (Fisch 1999a, 42). Over the years the number of cattle has been increasing rapidly to over 100,000 in 1989, and to about 124,000 in 1996 (GRN 1997). In the 1997/8 Annual Agricultural Survey, a total of 82,111 head of cattle,
72,729 goats, 135 sheep and 655 pigs were counted (GRN 1998, 9). In consumption terms each head of cattle takes at least 7.24 hectares of grazing land per year in its lifetime (ibid., 27).

Under normal circumstances goats are only gnawing animals and may not induce overgrazing if their population is controlled. The same is true for sheep and pigs, provided they do not devour shrubs completely. If, however, overgrazing happens erosion is likely to occur. There are no major changes between the 1997/8 and the 1998/9 annual agricultural censuses. According to Björkman (1999), 33,456 hectares of land were subjected to overgrazing by domestic animals in Caprivi in 1997 alone. Overgrazing in Caprivi happens largely because of the high number of livestock but also because of frequent drought and flood patterns. Because of drought and annual floods many communal farmers move their stock to the flood plains during drought or the floodplains residents migrate with their stock to higher ground during floods. These arrangements are carried out without prior investigation and as a result the carrying capacity is somewhat overreached by the presence of domestic livestock.

The first wildlife censuses in Caprivi were carried out between 1980 and 1990. These censuses were mainly carried out in designated conservation areas such as national parks and game reserves. Interestingly they show a continued increase in the elephant population from 410 in 1981, 884 in 1988 to 2946 in 1994 (Rodwell et al. 1995, 22). In some parts of the region, animals such as Cape hartebeests *Alcelaphus caama* (G. Cuvier), water bucks *Kobus ellipsiprymnus* (Ogilby) and red-lechwes *Kobus adenota leche* (Gray) were reduced from 49, 47 and 113 respectively to almost none in the 1994 census. These are not the only species reduced. Black rhinoceros *Diceros bicornis* (L.), for example, is said to be extinct in Caprivi. In the floodplains (these are flat valley-like low-lying areas which are flooded annually) in 1980 there were as many as 1088 lechwes, whereas in 1994 just over 450 were observed. This reduction is partly due to poaching and because of the lack of a proper conservation system that permits a ‘nobody’s business’ situation to arise.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the Caprivi Region with its abundant and diverse game, attracted ardent hunters and traders mainly from South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia. At the same time the region also became a sanctuary for
criminals (with modern guns and ammunition) from South Africa who came as asylum seekers. This situation led to an unfortunate but speedy depletion of game in Caprivi. Fisch (1999a, 47), for example, records that over 400 hippos, giraffes *Giraffa camelopardalis* sub species *angolensis wardi* (L.) and roan antelopes *Hippotragus equinus* (Desmarest) were hunted and shot by one Englishman in 1906 alone. He was one of the many dissidents from Botswana and South Africa who were hunting illegally in Caprivi. They were dissidents because they were escaping from prosecution and justice in their own countries. One reason for the reduction in animal population was the lack of law enforcement, and uncontrolled hunting, which was often done for sport and for commercial purposes.

Another reason was the disruption of traditional leadership structures that existed before colonisation. This meant that the traditional leaders could no longer exercise authority over their people properly. Fisch (1999a) also records that most people felt a sense of insecurity and fled the country into Botswana and Zambia. Nevertheless, considering the size of the region and its population, wildlife was undoubtedly abundant (in terms of local use) at the time. However, due to continued poaching, a new economic system and competition for territory with human beings, the population of wild game dried out like a tributary short of water from the main channel. By and large, it is tempting to conclude that the larger the human population, the higher the likelihood that game will disappear.

In spite of this, such a conclusion would be naive given that it is not population growth that is really the problem but the management and governance of resources and population. While there are human-induced problems that lead to wildlife reduction, natural causes such as drought are equally pronounced. Furthermore, the lack of law enforcement and the unsustainable management of the ecosystem also account for wildlife reduction. In addition, the competition for the use of resources has not been addressed adequately because of the perversity of the traditional and governmental laws. There is some evidence to suggest that the problem of communal wildlife management may be due to the absence of collaborative management of the natural resources and especially due to not taking into account the local economic situations. Quite ideally put, while people and wildlife have difficulty co-existing and increasing alongside to one another, the major challenge is how to reconcile their growth with that of community needs. Moreover, human beings have a choice to make, and a choice for more
sustainable use of resources at their disposal may have to be considered. Seasonal wild fires have also accounted for damage of large areas e.g. 410,012 hectares in 1997 and 394,796 hectares in 1998 (Björkman 1999).

Tourism in Caprivi generates substantial earnings for Namibia. An estimated 30,000-35,000 tourists visited the region in 1996 alone (Mendelsohn and Roberts 1998, 12). By international standards, however, such low figures indicate that the region belongs to the periphery of world tourism (Coltman 1989). The growth of tourism in Caprivi has been estimated at over 20 per cent during the past three years, a rate that is faster than tourism in Namibia as a whole. Caprivi’s tourism growth is largely attributed to the region being surrounded by some of sub-Sahara’s prime tourism destinations such as the Okavango Delta, Chobe National Park (Botswana), Dr David Livingstone’s Museum (Zambia) and Victoria Falls (Zimbabwe). Currently the trend has been somewhat reversed due to the political instability of 1998/9 and the spillover of the Angolan civil war.

Be that as it may, it is agriculture not tourism that is the main source of income and livelihood for the people of Caprivi. The Central Statistics Office’s 1999 estimates reveal that approximately 67 per cent of households have male heads with monthly income on average (N$5893) 20 per cent higher than those of female heads (N$4917). Overall, men tend to be employed in formal sectors while women are either unemployed or engaged in the informal sectors of the economy. A survey of agricultural practices in 1997/8 showed that 70 per cent of households had no source of income other than agriculture; 16 per cent received wages, 9 per cent depended on pensions and 5 per cent depended on funds from relatives as sources of revenue (GRN 1998, 34). Other activities, such as river-fishing, part-time work, arts and crafts, sale of firewood, beer brewing and domestic livestock farming, form part of the informal economy in the region.

According to GRN (1999b, 10-12), as with communal farms, none of the 10,882 farms visited used fertiliser and only 2 per cent used farm manure. In the 1997/8 farming season 20,851 hectares of land were cleared and under cultivation. Land under cultivation for the farming season 1998/9 (16,603 hectares) was relatively smaller than the previous year. Besides communal farming (mainly farming for the pot), some surpluses are sold at the local market in Katima Mulilo. Moreover, Naeraa et al. (1993,
41) argued that in Caprivi ‘formal as well as informal employment is more pronounced than in other rural areas in Namibia’.

Salambala Conservancy is a grass-root association formed by members of the Masubiya ethnic community but established by an act of law. After several years of state bureaucracy, in June 1998 Salambala was registered and made into a legal agency by the government. There are no exact population figures available for Salambala and therefore the population can only be estimated based on Mendelsohn and Roberts’ 1998 report on Caprivi. Indications are that the Conservancy could shelter an estimated five hundred households with an average of 5-8 persons per household. The concept of household is a very fluid one. Presently and in this text the concept of household is defined as a home comprised of one or more people living and sharing meals together regardless of whether they live in one house or not.
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Figure 1: Map of Caprivi Region.

By boundary description, Salambala Conservancy is located between 17°39′24″ S and 17°25′13″ S, and 24°32′45″ E and 24°48′19″ E. The Conservancy consists of two management area types. A wildlife breeding ground constitutes a core area of approximately 14,000 hectares. According to the constitution of the Conservancy, in this
area there should be no human interference or activities. Secondly, it consists of a buffer zone, a surrounding multiple-use area where the Conservancy’s residents live and practise agriculture. The total area of the Conservancy is 93,300 hectares. While the western, northern and southern parts of the core area are currently fenced, the easternmost part of the Conservancy core area is open to allow incoming migratory game from Chobe National Park (in Botswana along the border between Namibia and Botswana) to enter the Conservancy.

Keeping this part of the core area open is important because it allows the ecological process that is already ongoing to continue. Large mammals of the park migrate habitually, seasonally and annually into the Conservancy. Some of them, especially elephants and buffaloes, proceed through to Zambia, then into Zimbabwe before returning to Botswana. Government official sources also indicated that predators such as lions, spotted hyenas *Crocuta crocuta* (Erxleben) and wild dogs *Lycaon pictus* (Temminck) are major migrants during the annual dry season when the River Chobe subsides. In some areas the river dries out completely, making it easier for predators from the park to cross into the conservancy. Nonetheless, animal migration patterns form part of their spatial territory. The migration cycle happens once a year between June and August.

The climate of eastern Caprivi is subtropical, with dry-cold winters and hot-wet summers. Salambala’s core area has swamps whose surroundings are covered by woodlands and savannah bushes. The dominant tree species is the *Colophospermum mopane* (J.Kirk ex Benth., J.Kirk ex J. Léonard), a 7-10 metre tree with a stunted shape (Erkkilä and Siiskonen 1992, 23). For the most part, the local people use mopane trees for the construction of houses, schools and cattle kraals, and other people use mopane for arts and crafts. While the core area is predominantly a combination of mopane and Acacia tree species, the floodplains and the Kalahari woodlands predominantly form a part of the buffer zone (Mendelsohn and Roberts 1998).

The rainy season is between November and March (summer); the monthly mean temperature of 20°C and 5°C in winter (ibid., 7). The estimated annual mean precipitation of Salambala is 600 mm. However, with high temperatures the area is more prone to high evaporation rates. With clear skies and sparse cloud cover, Caprivi as a
whole has a potential annual evaporation rate of about 2500 mm of water per year, which accounts for over four times the volume of water normally provided by rain and other open waters from annual floods (ibid.). Even though frost is unusual it may occur in low-lying riverine areas and valleys. Due to irregular rainy seasons, Lake Liambezi has been dry since 1984 and the Bukalo channels stopped flowing already in the late 1970s.

There are six land types, namely open water, floodplains, riverine woodlands, mopane woodlands, Kalahari woodlands and Impalila woodlands. As a whole Caprivi has a total of about 36 vegetation environs. Caprivi’s vegetation is influenced by four factors, namely soil, floods, human activity and population increase. Notwithstanding the geographical location of the region, climatic considerations also make the ‘economic potential of the region much greater’ (Naeraa et al. 1993, 41). In comparison with other regions in Namibia, Caprivi is well served by rain with an annual precipitation of more than 700 mm, the highest in Namibia (GRN 1999a, 5-15), and it increases eastwards.

Educational services in the Conservancy are on average good compared with other areas in Namibia. Within the area, there are two education circuit inspection offices and two high schools, one at Bukalo where the Masubiya traditional headquarters is situated and another at Ngoma border village, home of both the incumbent chief and his predecessor. In addition there are seven combined schools and six primary schools. Combined schools have both junior secondary and primary school pupils. Pertaining to health services, there is one health centre and three clinics operational within the Conservancy. Some areas of the Conservancy also have both telephone and electricity power lines. The campsite in the core area operates on a solar panel system.

The road between Katima Mulilo and Ngoma that leads to Botswana has been tarred and completed. On the one hand, its completion has paved the way for cross-border trade between Namibia and other southern African countries. Contrary to development plans, the completion of the road also presents the risk of HIV/AIDS and other disease transmissions from and to the neighbouring countries. On the other hand, however, infrastructure has meant more internal migration from the floodplains into the Conservancy area. This migration also means that more land should be cleared for human habitation and cultivation. The clearing of land for the latter suggests that trouble
EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Research problem

The relationships between conservation authorities and local communities have been in somewhat of a conflict all over the world. Internationally, this issue has been particularly negative on those people commonly described as tribes or indigenous communities (Norström 1995). Most rural communities live off the surrounding forests. In many cases, they do not only depend on nature for food, shelter and medicines but also for spiritual strength. As the civil liberties of local communities become an issue, authorities take steps meant to reduce or even, where possible, avoid potential conflicts.

However, communities’ continuous demand for easier access to natural resources within protected areas is usually met with resistance. As the cases in southern Asia illustrate (ibid.; Madsen 1996, 5), tense confrontations sometimes result from the management and use of natural resources. The conflicts do not usually result from the demands for survival only but also from the very pressure that the animals in the protected areas put on the livelihood of the people living within buffer zones e.g. through the destruction of crops and killing of livestock. On the other hand, community activities such as poaching, farming, animal harassment and woodcutting activities limit the territory and freedom of the animals.

In southern Africa, particularly in South Africa and Namibia, in many cases when parks and other protected areas were established the local communities were evicted from their homes. Subsequently they were not allowed to hunt wild animals and gather plants in such areas as they had done for many years. However, these same ‘protected’ animals continued to ruin their livelihoods by destroying their crops and livestock. From time to time, cases of injuries or deaths of individuals were also reported (Munyaradzi and
Johnson 1996). In Zimbabwe, elephants and/or buffaloes have reportedly killed over 100 people since 1986 (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheet No. 7).

In eastern Africa, the Masai people, a tribe in Kenya and Tanzania, also complain of elephants destroying their crops and killing their cattle (Ransom 2000). Yet they have to protect these animals that do not provide them with any compensation to cover for the losses they cause. A live elephant in Kenya is worth US$14,375 in income from tourists for every year of its life. According to Ransom, elephant-related tourism in Kenya brings about US$200 million each year (ibid.). With the alleged high level of corruption and undemocratic tendencies in the country, Kenya’s wildlife revenue partly benefits individuals more than the local communities. Like in Kenya, the CAMPFIRE programme suggests that every elephant account for US$33,000 in trophy hunting fees per year per district in Zimbabwe. A substantial amount goes to the communities while the state and safari or professional hunting companies gain disproportionate revenues. However, with political instability and continuous economic crisis, Zimbabwe is not immune to the phenomenon of benefiting the few. Previously, when people did not benefit, they tended to be hostile and their enmity toward animals was very high. CAMPFIRE claims that this tendency in Zimbabwe has changed.

In Namibia the tourism sector was set and declared in 1991 to be a priority for economic development. According to GRN (1994), at that time little information was available regarding the potential of the tourism industry in Namibia. Due to this vacuum of hard facts the Commission of the European Union, ‘…engaged Hoff and Overgaard as consultants through the National Planning Commission…’ to gather facts at the request of the then Wildlife, Conservation and Tourism Ministry (ibid., 30). The aim was to undertake a study of Namibia’s tourism potential and to try and devise a five-year Tourism Development Plan and action programme covering the years 1993–1997 and an action programme with some applications up to 2002. That report culminated in a White Paper on Tourism Development (1994). According to the White Paper, training of staff is one important aspect that influences the expected increase in tourist arrivals and the consequent development that results from it. Lack of training was also identified as a major barrier that may jeopardise the tourism sector. Training is greatly required in departments that render services directly to the tourists. To some extent there is a shortage of well-educated staff in the Namibian tourism sector.
It appears, however, that not all tourists require luxurious facilities. They are looking for natural and more scenic accommodation. The recent creation of a Tourism Board is seen as a milestone in this industry and in Namibia as a whole. The board will be tasked with the networking of stakeholders, ensuring that all Namibians benefit from tourism at their level and turning Namibians themselves into domestic tourists. This is important for two reasons. First, because nation building has not been fully achieved, the need for most Namibians to visit regions they do not live in exists. As people explore the regions, they will understand other ethnic groups’ cultures and traditions and, hence, more healthy relations amongst Namibians may be instilled. Secondly, it is important for Namibians to be domestic tourists as this awakens them to what other Namibians are busy doing in terms of self-employment. And thirdly, domestic tourism is important because it increases national unity while simultaneously decreasing negative elements such as tribalism, racism and communalism.

In Caprivi, about 100 cases of elephants destroying crops are reported each year. At the same time over 80 cases of lions and hyenas killing domesticated animals are reported every year (Mendelsohn and Roberts 1998). Statistics given to me at the Department of Wildlife Resource Management in Katima Mulilo show that the rate of ‘problem animals’ occurrence for the period January–December 2000 increased to 142 from 80 in 1996. Of the 142, 61 were elephant cases. This is mainly because the elephants’ population has increased. Since the majority of the animals reported to be problematic are elephants (61), lions (41), crocodiles (10), hyenas (8), buffaloes (7), hippos (6) and leopards *Panthera pardus* (L.) (3), it has become clear that the question of wildlife conservation is also a matter of communal wildlife management. With the absence of a compensation policy, the authorities face an increasingly difficult task.

This issue has a two-way protracted dilemma. On the one hand there are conflicts between rural people and conservation staff over natural resource control. In addition authorities know that there is an increase in illegal hunting that communities do in order to survive amid poverty. On the other hand, while the real enemy to be faced is poverty, authorities also have to seek ways and means of reconciling the pressure that communities are putting on the land with the pressure that ‘problem animals’ put on the communities. Furthermore, the attempts to reconcile the latter with the former must
meet the local communities’ livelihood systems and must ensure that culture is not negatively affected in the introduction of new ways of thinking and living.

The last three years have seen drastic internal migration from the floodplains and wetlands into the uplands of Ngoma and Ikumwe. These areas form a part of Salambala’s savannah woodlands and mopane, increasing south-westward into the core area. The reason for the internal migration can be attributed to the proximity to infrastructure and better services. By and large, internal migration means less and less grazing land for large mammals like elephants, hippos and buffaloes. In some areas these mammals seem to turn to crops as pasture, provoking anger in the local community. Although rural communities have close cultural links with the natural world, because of their threatened livelihood they still see game as a problem. This is especially true at Ikumwe, which official sources described to be an area badly affected mainly by elephants.

During my visit in Salambala’s core area in January 2001, it was reported that a day before my visit a nearby village had trouble with two lions, but no losses were reported. The two beasts are residents of the core area. A survey conducted by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism showed that most communities in certain areas are hostile to nature conservation officials and that they regard them as ‘policemen’ (GRN 1995). The background behind this distrust can be partly explained by the actions of the security forces during the colonial era. At that time, police or security force members were not seen as peacemakers and not as someone you could run to when you were in trouble, but rather someone you should avoid at all times.

In Caprivi, there is increased enmity toward animals among impoverished communities. According to the Government of Namibia (ibid., 7) communities in eastern Caprivi strongly resisted the stationing of the anti-poaching units close to their villages and devised ambush tactics against rangers, in error shooting a postman instead. In some instances, hostilities have extended to stealing fences and to the deliberate pushing of cattle into parks. Negativism towards some animals, especially ‘problem animals’ such as elephants and lions, has not changed. These hostilities, however, are not only a result of colonial history but they are more and more becoming a question of governance and lack of contextual policy by governments.
Recently, there has been an ongoing legal battle between two families and the government in Salambala Conservancy east of Katima Mulilo. The families have claimed that they are being forced to move out of Salambala core area and that the authorities by doing so are threatening their very survival. From this, it is clear that wildlife conservation and community livelihoods are issues that must be investigated in detail. The support of the people who live side by side with both the protected areas and the animals is crucial in seeking solutions. These are the people without whom neither has much of a future (CAMPFIRE Internet Page, Fact Sheet No. 4; see also Norström 1995).

Most conservancies are in rural areas and usually adjacent to a national park, game or nature reserve. This fact results in two connected issues. First, there is a need for the protection of nature. Secondly, there is a conflicting relationship between the implementing party and the local people who used the same area for their daily livelihood before the protected areas were established. Can there be a workable formula to lessen this conflicting, dynamic yet complex issue? It was therefore important to find out what has happened since the establishment of Salambala Conservancy.

Currently, the Conservancy has an annual hunting quota of two elephants per year and each elephant is expected to generate N$50,000. The Conservancy has generated N$200,800 mostly from trophy hunting, bird hunting and a little from the campsite between the years 1998 and 2000. At the time of the research, the Conservancy was to pay out N$40,000 to the 20 communities within the Conservancy, which works out at N$2000 per community. The traditional headquarters of the homogeneous Masubiya was also to pocket N$2000. Even though the payments were a type of ‘thank you for support’, in essence this was a matter of procedure as the Conservancy constitution stipulates and requires that the community at public meetings should decide the use of the income generated.

As per constitutional requirements, these payments were decided at a community meeting and were in line with the Conservancy’s policy on financial benefits. The policy states that the use of money ‘shall be decided by the members at an annual general meeting or special general meeting and in accordance with the principles and guidelines
laid out by the Salambala Conservancy Benefits Distribution Plan’ (Salambala Conservancy 1998, 7). The funds, however, must come from the Community Trust Fund (CTF), which is outside the operational budget. In other words these were the monies not required for the daily operational expenses of the Conservancy. Being aware of the apparent success of the CAMPFIRE approach in Zimbabwe, this complex and yet confusing relationship led me to ask: How appropriate is the CAMPFIRE model of Community-Based Tourism for Namibia?

2.2 Research objective

This research project encourages the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET), Namibia Community Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA), Federation of Namibia Tourism Association (FENATA), Salambala Conservancy and the University of Namibia to develop a regional community-level capacity to undertake research and seek an appropriate approach to conservation and rural development. In theory, such research should enable rural communities to use natural resources at their disposal in a sustainable manner. In addition, the project reinforces the sustainable use of natural resources at the community level and instils the attitude of conservation and ownership in the local people, using the available resources responsibly and in a sustainable manner.

At the same time, the project seeks to invoke the establishment of a working group within the study area. A working group in this context means the collective efforts of all the shareholders (or interest groups) to ensure that the Conservancy’s goals are achieved, and would consist of all those who concern themselves with the day-to-day running of the Conservancy and all it implies. It is hoped that the project will provide a framework for evaluating the implementation of community-based tourism ventures in communal and wildlife-protected areas in the future.

By using the CAMPFIRE approach, the objectives of this study are:
- To investigate the possibility of directing potential income to the local community from CBT;
- To assess the response of the local community to potential tourists and tourism; and
• To identify potential problems that may occur with the application of the CAMPFIRE model.

Wherever conservation measures are implemented in conservancies, community needs and priorities should be taken into account. Before measures are taken, community participation is equally important. Why is community participation important? There are four reasons why community participation in defining needs, resources and priorities is essential. Community participation is important because any type of development is likely to have socio-economic impacts on the very community in which it is being employed, and some negative impacts are undeniable. For this reason, resource management requires not only a new way of managing resources but also a way of prioritising, assessing and determining what constitutes positive development.

First, it is important to involve the community because that is how the support of a development project or tourism venture can be achieved. Secondly, land and land use in rural areas is not just a matter of theory and practice. It is, therefore, important to bear in mind that land is not just a ‘thing’, but also a condensation of social relations (Mbuende 1986, 144). Land and land use are factors that determine the sense of being and existence. Hence, it is vital to seek the ‘inside context’ that must provide some understanding of how rural communities function and the bureaucracy that they contain.

Thirdly, not all really know and/or have an idea what is of importance to a local community, what is of religious value and that which is regarded as taboo. By communicating with the rural communities, resource managers would know what is important and what is not a resource to the community concerned. Lastly, participation is important for the community itself to determine its priorities and to achieve the desired goal with appropriate technical help.

In the case of Salambala Conservancy, community involvement should help minimise the costs and increase the support of the community so that they can invest in tourism ventures as a resource. Having an ongoing participation plan, the people who live in the Conservancy, people who are involved directly or indirectly in decision-making and providing the required know-how to the community, could derive benefits from community-based conservation and tourism. As far as southern Africa is concerned, Zimbabwe and Zambia hold some of the most successful stories in wildlife utilisation
Their approach has been the teaming-up and collaboration with the state, NGOs and traditional authorities to seek a workable formula of wildlife management and rural development. The focus has been shifting from absolute conservation to controlled utilisation of wildlife. Unfortunately, in speculative terms, these same countries have also ruined their chance in international eco-tourism because of alleged corruption and undemocratic reputations.

2.3 Theoretical framework

From the outset, it is important to point out that, my theoretical discussion will not focus on the modernisation theory, in other words the problems discussed earlier are because of a clash between traditional and commercial economic systems. Neither will I focus on the underdevelopment theory, i.e. the traditional sector no longer exists, as capitalism has penetrated it through, permitting a market-sector research focus. It should be noted also, that tourism and conservation are discussed as two issues in one, namely natural resource management. The locus of this study is therefore on the ways sought to manage the existing conflicts, not on their genesis. Hence, first it is important to discuss the concepts with which conservation is associated.

The concept of tourism has been in common use for decades. However, what it exactly means has been a subject of debate. Is it a term explaining the concentration of peoples who are having leisure time in certain places, and interacting with nature? Is it just socio-economic activity that travellers do out of normal place of residence? Just as Boniface and Cooper (1995, 1-2) also ask, is tourism part and parcel of leisure and recreation? If leisure is the measure of time spent during after-work hours, then recreation is the variety of activities executed during leisure time. If this assumption is correct, then tourism is one of those activities (ibid., 1). However, tourism is not that simple to define.

There are many definitions of tourism. Mathieson and Wall (1982) define tourism as the temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal place of work and residence, the activities undertaken during their stay in these destinations, and the facilities created to cater for their needs. This definition almost entirely ignores the importance and types of the resources at the destination area. What, then, is community-
based tourism? In this thesis, community-based tourism refers to the activities and initiatives of the local people in a specific rural destination where the local residents are catering for tourists’ needs with and within the available resources. Clearly, community-based tourism is but a distinctive form of recreation and a spectrum of the travel scene that demands separate research consideration.

Before examining the distinctive nature of community-based tourism, there are variables to consider about tourism in general. First, tourism takes place in various forms e.g. international, domestic, business tourism, and so on. Secondly, there are generation areas (where tourists come from) and destination areas (where they arrive). Thirdly, in geographical terms tourism is a spatial human activity that must be studied at a variety of scales ranging from international to peripheral worlds of tourism. Some theorists have argued that tourism should be defined by considering practice, measurement and legislation (Cooper et al. 1999). In other words it should be defined by looking at its demand side and the supply side, not just needs. For some writers, however, this is conveniently suppressed because ‘defining tourism in terms of motivation [of action] or other characteristics of travellers would be like trying to define the health-care professions by describing a sick person’ (Smith 1989, 33).

Others continue to argue that it is important to define tourism from a demand-side perspective because then you can conceptualise the economic value that tourism contributes. As argued by the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2000), the definition of tourism can be examined if it has a supply (output) and demand (input refers to inflow of activities and revenue) side, and can be used to measure tourism’s impact on employment. In the view of WTTC, by looking at the consumer expenditure and the revenue that countries derive from travel companies, one would be able to find a way by which the contribution of tourism to the overall economy may be calculated.

There are mainly two approaches to defining the concept though, i.e. the descriptive and the technical viewpoints. As Leiper (1979, 400) suggested ‘the tourist industry consists of all those firms, organisations and facilities which are intended to serve the specific needs and wants of tourists’. Researchers are often tempted to define the tourism industry and its activities rather than the concept of tourism itself. This is partly because tourism is activity-driven rather than principle-based. Another reason is that the
discipline of tourism is relatively new (Cooper et al. 1999). Nonetheless, the individual institutions that offer services to tourists are either directly or indirectly part of the definition.

In the present case, any individual or organisational body aspiring to offer one form of tourism or another is part of the industry. For instance, a municipality or a village council would qualify to be defined as an institution within the tourism industry as it serves the needs and wants of travellers. Thus in this thesis, the concept of tourism refers to and is treated mainly from a supplier perspective. Even though demand is primarily about customer satisfaction, there are also other factors that reduce demand e.g. wars, economic recessions, natural disasters, and so on. Resources at the destination ‘supplier’ remain intact in spite of all demand affecting the factors mentioned above.

Nonetheless, I take a supplier’s perspective because the sustainability of activities and services offered by the community to visitors is central to this research, and the focus is also on responsible use and management of natural resources at the destination. Hence, sustainable development and its success should be measured at the geographical space (in this case Salambala Conservancy) where it is or is to be practised. Tourism as such is not limited to international demand but can be supply-driven in consideration of local (domestic) products and demand. Obviously it is also affected by the international state of the various sectors of the economy, e.g. price of petroleum and the state of linked sectors that affect it.

In terms of community-based tourism and according to its definition, rural villagers are tourism suppliers if they directly offer an opportunity for tourists to take photos, or buy souvenirs, or indirectly by simply avoiding or limiting the cutting of trees and increasing the chances for conservation of animals. In a way, community-based conservation is about giving the tourists an opportunity to meet their needs. On the other hand, the technical approach is concerned with differentiation between those services that are heavily dependent on travellers and those that can still be served domestically. Above and beyond, whichever scale and approach one takes, tourism has many players who play different games in different places.
In order to ‘oblige’ a measure of quality, WTO and UNEP decided to develop a Standard International Classification of Tourism Activities (SICTA) which may help service providers render effective service to their clients (WTO and UNEP 1994; Cooper et al. 1999). The approach is intended to be consistent with other industrial sectors and to provide a framework that allows the gauging of the tourism sector. In other words, those institutions that offer activities that do not meet the SICTA requirements are offering a poor service to tourists. However, there are no systematic mechanisms of ensuring the transference of the SICTA requirements from paper to operations.

In operational, innovative and academic practice, the definition of tourism really depends on the perspective one is taking, i.e. whether from a demand side, supply side, or both. To try to develop and encourage consensus on the definition of tourism, it was agreed that there must be a working definition (WTO and UNEP 1994). The consensus was that tourism should be defined as ‘the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes’. Thus this suggests that should the stay be more than 12 months then such a movement may be considered to be a long journey. Not surprisingly, this ignores the intensity of activity and only considers the time period. The focus is on ‘what’ tourists may do ‘when’ (time) they travel to ‘where’ (destination) they go but fails to point out ‘why’ (motive). What is more important about tourism, however, is that it cannot be defined and/or it is incomplete if motivation is absent. Tourists’ travel intentions and actual travelling between places are motivated, they do not just travel without reason. See Coltman (1989) for detailed discussions on travel motivations.

From a conceptual demand-side point of view, there are several essential aspects of tourism. First, tourism arises out of movements of people in various places to various destinations. Secondly, it suggests that there is travel and activities to be done at the destination. Thirdly, the travel and activities take place outside the usual places of residence. Fourthly, the move has specific intended activities, a limited time frame and a specific purpose. Finally, the intention of permanent residence or taking up an employment opportunity is not desired (Cooper et al. 1999, 9).
As with the demand side, in the context of this thesis, the supply side’s essential aspects of tourism include, first, that rurality is a potential tourist resource. Secondly, the interaction with and the reception of tourists are rendered with dignity and with integrity by the host and hostess. Thirdly, services are not provided to fit demand but in accordance with the ability to source them locally. To conclude, motivation and work can be related, thus work may be done but with zero payment expectation, e.g. a tourist may volunteer to build a house with the locals or herd cattle with them. However, he or she is not expected to charge or be paid any wages. Such an arrangement deduces that those tourists willing and able to participate in local work can do so if they so wish. This would also motivate and satisfy some tourists who may be interested in so-called development work in the host place. Such tourism is referred to as sustainable tourism development.

Diamantis and Ladkin (1999, 35-36) record that in 1993 the World Tourism Organisation identified three principles that embrace the concept of sustainable tourism development:

a) *Ecological sustainability*: tourism should demonstrate that development is compatible with the maintenance of essential ecological processes, biological resources and the diversity that the earth contains;

b) *Social and cultural sustainability*: by and large tourism should increase communities’ control over their lives and it must be compatible with their values, culture and ethics that are affected by it. In addition it is also assumed that tourism strengthens and maintains a community identity; and

c) *Economic sustainability*: in view of the number of people involved, it is also assumed that tourism development supports the use, management and exploitation of local resources for future generations while ensuring economic efficiency for the current generation.

In developing countries, there are two other requirements that sustainable tourism development should fulfil: a) the use of non-renewable resources should be limited parallel to the quantity of renewable substitutes created in the process of tourism supply;
and b) the emission of wastes should be within the carrying capacity of the ecosystem (Gössling 2000). Unfortunately, it is not always the case that tourism practices follow these principles. Not all tourists and suppliers engage in sustainable activities even if they consider whatever they do as such. Carter (1992) provides an insightful discussion and example on this trend in the Central American state of Belize. Sustainable ecotourism is ‘not even guaranteed to be ecologically sensitive, let alone sustainable as far as host populations, tourists and the environment itself is concerned’ (ibid., 20). For an activity to be sustainable, local community must necessarily view it to be delivering positive results. Moreover, the communities need to be informed as to why and what the mission of the tourists is.

Over the years, the concept of sustainable tourism development has generated a voluminous debate. In the context of tourism and wildlife management, more recently the focus has begun to shift from the traditional view (see discussion in section 2.1 and Chapter 3) to one of harmonising the relationship between animals and people. As far as the advocates of the latter approach are concerned, it is a question of preserving rather than destroying (Briguglio et al. 1996). Critics of this approach argue that the traditional approach to nature conservation does not solve the real problem and that the results are rarely sustainable by both the wildlife management and the local community (Brown and Wyckoff-Baird 1992). Besides, the proponents of sustainable conservation claim that government and institutions have not addressed the dynamic relationship between game, plants and people adequately. The proponents of the sustainable tourism development theory (Goeldner et al. 2000; France 1997; and Briguglio et al. 1996) have argued that sustainable tourism uses resources in such a way that they are not exhausted. It is important, however, to note that not all industrial practices of tourism are sustainable.

In recent years, issues of sustainable tourism have been a subject of discussion and have generated copious texts ranging from criticism to support for its applicability. One thorny issue, which is discussed in this thesis, is that it is often taken for granted that the communities also take the view of the sustainability advocates who see animals, forests, and culture as a resource. It is, in Howitt’s (2001, 156) words, this ‘common sense approach to resource management that reproduces injustice, inequality, intolerance and unsustainability’. Rees (1985, 11-13), on the other hand, argues that before any element
can be classified as a resource it must meet two basic preconditions. First, knowledge and technical skills must exist to allow the proper extraction and utilisation of the resource. Secondly, there must be a demand for the materials or semi-products produced.

In Rees’ (ibid.) analysis, if none of the above is met, then a particular thing cannot be classified as a resource but rather ‘just natural stuff’. This approach, however, is not appropriate in community-based natural resources because it supposes conditions that most communities may not meet. A resource does not have to be officially and/or technically appraised to be seen as such by a community; if anything, it has value in kind and degree for them. In my view, resources should be defined and classified by the locals not determined by agencies. Because human beings define resources, usually what constitutes a resource varies and depends on those who define it and for what purpose, in relation to the perceived user. In other words, a resource does not exist until one puts a value on it. That value may be having two sides, one being a value which is not tangible and the other being a value of use in physical terms.

No matter how important government views are on a particular project, it must have community support for it to be successful (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheets No.13; Munyaradzi and Johnson 1996; IIED 1994). Usually, it is institutions and planning agencies and not communities that appraise the usefulness of a specific environment for the purpose of attaining a specific end (Howitt 2001, 158-160). However, as we will later see, natural resource management now more than ever demands a rethinking of approaches. For something to be of significance to the community there must be consideration of what constitutes a resource in the eyes of the community. Is it important for a community to identify what is to be sustained? Who should decide this? What is and what is not implementable? How do we determine future needs? What experiences do future generations desire? What are the yardsticks with which to measure losses or gains? Must our efforts at all times be sustainable, or is it possible to achieve sustainability after we initially practise unsustainable activities? Just as Smit (2001) questions ‘if the goal of sustainability is to meet human needs, which needs are these, how and when do we know these needs are met’?
When explaining rural socio-economic dynamics and the search for sustainability, it is impossible to base a one-theory perspective on political or economic and/or social emancipation, including tourism, conservation and wildlife management. Moreover, there is no one specific procedure for rural economic revival. Many researchers e.g. Grabher and Stark (1997), Hugo et al. (1997) and Howitt (2001), have reasoned that rural socio-economic growth does not evolve along a single hierarchical path towards a new economic order, but rather rural development proceeds via a comprehensive set of tryouts, slip-ups and triumphs. It is the approach to these trials, errors and successes that we need to re-cogitate. Regions and communities develop out of a combination of factors that affect indirectly or directly the actors of development in those regions.

In order to understand a rural community comprehensively, one can imagine a gambling house. Many different kinds of people visit it; many play, but few win. Some know the rules and tricks of a game better than others; some are more skilled than others. Different people choose to play different games in different ways. While the players cannot change the rules of the game, there are rules in place and they are subject to different interpretations. Where they are written, some players are illiterate yet they play the game anyway. In the end, we cannot possibly master the different but yet interrelated games in a gambling house.

As the game continues, both the losers and the winners are all anyway searching for an economic supplement for survival. Rural communities are like that, even though there are interrelated issues of natural resource use, tourism, wildlife, conservation, poverty, culture, agriculture and law. Inasmuch there are issues of economic and environmental use, there cannot be a single outright solution. A solution to agriculture may affect wildlife and a solution to poverty may negatively affect culture. The introduction of tourism may also result in problems of sex tourism and can thus significantly affect culture.

Due to the diversity in scope, kind and degree of issues, what is required is a network evolutionary approach, where economics, sociology, law, geography, history, marketing and religion are studied and advanced forward to a specific rural development project. It must be noted, however, that each of these systems and disciplines is complex and dynamic in its own right (Howitt 2001). Of course this makes the process tedious, but
sustainable development is not an inherent characteristic of any existing form or situation but a goal that all must strive to achieve. Applied like this, sustainable development in rural areas and elsewhere is not a resulting phase or static product but a style of operation that must continuously permit the ‘landless’ to attain economic empowerment.

In terms of community-based tourism, there are also different players, officials, and managers in a specific rural settlement. Some decisions may be deemed natural but other decisions may be due to spatial diffusion of innovations, skills and technological availability. Overall, no matter how peripheral an area may be, international event affect what goes on in a specific local area. The recent terrorism in the United States of America, for instance, has meant less travel. Not only the tourism industry is affected, but also the financial markets to which many travel-related industries are linked. For example for an airliner to fly, creditors must inject money, lawyers must be engaged in legal advisory, fuel must be available and affordable, agriculture must be in continued production to produce food, and there must be no political instability. Sustainable tourism and conservation development and CBT lack a Network Evolutionary Approach that recognises the need to think globally but yet act locally in a systematic but holistic manner. It must be mentioned here that this does not mean everything will go well, rather it helps in reducing avoidable potential problems.

2.4 Research methodology

Two research methods were employed in this project. First, a questionnaire survey on a sampled population within Salambala Conservancy was carried out. The field-work survey was done from December 2000 through January 2001. A total number of 60 copies of the survey questionnaire (Appendix 3) were planned for the research work. Among these, four questionnaires were given to different institutions that requested them during discussions with the researcher, and the remaining 56 were used for the survey purposes. The institutions that were given the interview questions and the survey questionnaire include the University of Namibia (Academic Affairs and Research Office), Ministry of Environment and Tourism (Office of the Permanent Secretary) in Windhoek, the directorate of resource management in Katima Mulilo (Chief Warden,
eastern Caprivi) and the Salambala management committee (Executive Committee). The survey was carried out in 18 different communities (villages).

The prospective respondents were targeted by using a simple random procedure, and this was done because the survey was not intended to ‘classify people, their circumstance and their environment’ (Flowerdew and Martin 1999, 77). Rather the research was seeking a more analytical approach that would help explain why the current situation in the Conservancy is what it is. As Flowerdew and Martin (ibid., 78) argue, ‘analytical surveys are concerned more with explanations and causality… and are therefore more frequently adopted by academic researchers’. Another reason why random sampling was employed is because I supposed that since the Conservancy was established already in 1998, the general community would have some knowledge about how the Conservancy is progressing and what it is doing. Furthermore, Salambala Conservancy has not been evaluated since its inception in 1998. However, during the survey it became clear that the community did not have a proper idea of how the Conservancy functions.

To ensure that each person had an equal probability of being selected and to avoid bias, I took the first house on my right in each village and then the third house on the left. Nevertheless, it was discovered that the population is eminently homogenous. As a result, the probability of difference in opinion occurring between the sample size and the general population from which it was derived would therefore not pose an error (ibid., 81). For field-work purposes, I used the interviewer–administered questionnaire survey technique (ibid., 82). In addition, observations were part of my field-work techniques. The purpose of field-work was not just to collect data but also to be able to be part of an ongoing socio-cultural setting. In a way, by being onsite one is able to see, hear and feel, and thus better understand the phenomenon studied.

There are a number of advantages in applying observation as a technique in research. As Patton (1990, 202) reflects, one purpose of field work is ‘to describe the setting that was observed, the activities that took place in that setting, the people who participated in the activities, and the meaning of what was observed from the perspective of those observed’. By doing field observation, I was able to see things largely ignored in meetings and discussions. For example, neither authorities nor Conservancy residents
spoke about land degradation, deforestation, or the problems associated with communal land management. Yet these problems are widespread.

In Patton’s view, observations are affected by time in so far that time enables one to ‘combine participation and observation so as to become capable of understanding the program as an insider while describing the program for outsiders’ (ibid., 207). In this case, time insignificantly affected this study because I have known the study area for many years. However, since societies are dynamic, it is possible that there could have been changes that had taken place in my absence. It should be noted here that since I am Caprivian, partiality should not be overruled.

Field observations brought about the understanding that what is considered a resource to government may not necessarily be so to the community. In the background, there was much talk in villages, for example about the future of the sacred forest in the area. Apparently, there are plans to build a lodge on the bank of the River Chobe just adjacent to the sacred forest. Due to the location of the forest, and the fact that it is a largely undisturbed environment, animals from the nearby Chobe National Park habitually enter the area making it a tourist attraction, at least so in the eyes of those who want to develop the place for such purposes. However, as one member of the community enlightened me in the interviews, should such a plan be carried out, it would constitute a threat to our sense of existence.

Another method that I employed were the qualitative interviews with key informants from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (Directorate of Resource Management) in Caprivi, the NACOBTA Caprivi representative, church leaders, youth, traditional authorities and the executive committee of Salambala Conservancy (Appendix 4). A total of nine interviews were carried out with the above representatives. The institutions had the liberty to assign a specific person who, in their view, was best equipped with issues related to tourism development, wildlife management and/or who was responsible for handling research inquiries. The interviews were tape-recorded and notes were also written. The transcription of the taped interviews and hand-written notes were both revised and summarised after field work. The results of the interviews are discussed throughout the research and not in a separate section.
An interview with the regional authorities to get a sense of the political plans towards tourism was not possible despite attempts. One reason that might explain this is that most politicians were still on recess as it was a holiday season in Namibia. As a result, it was difficult to arrange meetings with them. During field work, it came to my attention that both the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) officials and the Salambala Conservancy management authorities were aware of the CAMPFIRE approach. However, in the discussions with me, it became clear that what the officials knew about CAMPFIRE had more to do with how the distribution of funds from trophy hunting is carried out.

Outside of this, they also knew about the shortcomings that have occurred with the implementation of the CAMPFIRE approach in Zimbabwe. For instance, one member of the Salambala Conservancy executive committee indicated that the communities in Zimbabwe are not in charge of their money and that is the reason why we are proud of this Conservancy arrangement. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism sources at Katima Mulilo specifically referred to taxation on communal wildlife revenues in Zimbabwe as a particular failure and its absence in Namibia as an achievement. The rationale behind the withdrawal of taxation appears to be an attempt to empower the communities economically in the shortest possible time. Politically, the policy of no taxation may be explained as part of the advocacy for decentralisation in Namibia. Be that as it may, there are no plans and measures to institute community-based planning at the regional level.

Because of the nature of this research and the culture and norms of the community, focus group method could not be used. It is very seldom acceptable for a younger person to differ openly with an elder person’s opinion. A contrary view can be taken as a sign of disrespect. Thus respondents may answer questions to appease their seniors rather than give their honest opinions. Moreover, focus groups have a well-known disadvantage such as the dominance of one or two members or the most respected members (Patton 1990; Chambers 1992).

As the aim of this research was not to change the culture, the focus group technique was intentionally avoided. Referring to data analysis, the quantitative field materials were analysed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The focus was on the
frequency of phenomenon revealed by the survey. In the explanation of the quantitative results and presentations, and in the describing of the meaning of the data, the focus is mainly on the interviews and research notes from the field work. This is done to let the respondents speak, essentially employing a qualitative approach in the interpretation of the findings. In some instances maps also form part of the analysis and presentation.

2.5 Field-work arrangements

A decision was taken before field work not to collect detailed data on such aspects of rural communal life as micro-level economic activities, bartering system, food sharing between households, local use of flora and fauna for medical treatments, and cultural patterns and changes. This also applies to other similar matters related to the everyday life of the people of Salambala. Collecting such detailed information would simply have been outside the parameters of this research. In addition, such research requires more time, resources and intimate relationships with the local people and the researcher, which was not possible at the time of field work. Such data, however, would have helped to understand the Salambala community more comprehensively.

Considering migration patterns, much like in other rural areas of Namibia, the concept and definition of household is very fluid in eastern Caprivi. Households are in perpetual change (rural-urban migration is estimated to be 6.5 per cent per year), rendering any definition of ‘household’ difficult. However, a decision to adopt household as a unit of analysis was taken mainly because it constitutes a primary economic unit by which the informal economy and social relations can be analysed. Furthermore, it is within this unit (household) that communities create, lose or re-create both communal and personal identity and their relationship with the Conservancy. The problem with this concept is that with extended families the unit is so large that it may result in counting some people twice, which may be seen as an error.

Nevertheless, it was the only way the research could be done in a relatively short time. In an attempt to avoid such errors, respondents were requested to only count those people who physically live with them most of the time rather than those living with uncles and cousins elsewhere. Another issue of research methodology related to the
word ‘tourist’. In the local vocabulary the word tourist does not exist. The closest word is the expression *muenzi* literally referring to a visitor. It denotes someone from a different and in most cases faraway place. Such a person, however, is only accorded the term when he or she stays for some time, at least a day. It is possible that there may have been ‘tourists’ in the villages but because they did not stay they were not considered to be such. Under normal circumstances, visitors are to be introduced to the village headmen as a matter of custom and law. This is often not the case with tourists. It remains to be seen whether this will be an issue when community-based tourism will be fully on course in Salambala.

During the field work it became apparent that the communities are not properly informed about the managerial division of the Conservancy. Almost all regarded themselves as outside the Conservancy. In other words, they refer to the core area as the Conservancy and the area where they live as outside. There are two important implications with this misunderstanding. First, they consider animals and other natural resources outside the core area as unprotected and ‘huntable’. As a result they do not attach value and importance to the buffer zone as they do to the core area. Second, any attempt to put up a development project that requires more land would be seen as an infringement that is interpreted as an endeavour to deprive the community of more power over land. In some cases, when they referred to the Conservancy, they were speaking of the core area and not of the entire Conservancy.

### 3 Natural Resource Use and Management

Approaches to natural resource management in Africa and Namibia have evolved over time. Wildlife management changed from communal ownership and traditional control to state ownership. In more recent decades, natural resource management has no longer been the ultimate role of governments; a more co-ordinated approach between all stakeholders is being sought. In this study, stakeholders are defined as those people who have respective rights, responsibility and interests in the management of a resource in a particular area.

Some researchers have argued that conservation of plants and animals in southern Africa began well before colonisation (Woodcock 1998, 349-357; Bhatia and Buckley 1998,
They argue that through a variety of traditional means of protection (e.g. royal game reserves and the low-impact hunting weapons and methods such as spears, bows and arrows, snares and pits) a conservation effort was being made and maintained by traditional leaders.

Significant as this may be, the fact that both population density and agricultural activities were relatively low also means there was less competition for resources between people and animals. In as much as modern lethal weapons were used to gun down vast numbers of animals at the beginning of the last century, more recently the clearing of land for agricultural purposes has also converted many hectares of land into farms, depriving wildlife their habitat. In Caprivi, and Salambala in particular, subsistence farmers have two or more fields averaging ten hectares each in different areas. Fields are located five or more kilometres away from the residential place, making grazing land for both domesticated animals and wildlife limited.

3.1 **Contextual evolution of CAMPFIRE**

The so-called scramble for Africa since 1890 after the Berlin Conference had many negative effects on the management of natural resources in sub-Saharan Africa. In Zimbabwe, the settler administration attempted to govern land by establishing tribal trusts or homelands that were backed by coercive powers from the central government even though district commissioners were responsible for the land administered (Metcalfe 1994). The structures that were put in place resulted in forced resettlement during colonisation. Land and wildlife resources in Namibia and Zimbabwe were no exception to this affliction. Murphree (1994, 4) observes that ‘one of the central (research) tragedies in the history of [Southern African] land and natural resource management is that the debate on the tenure [rights] has been largely restricted to a discussion on the relative merit of the state or private property regimes. Policy has assumed two options, privatise or nationalise, ignoring the further option of a communal property regime [which existed under de facto terms]’.

Communal property regimes have their positive and negative sides (Cherry 1997). Zimbabwe, CAMPFIRE’s birthplace, has a population of 11.4 million people (2000 est.), and has an area size of 390,580 sq. Km (Internet page and Metcalfe 1994).
According to Metcalfe (1994), 41.8 per cent of the total area is communal land and largely poor soil, but more than 90 per cent of the population are living on less-productive land. The private commercial farmers occupy 36.4 per cent of the fertile and productive land (ibid.). The state owns 12.1 per cent of the land as national parks or forest reserves (Dasmann 1972). This situation of disproportionate access to land is a remnant of colonial arrangements and partly accounts for today’s political fiasco in Zimbabwe. Nevertheless, the way that the governing political leadership has handled the crisis has ruined the country’s international reputation, which has affected the arrival of tourists. During January 2001, when I visited Victoria Falls, tourists were visibly absent as compared with the visit in 1998.

Upon independence in 1980, the Government of Zimbabwe with other institutions and NGOs attempted to review the resource and property regimes of the country. It was the time when population was growing and putting resources under pressure. Before that review, in 1975, a legislative act gave the commercial farmers (mainly white) de jure rights – thus giving private farmers the right to the economic value of land (ibid.; see also CAMPFIRE Internet page). The late 1970s and mid-80s were the years in which the pilot/pre-CAMPFIRE phases were conducted under the theoretical impetus of Fulbright scholars such as Dasmann and Mossmann (1961), Mossmann (1963), and Cumming (1990). In 1987 a legislation evaluation gave rise to the National Conservation Strategy and CAMPFIRE was formally born (Metcalfe 1994). That regulation sheds light on the significance of involving politicians in matters of conservation. Stakeholders agencies who were involved in the legislation evaluation included the Government of Zimbabwe’s Ministry of Wildlife and Conservation, Commercial Farmers Association, University of Zimbabwe and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences, District Councils, NGOs, WWF, Zimbabwe Trust, Communal Farmers and the Ethnic groups’ leaderships or traditional leaders in the country.

3.2.1 Why CAMPFIRE?

CAMPFIRE is only one of the many approaches to community-based wildlife management (CWM) in Africa. CWM approaches were a result of criticism from some conservationists and NGOs on the traditional conservation approach by governments
and for failing to protect wildlife and its habitats (Songorwa et al. 2000), and for the reluctance to involve local communities. The new approach claims to provide the best option for sustainable management of wildlife, particularly in Africa.

Such approaches are called differently in several countries, e.g. CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe, ADMADE in Zambia, and CBNRM in Namibia. Songorwa et al. have identified and summarised four assumptions underlying these approaches. First, government and wildlife authorities are willing to waive ownership and responsibilities for wildlife conservation to rural communities. Secondly, communities are interested in engaging in managing wildlife. Thirdly, communities have the capacity and ability to manage wildlife. Finally, wildlife conservation and rural economic development should ideally co-exist without conflicting trends (ibid.). It has also been argued that communities compound a natural resource management institute (Murphree 1993).

Among the approaches mentioned above, I chose CAMPFIRE because of Namibia’s proximity to Zimbabwe and partly due to common history. In addition there are claims in some circles that the CAMPFIRE model is working successfully. However, while CAMPFIRE is an impressive theory indeed, this model renders problematic implementation in context and scope. Arguably, CAMPFIRE’s operational structures suggest an implementation procedure by people who may have no skills required by its theory. Most rural communities in Third-world countries have a lower educational resource base. As a result they are unable to reinforce what may be seen as management and management plan. Currently in Salambala, CBRNM is the approach that is being implemented.

According to Metcalfe (1994), the major question that CAMPFIRE addresses is: Why should rural communities be motivated to conserve the environment, and who benefits financially from this conservation while conservation itself is the main goal? It is important to consider the two parallels to together. Moreover, the very fact that these questions are raised provokes an issue of property rights. While others argue the case of ancestral land ownership, for example (see Hangula 1998), for others natural resource use is a question of responding to the dynamics of a society and the changes in political, economic, demographic and ecological processes.
By and large, in scope, CAMPFIRE ranges from management techniques, theory of resource use and principle of rural development to geopolitical resource emancipation (Murphree 1994). Arguably, CAMPFIRE is a model of collaborative management because it encompasses several stakeholders and is aimed at having a shared decision-making process. The objective of CAMPFIRE is to positively impact bio-diversity through conservation, while in essence trying to encourage rural development and conservation. The philosophy is that by conservation of flora and fauna, the respective communities may earn valuable incentives. That is essentially the primary aim of conservation. According to CAMPFIRE, the results from rural community efforts have been a success, meaning among other things that community-based tourism and natural resource management has advantages not only to the state coffers but also to the community and the environment.

The understanding that resource use and natural resource management are about ‘Us with Them’ is central to CAMPFIRE’s approach in the sector of community-based tourism. In other words, there must be commitment to both sides and also that the only way forward is working as a team. According to Metcalfe (1994, 161-186), chief to this approach is ‘as long as wildlife remains state property no one will invest in it as a resource’. And also that ‘external enforced rules break down if not maintained, but internally defined rules require full devolution of tenure rights on the resource concerned’ (ibid.). Rural development projects may only be successful when the community concerned is part of the ‘initial and comprehensive ongoing’ activities of the managed resources in a specific area. For communities it is important to have a positive correlation between the quality of their lives and the standard of management of natural resources.
Table 1: CAMPFIRE approach to CBT. Source: created from CAMPFIRE Internet pages fact sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Effects (seen as positive)</th>
<th>Related results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing the land: People and animals (wildlife department and conservancy staff)</td>
<td>Training &amp; workshops. Forum of discussion. Elephant funds paying for conservation and damages.</td>
<td>Reduced enmity for animals. Community demonstrates Capacity to manage Resources.</td>
<td>Funding sustainable rural development projects. Creation of emergency funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this context the community would be able to weigh the benefits against the costs and vice versa with the long-term effect of each.Comparatively, this approach takes into account issues such as history, culture, ethnic groups, conservation and sustainability, crop damage, ‘problem animals’ and compensation issues. Collaborative management therefore is not only about participation and partnerships but it is essentially about responsible actions, procedures and future forecasts in relation to today’s way of managing resources.

As seen in Table 1, the CAMPFIRE approach is supposed to be community-based tourism development and that by nature it is meant to be comprehensive and diverse, replicating an ongoing laboratory-like situation, empirically proving and disapproving resource management approaches in rural areas. This activity has revealed for instance that training, the provision of credit, market research and information are not the only major issues in communal resource management. It is more important to ensure that the community itself takes charge of the resource management as the theory portrays. In
addition, the rural community should be able to do marketing and promotion and be able
to use today’s modes of communication. There is little practical truth to this, however.
For example, up until now the local communities within the districts where CAMPFIRE
is in operation have not been given political power and full fiscal authority. CAMPFIRE
is still administered by the Zimbabwe Trust, technically an organ of the state.

On its Internet page, CAMPFIRE lists nine organisations that it says are members of the
collaborative group and they include the CAMPFIRE Association, Department of
National Parks and Wildlife Management, Ministry of Local Government, Rural and
Urban Development, Zimbabwe Trust, Africa Resources Trust, World Wide Fund for
Nature (WWF), ACTION and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences. Contrary to
claims by CAMPFIRE, the communities have either not been given powers or are
unable to take over the full administration of the natural resources and revenue. On the
other hand, unless financial mechanisms are refined to fit the needs of the local people
as reports come in, it is going to remain difficult for the local communities to sustain
themselves.

A new tourist or attraction site, for example, takes a number of years to become self-
sustaining and fully operational. The delay is complicated and is made tedious by a
range of factors amongst which chief is the promotion and marketing of these sites.
Since rural communities cannot always afford to wait for several years, they will need to
be able to combine tourism projects with more immediate income-generating enterprise
e.g. small-scale agricultural activities and the selling of natural produce such as wild
fruits and honey.

Another difficulty is the need for land tenure to change into de jure ownership of
communal land. This is vital because communities are insecure and their attitudes reveal
the ‘tragedy of the commons’ (Middleton 1999). The tragedy of the commons is a
theory that argues that resources under common ownership are prone to overuse and
abuse. In communal land for example, it is in the interest of an individual to graze as
many livestock as possible, but if too many individuals have the same attitude the
grazing land may become overused and impoverished (ibid.). One of the problems with
this is that most people attach less value to resources that are publicly or communally
owned. As a result there are more of irresponsible actions than responsible efforts. At
the moment, the community in the conservancy has de facto rights but have no tenure rights over the land. If governments who have the decision-making powers will not take the necessary steps toward land reform, rural development is unlikely to be achieved.

It is important to note, however, that common ownership does not necessarily lead to overexploitation of resources (ibid.). Commonly-owned resources produce a strong social and cultural rule for a community. Often in situations where resource degradation occurs it arises because the traditional rule on resource control breaks down for some reason. For instance, previously Salambala was a hunting reserve for the chief or Mulena Moralislwani of the Masubia ethnic group. The Mulena would issue an announcement for hunting and he would choose specific people to do the hunting and then meat would be given out equally to different villages. This is no longer the case because the traditional system was altered, and anyone who can hunt can do so illegally. Whereas in the past they would fear severe punishment, today no one would dare to report the illegal hunters.

The major fear is that today’s unoccupied land can lead to disputes among the next generation community. In northern Namibia, for example, illegal fencing in communal areas is already a large problem (Hangula 1998). Under the current land policy, the practice is illegal and punishable. Caprivi’s situation is different. Land conflicts exist but they are not a result of fencing but rather part of socio-economic uncertainty, which is worsened by the fact that agricultural is in a limbo-like state, hovering in between subsistence farming and commercial farming. Education, the privatisation of government tractors and the desire for commercial agricultural entrepreneurship has contributed significantly to this state of affairs. More and more people want to have privately-owned land.

Legal reformation of land ownership within communal areas may quell the uncertainty faced by subsistence farmers of Namibia. However, it will take a long time before any indisputable results of this process are felt and seen. Communal land is supposed to be collectively owned, used and managed, but the situation is the reverse. Moreover, the dualistic nature of the economy is still a major hindrance to rural economic growth (Mbuende 1986, 102). The legislature is still working on an adequate policy.
3.3 Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM)

The Community-Based Natural Resource Management approach in Namibia is partly drawn from the experience of the neighbouring countries, a part is indigenous and partly also based on a body of theory of common property resource management (Jones 1999). It is also largely an offspring of NGOs like the Integrated Rural Development and Nature Conservation (IRDNC), WWF and others. This programme (CBNRM) has three complementing agendas (DEA Internet page). According to the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the approach concerns conservation in that it ‘promotes biodiversity conservation by creating the necessary conditions for sustainable use’. Secondly, CBNRM is a rural development programme because it permits the rural ‘communities to derive a direct financial benefit from wildlife and tourism activities on their land’. Thirdly, CBNRM is a political programme because, according to Ministry of Environment and Tourism (ibid.), it ‘empowers the local communities to embark on issues that affect their daily lives’.

Decision-making, accountability and governance are the main issues that the government has identified to supposedly affect the community when natural resource management is considered (DEA 1995). As will be discussed in Chapters four, five and six, issues concerning and affecting communities are wide-ranging. The central government has to devolve the rights over resources directly to local communities (GRN 1996). Although theoretically CBNRM is largely seen as collaboration between the government, donor agencies, local NGOs and local communities, in practical terms it is quite another thing. This approach was born at the time when the Namibian Parliament was passing legislature on tourism and resource use in 1996. In a nutshell, CBNRM works by encouraging communities to form land management units called conservancies. In optimistic circles, it is hoped that the CBNRM approach and the establishment of the conservancies will stimulate rural economic development and further economically empower the majority of the Namibian citizens who are housed in the rural areas. Table 2 below shows a model of community-based tourism suggested in Namibia under the CBNRM approach.
Table 2: CBNRM approach/models to CBT in Namibia. (Source: Ashley and Garland 1994.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Possible Enterprise</th>
<th>Existing/planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Private investor-controlled enterprise with employment potential as the only direct community benefit.</td>
<td>Hunting concession with professional hunters. Hunting concession using traditional trackers. Luxury wildlife-viewing lodges in communal areas.</td>
<td>Anvo Safaris, in eastern Bushmanland. Possible development in Bushmanland, Kunene and Caprivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Private investor who shares revenue with the community.</td>
<td>Luxury lodge with bed night levy contributed to the local community.</td>
<td>Lianshulu Lodge, eastern Caprivi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Outside investor in revenue but sharing joint venture with community.</td>
<td>Luxury lodge established as a joint venture between entrepreneur and community, each receiving profit shares. Overlapping private and community enterprise.</td>
<td>Proposed venture in Kunene. Initial phase of Lizauli, Caprivi. Traditional village established with the help of the adjacent Lianshulu Lodge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Aims and goals of Salambala Conservancy

Salambala Conservancy’s constitution outlines the following as primary aims and objectives of the Conservancy:

- to create an environment conducive for the return of game to the Salambala area;
- to manage Salambala’s wildlife and other natural resources in accordance with an approved management plan in a sustainable manner to maximise the return of benefits to the communities in and around the Salambala area;
- to protect Salambala’s wildlife and plants for future generations of Namibian residents, particularly those living in East Caprivi;
- to develop tourism accommodation and guided tours for tourism in the Conservancy to derive benefits for the communities (Source: Salambala Conservancy 1998). 

Under these objectives, the Conservancy is commanded to ‘free up land’ for game, manage their presence and subsequently preserve them for future generations while strengthening the income base of the present local community. However, these
objectives would be very difficult to achieve in absence of an integrated land-use plan. Despite the fact that the constitution requires a management plan, at the time of research there was no management plan of any sort. One reason is that, even though some NGOs advocate that local communities should be given full power and authority to manage community-based programmes, people are often largely uneducated and have no skills to run such programmes efficiently. As a result in this case, there are no management plans in the Conservancy and therefore the tense relationship between residents and wildlife cannot be reduced. For this reason, the participation of local educational institutions must be taken into serious consideration. The achievements or failures of the above objectives are discussed in detail in Chapters five and six.

Subject to the Conservancy system, the CBNRM programme aims at re-creating a common property management regime, a communal ownership of natural resources. The government’s view is that when the CBNRM programme is fully implemented, communities would be emancipated and that traditional leadership would be restored. As will be seen below, results from Salambala show the opposite. The major reason for this is the ambiguity of current land tenure and the absence of adequate legislation. Nonetheless, out of this need for a communal property regime, a local organisation called Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA) was born (NACOBTA 2001). This association together with other bodies such as the Federation of Namibian Tourism Association (FENATA) promotes tourism in rural areas. NACOBTA is discussed and analysed in detail in chapter five.

3.3.2 Tourism in an independent Namibia

In post-colonial Namibia tourism was virtually unaccounted for, and academic literature proves it. After independence was achieved, this sector of the economy steadfastly strengthened foreign revenue in the country. Presently tourism is the third-largest earner of foreign revenue after fisheries and mining. Tourism is also the second-largest employer after agriculture, whereas previously since the early 1930s fishing, mining and agriculture have dominated the economy (Mbuende 1986). Tourism has boosted the economy and has somewhat adjusted Namibia’s foreign currency reserves. According to the government, about N$500 million was directly generated from the tourism industry
in 1992. Of this amount, about N$160 million went into the state coffers and the rest to tourism operators.

According to the Federation of Namibian Tourism Association (FENATA), since 1996, it is estimated that Namibia has earned about N$1.3 billion in foreign currency from tourism annually (Windhoek Observer Newspaper 2000). The figures indicate that there must have been growth in the Namibian tourism industry. A regional breakdown of these figures would also be interesting, but such data do not exist. Regrettably, little is known about revenue generated by tourism in communal areas. In employment terms, according to the Ministry of Environment and Tourism in 1992, tourism alone was estimated to have generated approximately 20,000 jobs (GRN 1994). The Ministry claims that these jobs were a consequence of 280,000 tourists who visiting Namibia (ibid.).

It has to be noted that due to the fact that the majority of what could be termed tourists are actually relatives from other countries who come to visit their close kin. The net effect is therefore difficult to calculate. Tourism marketers in South Africa have recently launched an advertising campaign with the slogan, ‘for every tourist visiting South Africa there is one job created’. If this is so, then tourism is very important to a country in general. Nevertheless, accurate and contextually sound mechanisms must still be established, legislated and implemented in consultation with all stakeholders relating to tourism. Since independence, many policies and legislations have been changed. One of the areas that have benefited from this invalidation of the previous laws is the tourism industry. The 1994 White Paper on Tourism, 1995 Wildlife Management Amendment Bill, 1995 Community-Based Tourism Policy, the creation of NACOBTA in 1995, the CBNRM programme since 1996 and the establishment of the Tourism Board in 2001 are good examples.

Besides Namibia’s fragile and desert environments, the authors of Caprivi’s environmental atlas projected that if the clearing of land continues at the current rate, by the year 2032 all the best soil areas in Caprivi will be cleared, and by the year 2082 virtually all Caprivi will be cleared for the purposes of agriculture. Alternatively, community-based tourism is one of the options that are seen as an essential element toward curbing the alarming forecast. The idea is to be implemented through the
creation of conservancies. The government’s definition of Conservancy is that it consist of a group of commercial farms or areas of communal land on which neighbouring landowners or members have pooled resources for the purpose of conserving and using wildlife in a sustainable way (GRN 1996).

One element that has not been emphasised enough by the government is the role of community-based tourism. Such tourism has rather been treated as an indirect benefit of conservation, if ever considered, presumably something that should naturally sort itself out as the number of game species increases in the conservancies. The main objective of the conservancies is to promote greater sustainable use of natural resources through cooperation and improved management of land and wildlife in relation to the local people. The conservancies are managed through an elected committee (ibid.). In this project, the focus is on community control and ownership of natural resources adjacent to or within where the communities live in relation to the designated Conservancy area. It must be noted however, that a community is different and because of this variation it is important to emphasise the role of partnerships.

A study by Barnes et al. (1997) mapped out tourists’ willingness to pay for viewing and wildlife conservation in Namibia. They found that the average tourist was willing to pay an average of N$144 as kind of levy for wildlife conservation purposes, N$247 for wildlife, crafts and arts viewing and management per day. Tourists’ willingness to pay a community welfare levy, in addition to normal charges, was notably low (N$46). Nonetheless, a significant majority (76 per cent) of the respondents indicated that they would be willing to stay at a community-run campsite provided it was not more expensive when compared with campsites run by either the government or the private sector (ibid., 8-15). Moreover, government services have a connotation of being expensive yet low-quality services.

Tourists’ willingness to pay park entrance fees was also evaluated. According to the survey, tourists wanted to pay and indicated that the Namibian park fees were too low (N$8 per person per day) compared with Botswana (N$68 per person per day) (ibid.). Furthermore, they also said they would be willing to pay and stay at a community-private joint-venture lodge. The interesting feature here is that tourists either suspect that the services in community-run campsites are lower, or they at least expect that some
private-sector services are desirable but community services may not be good. As a conclusion, it can be said that the ways and means by which communities could extract the much-needed income warrant further investigation along with the potential impacts. Nonetheless, it would be unjust to portray community services as poor since many may be operating within the available resources.

4 SALAMBALA CONSERVANCY ASSESSMENT

In Chapter one I asked the question: How applicable is the CAMPFIRE approach to natural resource management and community-based tourism for Namibia? And in Chapters two and three I further outlined the complexities and dynamics that are encountered when dealing with resource management and community-based tourism in southern Africa, and Caprivi in particular. This section in which the research findings from Salambala Conservancy are outlined and discussed, is one but the first step in answering the question. It is should be mentioned here that given the fact that, the data collected was mainly in Salambala, the findings should not be generalised for the whole Namibia.

In statistical terms, there are fewer men and more women in Namibia (GRN 1999a). As such it was not surprising that the majority of my respondents were women. Of all respondents 53.6 per cent were women. This is mainly because they are the ones who spend more time at home. Although the majority of the respondents were housewives at the time of research, only 10.7 per cent saw themselves as housewives. Feasibly they see themselves as people who could be employed. In hypothetical terms, there are two reasons why this is so. One theory supposes that men usually move away from home to work somewhere else. And as a result they are absent, rendering women responsible for the overall household responsibilities.

Another theory is that while previously women were denied or marginalised from having access to education, now that they are receiving equal opportunities for education they consider themselves employable and do not support the concept of ‘child bearers’ only. Culturally they were expected to stay home, contribute to the domestic work and help their mothers if they were not married yet. This, however, appears to be changing. In the sample population there was a strong correlation between education,
sex and age. Education among women above the age of 60 was almost non-existent but it sharply increased according to how young they were. The younger the woman the higher the probability there is, to have the same education as that of men of her age. Amongst the 20-39 age group, education was almost equal between men and women.

Typical of Namibian rural areas is that mainly the old and the young inhabit them. However, it was interesting that the majority of the respondents were within the reproductive and working-age groups (20-39) 50 per cent and (40-59) 30 per cent. Of all respondents more than half (57 per cent) in the above categories were unemployed. Considering the fact that Caprivi’s population is mainly young, it was expected that there would be less elderly in the study area (see also Mendelsohn and Roberts 1998). Of all the sampled population about 18 per cent were above 60 years of age, a relatively insignificant figure when compared with rural areas in the former Soviet Union states and EU member countries (EU-EUROSTAT 1995, 142-151).

Another interesting issue is that the people who saw themselves as unemployed also indicated they were subsistence farmers. Feasibly, this may point to the fact that they do not regard agriculture as a way of deriving income but rather as a way of life, something done on a traditional basis. About 14 per cent of the respondents had never gone to school, 30 per cent had primary education only, 27 per cent had or continue to have some secondary education, 25 per cent had completed high school and only one individual was in tertiary education. According to the survey, in Salambala the composition of households varies from family to family. Most households’ population structures were between 0-5 (42 per cent), 6-11 (38 per cent), 12-16 (18 per cent) and 17-above (2 per cent) members. In view of the fact that most people are unemployed, life remains an economic challenge for many households in Salambala. Thus, for many, other forms of survival have to be sought.

According to the results of this survey, while about 17.9 per cent of the respondents considered employment within the Conservancy as a benefit (probably the elderly), 8.9 per cent of the respondents also considered animal increase in Salambala as beneficial. Of the total, 67.9 per cent of the respondents did not see benefits from the Conservancy. Thus, on the whole, the majority did not see the Conservancy as a resource. Although it can be argued that ‘no benefit’ is a matter of perceptive resource choice, the fact is that
unless there are concrete and tangible results from the Conservancy, the community will remain negative about its activities. As Figure 3 shows, many people do not see the Conservancy as beneficial.
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**Figure 2. Villages of Salambala Conservancy.**

As far as they are concerned it has been good for the few who have been employed. Some individuals argued that the Conservancy has *just caused poverty, hunger, they don’t even pay people well, but there are lots of elephants tramping our crops and hyenas eating our stock. Just on the New Year eve one of my cows was eaten by a hyena* (Q6). Employment initiatives offered by the Conservancy have been temporal e.g. repairing the core area fence, or permanent e.g. game guards, environmental officers and field monitors. Few have benefited so far. Recruitment of employees is done on a proportionate basis according to availability of a vacancy in a specific village. For instance, if a vacancy exists at Ioma, only candidates from that area qualify for recruitment.

This, according to the executive committee only applies to non-professional posts. Professional posts, on the other hand, are advertised and contested and people are recruited on academic credentials. While visiting the core area there was a group of seven men repairing the fence after elephants had destroyed it. One of these men said
there is … an increase in the number of animals here but there have not been any tangible benefits, no jobs we hoped for... we have been disappointed (Q8). As far as he was concerned, the job he was doing was just a ‘part-time job’ without much revenue forthcoming. However, it must be mentioned here that because the Conservancy is only three years old, an expectation for things to be excellent is premature. Be that as it may, the little that has been done is laudable development.

On the other hand, the increase in wildlife was something that some respondents believed to have been very useful for the community. As one respondent put it, *I have heard of trophy hunting in Salambala and we also hear that it is a lot of money* (Q11). Besides the revenue that Salambala may generate from trophy hunting, in the view of one traditional leader *Salambala has just brought hunger, they have stopped us from getting the food that is our only way of survival, we never hear of Salambala sponsoring something* (Q31). In his view there are no serious problems …*but what I want is that the prices should be lowered so that we can afford these things* (ibid.), in other words ‘huntable’ animals should be sold to the community.
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The management’s position is that the sale of animals would start to happen once the authorities are convinced the number of such animals is large enough to allow controlled utilisation. According to MET official sources, what would happen is that *When a member of the Conservancy buys an animal, we will kill it for him or her and deliver it*
at home... we do this because we can do it at the right time without causing shock among animals. Moreover, the challenge is to meet the communities’ needs while minimising the costs they endure from the conservation of wildlife. There seems to be no outright solution to the cost of conservation and the need for communities to depend on nature in a sustainable manner. The challenge here is to increase in the shortest possible time the benefits to outweigh the cost the communities suffer.

Box 1. Mwale is a 26-year-old unemployed resident of Salambala. Upon completing her matriculation in 1992, she dreamed of being a nurse. However, she could not manage to pay for her education. Her only hope was to find work in Katima Mulilo and try to save money for education later. However, that job is still a dream. She lives with her two children at Mutikitila village south of the core area. Besides serving as a member of the Management Committee of Salambala, Mwale has also been a victim of elephants trampling crops. She depends entirely on subsistence farming to survive. She knows that once the problem animals strike starvation is likely to occur. But she says I cannot recommend the killing of these animals because they are still few. I can only hope that the Conservancy executive committee will find a way of compensating the affected people in future. Her grandmother is paying for her two children’s school fees from her N$300 monthly pension. In her view, like many other Salambala residents, she anticipates that one day the Conservancy’s problems will be outweighed by benefits. In three years the conservancy will be fully developed, tourism will be fully fledged, it will also expand, and more job opportunities will be created. More trophy hunters will come, as a result more money will come for the development of the Conservancy.

Inasmuch as there is damage caused by ‘problem animals’, there are also problems from the community on the Conservancy. Some 16 per cent of the respondents considered the presence of the three families as a development obstacle in the Conservancy. As one respondent stated, there are some misunderstandings but we need to sit down together and talk with these people, government must take a firm decision (Q8). According to another respondent these families ...say that the Khuta gave them this place [core area] but they now do not want to give it back. What should be done is that the authorities need to advise them and the Khuta must then take measures that will satisfy them also (Q11). While some people were moderate about the issue, some were taking a hard-line approach. As far as one of those who expressed a hard-line approach was concerned, the families must be forced out as other people moved out willingly (Q12).

Despite the three families’ presence in the core area with livestock, in my analysis there is currently nothing that can be said to constitute a threat to the Conservancy. The area is large enough for animals to breed in and to feed on. Core area activities should perpetually function according to plans, because these families are far from the main water holes used by animals. The problem will come from the families when the
population of animals, especially elephants and lions, will increase. Two lions can cause serious problems. In January 2001 alone, according to statistics provided to me, 11 cases of lion attacks on cattle kraals were reported in the conservancy. This is probably what will eventually make the conflict more pressing. It is likely that most families are going to threaten animals or even shoot them, which will in turn cause animals to migrate somewhere else, Chobe National Park, for instance. Should such a migration happen, then the Conservancy’s objectives will be ruined and the project may become a failure.

Another 23.2 per cent considered the members of the management as a major problem for the Conservancy. One respondent argued that the Conservancy management has put unrealistic … restrictions on cutting housing poles and thatching grass in the Conservancy area, which has compelled us to get permits from Bukalo at a price [unspecified]. And travel for such purposes costs money, in addition there is also nepotism on recruitment in the Conservancy (Q18). Allegations of corruption are discussed later. The community also pointed out the inefficiency and lack of communication on the part of management as a major concern. Conservancy management is apparently not creating any jobs for our children, they do not even inform us about changes or developments in the Conservancy. They do not come to us for information, I suggest that they visit communities so that they get information or concerns from us, then they can plan and address these problems, one respondent said (Q54).

Nevertheless, 51.8 per cent of the respondents did not see any problem caused by the community on the Conservancy. This percentage may be taken as an indication of apathy and misunderstandings regarding the operations of the Conservancy. The increase in the felling of trees for agricultural purposes by people migrating from the floodplains should be a matter of concern. Nonetheless, 5.4 per cent regarded unemployment-related problems as having a negative influence on the functions of the Conservancy. When unemployment is high, people try anything to make a living.

In a related issue, one respondent argued that the Conservancy has not brought any benefits yet but the respondent was quick to say we need hotels, so we could sell souvenirs and get work for our elder children (Q19). In a way this shows that some
members of the community still see potential in the Conservancy but most likely the advantages or benefits are coming too late. Neither is it being suggested here that benefits will come sooner or later. With poverty and challenging economic circumstances communities cannot afford to wait for too long. This is one of the predicaments that rural development and NGO-advocated conservation programmes such as this one face. One may ask: If a rural development programme does not empower and finance an income generation project for the community, then what good is it? In the absence of communal projects, revenues are likely to go into the pockets of the few. In Salambala for instance, 92 per cent of the respondents indicated that the Conservancy finances no communal projects their districts.

It is therefore no wonder they are negative about the project. Nor are there projects funded and managed by the community itself. Nevertheless, Salambala Conservancy has not only offered opportunities for employment but also offered courses to its employees and the members of the community involved and/or interested in self-help projects. Some of those courses, according to one beneficiary, have been beneficial in terms of knowledge, but it is nothing if there is no money to start up something (Q3). The question he is bringing forth is that of access to soft loans and credit schemes, which if provided should enable the trainees to set up small and medium-sized enterprises. They cannot get such financial assistance in absence of legal tenure security. These courses, according to the executive committee, are organised by the management but are facilitated by the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA).

Like in many parts of Southern Africa, it will take long before such courses will start to show tangible results. This may be attributed in some areas to lack of education but largely also due to the fact that there are no mechanisms in place to enable young and small-business entrepreneurs to have access to loans, credits and land tenure. Rural development also requires the involvement of the local business people to be able to speed up the tangible results of the Conservancy. An increase in the number of animals is indeed a success, but to whom? Moreover, the increase is largely among elephants while other large animals have been decreasing. Nonetheless, what matters for the community is the extent, rate and degree to which the Conservancy affects its livelihood in a sustainable manner. For instance, the increase in the number of trophy animals has,
according to the executive committee, enabled the Conservancy to earn revenue totalling N$200,800.

However, the increase in trophy animals has also been a threat to the food provisions for the local people. Furthermore, these large animals need much food, and hence large breeding and grazing areas. As a result from time to time, lions from Salambala [core area] are attacking our cattle and elephants are eating and trampling our crops in the fields (Q2). In Ioma area, for instance, ...lions [from the core area] killed six head of cattle in one night (Q18). At Mutikitila village, south-eastern part of the core area, lions killed three head of cattle and another three and a goat were killed by a [what some respondents believed was a migratory] hyena from Botswana (Q16). Of all the problems reported during the survey, 44.6 per cent are animal related and the relevant authorities have never solved 50 per cent of these problems. For example, when a community member loses a cow without the predator animal responsible for the loss being killed or the particular individual compensated, they consider such an issue unresolved.

Some of the cases (3.6 per cent) have not been reported to authorities. For the community, however, the solution to these problems should constitute compensation to the victims (12.5 per cent) for the lost cattle and crops. According to the respondents, if the state and the Conservancy are not able to reimburse the people affected, then the deployment and employment of more game guards (8.9 per cent) should be a matter of priority. However, there is another side to this story. There may be a need to control the population increase, which ideally may enable the achievement of sustainable development. Overall, Caprivians attach higher significance to cattle than goats, partly because of beef and milk production. In addition, cattle are important because they are used as draught animals and their hides are used for making ropes for domestic purposes.

Cattle are preferred since they are seen as a store of wealth and as insurance for episodic crop failures (Naeraa et al. 1993). Furthermore, the local customs and traditions require that for a man to marry a bride, dowry (malobolo) in the form of cattle must be paid to the parents of the wife-to-be. In some cases, dowry can be as high as ten head of cattle. It is therefore not surprising that 10.7 per cent of the respondents were angry and wanted the predator animals killed. In total, 87.5 per cent of the respondents owned cattle. This
figure could even be higher because in Caprivi not many people look after their cattle themselves. There is a system called mafisa. Under the mafisa arrangement, a herder, who lives somewhere else far from where the owner of the cattle lives, gets every third calf while the owner keeps every first and second calf. This method is encouraged and is part of the local tradition to reduce poverty and narrow the gap between the haves and the have-nots.

Nonetheless, the problems in Salambala discussed above have largely been unsolved because of an absence of an integrated operation scheme by the government and the Conservancy management. There are no clear frameworks under which the Conservancy management, staff and MET officials could operate jointly. In some instances, this has caused hesitation on the part of wildlife authorities, as they have apparently been blamed in the past for interfering too much in Conservancy affairs. For example in 1999, according to wildlife officials in Katima Mulilo, after a hippopotamus was poached in the River Chobe, some members of the Conservancy management prevented wildlife officials from carrying out the investigations. Therefore, up until now the wrongdoers have not been apprehended nor prosecuted (wildlife official).

In Caprivi, and in Salambala in particular, everyone agrees that the issue of poaching is a serious one. Neither are there differences of opinion on what causes it. The differences appear when it comes to who is poaching and what must be done with the poachers, especially if they are poor. As far as the Conservancy executive committee is concerned, as expressed by one of its members, we understand that poverty is very high in this area, we can only encourage people not to poach. In other words, the Conservancy executive committee prefers to be tolerant on the matter and with those found poaching. This does not mean they condone poaching, they are just being realistic about the situation.

On the other hand, the Conservancy has a shortage of well-trained workers and a shortage of vehicles and as such many of the staff members are thus practically unable to respond to reported cases in time. Poaching was reported to be continuous in some sections of the Conservancy such as Silumbi and Sikanjabuka. There have been reports of poaching since October 2000 ...but we have no watch towers, no patrol vehicles, the area cannot be reached at this point in time...because it is too wet and muddy, logistics is one of our major problems (executive committee member). Previously game hunting
was a means of livelihood in the context of low population. Then it was a lifestyle, but today hunting has become more and more an issue of economic survival. It is within this context that the Conservancy authorities seem to overlook ‘hunting for the pot’.

Interestingly the view of the traditional leaders was, and correctly so, that there is nothing new about these problems. The hurdles were there even long before the Conservancy was established. What has changed is that the situation has become worse over time. As expressed by one traditional leader, People have to realise that animals are finished, if we need more we have to let them produce more. According to one respondent, the issue of ‘problem animals’ is a hopeless one, since it is animals from Botswana: How can these problems be solved if they are not caused from here (Q30). The respondent seems to point to the realisation of the fact those animals respects no borders, and their management should not be seen as internal by the authorities but rather as a matter that requires co-operation between the nations sharing the borders.

Without doubt, this necessitates the need for a cross-border policy and strategy of planning and implementing wildlife management. The purpose of such a policy and strategy would be to co-ordinate wildlife and community-based tourism, and to bond it with other land use planning at a regional level. A further purpose would be to invoke a cross-border liaison forum on land use and development between Conservancy, governments, ministries, political institutions, traditional local leaders, private sector, tourism operators and NGOs. Since animals respect no borders, another important component must be regional cross-border co-operation between Caprivi authorities and those of Chobe district in Botswana to manage wildlife in a trans-national arrangement. The complexity of the matter suggests that Salambala will require more educated, qualified technical and skilled personnel to render effective services to the Conservancy residents’ needs. As it is, education and educational campaigns will not only be required for staff but also for the ordinary local residents.

While the Namibian Government’s plans on devolving power and authority over natural resources management are estimable, under the current land policy the land on which the communities and the natural resources are situated does not belong to them. Communities are entitled to user rights (de facto rights) but not ownership rights (de jure rights). This makes governing the land tenure systems in communal areas insecure,
perplexing and ambiguous. After the 1991 Land Reform and the Land Question Conference, it was agreed that land reform, and communal land in particular, should be made a reform and policy priority (Corbett and Daniels 1996; GRN 1991). Despite that consensus in the 1991 Land Reform and the Land Question Conference, it is no secret that the process has proved ineffectual in bringing about a communal land policy.

Communal land sustains the majority of the Namibian people who live from subsistence farming. It is important to recognise that communal land has communal problems (Cherry 1997). The unwritten traditional law still applies to the communal areas (see Corbett and Daniels 1996 for a comprehensive discussion on legislation affecting conservancies). It is also under this law, in addition to national law, that foreigners (tourists) will be expected to observe when in communal areas, which they cannot access in written form. It is pertinent to note that the traditional law, let alone its enforcement, is highly prone to misinterpretation due to it not being in written form. The issue of land and land tenure has been central to the ongoing disagreement between the government, the Conservancy and the three families in the core area. For example, besides all other assumptions, i.e. political motivation, the issue is essentially that of land tenure. The government can evict whomever it chooses, but under the traditional land law the government has no jurisdiction over this issue.

At the same time, the traditional authorities cannot evict residents from areas they are no longer suppose to be, because constitutionally it would be illegal to do so. Moreover, for the traditional authorities these are people who are in their jurisdiction but also people whom they should not shun. They are part and parcel of the community and therefore their needs should equally be given serious attention. Under the national land policy draft, commercial land is privately owned and communal land belongs to the state. Just as Corbett and Daniels argue (1996, 9), the ‘security of tenure, whether it be in the form of group or individual tenure, is crucial for the development of Community Based Natural Resource Management [CBNRM] because without it the development options [such as CBT] of communities are limited and their ability to attract investment capital are severely constrained’.

Some time ago, in 1998, there were plans to build a lodge jointly by a Zimbabwean investor and Salambala Conservancy. However, the plans apparently could not be
realised because the investor refused to take the risk. According to the management of Salambala, the investor was of the opinion that animals would not reside in Salambala core area as long as people and settlements were there. As a result, fewer tourists would come to the lodge, he allegedly argued. Even though the withdrawal by the investor was largely blamed on the three families’ refusal to leave the core area, land tenure and land-use policies were essentially at the heart of the problem. The absence of a proper land policy makes development plans difficult to implement. It remains to be seen what land reform, whether collectivisation or privatising, will do to the land question in relation to Namibia’s political and economic interests. Either collectivisation or privatising requires studies of land and tenure rights, land-use patterns, population densities, employment and productivity in order to establish a criterion for land-based resource appraisal.

In the words of one of the traditional leaders, These people should be forced out of the Conservancy [core area] ... they cannot ruin the development of this area, they have been negotiating in bad faith, I pray that everything goes well. Yet the failure to reform communal land is a failure to develop. As a result, problems are in essence likely to increase. When one is given a piece of land by the Khuta, there is only one way of ascertaining ownership, ‘a verbal agreement in the presence of witnesses’. One complication with this is that the agreement dies out with the generation that made the agreement. In most cases, agreement-makers are too old to remember correctly should problems arise. Because they are old, they shift position when harassed. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that the witness(es) would not be swayed by one of the parties concerned. This is also likely to be a major problem even when land reform takes effect.

On the question of what should be done with the three families, about 10.7 per cent of the respondents regarded forced removal as the most appropriate measure. There are other places at which these families could live. However, they consider such places grazing areas and further they argue that they have the right to live wherever they want. Like in most parts of Caprivi, in Salambala people have double or even triple settlements. This settlement pattern is partly created by those who work in town or elsewhere where they have houses in addition to the one at the homestead and the other at the cattle post. However, the main reason for this is the limited availability of water for people, better grazing lands for stock and proximity of infrastructure to people. Keeping this context in mind, it is not surprising that one respondent suggested that
these families should just come here and join us, their houses and fields are here (Q13). But as far as the families themselves are concerned we cannot leave this place, we cannot starve our livestock (Q48), and we have been here for many years, it is just the best place for our cattle (Q19).

It remains to be seen what will happen in this matter, bearing in mind the ambiguity of communal procedures. From the resource appraisal perspective, the problem was inherently in the project from the beginning. Public hearing was taken as a measurement of support whereas public hearings are seldom a means of resource appraisal. Like pre-feasibility assessment, public hearings and community meetings are only part of the consultation phase. What is required is the ongoing participation of the concerned and interested parties. Such participation may take the form of workshops and discussion forums. Due to the fact that much time has to pass before the community is able to comprehend the idea as a whole, one or two public meetings cannot be understood to mean support. At best, it is only a part of participatory planning which would require the establishment of a working group or a group of stakeholders, which is in my opinion what should have been done. It ensures two things; first those with reservation are given the opportunity to ‘air’ their views with possible suggestions and secondly, subsequent problems are dealt with as they appear.

In regard to the ambiguity and vagueness of the traditional law, the traditional authorities spoken to did not appear to consider the solution to the problem of human presence in the core area as their responsibility. The government should act, if they do not act nothing will happen, he said (traditional leader). Government officials do, however, take exactly the opposite position. It is their [traditional authorities] responsibility to solve this issue, those families were given that land by the Khuta not government, but what we know is that there are some misunderstandings (government official). One of the family members in the core area commented, We feel ill treated, it was our idea and it was hijacked, now they want us to leave this place just because of political differences with them (Q47).

Moreover, it is clear that the responsibility for communal land administration is not shared between the government and the traditional leaders. Neither is it clear as to under whose ownership the land really belongs in the minds of the ordinary community
members. On the whole, communal land administration is quite confusing. Considering what the community saw as problems in the Conservancy, about 16 per cent regarded the families from the core area as a hindrance towards the development of Salambala. As indicated earlier, the villagers seemed to refer to the fact that quick promises were given about the coming of benefits in the Conservancy, 23.2 per cent expected the management to deliver and they deemed it a problem, explaining, how can we support the Conservancy when nothing is coming (Q30). And another said we are still hungry (Q31). In as much as 51.8 per cent did not see any problems, 5.4 per cent regarded unemployment as something affecting the Conservancy.

In my discussions with one traditional leader, it became clear that as far as the community is concerned, life is not a question of problems or how many animals the Conservancy has; it is a question of sustainable livelihood and food provisions. He asked, why should you develop this place for tourists? [Asked why not, he said], No, the prices of wild animals should be reduced so that we can afford [to buy] them. Once in a while, one or two animals should be killed for us to eat. Probably for him, wildlife and local people do not go together, especially if at the community’s expense.

There are two issues here. First is that the livelihood of the communities is not presently dependent on job or income-generating activities. It is dependent on a complex local system of spiritual, social and ecological values existing in the local area. The nutritional base is partly from wildlife but mainly from agriculture. Secondly, contrary to assumptions of CAMPFIRE and NACOBTA, animal enmity by the community is changed by revenue and it is not true that there is a positive correlation between people and animals. While there is indeed a bond between nature and humankind, the community’s view of the utilisation of nature is not changed by salaries or revenues that come either from conservation or tourism. Although this may change in time, it is at least not going to be the case in a short term. The meanings related to specific animals significantly influence communal values. Locally, there are Cape pangolin *Manis smutsia temmincki* (Smuts) or *Inkaka* as locally known. This animal’s presence is seen as a symbol of peace, fortune and good things to come and as such they are not killed. Those who kill them are believed to become cursed themselves as well as their generations to come. The animals are either totems or used in traditional healing
ceremonies, and that is what matters to the community. This kind of societal importance is something that cannot be priced.

4.2 Community-based tourism as a potential for community development in Salambala

To answer the question as to whether there is potential for community-based tourism in Salambala Conservancy, it is important to first establish the purpose of its existence in the view of the suppliers-to-be. Clearly there are a variety of viewpoints as to why Salambala is there. Besides the Conservancy’s official version as discussed in section 3.3.1, the community has a relatively good idea of what the Conservancy is about. They agree that the Conservancy is meant for some form of community development. And that tourism, natural resource management and nature conservation are equally important cornerstones of the conservancy’s existence and the potential it offers is highly untapped.

While 25 per cent of the respondents indicated that the Conservancy is for the purposes of the community to generate income and to increase conservation of wildlife, some people felt that the Conservancy has not yet met this measure. As one female respondent put it, *I thought Salambala was for the community, but that is only in saying, not in the real sense of the word. It is meant for tourists but not to help us as communities, only committee members are benefiting* (Q1).

**Box 2.** Shakufweba is a 21-year-old resident of Ioma. His father works in Katima Mulilo and he is in charge of ensuring that everything at home is in order. Having completed high school two years ago, Shakufweba is tired of being unemployed. As far as he is concerned, since the Conservancy was established no benefits have been achieved, he complains of too many problem animals and he says, *I will be killing every animal that will enter our fields or attack our cattle.* His father is polygamous and has three wives. In his mother’s house alone they are 15 and they have 70 head of cattle. Therefore anything that threatens his household’s livelihood is met with strong resistance. Upon hearing that the Conservancy was to pay a total amount of N$2000 to Ioma community, he claims the section of his village suggested that the money be used for construction of a water dam to serve the whole village’s cattle. This proposal was forwarded to the Conservancy, but there was no response. *No, they have not yet given us feedback. They should not expect cooperation from us... I will only suggest a better way of how these issues can be handled to our satisfaction when I get feedback.* He concedes that Salambala was meant for the community to generate income and more so for tourists also. But he thinks that Salambala ...*will not progress because there is corruption and discrimination by the management of this Conservancy.*
Clearly, some respondents were upset. *It is not for the community because I am not benefiting and the community is not getting anything at all. It seems that it is only for tourists to visit and for the management to benefit* (Q37). He seems to point to the fact that the Conservancy has good intentions but it has not delivered yet. Salambala in one resident’s view is said to be a community Conservancy but it is not the case, *there is more discrimination in this Conservancy...tourists and members of the management are benefiting at our expense* (Q51). In addition, the respondent also indicated that the Conservancy is not entirely established for tourism but also for educational and conservation purposes. About 23 per cent considered Salambala as an area not for tourism purposes only but also *to protect wild animals and to reduce deforestation, but yes it can be used for tourism*, one of them said (Q56).

Despite the fact that there is a mixture of issues regarding the purpose of the establishment of the Conservancy, the residents know the Conservancy should one day benefit them in one way or another. Interestingly, less than five per cent of the respondents considered the Conservancy an environmental and educational area to be used by the local schools for research and environmental education purposes. Moreover, the lack of emphasis in the respondents’ view about conserving for future generations was also notable as one reason why the Conservancy was established.

The “Big Five” of African ecotourism, i.e. lion, elephant, buffalo, giraffe, and leopard, and many other animals can be seen in Salambala. Of particular interest are the lechwe and sitatunga because of their rarity and limited world distribution. In and around Caprivi Region, lechwe is the only large mammal species indigenous to the region (Stuart and Stuart 1992). In 1999 the Ministry of Environment and Tourism donated 25 impala *Aepyceros melampus* (Lichtenstein) from Etosha National Park to Salambala Conservancy. Furthermore WWF also donated 60 impala. According to the MET regional office, WWF also approved the purchase of 400 impala from Tuli Block in Botswana. Other species reported by MET office in the Conservancy include eland *taurotragus oryx* (Pallas), roan antelope *Hippotragus equinus* (Desmarest), rare sable antelope *Hippotragus niger* (Harris), red-lechwe, elephants, two resident lions and various predators, migrant Burchell’s zebras *Equus hippotigris burchelli* (Gray) and buffaloes. These animal species are among potential attractions for tourism to the region.
and Salambala in particular. In addition to wildlife, there are three arts and crafts centres in Salambala, at Ioma, Isuswa and Ngoma, while at Bukalo there is an open-air museum.

Notwithstanding this potential, only 7.1 per cent of the respondents reported to have been visited by tourists in the buffer zone. They also indicated that they had accommodated those tourists. Nevertheless, by looking at the activities they did with the ‘tourists’, which included farm-related activities (8.9 per cent), there is no doubt that these were just next of kin. Many families visit one another during the ploughing, weeding and harvesting seasons. This tradition enables the visitor to help the host. However, at the end of the visit, these visitors are given some part of the harvest in appreciation for their help. These arrangements are more common among women, and are part of the overall strategy of coping with poverty.

In the core area, records from the Conservancy visitor book show that between 1998 and January 2001 only 37 tourists visited the core area. Among them were four Americans, five Germans, two Dutch and seven South Africans, the rest being Namibian citizens. It is possible, however, that these ‘foreign tourists’ could have been staff of NGOs such as WWF and the World Conservation Union. When considering the amount generated from trophy hunting (N$50,000 per elephant), probably only four trophy hunters came to the Conservancy. This figure is confirmed by the indication that about 14 (25 per cent) of the respondents were visited by tourists and only two (3.6 per cent) came for trophy-hunting purposes, the latter of which was not tourism-related.

The community members reported that some (5.4 per cent) of the tourists who visited them were staying in the core area’s campsite. In the core area, there are four individual and private campsites (3/4 tents each; site 1 takes larger groups of 5/6 tents) with tap, barbecue area and a lapa kitchen with sink. In times of hot weather, large trees in the campsite surroundings provide shade. Each campsite is served with an adjacent flush toilet and shower. However, at site 1, these facilities were still to be repaired after elephants in search of water destroyed them in January 2001.

There are several reasons, which explain the low visitor rate in Salambala. One reason is the 1998 political instability and the 1999 bloody secessionist attack at Katima Mulilo. Although this is true, currently the major reason is the lack of marketing and promotion.
strategies. Considering the fact that few people actually know where the Conservancy begins and ends, the indications are that people think the core area is the one meant for conservation and tourism purposes, while in actual fact the whole Conservancy is meant for such aspiration. By implication, this means that currently there is no community-based tourism in Salambala. Due to the vulnerable location of the region, and being prone to political and media exaggerations, it is advisable to redirect the focus of marketing to domestic tourists. In addition, it may also be that the Conservancy has not been made attractive enough. For the locals from Katima Mulilo or other towns to visit the Conservancy, it must be made attractive enough for them. To determine the interests and demands of the local-domestic tourism market, market research is a must.

When future visits are considered, especially in relation to whether the communities of Salambala would be willing to host tourists in their homes for a fee, 53.6 per cent of the respondents indicated ‘yes’ and 46.4 per cent indicated ‘no’. The reason why they do not want to charge tourists (12.5 per cent) is because our culture and tradition do not provide for charging visitors, a visitor is accommodated free of charge (Q3). And that I feel it is like bribing or cheating people for something not worth it (Q40). These revelations show that traditional values are still strong. As a result, it will require some sociological perspectives to reconcile the two. At the heart of the above quotations is the community’s definition of ‘a being’ or a human being. In general terms if one is visiting or even passing by a village, such a person would not be let go without being given food or water.

When that happens, then a visitor would describe such people as ‘real people’. In other words, their measure of ‘a being’ is based on how best you treat others and make life as comfortable as possible for them. In this case, they feel it is not right to charge a tourist a fee because such as person will not describe them as ‘real people’ and would see them as not human enough. It is very important for them to spend for the good of others rather than to save for one’s own good. Hospitality is associated with being human. There is also a local proverb that one should not mistreat visitors because you only know where you are coming from, but you do not know where you are going (Q26). In the event that one is on a journey, they do not overrule the possibility that they may meet the same person they either mistreated or treated well, and may be treated the same way themselves. It is part of their tradition and values, which, they feel, should continue. A
sociological research on these issues would be interesting. However, I am not aware of any literature about culture in this region. Once revenue starts to come, it remains to be seen whether this thinking will change.

Another side of the story of ‘no’ is that there is mistrust and a feeling of caution in relation to foreigners. As discussed earlier, history still plays a major part in the community’s sense of trust. Some respondents said they would not allow or host tourists because the coming of tourists heralds the coming of missionaries and subsequent colonialism. As one 66-year-old respondent recalled *this is how they first came with the Bible and then everything changed* (Q7). Some respondents also argued that tourists come for different reasons, many of which are not known to them. Nonetheless, those who are willing to host tourists indicated they would offer anything that tourists requested whether it is accommodation, food or anything else.

To others, it is a question of preparedness without which the required quality of service cannot be achieved. The majority of the respondents said they have no training in tourism services and, as far as they were concerned, offering services to tourists without training may displease the tourist and amount to negative social impacts. As discovered during the field work, there is very little information, if any, available on tourism to the residents of Salambala. As to what tourism is and how it may be managed or the kind of services can be offered, there is little information provided to the community. This is not, however, contrary to claims by NACOBTA that they have offered training related to tourism. What this points out is that there is less information given to the community about what is going on in the Conservancy. Secondly, the training and information campaigns have been limited to a select few.

Ideally, with the availability of local schools, these courses could be institutionalised and integrated into the school programmes to offer ongoing training to learners and the interested community members. How can tourists be hosted if *I do not know how to handle a tourist, I will just treat him or her like an ordinary visitor... to whom I will provide accommodation and meals free... that is all I do* (Q24). It must be asked, therefore, what package should tourists come for? Or is this all that can be provided locally, owing to the potential and the rich culture, lifestyle and crafts which a potential tourist may be looking for? Again, certainly not. There is a need for a more proactive
strategy in advancing community-based tourism in Salambala. More information, education and training are undoubtedly also required in this regard.

4.2.1 The multiplier effect

When the potential benefits of tourism are considered, one vital factor of community-based tourism to be considered is the multiplier effect (Coltman 1989). A holistic approach to the local economy helps in understanding this effect. Consider money spent in a campsite by students from a local school. To be operational, a community-run campsite needs to buy new equipment and the surroundings must be made attractive to visitors. Payments for those items may be made to the manufactures of the equipment and decoration/art items, and they in turn will spend the money in the local economy. The campsite operators or the ‘tourists’ may buy food, alcohol and additional supplies from other suppliers who may have to buy their products from yet another source. The campsite will have employees who have to be paid and who in turn will spend their money in the local economy.

Some people, after receiving the money, may put some of it in the bank. The bank can use the money for loans to enterprises and individuals requiring it. Banks may also pay interest to depositors and profits to shareholders. In this process, a dairy farmer, cattle herder, fisherman, basket maker or a wild-fruit gatherer may benefit from tourism revenues’ multiplier effect without knowing it. How feasible is the multiplier effect in Salambala? Are there sectors that can be networked to make the multiplier effect produce results? Depending on the scale (whether local, regional or national) the feasibility is within ‘spitting distance’. Equipment can be purchased and banking is available some 60 km away in Katima Mulilo; all other services are available in the Conservancy. The major question is: How large can the multiplier effect of an area such as Salambala be? The extent of the multiplier effect depends in part on how closely the local economic sectors are linked, and/or how diverse the activities within a tourist area are (Coltman 1989).

The larger and more networked the economy is the higher the tangible effect. If the available sectors feed their needs from the sectors within their local area, there will be
less need for goods to be imported and as a result the multiplier effect arguably will be higher. For the multiplier effect to be achieved, Salambala being in a communal area, there must be change in the land tenure system and there must be an integrated approach with other economic (informal, not illegal and formal) sectors without which a leakage effect is likely. This will require support from the central government and a concerted effort to stabilise the political and economic system of the region. See Coltman (1989) for more on multiplier and leakage effects.

4.3 Planning sustainable community-based tourism

One of the difficulties in providing a commonly accepted definition of tourism is its links with other suppositions. When it is not defined, it creates difficulties in planning and operating tourism establishments. However, concepts such as environment, nature, land, people and economics complicate its definition. In other words, depending on the scope of the study the definition is not centred on the characteristics of the tourist, but rather it is essentially about the product, the geographical location and how such tourism product is being provided. Obviously not every traveller fits the concept of being a tourist. In the survey, 23.2 per cent of the respondents indicated that they are not willing to host tourists if they are not informed properly about their coming. I am very suspicious these days... you never know what they are looking for and how they will get it, we need to be very careful, some of these people are rebels, we need to be careful, one respondent indicated (Q30). As far as some respondents were concerned, it depends on the tourists’ nationalities because some of the tourists are spies...and [they] can be hostile to our national security, Botswana Angolans for example (Q27). In one female respondent’s words we know that some of them do not come to build, but to destroy (Q2) and it is such people they will not host, she said.

While history and current political rhetoric may account for some of the suspicions, comments such as these are an indication of limited information regarding tourism and ecotourists. Overall, according to the survey, 69.6 per cent would be happy to host tourists, regardless of whether it is in their homes or not. Just as one said, We just want all [tourists], we do not want discrimination... all these people can come and we will show them and tell them how we live... how we relate to one another... in that process
we learn from each other (Q24). Education and knowledge are two aspects that the respondents pointed to when speaking of hosting tourists. As far as some of them were concerned, the process of hosting a tourist is in itself a learning environment. When tourists come they will learn a lot from us, but we will also learn a lot from them, so we like everybody, said the respondent (Q17). After all, hosting a tourist is when you can know what is happening between the country and its people, one male respondent said (Q29).

In addition to income requirements of the host, it appears that there are also social needs at the host place. Opportunities to meet people and learn about them, their lives, to gain new knowledge of different countries and people and to make friends are also part of the personal motivations of the hosts. These non-economic motivations are also acknowledged by Oppermann (1995), Kovács (1998) and were also personally observed in Lithuania in 2001. Of the total respondents only 3.6 per cent said they would not host any tourist no matter what.

**Box 3.** At Isuswa lives 24-year-old Mwala. He is training to be a teacher at the Caprivi College of Education. In his assessment, Salambala should be used for educational purposes, especially by the local schools. Even though tourism may be an alternative he considers it a lower priority. During school holidays he works as a part-time worker in Katima Mulilo. As far as he is concerned, even if tourism and employment opportunities were increased in Salambala, people would not change their loyalty to agriculture because we believe in what we do ourselves and we cannot depend on money only. In his view, it is not the introduction of new species that will change the status of Salambala but rather the change in people who are engaged with the Conservancy activities. In case some more animals are introduced, his advice is there must be a proper impact assessment before anything is done…we know poaching is going on…there are also issues of the carrying capacity. Mwala does not have parents; they died a couple of years ago. His elder brother also died three years ago. In addition to the help he gets from relatives, he tries to fund his younger brother’s education by doing part-time work. He strongly maintains the future rests on education.

It appears that community-based tourism by itself is complex and dictates that the supplier of tourism rather than the seeker should be educated. In addition, the supplier must be directly involved in research in order to understand the natural, economic and social patterns affected by demand. More so, there is a need to understand and integrate these patterns in the overall supply package. If community-based tourism were to be developed in Salambala, it would require a new strategy that would call for change in the local school curriculum and a collaborative approach between various institutions. Schools, wildlife managers, traditional authorities, fishermen, artists, local NGOs,
business people, farmers, security forces and political institutions have to constitute a working group that could embark on tourism planning and management. Without instituting a stakeholders and interest groups’ forum it is hard to see how community-based tourism can possibly be a potential sustainable option for community development in Salambala.

4.3.1 The definition of a tourist

A tourist is a person with an unknown agenda of travel (Salambala resident)

We have already discussed tourists at great length, but do we really know who/what a tourist is? What is the difference for instance, between a traveller and a tourist? When does a traveller become a tourist? Sometimes it is interesting to hear what rural communities think of tourists, and also I was interested in finding out what the local people’s definition of a tourist is. The majority’s analogy contained the words such as ‘foreign’, ‘money’, ‘animals’, ‘nature’ ‘forest’ and ‘travel’. Figure 4 shows different definitions from Salambala. In the view of some local community members, tourists are those people who go out travelling, investing money and also marketing places they visited in their home country (traditional leader). While they are travellers with lots of money to spend, by watching animals some of them come for study purposes and in return they pay money or financial contribution to the Conservancy (student). Noteworthy is that the concept seems to be attached to greener environments and finance.

In addition, the community considers tourism to be for people from towns. As far as they are concerned, a tourist is a person who visits places where there are animals, arts and craft items to see (Q49). As travelling requires money, a tourist is a person who travels and visits a lot of areas, it is people with money, one male respondent argued (Q20). What seems absent in the community’s definition of a tourist is the motivation and purpose of visit by a tourist. Furthermore, what is moreover lacking is the quality experience that most tourists would want to have. Tourists do not just travel; they travel because they have a set of specific issues to acquaint themselves with. Furthermore, they
travel because there are values they attach to the area of destination in relation to how it will satisfy them (Coltman 1989). That satisfaction takes various forms and patterns.

Table 3. A host of definitions of a tourist by inhabitants of Salambala Conservancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person who wants to learn and understand more about other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody who moves around and camps in forests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who brings peace to the host place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A non-resident of the area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who go out taking photographs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relative who visits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from towns, people who have never seen animals and greener environments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person with a unknown agenda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visitor who comes for tourism purposes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People travelling, seeing places, mainly white people</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who brings development to the country by buying local products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who moves from place to place</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A foreigner who spends money on visiting other places to which he or she does not belong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No idea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who visits on special occasion but pays for accomodation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A visitor from a foreign place</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person who comes to unknown places for enjoyment or study purposes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody from afar who comes to watch animals and pays for it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody from afar with lots of money</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is indeed money that enables people to travel from Finland to Namibia for example, but they are not tourists for that reason. Defining a travellers as tourists according to their financial capability is like defining a soldier as dangerous corresponding to the amour in his possession. Doing so, however, is incorrect because it is not the amour that makes him a dangerous soldier but rather his motivation. Thus, while it is educational or mind-improving to travel, some tourists travel for spiritual, physical, psychological or curiosity reasons. This is one aspect that the local community should be informed about in relation to tourism supply. Since it is not about what the supplier thinks will satisfy the seeker but it is rather about ‘what will satisfy the one in need’. Quality experience is a matter that cannot be ignored in tourism. In tourism management circles, quality experience is used in comparative terms to indicate a degree of brilliance or superiority over services offered in a particular place as opposite of service offered somewhere else.
(Gyimothy 2000). Nonetheless, quality experience should be described and interpreted in relative terms so as to ‘fit the purpose’ for which it is designed (Juran 1979). An examination of quality assurance in customer care has clearly demonstrated that if hospitality and tourism business are to achieve a quality system to meet customer expectations, then the provision of material resources alone is insufficient (Sweeney and Wanhill 1996).

A rural development and community project requires a holistic approach. Seldom is this approach followed. The assumption is often that land use, law, politics, regional development and marketing are natural processes that are inherently in place, or what Howitt (2001) criticises as mistakenly thought of as ‘common sense’. However, these disciplines are necessary for one to be able to comprehensively undertake a successful community project. They are important because they affect the implementation of such projects. Therefore, they form an essential component to be integrated in the planning and implementing phases of a community project such as Salambala Conservancy.

There are three basic elements that seem to complement CBT, i.e. nature, economic livelihoods and cultural preservation, and three identifiable types of tourists, i.e. adventure, culture and ecotourists. Together they would enable the Conservancy authorities to understand and prioritise the motives of tourists’ travel, e.g. physical, psychological, spiritual reasons and so on. These motives together should meet the principles of sustainability, community needs, the disciplines above and the legislation in place. When a systems approach is considered (Jafari 1983), over time community-based tourism can be re-oriented to specific objectives and can be cemented with other land-use plans. A systems approach allows the use of other disciplines in researching, planning, implementing and evaluating CBT.

4.4 Land use practices and new species support in Salambala

4.4.1 It is the land that matters

According to the survey results, the majority (66 per cent) of households in Salambala are subsistence farmers. Livestock rearing and crop cultivation provides for the significant part of the community’s livelihood (Naeraa et al. 1993). As earlier indicated, the majority of the respondents (87.5 per cent) depend on domesticated animals such as
cattle, chickens and goats, to a lesser extent pigs, for survival. Many are also dependent on gathering from the core area. The majority indicated they cut housing poles (73.2 per cent), collect firewood (37.5 per cent), cut thatching grass (39.3 per cent), and gather wild fruits (19.6 per cent) from the core area. Under current regulations, the residents of Salambala are required to have a permit in order to cut housing poles in the core area.

According to the survey, however, very few cut housing poles with permits from the Khuta. They say it is expensive to travel to Bukalo to obtain permits. Such responsibilities could easily be decentralised to village Indunas or alternatively school authorities. Apart from the formal sectors that some households’ members are part of, many (42 per cent) are involved in informal economic activities. In addition to agriculture, these activities include traditional beer brewing, piecework, seasonal fishing and selling. The combination of these activities constitutes the economic coping strategies in Salambala. Although not evidenced with hard facts in this study, some households depend on funds sent by relatives and/or the governments’ pension system. More youthful and working-age people in towns usually send their children to live with grandmothers in the rural areas. Funds from relatives are then sent to the respective families living in the countryside.

Namibia and South Africa are the only two countries in southern Africa that have a system of pension payments. Regardless of whether the person has worked or not, the aged (65 years), disabled, physically and mentally challenged qualify for the payments. Lack of identification documents (many complained about this issue) is, however, a problem. Without the document no pension is paid. No matter how little (N$250 per month) the pension may be, it is usually shared and used by the whole household unit. In other words, it is not only the recipient who uses the money but also the people (dependants) with whom he or she lives. In some instances, the pension also pays for school fees in addition to buying household groceries.

Funds from relatives are also used for the same purpose. At the time of research 50 kg of maize-meal, which is the staple food in the region, was costing N$90. The residents have to buy maize-meal in Katima Mulilo at a transport cost of about N$15. In the floodplains, the transport cost is N$50. Maize-meal prices are much higher in local groceries. According to the survey, considering that the households in Salambala have
more mouths to feed, many households are economically challenged. It is no wonder that many households in the Conservancy, as the findings indicate, have a tendency of being loyal to subsistence agriculture. Due to the redundancy that was created after independence, particularly for those who served in the South West African Territorial Force (SWATF), most households rely on subsistence farming. Nonetheless, about 60.7 per cent of the respondents indicated they would not reduce dependence on agriculture even if other opportunities such as employment arose in Salambala.

As far as they are concerned, it takes ageing, sicknesses and death for one to stop farming. They argue that formal work and other ways of livelihood offer no security and may cause social disappointments. *No, because I regard this work [employment] temporal, and because when you make a mistake they fire you. I will depend only on land* (Q45). Another respondent echoed, *No, I would remain a farmer because I don’t rely on such jobs, because I might be dismissed… and then suffer again… I will do both work and farm* (Q44). Even though this is partly the reason, the major (17.9 per cent) reason is that they consider employment to be for the younger generation. In the view of some elderly people, trying to work in Salambala Conservancy is not worth it because *work is for young people* (Q47) and that they have other high priorities, too.

Previously, drought affected Caprivi’s agricultural production for the years 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996 and 2000, and as hence it is not surprising that some people indicated *If it is a drought time… there is no choice, I will work* (Q32). In a situation of poverty one has to do all it takes to find a way of living. Likewise the people of Salambala, on a day-to-day basis, have to find a way of living. It was therefore not unexpected that about 10.7 per cent of the respondents indicated that they would do both, if work opportunities were there, in order to attain maximum resources at their disposal. In an event where Salambala would offer employment opportunities *I will do both to maximise my earnings* (Q13).

Whereas others (those who indicated yes) had hopes of selling crafts and arts to potential tourists, working and sending funds to family, others want to use land as pasture only and to try out partnerships with companies from elsewhere. The majority of people in the Conservancy desire to continue and expand crop cultivation. Potential partnership with companies is an innovative idea but regrettably such a move would
most likely be blocked under communal land law. In Salambala, land is not yet a scarce commodity. The problem is tenure and ownership of land. This will continue to hamper many development efforts and dreams in the area for a while. The need to put land tenure in place is urgent.

As a business idea, partnership with companies means that land has to be managed properly, declared private and be fenced, the last of which is unlikely to be tolerated both by the community and the Khuta as it means reduction in access to grazing land presently not owned by the community but used communally. In the event that both the Khuta and the community accept a partnership venture as a potential solution, a significant reduction in the number of current livestock and particularly cattle numbers would be required in Salambala. The 56 households surveyed in this study owned the total of 1079 cattle. It remains to be seen if anything may alter the attachment to cattle.

While some respondents (12.5 per cent) indicated to have been involved in a land dispute because of the resettlement from the core area, 87.5 per cent had not heard or got involved in a land-related dispute because of the resettlement. Those who had been involved complained that while in Salambala [core area], some people took our farmland... we have serious problems. There is just no way to survive. Now we have no place (Q47). Nonetheless, bearing in mind the current settlement pattern, it is unlikely that such farmland dispute had been provoked by the resettlement from the core area.

Furthermore, land problems in communal areas are difficult to solve because the claims are made that ‘my grandfather used to live and/or farm in this or that area’ without any form of document for verification. This is not to suggest that such a system is too primitive but rather to simply point to the fact that such a system is no longer compatible with today’s way of life. In the present case, it is well known that the families still own houses where they lived previously and they have houses where they reside now. Although it is not articulated, this matter is partly a question of place attachment but essentially a question of need for land and tenure security. Such problems are undoubtedly likely to increase. The recent migration patterns and the fact that there is no change in ownership between the former place and the new one only underline the need for an urgent but contextual and proper reform of communal land.
4.4.2 Support for new species in Salambala

In this section, the idea was to assess the community’s willingness to the introduction of new animal species. I wanted to know which animals they support, why and if not, and what are the reasons for their choices. Because wildlife is one of the central attractions to tourists, it is important to assess the implication the community’s willingness has on conservation, controlled utilisation and community-based tourism. According to the traditional leaders in Salambala, the area was rich in animals previously and the return of wildlife is something that this generation should appreciate. As far as they were concerned, the land was beautiful and there was ‘real life’. They loved the abundance of animals because it was part of the system that supported their livelihood. On a day-to-day basis, it was the fauna and flora that provided food, medicine, clothing and protection for their lives. It was probably a sustainable lifestyle and the ecosystem supported them because they were few.

However, there have been changes to this lifestyle. The modernisation era and its economic systems have brought about a new way of life; a lifestyle that is of economic circumstances, challenging and expensive to live in. Nowadays some animals are scarce while some animals have become extinct (Rodwell et al. 1995). In hypothetical terms, one is able to suggest two theories on why this is so. One attributes the scarcity of animals to too high human population and the other to unsustainable policies and inadequate approaches of managing the relationship between humans and nature. As discussed in Chapters one, two and three, all of the above are undeniable factors contributing to the challenges faced in managing natural resources. Besides all the rhetoric, the real issue is that there is a need to find a way by which the rural communities can meet their needs while maintaining conservation of wildlife in their areas for future generations. It remains to be seen as to which of the two in the community’s eyes should be a priority, as each affects natural resource management in a different way, and the impact varies in kind and in degree in different places.

Despite all the difficulties with ‘problem animals’ reported in the community, it is surprising that the majority (92.9 per cent) of respondents indicated they would support the introduction of large animal species to Salambala. They are after all, dependent on wildlife for survival. The few that expressed reservations were conceivably more
enlightened with issues of conservation. In their view it is a question of whom it will benefit, but for now No, when animals come they will not give them to us... it will not work said one respondent (Q21). Another respondent also acknowledged that more animals mean more problems and misunderstandings with government... the more animals the more problems... we will end up with no land (Q25), as these animals need more land and can be difficult to manage. Meaning, it is an issue that must be studied carefully to see whether the carrying capacity of the area can accommodate such a move... there were impalas introduced to this area from Botswana but they are migrating and nobody knows why (Q40).

According to the survey results, the type of species mainly supported by the conservancy community, are large herbivorous mammals such as elephants, antelopes, kudus, buffaloes, zebras, giraffes, wildebeests, impalas, rhinos and springboks Antidorcas marsupialis (Zimmermann). Even though governments come and go, the current government authorities also hold the same desire. However, springboks apparently cannot survive in Salambala due to tall grass [makes grazing difficult], but also that tall grass makes them too vulnerable to predators, one MET official indicated. The support for predators was notably absent. Very few supported all animals or specifically predators. This result may indicate the fact that there is a stronger correlation between cattle and the local community than with crops. Knowing that mammals would trample the fields but supporting their introduction can only suggest that the local community would tolerate the damage. However, that tolerance is absent for predators due to the societal and economic value that the community attaches to livestock.

When considering the reasons for supporting the introduction of new species, the majority (42.9 per cent) indicated that they considered the proposal of new species to increase tourism, more economic returns in the Conservancy and as a result better chances for employment. In addition, some of them (30.4 per cent) also regarded such a measure as something substantial for future generations because species like springbok [are not known] by my young grandson since he was born, he never saw a springbok but now he will see them in Salambala (Q5). One considered the introduction of new species to be for those who do not know such animals for them to know (Q15). Some of the respondents were more pro-conservationist. For them (8.9 per cent) the proposal means
that the land would be beautiful, because of wild animals’ presence (Q10, also echoed by Q33).

Of all the respondents 5.4 per cent supported the introduction of new species because such animals (mammals) can also provide food. As one traditional leader put it, they should kill some of them for us once in a while... so that we can make festivities. Another 5.4 per cent supported the introduction of mammals because they are no threat to their livestock. As far as some youth were concerned, I support the introduction of giraffe, zebra, springbok, kudu, wildebeest and oryx (sable antelope), because it would increase tourism in our Conservancy, and I [would] be introduced to new species which I did not know (Q38). For others, it is because I have not seen these animals before (Q44) and that, as far as one was concerned, these animals are not available here in the Conservancy. It will also promote tourism (Q49). In addition, these mammals are big and when sold it is good money (Q9) for the Conservancy. It appears that the community concedes that there is a need for more conservation and that it is essential for the future generation, and for the future of the Conservancy.

5 THE FUTURE OF SALAMBALA CONSERVANCY

Despite all the problems and issues affecting Salambala, available data seem to show that the community is hopeful about the potential in the area. Whereas the survey results are still the focus, this section is intended to measure the vision of the Conservancy in the three years to come in the Conservancy’s view while simultaneously considering the problems that were raised during the field work. According to the survey, 14.3 per cent of the respondents regarded the Conservancy as having a grey future. They argued that there would be no improvements in the Conservancy. Some of these assertions arose from the fact that the Conservancy has not been without problems. There have been some areas of disappointments and difficulties.

Some had hopes of being employed and are now struggling to come to terms with the reality of unemployment. They further suggested that the Conservancy will not be successful: may be but according to what I see nothing will happen, because all what they [management] do is to promise people but nothings happens (Q5). In one respondent’s view it is a grey area, because I don’t know what will happen since I am
not well informed about the Conservancy (Q50). Moreover it may not work because there are no tourists... animals that are there are few... only lions and hyenas, which kill our cattle and threaten our lives (Q55). In other words, they seem to suggest an increase in the marketing of Salambala and a reduction in predators. This indicates to the challenge of keeping the numbers of predators at tolerable levels or levels of acceptable limits and to reconcile the latter with the economic returns the communities expect to have. This issue is particularly overwhelming because two lions should not be seen as too much yet they are enough to cause problems.

However, as far as some community members (21.4 per cent) were concerned, Salambala’s failure would be a matter of the administration of the area. Salambala may be successful but I have no hope for a better future [for the Conservancy] in its present structure and present management (Q53). There seems to be disillusionment in the current management among the community. Allegations of corruption and nepotism were significant. According to the management and constitution, vacancies of non-professional posts are announced in meetings in the particular area where the vacancy exists. The villagers are then expected to vote for an individual in their view best qualified for the post. While it is possible that some influential families may get their sons or daughters voted in, it is not the problem of the management, the management is dictated by the will of the majority and must stand by the constitutional procedures.

There may not be corruption or nepotism as such, as some people alleged, but rather some misunderstandings stemming from the lack of communication between the management and the Conservancy members. The possibilities for corruption and nepotism to occur, however, cannot be ruled out. Under unusual circumstances, venality may happen either by unilateral decision by the management or in instances where not many people turn up for the meeting, which is likely in some rural communities. Also bearing in mind the distrust among the Conservancy members, the attendance of meetings may not be up to desirable levels. This by itself creates a situation where a few people’s choice is likely to be elected for a post.

Besides stating that management committee members shall serve for three years, the constitution is silent regarding the tenure of the office bearers in case there is a need for re-election and the number of times one may contest for office. The very fact that the
community has so many (21.4 per cent) concerned about the change of management is an indication of problems of silence, misunderstanding and lack of information dissemination among the respective parties. In essence, both the management and the executive committee’s terms of office were expiring this year (2001). Nonetheless, the majority (37.4 per cent) of the respondents expected that the Conservancy will be very successful in the three years to come provided they increase water for animals and market it to [potential] tourists... it should be successful (Q48). In the interviews with a government official, it became clear that there is a need to change the drinking water system [currently it is drinking troughs] to more natural swamps. We plan to flood these swamps by installing water pump engines... because currently animals do not drink this water [as it] is too hot for them, he said.

There are four swamps (Salambala, Nyete, Mazibabili and Telahe) in the core area, and they are usually flooded only after plentiful rains. They all provide food to the local community in the form of water lilies and their tubers. Optimistic respondents stressed the importance and potential of Salambala Conservancy. It should be successful if we remain united and more effort is put into the Conservancy (Q16). Like the old political saying ‘united we stand, divided we fall’, they argue that the only way by which Salambala would be successful is to have a concerted effort together as a team. Hence it only calls for a working and forum groups that would function as stakeholders in the Conservancy affairs. Another vital part for some people would be to emphasise the importance of trophy species. If trophy hunting continues then we will see benefits... but we also need donor funds to train people and develop the area (Q9).

5.1 Evaluation of the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA)

Until recently, the tourism sector in Namibia was developed, owned, managed and controlled by a minority private sector and partly by the state. These two entities offered traditional tourism products such as wildlife, desert and wilderness environments, safaris, and the heritage of Namibia’s colonial past. After independence in 1990, the Namibian Government formulated policies and issued legislation to promote sustainable tourism. The government emphasised the involvement of all communities throughout
the country in tourism and natural resource management, including wildlife conservation.

The landmark for the establishment of community-based tourism has been the establishment of the Namibia Community-Based Tourism Association (NACOBTA). Various communities in rural Namibia involved in tourism initiated NACOBTA in 1995. As the responsible organisation, and a member of the Federation of Namibian Tourism Association (FENATA), the umbrella organisation of the private sector, primarily, the association is charged with the development of community-based tourism, particularly the operations of conservancies. NACOBTA receives financial support from United States Aid for International Development (USAID), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and the European Union (EU).

Relative growth in tourism prompted the need for an association to champion the development of community-based tourism in Namibia. In addition to facilitating Conservancy operations, NACOBTA is also tasked with the promotion of the natural and cultural resources of the local communities as tourist attractions, since they may generate economic benefits. At present, the organisation has 38 member enterprises, including conservancies, campsites, rest camps, traditional villages, craft centres, museums, and indigenous tour guides’ associations. According to NACOBTA, there are currently 40 CBT enterprises co-ordinated all over Namibia. A further number of communities are being assisted in initiating and developing tourism enterprises.

A seven-member management committee, each active in a community-based tourism enterprise, directs NACOBTA. The vice-chairperson of Salambala, for instance, also serves on the management committee of NACOBTA in the capacity of vice-chairperson. NACOBTA collaborates closely with the private sector in the achievement of its aims and objectives. The association aims to increase involvement in community-based tourism and to ensure equal distribution of tourism benefits in the whole of Namibia. In other words, the organisation markets the community enterprises equally. NACOBTA gains the co-operation of communities through partnerships and some in-service training and development courses it offers to member organisations. These courses are meant to enlighten rural communities about business proposals and teach them how to manage
small enterprises. Furthermore, the courses are planned so as to improve some community members’ skills in tourism and tourism-related businesses. The association also promotes and markets their products in national and international tourism fairs. Similarly, NACOBTA involves communities in roles of responsibility in the management of CBT enterprises.

5.2 The role of NACOBTA in Salambala

While NACOBTA’s primary objectives in community-based tourism are to aid job creation, poverty alleviation, community participation and economic growth, it is difficult to assess the role of NACOBTA in Caprivi and Salambala in particular. There are several reasons why this is so. First, as far as tourism is concerned, most of the difficulties Caprivi faces are institutional and political in nature. For example, the decrease in incoming tourists was a result of the institutional and political insensitivity of the central government when it was decided to help the Angolan Government to fight against the UNITA rebel movement. As a result, some of NACOBTA’s aims were made difficult to achieve in Caprivi. Secondly, the fact that the association is still young also means that the majority of people are not aware of its activities.

Thirdly, NACOBTA’s plans for rural tourism development are influenced by the current legislation on land and natural resource use. If such legislation is not implemented, then NGOs like NACOBTA are also negatively affected. Besides this difficulty, there are other challenges to CBT implementation, and the challenge is how rural development ventures can best be diversified to benefit a larger number of the community in the shortest possible time. By its nature, NACOBTA can only operate efficiently in a decentralised set-up, in which currently the central government still decides much of what should be done.

For some time now, one challenge has been how to ensure that human capacity and the technical upkeep in the Conservancy are able to deliver real economic results without compromising either the local culture or the environment. Another challenge would be to open up the ‘communal comradeship’ society from both secrecy about poaching and the partly colonial legacy of seeing authorities as opponents. It is well known that people are poaching. However, the communities within which the poachers live are
silent about the ongoing activities. This is because cultural and extended family relationships between people are still strong.

Nonetheless, in Salambala Conservancy it is even more difficult to evaluate NACOBTA. The major reasons are that there are no real CBT enterprises and secondly, those that are there are operationally vague. The arts and crafts centres for example are run on a ‘whoever comes’ basis. They have no clear objectives and operational plans under which to run the enterprises. It remains to be seen whether CBT should be operated that way anyway. Since CBT involves mostly people who are not well educated and are often under-funded, there must be concerns for NGOs, governments and Conservancy management to work toward possible solutions. This is not to undermine the fact that there is also valuable local knowledge, but the argument is that the ways in which enterprises operate require some form of education. Be that as it may, the evaluation is done on the basis of the field work data. Because there was limited time to confirm or prove some of what NACOBTA claims to have been successes, they should be treated with caution. The questions that follow are meant to evaluate NACOBTA’s specific work in Salambala.

5.2.1 Have NACOBTA’s information campaign and workshops been effective?

As discussed earlier, NACOBTA carried out educational and informative meetings about tourism and small medium-sized enterprises in Salambala. However, the residents of Salambala remain uninformed about tourism and there is a general lack of information. The majority of people did not know of any NGOs operating in Salambala Conservancy. Furthermore, understandably so, there is also a tendency to see tourists as people who could be very hostile to the Conservancy residents and the state. This supposes that those who host a tourist or tourists should be careful because tourists’ missions are unknown or hidden, in their view. A vigorous campaign to inform residents about tourism and tourists is only a part of the necessary steps that the association needs to embark upon. This is important because the measure of knowledge the community has about tourism is the same measure by which tourists’ satisfaction will be met.
The association also reports that it had conducted seventeen tourism workshops and training courses in the last three years, involving participants from five out of thirteen regions, including Salambala Conservancy. In the interviews one of the participants of the course on small and medium-sized enterprises said that *the course was very educational for us, but what we need now is access to loans so that we can start to develop...* [tourism enterprises]. It was also claimed that young people and women have been active leaders in initiating tourism development activities in their areas. Despite this claim, there were no young people directly involved with the Conservancy in Salambala. It is unlikely, however, that young and educated people will take up positions in the Conservancy even if they are made available to them. Lower salaries and the bureaucracy of the traditional system are no longer compatible with the youth.

Nonetheless, young people need to be encouraged to actively participate directly in the planning and implementation of the Conservancy programmes and activities. Out of the six-member executive committee two are women. When looking at the village representatives on the management committee it was also clear that there are fewer women, eight out of the 29 representatives were women (Salambala Conservancy 1998). On the other hand, bearing in mind previous tendencies of isolating women, this is a very significant move. Many women are involved in making arts and crafts, and they are also the people responsible for the selling of these items. However, there is nothing new about this trend. Women’s activities have not changed, they continue to work on the same things they have been working on for many decades. Women have been doing such work for many years, understanding it as their responsibility as culture requires. This leads one to ask: Has public opinion of tourism and tourists in Salambala changed?

NACOBTA claimed that there has been an increase in public awareness and understanding about community-based tourism and tourists. It was also claimed that environmental conservation and increased knowledge of the different types of tourism facilities and attractions in the various communities have likewise improved. While indeed there has been some understanding regarding conservation, very little is known about tourists and tourism. Furthermore, some community members believed that tourists are people who only visit parks, would only be accommodated in hotels in towns, take pictures in the countryside and fly back to their home countries and towns.
All being well, as workshops and campaigns increase in Salambala, public opinion about tourism and tourists will change.

5.2.2  Have enterprise ownership and tourism development become the right of the majority?

It is claimed that ownership, control and development of tourism have ceased to be the prerogative of a select few (NACOBTA 2001). In strict terms, tourism as an industry has moved from a select few to a new elite group. Even though the process of tourism development is no longer the responsibility of the select few, tourism is still practically in the hands of the few. Most tourism establishments are privately owned. The few that communities do control and own are mostly campsites with little revenue derived thereof compared with the number of people that are supposed to depend on it. It should be pointed out here that this is not because NACOBTA has been ineffectual, but rather it is a technical issue relating to absence or existence of legislation and financial mechanisms that affect new enterprises.

Moreover, privately-owned establishments are easy to manage and overall they render more effective services to customers than government and community-oriented services. In Caprivi for example, aside from the Salambala campsite, Lianshulu campsite (along the River Kwando) and the Lizauli traditional village (along the Kongola-Katima road), all other tourism establishments are in the hands of a few private people. However, in institutional terms, Caprivi ranks second with four conservancies (Kwandu, Salambala, Mayuni and Wuparo) after the Kunene region, which has seven conservancies. NACOBTA’s effort in this regard has been successful. Has this, however, meant an increase in partnerships between the private sector and the communities?

It is argued that there has been an increase in partnerships between the private sector and communities. In general terms, such partnerships indeed exist, but they are not indicative of a ‘smart partnership’. In Caprivi, where these partnerships are in place between private lodge owners and communities, the private sector charges entrance and bed levy fees that are then invested into the community. There are no institutional ties that would permit the local people access to management and marketing skills. For example, an expansion venture between the community and private sector is reported to
exist between Lianshulu Lodge and the Lizauli traditional village (Ashley and Garland 1994). As a result of that partnership, visiting the traditional village is part of the package that a tourist gets when residing in Lianshulu Lodge. The profit is shared between the two entities. Arrangements such as this one economically benefit the community but do not lead to self-sufficiency in a long term. As such these arrangements are self-defeating and keep communities in dependence. However, a monitoring mechanism to ensure that the rural community ‘gets what it is entitled to’ still has to be put in place. Moreover, the venture in Salambala failed due to reasons discussed earlier. For more on partnerships between communities and private investors see Ashley and Garland (1994).

5.2.3 Did NACOBTA’s role help in reviving culture?

The general rhetoric about community-based tourism in Namibia is that culture is of value to tourists. During an academic excursion with the University of Namibia in the south of the country in 1999, we studied community-private sector arrangements of tourism in commercial farmlands. We visited one farm where the San people are enticed by lodge owners in the name of cultural revival. They are taken on a daily basis away from their normal residence to an artificial San village some kilometres away. While we were there, each of us (56 students and two staff, as tourists) was charged N$70 for a ‘San culture experience’. After every two weeks, an amount of N$250 was paid to the villagers collectively. When talking to them, they expressed anger and alleged abuse. While they indeed conveyed interest in seeing their culture maintained, they were not happy, and the question we need to ask is: What is the right way of approaching such arrangements? Is there a right way when dealing with culture?

Saarinen (2001) in Finnish Lapland also records this trend. For instance, Saarinen (1998, 223) records that in summer 1998, refrigerators were advertised on national television by a well-known Finnish actor dressed in a supposedly Sami costume with mud on his face and hay under his ethnic-looking hat. Before the actor runs out of the picture to the snow-covered fell landscape at Levi skiing resort in western Lapland, he speaks with an artificial ‘Sami accent’ about the freezing qualities of the product while flexes his wrist as if he were lifting a bottle of alcohol.
Saarinen (ibid.) concludes that this suggestive drunken behaviour and addiction to alcohol, muddy face, almost toothless mouth and the use of hay allude to the historically-constructed negative representations and discourses of the Sami in travel literature. This tendency to advertise cultures as primitive only raises question of ethics in tourism marketing. Overall, management, authenticity, ethics and economic considerations are important issues in tourism (Murphy 1985, 30-38). These are issues that the World Tourism Organisation is pursuing (MCB University Press, Internet page).

The Lizauli traditional village is seen as an attempt to revive culture. This so-called revival, however, has no impact on the youth that the revival is supposed to benefit. If this is the case, how effective is community planning and to what extent can it be achieved?

5.2.4 Has NACOBTA effectively affected community-based planning process?

Overall, the communities in Caprivi have formed conservancies and management committees, providing an opportunity for traditional authorities to attain and/or maintain their leadership role. It must be noted here that traditional leaders in Salambala seem to be taking a ‘hovering’ approach in Conservancy affairs. Probably they do not want to be seen as interfering in the day-to-day activities of the management. So far, four communal area conservancies have been established, registered and made into legal entities in Caprivi Region, i.e. Kwandu, Mayuni, Wuparo and Salambala. In Namibia as a whole, more than 25 conservancies are currently being formed (Appendix 1) and the number is growing.

When conservancies are approved, registered and made into legal entities, the communities can keep the income derived from hunting, trophy hunting and sale of game. Unlike in CAMPFIRE, the Conservancy is exempted from tax payments, they get one hundred per cent of the income (MET official). Besides all these laudable developments, much of what is done is in actual fact done by the central governments. Local authorities have no power, and the authority to approve or recognise a conservancy is at the pleasure of the Minister of the Environment and Tourism, and a conservancy can only be made into a legal entity by the president. On the one hand,
when do we draw a line as to what constitutes community planning and what does not? And on the other, what is it that communities define and consider as ‘management’, ‘capacity building’, ‘institutional strengthening’ and ‘planning’? How and what should we negotiate with them? Just as Howitt (2001, 155) notes, there are ‘often profound misunderstandings about goals, purpose and process in even non-conflictual arrangements’. Community-based planning is still far from being realised, but the absence of community planning and partly the political sensitivity, instability, and the peripheral location of the region explain the circumstances in which Salambala finds itself.

This, however, does not mean a superior job would have been impossible. Non-governmental organisations such as NACOBTA and IDRC could have done a better job in terms of planning, marketing, managing and training of both the Conservancy staff and community members. From the research findings, we see clearly that the initial planning of the Conservancy did not consider the involvement of more stakeholders. For example, if the schools were made part and parcel of Salambala’s planning process, the reluctance to use the Conservancy for educational and other purposes would arguably be absent. What could be done is to work out a local school curriculum that encompasses entrepreneurship, conservation and environmental survey and exploration. Not only the local schools and the Conservancy would be involved but also the security forces and other state organs. This would ensure a more sustainable and useful cementing of decentralisation and community participation in the entire rural development approach.

The communities could have been encouraged to invest more in income-generating projects. The planned lodge could easily be built with the income raised from trophy hunting. However, the disadvantage with this kind of community project is that the community itself has the final say, not the management. Decisions are not made on cost benefits or strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) analysis but rather on a majority vote. Negotiations are a difficult task that takes tedious work before a mutual compromise is reached with the community members even if participatory planning and mission success factors are applied.

One needs to ask: Is community-based tourism therefore desirable? For those who are not willing to endure tedious and long hours of negotiation the answer is an obvious no.
The process may be tedious, but such programmes are needed because they aid rural development. Secondly, CBT is possible and it is important for authorities to ensure a more sustainable conservation of flora and fauna. Thirdly, regardless of how tedious the search is, without CBT the relationship between wildlife and local communities would worsen. Therefore what is needed is a continuation of research and the participation of the locals in the search for a more sustainable solution to this dynamic but complex issue.

It must be noted here that rural communities are changing, and they are changing fast. Just as one youth leader said in the interviews, *It looks like the Conservancy will not work... the management is not careful enough, they are not well educated. To succeed we have to change the management in relation to new changes of society... taking out the involvement of the traditional leaders and putting young educated people in management positions will be a good solution* (Interviews). A re-examination of sociology, philosophy, the law, the political and diplomatic systems, the economic arrangements and so on seems to be an obvious starting point in the search for a sustainable solution to the issue of the co-existence of wildlife and people.

As more and more people receive education and well-paying jobs, chances of accessing and envying modern ways of living are increasing. Some might not hesitate to challenge the traditional authority if it is in their interest to do so. In fact, the heads of two of the three families in the core area who have been engaged in a legal battle with the Conservancy, *Khuta* and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism are arguably well-educated and well-paid government officials. Hence, the community expects both the *Khuta* and the Conservancy management to deliver an amicable solution. After all, they are part of the dynamics of society. Considering the open borders and the geographical proximity to the national parks in Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia, more co-ordination and networking of tourism operators could be considered as a package to tourists.

### 5.3 Challenges, potentials and prospects

Salambala faces challenges regarding the practicalities of community-based tourism. What are these challenges, what approach should we follow to solve them, and how do we know we have solved the real issue? From the accessibility point of view, this
communal Conservancy is remote but reachable. Like other rural communities, Salambala also often lacks sufficient funds for the high-quality infrastructure demanded by some ‘luxury-addicted tourists’. Needless to say, depending on the type of tourists, accommodation does not have to be luxurious. In fact, most ecotourists are more likely going to appreciate native cultural accommodation.

For the local people and those of neighbouring Zambia, Zimbabwe and Botswana and motoring tourists the Conservancy is easily reachable via the Ngoma road. Ideally, the management of the Conservancy should focus on the local market in terms of the promotion of the area. In a traditional sense, game viewing will also be a challenge. Some areas are not suitable for game viewing (e.g. Mutikitila, Ioma, Ikumwe, and Isuswa) and they will require strategies and innovative solutions to be useful. The best places are those situated at or nearby water holes. Thus, proximity to a water hole and time of the animals’ visit to it play a role in attracting tourists. Usually most animals drink water during noon or sundown, largely because that is when human activity is less.

Another major problem is the fact that tourism cannot influence its own destiny without effects from politics. Tourism is very vulnerable to political decisions and events. Actions and decisions such as the 2 August 1999 Secession Attack, Namibia’s decision to allow Angolan forces to operate and launch attacks on the UNITA rebel movement from Namibian soil and the Zimbabwean political and economic upheavals have hindered Caprivi’s tourism industry to develop. Perhaps it is time to reduce the dependence on international tourism and focus on the local markets. Even the traditionally strong tourism areas have suffered a major blow. According to the figures received from the regional MET office, both Mudumu and Mamili National Parks have recorded the lowest visitor figures in a decade, i.e. from 4000 tourists per annum in 1998/9 to less than 150 in the year 2000. A check of the guest book indicated that Salambala has also been hit with numbers falling down to 37 in 2000. In spite of the difficulties, CBT in the CAMPFIRE programme has in practice been operational through alternative arrangements with the private sector. If at all possible, alternative arrangements may be required to a greater degree in Salambala.

The development of tourist facilities in communal areas is also being constrained by the lack of secure land tenure, and the prohibitive cost of building basic infrastructure for
tourism purposes. Such infrastructure may include roads, accommodation and telecommunication facilities. Under traditional land-use law, it is practically impossible to lease land. In large communities it may also be difficult to agree on how the revenue would be used. One way is to have the villagers themselves hosting tourists so that the households can earn income. When communities host the tourists, it is reported by CAMPFIRE that they are responsible for the entire tourism process, from marketing through to hosting tourists in their own villages. During that time, visitors’ camp or stay in the traditional round mud huts and can make arrangements to share traditional meals with the local people (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheet No.8 on the case of Sunungukai Camp in Zimbabwe).

It is very unlikely that the communities could utilise the Internet to advertise their services or drop leaflets at airports. They have no access to such things and cannot afford them. No such thing was reported in Salambala, and even though it could be done the major constraints are that the area is still largely unknown, Internet facilities are neither available nor affordable and there are no people to do the work. In Finland, government authorities are concerned about rural tourism enterprises and are seeking ways and means to boost the tourism sector by having effective co-operation with all stakeholders (Häyhä 2001). In Salambala, when it comes to trophy hunting the quota system has been adopted through a consensus between the government and the Conservancy. The government, however, does reserve the right to control the quotas if it is of the opinion that the number proposed by the Conservancy management is not realistic. Based on the basic principle of sustainability and the need to stay within the carrying capacity, we help the local community with the interpretation of law and we try and ensure they use natural resources wisely, a wildlife official said.

Nonetheless, with revenues from trophy hunting, community development projects such as clinics, information centres, grain mills and schools can be prioritised. In Zambia for instance, under the Administrative Management Design Programme (ADMADE), the local community has used the revenues derived from wildlife management for their rural development projects. What is advocated in this thesis is a real-life situation where tourists come and live or are hosted in a household, do the activities that the local people do, eat the food they eat and if desired partake in any ongoing cultural activity. Such tourism is not only authentic and exotic but it also frees both the villagers and the
tourists from false and misleading lifestyles. Culture, traditions and customs in Salambala are also potential tourism products whose value cannot be priced. Nevertheless, they provide an educational resource base for interested tourists.

5.4 Learning from others: What community-based tourism can and cannot do

What has become apparent is that community-based tourism can be a viable option for generating economic opportunities, fostering environmental conservation and in some way reviving traditional cultures and customs in the rural or isolated areas of most countries. The direct involvement and participation of local communities in the development and management of small tourism enterprises are decisive factors in the success of rural development projects. Contributions to sustainable development of communities' co-operative arrangements by small tourism companies are a key element in aspects such as the training of human resources, the marketing and promotion of tourism services, access to financial resources, and negotiations with large tour operators. One single dilemma, however, is the land and the tenure system in communal areas. Reform is something that authorities have to urgently work on. This is likely to take a relatively long time due to the complexity of the reform process.

CAMPFIRE claims that when local communities are actively involved in planning processes and decision-making, government extension services acknowledge and use traditional management systems. CAMPFIRE also claims that community participation is important for improving the programmes as and when it is appropriate; as well as providing training, credit and other extension services. If there is secure land tenure, and there are access and resource-use rights for the community, particularly for women, then the community has legal rights to utilise and sell natural resource products. When that takes place, most rural development projects can be successful. On the other hand, despite commitment from the State and other stakeholders, keeping this approach in mind, it is apparent that no CBT will survive if the community itself does not have a vision of the tourism establishment. While communities are given the legal rights over natural resources, conservation goals should not be undermined because they are the primary source. In addition, political liaison should be maintained if anything is to be gained from community-based tourism and conservation. Politicians make and pass legislation and therefore their participation is equally vital.
It was also clear from the Conservancy that communities have different views on conservation. There seem to be perceptual differences between authorities and the local community regarding conservation. Communities tend to view conservation areas as a move against collaborative communal management, something that deprives them of their rights to the supposedly ‘God-given’ resource. This view may exist when the do’s and don’ts of the specific area are not spelt out clearly to the community. For this reason, more co-ordinated efforts toward conservation are essential. As shown in the introduction, the future without tourism is something of concern for Caprivi and Namibia at large. Population growth has meant more pressure on land. More land must be cleared every year for agricultural purposes. Another aspect of CBT that tends to complicate its application is the reality of poverty. The people who live in poverty and have a limited choice of survival are to survive at the mercy of the policy-makers. Policy-makers emphasise conservation and do not take into account the reality of poverty.

Communities will accept a rebuke if given sustainable alternatives. Communities that depend on firewood should not be stopped from cutting wood if alternative sources of fuel are not provided. Nonetheless, CBT is also a question of land use and planning. Understandably so, for the policy makers it is conservation first before income starts to come. However, this should not exclude innovative solutions. Equally important is that should poaching continue and be tolerated, Salambala’s potential will be shattered. The CAMPFIRE’s model of how a community progresses from resource user to resource protector and from resource protector to resource beneficiary falls short of a ‘hands-on’ approach. There is some understanding that the communities on the overall have not assumed a comprehensive administration of the project. Zimbabwe Trustees, an organ of the state, have been running CAMPFIRE since its inception almost two decades ago.

In regard to marketing, there are a couple of issues to be noted. In contemporary tourism, cultures and rural areas are sometimes marketed and portrayed as areas that have been lost and need revival. However, it is important not to stereotype a community. The tendency to advertise cultures as primitive, poor and backward only raises the question of ethics in tourism marketing. On the other hand, one has to ask: Is there an irreconcilable difference between the way a destination must be promoted to tourists and
the way in which its indigenous population may perceive the destination? Answering this question in this study will be out of its scope and as such it can only be left as a research question. Nonetheless these are issues that the World Tourism Organization is pursuing (MCB University Press, Internet page).

In terms of latent markets for tourism in Salambala, there are notable potentials. Wetlands and floodplains cover more than half of Caprivi Region. They provide excellent opportunities for adventure tourists during floods and the rainy season. In the absence of research, however, such tourism may not be sustainable and environmentally friendly. Within these landscapes there is a diversity of fauna and flora species that could be of interest to tourist. Within the wetlands, fish contributes a significant percentage of the inhabitants’ daily diet. Because of economic disparities, the majority of Namibians depend mainly on land and its meagre resources for their survival. This makes land, water and vegetation the most valuable but also the most vulnerable resources in the country. With great care taken, fisheries can be brought a step further and turned into an ecotourism input.

To reaffirm, marketing and promotion should be made a priority. This will enable the region’s income base to grow. As this happens, tourism would help reduce the depopulation of the rural youth. Fisheries in the communal areas within the wetlands and floodplains of eastern Caprivi can be a viable economic activity that may generate money. Fishing as a source of income and fishing as a leisure activity, are potential viable activities. In the latter context, fishing can be used to promote tourism. During and after floods, eastern Caprivi’s wetlands house a variety of natural food resources whose nutritional value is scientifically unknown but seriously recommended by the elderly within the habitat. The same is true for the terrestrial ecosystems whose wild fruit vary with the seasons. Other potential sources may include the strengthening of the already existing art centres and link them up with tourism- operating companies in Botswana, Zimbabwe and Zambia. Guided dugout-canoe trips are also potential opportunities.

These are the potential opportunities for community-based tourism in Salambala. Of course, there are always ups and downs in the management, planning, implementation and promotion of CBT. There are also variations in the perception of CBT ventures
between the men and the women. They also do not know how much money the conservation area is raising and how much of it should actually be used for community work. They tend to accuse the state for interfering in their affairs. There seems to be a real issue of mistrust and fragile relationships between governments and local communities. Such fragile relationships exist not only in Namibia, Zimbabwe and Botswana but also in other parts of the world (e.g. Ransom 2000 on Kenya; Madsen 1996; Norström 1995).

6 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The beginning of this thesis posed the question: ‘How applicable is the CAMPFIRE model for Namibia’? This is a very difficult yet important question. It is a difficult question because within the application period there is a process, the actors in the process increase or change and the degree to which something is seen to be an issue remains culturally defined. If the question were: who are the actors to be included in the application of CAMPFIRE in Namibia, the answer would be easy. As it is, there is no clear-cut answer to this question. Be that as it may, the answer is: CAMPFIRE can be applied in Namibia, provided a holistic and contextual focus is considered as analysed below. In order to answer ‘how’ this model could be applied, what I have decided to do is to focus on eight major assumptions associated with Communal Areas Management Program For Indigenous Resources in relation to research findings from Salambala, and combine them and subsequently suggest what could possibly be done.

6.1 Analysis of major assumptions of CAMPFIRE’s community-based tourism approaches

6.1.1 Can communal lands act as buffer zones between existing national parks and local communities?

The creation of game corridors is said to be a strategy for protecting the genetic diversity of wild species. In the Nyaminyami district, the district council has zoned the area on the southern shore of Lake Kariba next to Matusadona National Park. In conservation, zoning is meant to provide for different land-use purposes. Game corridors and breeding areas are set up so that species such as crocodiles on the lakeshore can be controlled in a sustainable manner (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact
Sheet No.4). However, the very fact that buffer zones are created also means more problems. Zoning requires setting aside land for specific purposes, which in turn causes land conflicts. Land-related conflicts evoke a re-examination of the communal land regime, which the CBT model claims to restore.

As to whether the buffer zone is a laudable development effort, in the mind of a communal farmer it is a bad development that has come to deprive him/her of land ownership. This is worsened by the fact that often the negative sides come first while the positive side arrives too late, if at all. The impoverished communities cannot wait that long. Understandably so, more land is required for conservation purposes and that by itself means less land for cultivation. With population growth, the conservation and use of natural resources will remain a challenge.

6.1.2 Does community-based tourism provides an avenue for job creation to the local community?

Arguably under CAMPFIRE, local people are trained and become involved as environmental educators, heritage promoters and game scouts. For example, CAMPFIRE reports that in the Sunungukai tourist camp in Zimbabwe the villagers themselves host the tourists and have been trained as game guards and guides. Furthermore, in 1980 in the Binga district nine years before CAMPFIRE’s activities there were 13 primary schools and no secondary school. According to CAMPFIRE, by 1995 there were 56 primary schools and 9 secondary schools in the area. The increase, however, should not be associated with or interpreted as the direct achievement of the project. One reason is due to the fact that the growth in the number of schools was a direct action of the government necessitated by natural population growth.

At the same time, the contribution that CAMPFIRE made cannot be dismissed. Job opportunities enabled the local residents to pay for education and possibly thus were able to retain some of the younger generation and reduce rural-urban migration. According to Chief Sinakatenge, Binga district, ‘Up until 1985, we were a people without hope. Our children too were suffering as diseases took their toll. There were no schools, no wells and no clinics. Villagers continually sought help as they were engaged
in a desperate struggle to survive. With CAMPFIRE, we now have rural health centres within easy reach’ (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheet No.2).

On the other hand, due to the amount of work done, the skills required, the unemployment rate and the level of education in most rural southern African countries, the number of people who could be employed is very small. For instance, in Salambala many people complained of lack of employment opportunities and in some cases even irregular payments. WWF and other experts carry out aerial animal census surveys, which could provide temporary work if done through a systematic ground procedure. However, they are less likely to be employed in these censuses because a census requires someone literate and skilled in that area.

6.1.3 Is environmental education in schools incorporated and essential in community development?

Community-based tourism may induce environmental education in schools and could promote the benefits of wildlife conservation to communities. While it might indeed theoretically be so, it is also true that there are few schools and teachers that have the logistical and fiscal incentives to do so. In fact, neither CAMPFIRE nor any other NGO cites an example where schools are active partners within community-based wildlife management programmes. Considering the fact that future project leaders are expected to come from the same communities, this must be seen as important.

Meanwhile in Salambala the schools are reluctant to use the Conservancy for the purposes of environmental education. Moreover, with a centralised planning system, resources that could enable education and wildlife management authorities to advance a certain project, takes a cumbersome process to obtain. For example in Katima Mulilo, government official sources indicated that it took three years to identify the location for a regional environmental centre to be used for educational purposes and a joint working group has not yet been established (Interviews). On the other hand, it is the central government that has the qualified staff to deal with environmental issues. Meaning that the situation could just worsen with decentralisation under way. It is important to note that environmental conservation and the right for the future generation to be accorded the opportunity to benefit from nature are ironically what CBT fails to
achieve. This, however, may have nothing to do with the model itself but rather it may have everything to do with the people involved and the way they implement it.

### 6.1.4 Does community-based tourism bring conservation and planning closer to the people?

As the word itself suggests, community-based tourism should mean communally based planning. However, decentralisation in community-based tourism and wildlife management has potentials and risks. It is an opportunity because it is often easier to integrate conservation into the regional land-use planning systems at the local level than at the national level. When this is done at the national level there are more stakeholders and the process is tedious. However, at the local level the process is less costly and can be a ‘guided change’ while under implementation.

Removing the protectionism approach that some governments still uphold could be a challenge but has been achieved to some extent in Kenya, Zambia and Zimbabwe (Songorwa et al. 2000, 642; IIED 1994). Change from central government on the other hand is a danger in itself. The discrepancy lies between what is required of the central government by international conventions and the prevailing situation within the local authority. Many times there are no community-based planning strategies and measures in place to correspond with projects like Salambala.

In addition, the local authorities do not always have sufficiently trained personnel to take on these responsibilities. In fact, it may become virtually impossible for decentralised regions to fulfil international conventions and obligations set by the central government. Thus, protected areas would be put to test by the availability of resources. Secondly, in some areas, e.g. southern Africa and South Asia, the local communities may not always appreciate the international importance that NGOs and governments attach to the ‘God-given-asset’ within their vicinity. They may not even know what conventions are in existence, why they are in existence and how they should be implemented and monitored. For a more detailed discussion see Hangula (1998), Corbett and Daniels (1996), also Hugo et al. (1997) and Munyaradzi and Johnson (1996). Ideally, CAMPFIRE should bring conservation, and its planning, closer to the
people because the people are its main and basic resource. It will require the approach to be as comprehensive as possible in kind and in degree.

6.1.5 Does community-based tourism generates funds to finance communal projects?

According to CAMPFIRE, both community-based wildlife management and community-based tourism generate funds. They generate revenue that is used for community projects or to supplement household incomes. In 1993 for example, twelve districts involved in CAMPFIRE with an estimated population of 400,000 earned US$1,516,693 from trophy fees (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheet No.12). However, if the funds were indeed distributed they would not be proportional and become insignificant whether in consideration of the number of people in the household or not. When not distributed per family, then it is even more advantageous only to those working in the project and/or to the influential few.

In Salambala, about N$40,000 was to be distributed among 19 communities, each village getting N$2000. While it is indeed better than nothing, the investment is unlikely to prove to be an economic boost to households. While Salambala itself may be a successful community project, with the high tendency in large communities to ‘free ride’, or what is called the tragedy of the commons, more questions than answers arise. Previously there were other different projects, but they failed because of fewer educated community members available to work. In the view of one of my respondents sometimes information is not well but even wrongly circulated and we felt cheated, and when I realised that I changed my mind and everything collapsed (Interviews). What, is then, the role and benefits of the community in managing wildlife and finance derived thereafter? The response should address both conservation and rural economics, which as a matter of principle should not prevent innovations. There is no question that CBT generates finance, the concern is how and what must be done with the money in order to enable the community to be as self-sufficient as possible.
6.1.6 Does community-based tourism improves communal land-use management?

Communal land-use management can be said to be one of the very few aspects in which the CWM and the CAMPFIRE are successful. With the help of the University of Zimbabwe and the country’s Ministry of Agriculture’s extension officers and the local community, grazing and thatching schemes have been put in place in the Bulilima Mangwe district of southern Zimbabwe (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheet No.10). As a result of that arrangement, cattle sales became more profitable for communal farmers. However, it is not the communities that are designing the land-use plans. Nor do they effect the management of such plans. It is the government’s extension officers and the University of Zimbabwe that are deployed in the supposedly community-based projects. The question then is: What can be said to be economically emancipating rural communities? Are they even happy with the restrictive management plans?

In Salambala Conservancy not only do the community members have little idea of the Conservancy boundaries but also the authorities have no management plans on paper. Bearing in mind that the Conservancy was only made into a legal entity in 1998, it is perhaps untimely to expect it to deliver and to be without problems. Nevertheless, management plans are necessary for the success of the Conservancy. CAMPFIRE insists that success will depend on the acceptance of hunting as a wildlife management tool by the international community and placing economic value on wild species (CAMPFIRE Internet page, Fact Sheet No.6). Secondly, by exploring different ways of wildlife management such as wildlife tourism, trophy hunting and game ranching, rural development can be achieved without conflicting with nature, rural communities and conservation authorities (ibid.).

It is still to be established whether forests, nature conservation and tourism are compatible with one another. Community-based tourism, in this sense, is seen as away of aiding rural development and conservation. Collaborative management is, however, crucial to their achievement. This kind of tourism has its own advantages, challenges and potentials. If planning is well facilitated, community-based tourism can yield several opportunities for the local people. On the other hand, communal land cannot be privatised as it is meant for the whole community to use and own. This does not only
challenge the perceived economic returns but also the very concept of management (Howitt 2001, 157), let alone the communities’ concept of what management is.

6.1.7 To what extent can community-based tourism be an employing sector?

Ideally, in a touristic set up, community members can work for local tour companies or sell souvenirs and snacks to tourists. The presence of foreign tour companies, however, presents a possibility of the leaking-down of economic returns. According to the World Tourism Organisation (2000), at least 55 per cent of the foreign exchange earned through tourism returns to the developed countries or where the operating company originates (see also Carter 1992). This happens through spending on imports for the tourism industry. Such expenses include fittings, foodstuffs and labour which are either not available locally or the operators just have a preference. In countries where there is heavy reliance on imports the figure could be as high as 75 per cent.

Arguably, this may be avoided by changing land tenure rights to entitle local residents to loans and being able to set up local catering institutions, which, considering the multiplier effect, should be of economic importance. The promotion of small and medium-sized enterprises is crucial to achieve rural development. Besides, the creation of such enterprises also requires private ownership, which is directly affecting communal land. Moreover, adequate research and development need to be given a priority. In the absence of ongoing consultations, workshops and refresher courses, the Conservancy operations dwindle and the staffs becomes prone to negative criticism, e.g. allegations of corruption, something that became clear during the research in Salambala.

Because of the nature of projects such as this, it is vital to keep the community well versed with the activities of the management. Confidence measures such as monthly briefings and/or financial quarterly reports should be done at all the times to build up the trust needed for the community to support the project. In some areas of Salambala for example, where information is lacking, people are not only largely negative toward the project but also toward the initial advantages that comes with it. The negative effects, however, are not necessarily those of the project itself but rather those of the implementation of this model (IIED 1994). More participatory approaches in the
implementation phases are the deciding factors. Only if a particular enterprise is successful can the probability for employment be higher.

6.1.8 Can community-based tourism improve the standards of living in the area?

Community-based tourism is a way through which the local economy may be stimulated and the provision of infrastructure for tourists, some of which may benefit residents as well (e.g. roads), be made available to the community. In the event of that taking effect, internal rural depopulation is likely to decrease and more youthful human resources would be introduced into the local economy. Currently those who are migrating are moving from rural areas to Katima Mulilo, the regional capital. Another type of migration is increasingly the movement of people from Caprivi to other parts of Namibia (see Pendleton and Frayne 1998). In recent years, the government’s rural electrification programme, rural digital telephone links and the completion of both the Trans-Caprivi highway and the Katima-Ngoma road are commendable. It is expected this will encourage Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), something that largely lacks at present.

In an ideal situation, as this happens, the standard of living will improve. This is obviously subject to the rate and impact that HIV/AIDS would have on the region’s overall economy. However, in the event of FDI and employment opportunities increasing, it is unlikely that the residents will decrease pressure on the land or reduce intense agricultural practices. Most people indicated they would continue farming, as there is no security in tourism employment. Employment is seen as a compliment to the current source of income, agriculture. For the communities to improve their standard of living and the quality of life, there is a need to combine agriculture and community-based tourism (Kovács 1998, 270-273). In addition to local informal and formal economic activities, this kind of tourism may increase the chances of the standard of living improving.

6.2 Discussion of future research issues in Salambala and Namibia

In recent times, the understanding that the competitiveness of any country is determined by the quality of knowledge and well-based human resource priorities and facilitation of
new ideas through research and development (R&D) rather than by its intrinsic natural beauty has now been accepted in some circles. The above assertion should not be unreservedly accepted without shedding light on the ethics of the environmental protection norms and values that each country pursues. It is unacceptable that when environmental values are established and legislated they are not adhered to. It should also be universally accepted that a country that cares about its natural resources, and the participation of the stakeholders and how the resources are being used, is competent indeed. Part of this build-up is research. Research is the body of knowledge and ideas that must guide the formulation and implementation of local, regional and national development policies.

One key to the future of community-based tourism in Namibia lies in the political development in which the country may be or has already been involved. Another is the need for continued adequate research, which should provide informed decision-making to politicians and policy-makers. Currently, the future of community-based tourism and wildlife management programmes is uncertain. Existing indicators show that tourism is a fast-growing industry. However, the questions that arise from this growth are multiple. The following questions are central to the proper management of tourism and natural resource in Namibia:

- To what extent can Namibia’s fragile environment allow such a spontaneous growth?
- To what extent can Namibia optimise the potential for tourism further?
- How many tourists can Namibia allow in the country’s tourism-practising areas?
- How can the income base of tourism be broadened to benefit a wider community and to alleviate rural poverty?
- What are the implications of making new regions of Namibia accessible to tourists?
- How can Namibia remain an attractive tourist destination?
- How sensitive is Namibia’s tourism to unpredictable political change and decision-making?
- Is the current theory of impact assessment and integrated environmental management applicable to community-based tourism studies?
Uncontrolled consequences of tourism can be avoided with good and careful management that aims at responsibility. During the last few years, the concept of community-based tourism has been introduced as the ultimate goal. Some schools of thought prefer the term ‘responsible tourism’. Semantic differences left aside, it entails a balanced and sensible combination of the local ecological, social and economic interests. However, such a combination is often hard to concretise. The planning of responsible tourism involves regional and national future actors (Smit 2001; Smit and Matengu 2000). It aims at a more even inter-regional distribution of tourism-generated income and tries to balance global demands with local trends because such tourism creates opportunities for local people to develop themselves.

Finally, it aims at advocating an approach to encourage tourists to become more sensitive towards nature, more conscious about the livelihood of local people and to stimulate alternative ways of acting, thinking and feeling. One of the most essential pre-conditions for the development of community-based tourism is to educate tourists and local people at the same time while optimising endemic tourist attractions simultaneously. The carrying capacities of local ecological, economic and social potential resources are set to guarantee the tourists with an authentic atmosphere (supply side), and an appropriately designed and selected set of tourist demand on the other hand is the main focus of this holistic approach.

6.3 Policy implications

At the onset, it should be noted that in as much as political environments are changing, rural communities are also transforming. These changes can be seen in population numbers, infrastructure, and type of services, economic niche and so on. Previously people in the rural areas of Namibia lived from hunting and gathering. Very few lived from agriculture. Currently agriculture is the main rural economic activity. Due to the present population increase, natural resources are more than ever under pressure. Access to agricultural land and its resource has become an issue dominating politics. It will not be long before things change especially when the information revolution arrives. Community-based tourism may offer one vital alternative in terms of economic return and environmental sustainability, and it is a convenient political-cultural catalyst.
Researchers and institutions are pressed with the need to devise ways and means through or with which rural Namibians can benefit more from the resources within their midst. This is, however, a demanding task that requires the penetration of research into communities in order to understand and consider the ways of thinking in rural societies at their most basic level and to investigate the perception the rural societies have of themselves.

Accurate and contextually-sound mechanisms still have to be established, legislated and implemented in consultation with all stakeholders in order to actively promote ecotourism as an alternative economic activity for rural communities. Mechanisms on how to benefit local communities better are not yet in place and in some cases must still be designed. There is a desperate need for entrepreneurial strategies that strictly support and promote appropriate resource use in rural parts of Namibia. Although much has been achieved during the last decade in terms of natural resource management, the development, planning and management of community-based tourism and wildlife management are largely following an uncoordinated approach with no clear visionary long-term objectives.

In general, a progressive step in the right direction has been taken. Arguably, the situation is made worse by the lack of human resource capacity in the government to implement innovative policies, in addition to the general rigidity of accepting new ways of thinking. The initiatives from some private entrepreneurs and NGOs are commendable, but in most cases were not pursued by the government. Sadly, the tourism industry of Namibia remains largely an industry for the few with very little benefits to the majority of Namibians. It has also remained a centralised economy, benefiting mostly firms that are large-town based, without bringing the money to the places that are most appealing to tourists – the rural areas (Smit and Matengu 2000).

The tourism industry also depends largely on urban-like infrastructure, instead of converting to the global demands in terms of a more sensitive appreciation of nature and cultural respect for the livelihoods of local people and finding enriching individual experiences for tourists. This form of ignorance may eventually wedge a lamentable division between the communal and commercial economies of tourism. At worst it may result in growing conflicts between rural communities and tourism authorities. These
disparities are complicated by delays by the central government to settle the uncertainties about the situation of land rights. Furthermore, there is a tendency to ignore tourism’s sensitivity to political instability. The recent political decisions to allow Angolan troops to fight UNITA from Namibian territory harmed tourism operations in Kavango and Caprivi to a great degree.

As geographers, some of us are in one way or another involved in planning, research and administration of tourism. Geography is designated the important task of helping to understand and overcome the tensions between society and the environment and to find best solutions through optimisation. The study of the environment and tourism concerns other than geographers, too, but the issues analysed in geography are always centred on the framework of human activity. Some geographers are not concerned about whether what they are doing is geography or not, they are concerned instead with what they can contribute to a larger goal, a goal that might be defined as the sensible planning, responsible development and appropriate management of the environment.

In its final form, this thesis could be used or seen as an assessment of the Salambala community’s awareness of the challenges, opportunities, threats and alternatives in the management of community-based tourism, natural resources and the income thereof. Secondly, the aim is to suggest the establishment of a working group that will deal with issues that concern the Conservancy of Salambala. Such a group could work on conflicts-related matters, legislation, the promotion of small-sized business enterprises, and the marketing of tourism in the Conservancy. It is essential to ensure that we first have a clear conceptual view of what we want to plan. In this case it is nature and people, and it is the people who have a choice to make. Planning includes the full involvement of the people concerned.

All other ramifications of the planning process, e.g. money, time, manpower, political consideration, environmental acceptability and economic feasibility, should be considered, too. Geographers, and planners alike, do not know everything. Therefore community-based tourism should be studied as a system along with other disciplines that affect it, e.g. law, marketing, economics, political science, land-use planning, and impact assessment. Thus allowing the participation of all stakeholders and scientists...
from neighbouring disciplines will permit a comprehensive picture in the planning and implementation of CBT. This should be done whether the process is tedious or not.

Because planning is also a set of politics, politicians and decision-makers must be consulted. This is often the most difficult task we are faced with. Ultimately, planning is about people. Whether land, nature, people or natural resources, the final goal is to satisfy the present while allowing the future generations to benefit. The planning of community-based tourism should also be aimed at finding the best options of how to benefit rural communities and conservation alike. Overall, community-based tourism in conservancies is all about welfare and economic growth, empowerment of community, education and the revitalisation of conservation in rural areas.

Meeting the above factors is what may eventually lead to the sustainability of rural development projects. Nevertheless natural resource management is not only the duty of officials, experts in a somewhat scientific realm or politicians in place, but it is also an act of shared decision-making. This is a process that must be forwarded in no uncertain terms. Community-based tourism implies a community-centred planning approach. As a result, decentralisation and restructuring may also be required so as both to entitle the communities and to bring about the administration of natural resources and benefits thereof closer to the locals.

In this context, a systematic focus on operational market economy of resource communities in peripheral areas to allow restructuring of local rural and regional economies should be considered every time community-based projects are entertained. See Varis (2000) and Neil and Tykkyläinen (1998) for more on rural community restructuring. Ensuring a strong base of wildlife conserved sustainably for the future generations and stimulating the local resource to meet the local people’s economic need undoubtedly demands a systematic yet holistic focus on policies across sectors and institutions. The role of NGOs should be encouraged because it is within their operational framework in which better-known approaches of community-based resource management has been coming forth. They are arguably better placed and able to work hand in hand with rural communities. Natural resource planning, management, capacity-building, institutional strengthening and negotiating are often defined at the expense of the existing local system, which is disrupting rather than reinforcing the existing
diversified economic system. This means, both NGOs and governments will need to revise their systems approach. Similarly, in seeking to negotiate outcomes, focus is on power rather than on the principles underpinning the genuine issues (Howitt 2001). When seeking a policy, it is these ‘things-first’ that must be settled, without them the policy amounts to socio-economic vandalism on rural people.
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APPENDIX 1

Conservancies in the Republic of Namibia

APPENDIX 2

Brief Periodic History of Caprivi

1600 - 1700 First Lozi Empire

1700 - 1820 The Masubiya settle in eastern Caprivi but subjected to Lozi rule

1820 - 1864 Kololo Empire

1864 - 1890 Second Lozi Empire

1890 Heligoland-Zanzibar treaty signed

1890 - 1908 Caprivi continues to be administered by Barotseland under the British colony from Zambia, as Germany did not assume authority over her new territory

1900s Caprivi becomes part of the German South West Africa as a result of negotiations between Germany and Britain, attempts by the Germans are made to exchange Caprivi for Ngamiland

1908 Captain Kurt Streitwolf arrives, German assumes responsibility

1909 Chikamatondo elected as Chief of the Masubiya

1914 First World War begins

1914 - 1918 Caprivi is administered as part of the British military rule but only at the end of WWI

1921 - 1929 Caprivi administered as part of the British Bechuanaland protectorate

1929 - 1939 Caprivi is placed under South West African administration from Windhoek as a part of the Mandatory by the UN

1940 - 1981 Caprivi is administered directly from South Africa under the Bantu Administration from Pretoria

1945.07.18 Chikamatondo dies at Schumansberg

1945.09.30 Muraliswa Nia is sworn in as new Masubiya Chief

1962 Caprivi African National Union (CANU) is founded under the leadership of Brendan Kangongolo Simbwaye

1961 - 1963 Mpacha Airport is built for C130 aircraft type

1971 First land mine explodes. Caprivi becomes a prohibited area effectively administered by the South African Territorial Defence Force (SWATF)
1981 - 1990 Caprivi is governed under the Administration for Caprivians but as part of the South West Africa administration in Windhoek

1990.03.21 Namibia becomes independent

1990 - 1992 Caprivi treated as part of an independent Namibia in transition

1992 Caprivi become one of the 13 political regions in an independent Namibia, with its own governor and six councillors

1994 Katima Mulilo, the regional capital is declared a town

1996 Moraliswani Maiba dies and Kisco Maiba Moraliswani becomes Chief

1999.08.02 The Caprivi Liberation Army, under the leadership of Mishake Muyongo now refugee in Denmark, carries out a Succession Attack

1999.08.03 Calm is restored in Caprivi

Source: Compiled from Fisch (1999a), Bruchmann (2000) and from interviews with traditional leaders in Salambala.
APPENDIX 3

Research Questionnaire for the Salambala Conservancy: Community-Based Tourism. Topic: How applicable is the CAMPFIRE model of community-based tourism for Namibia? The Case of Caprivi Region

Assessment of the Conservancy Section A

1. Since Salambala was established, what have been the benefits?
2. What communal project(s) have been financed by the Conservancy?
3. What are the current problems in the community because of the Conservancy?
4. Has the problem been solved? If no, why not? What should have been done?
5. If Yes, how was the problem solved?
6. What are the current problem(s) the community has on the Conservancy?
7. Have the problem(s) been solved?
   Yes  No
8. If No, why not? What should be done?
9. If Yes, how was the problem solved?

Community-Based Tourism Potentials. Section B

10. In your opinion what is Salambala for? Could it be for tourism as well?
11. In your opinion what is a tourist?
12. Have tourists visited you? If No, skip to 15.
   No
   If Yes, who?
13. If Yes, where did they stay?
   Camped in the village
   Camped outside the village
   In my house
   Campsite at Salambala main centre
   Other, please specify
   Don’t know
14. What activities did you do with them?
15. If No to 12, what would you offer to do with tourist, if visited by them?
16. Are there tourists whom you are NOT willing to host? Who and Why?
Which tourists are you WILLING to host? Write in the nationality or ethnic groups. Compile a list!
   Namibian from Caprivi (which ethnic group)
   Namibian not from Caprivi (which ethnic group)
   Just Namibian
   From Southern Africa (which country)
   From Europe or North America
   Other, please specify
17. Please explain your choice.
18. Are you willing to host tourists in your home for a fee?
   Yes
   If No, why not?

Land Use Practices. Section C.

19. What is your (present) livelihood dependent on? What do you do for a living?
20. Should other employment opportunities in Salambala arise, will you reduce dependence on land?
21. If yes, What would you do then?
22. With the resettlement from Salambala core area, have you heard or got involved in a land/field related conflict as a result?
   Yes
   No, why not?

23. How many domestic animals do you have?
   Cattle
   Goats

24. Multiple use. What do you collect/cut from Salambala core area?
   Wood
   Housing poles
   Grass
   Wild berries/fruits
   Other, please specify

25. Would you support the introduction of new species like Springbok in Salambala? Explain the idea to the respondent.
   If No, why? If Yes which one and why?

26. In conclusion, what do you anticipate will happen to the Conservancy in three years from now?

Biographic Data Section D

Gender
Male        Female

Age

Number of People in the Household

Occupation

Education

Thank you very much for your co-operation!
APPENDIX 4
Focus group and authorities questionnaire

1. What is the community’s vision of tourism and the Conservancy?
2. Is there a need for community-based tourism? Why and why not?
3. What is your current tourism data collection system?
4. How are you marketing tourism?
5. In what ways do you communicate with the community? How are decisions taken?
6. CBT by implication means community-based planning. What steps are being or could be taken? How would it actually be done?
7. Who do you think would be the main actors? Who are the current stakeholders and how do they work together?
8. How are communal procedures being followed? What recent tourism-related problems have you encountered? How were they solved?
9. Should individual(s) famil(ies) in the community start selling handicrafts? Who should it benefit? Is this a potential problem?
10. Regarding the impact of tourism on the environment, is there an environmental management programme/plan on site monitoring procedures?
11. What impacts do you foresee on the community by tourism?
12. Have you heard about CAMPFIRE? If Yes, what do you think about it?
**APPENDIX 5**

**List of respondents’ data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire No</th>
<th>direction</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 11</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 12</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 13</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 14</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 15</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 16</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 17</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 18</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 19</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 20</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 21</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 22</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 23</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 24</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 25</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 26</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 27</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 28</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 29</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 30</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 31</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 32</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 33</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 34</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 35</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 36</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 37</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 38</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 39</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 40</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 41</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 42</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 43</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 44</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 45</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q53</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q54</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>