

# Commission on Nomadic Peoples

“Pastoral territory and policy debates in Tanzania”

Daniel Ndagala

Nomadic Peoples, Number 34/35, 1994

The Commission on Nomadic Peoples of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) is collaborating with the Ford Foundation to digitize, preserve and extend access to the journal of *Nomadic Peoples*. For more information regarding the journal *Nomadic Peoples* visit the Commission on Nomadic Peoples website at [www.nomadicpeoples.info](http://www.nomadicpeoples.info) and the Berghahn Books website at [www.berghahnbooks.com](http://www.berghahnbooks.com)

# Pastoral territory and policy debates in Tanzania

*D.K. Ndagala*

## Introduction

The present decade has seen a substantial shift in perceptions on pastoral development, although many policy-makers and planners are still of the opinion that pastoralists are backward and resistant to change. Consequently, development packages are still 'manufactured' for delivery to pastoralists in order to change them for what is considered the better. Donor support is sought and secured for these packages. Pastoralists, on their part, have come to realise that they have to adapt in a number of ways if they are to survive in the current socio-economic environment.

Pastoral resources are on the decrease and the various factors which formerly acted as a shield against outsiders immigrating to pastoral areas are no longer capable of halting the land-hungry peasant cultivators and commercial farmers. Resource allocation and utilization at the local level in many pastoral areas can no longer be effectively controlled by elders' councils. Moreover, population increase within pastoral areas has led to low livestock per capita ratios and accelerated the pastoral diversification process, with agro-pastoralism taking the lead.

Population increase has been due to a number of factors. Leading among them, in recent years, is the influx of cultivators in search of arable land and the growing number of labourers brought-in by large-scale farmers to work on their farms. The latter factor has become

more marked in the late eighties following the International Monetary Fund-sponsored economic liberalization policies.

In this paper, I examine the way in which politics and policies have compromised pastoral property in Tanzania and jeopardised the pastoral economy. Pastoralism and the environment in which it is undertaken are more threatened than ever before. In August, 1980, exactly thirteen years ago, Prof. Philip Salzman presented a paper at an international conference on the 'Future of Pastoral Peoples' in which he examined the role of political factors in the future of pastoral peoples (Salzman 1981:130-133). In concluding his paper he said, "Make no mistake: political factors will play a major role in the future of pastoral peoples. We will do no one good service if we neglect the importance of political process and political goals" (ibid.). He proposed that our research priorities "...take these political factors into account and examine the circumstances under which governments act sympathetically toward pastoral peoples and the pastoral enterprise and the circumstances under which they act unsympathetically as well as the underlying reasons for this, whether they be political, cultural, or economic orientations."

This session on 'Policy, politics and the crisis of pastoral property' provides another opportunity for us to reflect on the impact of political factors on the development of pastoral peoples since

that conference. The political actors and the power brokers on the East African scene have since changed. Whereas at the beginning of the 1980s political factors were dominated by the relations between the state and pastoral peoples, a more complex situation prevails today. The collapse of the national economies has made the states more dependent on external aid for their development programmes. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have since gained key positions in policy-making. The end of the cold war and the disintegration of the Soviet Union has created new opportunities and constraints for East African states and peoples. Therefore, what is happening at the local level should be assessed in the light of what has taken (and is taking place) at national and international levels.

In discussing the dominant policy issues that affect pastoralism and environment in East Africa, I shall focus on the Tanzanian experience. The paper is divided into four parts. The first part examines developments in and around pastoral territory. The idea is to take stock of the conceptual and practical aspects of the area used by pastoral communities to produce their livelihood. Part two looks at pastoralism itself and its present status in practical terms and the way it is viewed in political and policy circles. Part three is an analysis of the factors that are taken into consideration by policy-makers, planners and administrators when supporting or opposing pastoralism, on the one hand, and when allocating or reallocating pastoral territory to other uses, on the other. Part four attempts to synthesize the points raised in the three preceding sections in order to reflect on the immediate future of pastoral peoples in East Africa amidst changing political and physical environments.

## Pastoral territory

About 60% of Tanzania's land area is rangeland receiving not more than 1,000 mm of rainfall per annum. Many pastoralists are found in areas with scanty rainfall, and the few that are found in areas of higher rainfall are systematically being pushed out. Pastoralists use their territory on an "as-it-were" basis i.e., they do not modify it for productive purposes (Fiocco, n.d.). The pastoral resource, in this case, is territory rather than land.

The concept of 'territory' includes pastures, watering areas (i.e., streams, springs, rivers, lakes) and sources of salt. Due to the fact that water and salt sites may be (and usually are) widely scattered, the concept of pastoral territory envisages an area which embraces all these components while, at the same time, allowing easy mobility and manoeuvrability — should the need arise. A unit of territory is an area-unit which encompasses all the spatially-dispersed elements necessary for viable and sustainable pastoral production by a community. Territory is, in a way, an ecological notion defined by tradition on the basis of use. The local community knows the location of the local resources and the short-cuts to them. The boundaries of its territory are thus determined by the spatial distribution and accessibility of the different components of territory.

The confusion between territory and land as management-units has been the source of conflicts in many pastoral areas. Some of the alienation of pastoral territory, as will be pointed out later, is based on the assumption that the areas in question were free land when, in fact, they were part of the area-units necessary for pastoral production undertaken by the respective local communities (see

Ndagala 1986).

The growing pressure on pastoral territory stems mainly from two factors. Firstly, pastoral lands in Tanzania can be put to a host of other uses, apart from pastoralism. About 60% of Tanzania's national herd is concentrated in 10% of the country's total land area, due to a number of factors, including the presence of tsetse fly. Much of this rangeland is disappearing under the hoe, as immigrants pour in from agricultural areas with severe shortages of land. The absence of enforced land-use plans for major pastoral areas is compounding this problem. The second factor is the relegation of traditional rangeland management mechanisms by government institutions. For example, charcoal makers are licensed by Forest Officers at District headquarters to cut down trees without prior consultation with the communities concerned. The charcoal makers are thus given rights in rangelands but are not given management responsibilities. In other words, pastoral territory is being transformed mainly by non-pastoralists to suit uses other than pastoralism. Lack of security of tenure acts as a disincentive to pastoralists to manage their territory effectively. There are several examples of pastoralists having been evicted by government from large tracts of their best pastures. Two examples are the alienation of significant Ngorongoro and Basuto lands to create room for wildlife conservation and large-scale commercial farming respectively.

Pastoralist dependence on seasonal surface water (rain ponds, seasonal rivers, etc.) in many cases contributed to preventing environmental degradation. This has been greatly undermined by the creation of new permanent water points. Originally, areas which lacked permanent water sources served as rainy season grazing areas only. Due

to the installation of permanent water sources such as boreholes these areas have now become full-time grazing areas. The resultant over-exploitation of these areas has led to processes of degradation.

### The status of pastoralism

Tanzania has the third largest national cattle herd in Africa after Ethiopia and the Sudan. This herd of about 13 million cattle is almost wholly owned by pastoral and agro-pastoral communities. The dairy farmers, ranchers and others own but 1% of the national herd. The contribution of the livestock sector to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is derived mainly from smallholder and pastoral herds. Any attempts to increase or control livestock production are, implicitly, attempts to increase or control pastoral production. Data on the volume and monetary value of pastoral production are not readily available, and the few that are available have to be used with caution because they are based mainly on estimates. Some estimates put the contribution of the livestock sector to the GDP at 10%, but the real contribution should be much higher due to the fact that a great percentage of livestock products go unrecorded because they are consumed at home. Recent estimates by Lamosai and Crees (1992) put the contribution of the livestock sector at 15% of the GDP. Whatever the percentage, about 90% of the total contribution of the livestock sector comes from the traditional herd held by pastoral and agro-pastoral communities (Mustafa 1989:124-5).

It is estimated that in 1977 Tanzania produced 340 million litres of milk of which 93% came from pastoral and agro-pastoral smallholders. It is also estimated that 414 thousand tons of beef are produced and consumed annually

mainly in the rural areas. If Tanzania did not produce these products their importation bill would outstrip that for fuel oil. Yet the traditional management skills and the devotion with which the national herd is maintained is belittled. Any successes in the livestock industry are normally attributed to veterinary technicians and other animal production specialists or their institutions. In fact, if all the products of pastoral production were fully recorded it is obvious that the contribution of pastoralism would be found to be much higher and worthy of more consideration.

Pastoralists in Tanzania are more transhumant than nomadic. Nevertheless, the location of the herds at any given season is still integrally linked to the availability of grass and access to water. Grass is greatly valued by pastoralists due to the many roles it serves. As food for cattle it has practical as well as symbolic value. Cultivation was avoided in the past partly because it destroys grass, the feed for livestock. Deliberate destruction of pastures or grass, as cultivation is sometimes construed, is antagonistic to pastoralism. Those who cherish grass and those who destroy it to give room for something else cannot operate mutually in the same area. The conflicts between cultivators and pastoralists should be understood in this light. Peterson and Peterson (1980) point out that the primary resource within the range ecosystem is the plant — the primary producer of foodstuffs. They argue that since almost all range products are directly dependent on the plant kingdom, management should focus on vegetation which logically leads to land management. They view pastoralists as being primarily livestock managers rather than land managers. This view is correct to a point. Land management tends to be strictly area specific in that it fo-

cuses on specific blocks of land with the implicit intention of transforming them. Pastoralists, on the other hand, do not focus on tracts of land enclosed by straight lines but on large territorial encirclements embracing various ecological niches necessary to sustain the herds through the seasons. The constituent parts of pastoral territory, which are primarily and predominantly natural, such as the various types of grasses, are not found all in one area. Their optimum utilization, therefore, presupposes mobility. I agree with Peterson and Peterson (*ibid.*:14) that "...transhumance and nomadism are systems or ways of life integrally linked to and primarily determined by environmental conditions, and have developed as a means for successful exploitation of resources". The management of pastoral territory is thus more inclusive than land management. At best, pastoralists are managers of the ecosystem rather than of individual blocks of land.

### Prejudice and policy concerns

In the past two decades pastoral production has been faced with many problems. For example, due to the economic crisis many animals have died for lack of adequate facilities for dipping livestock for control of parasites, to which they had become accustomed during the good times. The leading and long-term problem, however, continues to be the shrinkage of pastures due to the alienation of pastoral territory for other uses. This problem is usually, but not always, a result of prejudice and misunderstanding by policy-makers and planners about pastoralism. Before examining the policy issues relating to pastoralism a few factors are worth mentioning.

Until now many pastoralists lead self-reliant lives in that they are capable of feeding themselves and securing

their basic needs through livestock production. However, unless the processes of marginalization and impoverishment which have been set in motion by the scarcity of resources are halted, in a matter of few years many pastoralists will slip into destitution, becoming solely dependent on the sale of their labour. These processes cannot be halted unless there is political will and clearly defined policies to protect pastoral resources against alienation. I am well aware of the fact that pastoralists themselves are multiplying, and that displacement out of the pastoral economy has been occurring all along; however, the processes mentioned here are externally generated.

However, pastoralism is widely viewed as economically irrational. Pastoralists are said to accumulate cattle for social prestige rather than economic needs — an echo of the 'cattle complex' put forward by Herskovits in 1926. Yet, we know that cattle are the very source of pastoral livelihood, in addition to being storage of value (banks) and insurance against a wide range of risks.

Pastoralists are said to be footloose and to wander at random, thereby making it difficult for government to provide them with basic social services. This view was the basis for pastoral resettlement programmes such as Operation Imparnati in Maasailand (Ndagala 1982; Parkipuny 1979) and Operation Barabaig among the Datoga (Lioske 1990; Ndagala 1978, 1990, 1991b). The misconception that pastoralists wander randomly gives rise to the belief that pastoral claims to particular parcels of land are fluid and temporary. This belief and the presumption that pastoral territory is 'free' have led to much alienation of pastoral territory without compensation to the customary users. This is because the whole ideal of land-use is still tied to the displacement of nat-

ural vegetation with agricultural crops and/or physical structures. Therefore, the rights of pastoralists in land have remained vulnerable because pastoralism provides little evidence of such use.

Pastoral production is considered by policy-makers as backward relative to farming. There have been efforts to have pastoralists adopt agriculture not primarily as a way of enabling them to produce grain, on which they have become increasingly dependent, but in order to have them abandon 'backward' ways associated with pastoralism. In fact, in some planning and policy circles pastoralism is seen to be an unwanted and dying production system. It is believed that population growth will soon obliterate the seemingly empty lands and pastoral people will have to learn how to compete in the race to cultivate, and to turn their territory into agricultural plots (PANET 1992:5). The immigration of farmers into pastoral areas where they put high potential pastoral territory under cultivation has in many instances been regarded as a 'civilizing mission' (cf. Raikes 1981:49). This is because, in addition to putting the seemingly unused land to what are said to be profitable productive ventures, agriculture is believed to soften 'pastoral resistance' and expose pastoralists to ways of modern living. Agriculture is advocated even in arid areas.

It is hard to understand why pastoralism is fought even when its contribution to the national economy and the nutritional status of the people is realised and appreciated. Perhaps the number of people engaged in pastoralism compared to those engaged in agriculture has something to do with it. Given the low percentage of people practising pastoralism, it is possible that the advocates of pastoralism often find themselves outnumbered in policy-making circles. The other, and

probably more critical, reason for policy relegation of pastoralism could be the failure by policy-makers to understand the relationship between pastoral territory and pastoral production. Whereas arable farming is advocated all the time, pastoralists are always called upon to reduce the numbers of their livestock. Since cultivation destroys grass which is an important component of pastoral territory, its expansion is a threat to livestock production. Pastoralists regard their herds as their fields, which, unlike those of cultivators, are on the hoof (cf. Ekvall 1968). The question which puzzles pastoralists is why they are told to reduce their fields when, at the same time, cultivators are encouraged to expand theirs. They tend to see this as a plot to eliminate them. Their fears have increased in recent years due to the continuous alienation of pastoral territory for agriculture. This has been (and is) going on amid calls to have pastoralists reduce the number of their livestock.

The communal land tenure under which most pastoral land is held has been singled out as the major constraint to improved management of natural pastures. Planners and policy-makers still accept almost verbatim the 'tragedy of the commons' thesis put forward by Hardin (1968), which argues that individual herders have no incentive to restrict stock numbers, and that their herding of private animals on communal pastures will inevitably lead to over-grazing and land degradation. The technical solutions usually proposed for this problem is individualization of land through individual tenure or various new forms of group tenure (Helland 1990:171) such as group ranches. Although this view has found fertile ground among planners in Tanzania there is no conclusive evidence to show that individual pastures are always better managed than

communal ones. In fact, the thesis is based on the confusion between 'open access' and 'communal access' property regimes (Lane & Moorehead 1993). Though accessible to all members of a community no portion of pastoral territory is truly 'common' or 'open'. Specific groups exercise proprietary rights over specific units of territory and have traditional control mechanisms. Over-grazing noticeable in a growing number of pastoral areas is due to the collapse of these mechanisms. They collapsed as a result of recent events such as the subordination of native authorities and nationalization of land.

Pastoralists have a well developed and acutely sensitive decision-making rationale in range management (Western & Dunne 1979:30). For example, studies on the Maasai (Ibid.; Ndagala 1992) and the Fulani (Salih 1991) confirm the accuracy of pastoral knowledge about seasonal variations in rainfall and forage, the elaborate uses of different types of trees and grasses and the many types of behaviour of animals found in their localities. Pastoralists are conversant with a host of other factors crucial to the sustainable use of rangelands.

In spite of all this, there is evidence to support the observation by Behnke and Scoones (1992:32) that international agencies and African governments devoted considerable effort to the suppression of pastoral techniques of land and livestock management. Programmes to that effect were designed and implemented on the assumption that pastoralism was inherently destructive and, hence, required radical reform. The most notable of such undertakings are the Range Management Programmes undertaken in Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Tanzania and many countries of the Sahel Zone. In Tanzania, Range Management was attempted through the Ma-

sai Range Project, a ten year project which was financed by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

### Livestock policy

So far, Government policy on livestock development in Tanzania is contained in the 1983 document — The Livestock Policy of Tanzania (Government of Tanzania, 1983). The policy implicitly supports the orthodox view which sees individual land holding as conducive to gainful investment of effort and money. Pastoralism which, together with agropastoralism, constitutes what the policy calls the traditional sub-sector is regarded as backward. Its communal access to territory is said to lead to overstocking, overgrazing and destruction of soil structure. Consequently, the policy seeks to transform the 'backward' traditional sub-sector into a 'modern' sub-sector. It is observed in the policy document that the major hindrances to this transformation are the traditional producers' attitudes and practices.

Since policy-makers see the process of changing producers' attitudes as a lengthy one, it is proposed that emphasis be given to the expansion of the fledgling commercial sub-sector. This means that the traditional producers (pastoralists) who keep over 99% of cattle, goats and sheep would have to be side-stepped in favour of the commercial sub-sector which accounts for less than 1% of all livestock. It is recognised by the policy-makers that the majority of the milk produced in Tanzania comes from the traditional herd, but it is made clear in the livestock policy that "...even though there is potential for increasing production from this source the greatest emphasis will be placed on expanding the size and increasing the productivity of the grade dairy herd" (GOT

1983:15, para 48). A decade of policy relegation of the traditional sector has shown that the trust placed in the modern sub-sector was undue. There is a realization that the potential of the traditional sector for increasing production should have been exploited in the first place. The policy is now under review and efforts are being made to get the traditional sector due consideration.

The important provisions of the livestock policy which were never implemented are those relating to land rights. According to paragraph 29 of the document (GOT 1983:11), the long term aim of the policy was to optimise the meat supply from the traditional range lands on a sustained yield basis. Proper land use was to be promoted through an integrated land planning approach to demarcate and classify land in terms of its best use. The Range Development and Management Act of 1964, and the Villagization Act of 1975 were to be reviewed to harmonize the legislation. Moreover villages were to be classified according to their reliance on livestock related activities in order to provide adequate protection for the rights of livestock keepers. Areas allocated for livestock production were to be paddocked by natural barriers or, where necessary, artificial fence lines. The rights of individual smallholders with livestock were to be protected within the village by setting aside land for individual smallholders and communal grazing. None of these activities was undertaken.

The failure to implement these provisions was built into the policy itself. For example, whereas the implementation of the individual provisions fell under the jurisdiction of different institutions they were treated as if they were all under the Ministry responsible for Livestock Development. In the absence of a coordinating and follow-up mechanism the purported aims of



these land-use provisions could not be achieved. Moreover, the livestock keepers who would have played an important role had they been mobilised to protect their rights were, instead, taken for granted as passive recipients of 'development packages'. Pastoralists have less land today than they had in 1983 when the policy was effected.

### Land rights

Although many pastoralists in Tanzania still use their territory according to their customary tenure, this has been under administrative and political pressure since land was first nationalised under the colonial German Imperial Ordinance of 26th November, 1895. Except where claims to ownership and to real rights in land could be proved by private and certain other persons, all land was deemed 'unowned' and regarded as Crown land whose ownership was vested in the Reich. As Africans had no documentary evidence to prove their claims they lost security of tenure in their customary land (James & Fimbo 1973:31). This was a necessary step if German farmers were to get access to land in a country where they had no customary rights. The British who replaced the Germans as a colonial power enacted the Land Ordinance in 1923 which was quite similar to the German Imperial Ordinance. Despite the amendments made to the Land Ordinance in 1928 and 1950 to give some recognition to the rights of Africans to land, in practice Africans continued to be dispossessed without compensation.

The disregard for customary land rights by the colonial policies and laws are understandable. European and other non-African farmers could not otherwise have secured land, let alone the land of their choice, without membership in one of the local communi-

ties. One would expect things to have changed in favour of customary land tenure after the country gained independence, but that was not the case. To understand why this did not happen one has to look at the political statements of those who took the reins of power at the time of independence. In 1958 Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, who later had a very strong influence on the political development of the country, published a pamphlet on 'National Property' in which he argued against exclusive rights in land. On customary territoriality he said:

In the past, when our population was divided into different tribal groups, the land belonged to the particular tribe living on it. In future, however, our population will be united as one nation, and the land will belong to the nation. And today just as one man cannot prevent another man from his tribe from using land, so also tomorrow one tribe will not be able to prevent another tribe from using land that is actually the property of the nation as a whole. Our aim is to reach an arrangement for distributing land which we can use to meet our requirements. I see no better arrangement than the system of leasehold (Nyerere 1966:57-8).

Already at the eve of independence the leadership of the new nation was bent on extinguishing customary land rights. The implicit reason seems to have been the belief that the new nation would not be made up of tribesmen but citizens with the right to live anywhere within the national boundaries.

Another argument similar to that of Mwalimu Nyerere was advanced by James and Fimbo (1973) from an economic point of view. They argue that:

In the past, the claim that one tribe could as of right exclude the members of other tribes from all

land within its sphere of influence was compatible with the self-sufficient character of tribal subsistence economies. Today it is no longer possible to defend the claim on the same ground. None of the tribal areas of East Africa can be regarded as viable economic, or even political, units in isolation from each other. The claim to exclusive tribal rights thus becomes a claim to rights without corresponding obligations and so runs counter to the principal on which the policy of any modern State must be based (ibid.: 96).

This argument is also supported by evidence of movements of people from one part of the country to another in pursuit of better or sufficient land for agriculture or livestock keeping.

As a result of the laws and policies arising from these arguments, land was transformed from a resource which was communally owned by different native communities into a public resource controlled by the State. Individuals or groups have user-rights which they may hold as long as the State deems it fit. The dispossession of the natives of the different localities made it possible for people from one part of the country (and increasingly from outside the country) to get access to land in other parts of the country. In a way, these movements and land acquisitions were (and are still) seen as a way of consolidating unity among the citizens. Although pastoralists and members of other occupational groups have been leaving their customary lands to live elsewhere in the country, so far many more members of the other groups have moved into pastoral areas. This will continue to be the case for some time to come. The number of pastoralists leaving their customary territories to settle in other parts of the country is likely to increase due to numerous social and economic pressures,

as well as to the opening up of territory currently infested with tsetse fly.

In trying to meet the land interests of all citizens, the administration of land matters is almost everybody's (or nobody's) responsibility. There are so many institutions dealing with land, each with its own policy emphasis, that the resultant confusion and over-use (or misuse?) of power has acted against pastoralists and viable range management. At the national level there are the Ministry of Lands and Urban Development; the National Land Use Planning Commission; the Ministry of Natural Resources, Tourism and Environment; and the Ministry of Agriculture; just to name a few of the institutions engaged in land allocation and re-allocation. Then, there are the Offices of the Regional Commissioners, the Urban and District Councils, the Village Governments and so on, all with a wide range of powers to allocate and re-allocate land. Moreover, many programmes are still designed and implemented as if land were an unlimited resource, often with little regard to the needs and interests of the local communities. The major effect of this bureaucratic confusion is the marginalization of pastoralism and lack of a coherent rangelands management plan.

### Programmes and strategies

Sustainable range management will for a long time remain unattainable in pastoral areas because, apart from the official bias against pastoralism, there exists an interest gap between pastoralists and planners. Planners are trained to appreciate modern techniques of production with little or no interest in pastoral or cultural factors of production (See Salih 1991). Whereas modern planning is geared towards the modernization of livestock industry through the introduc-

tion of imported technology and institutions the pastoral system of resource management is based on local knowledge (ibid.: 28). The gap between planners and pastoralists cannot be overcome without change of strategy. The 'top-down' approach which treats pastoralists as mere recipients of governmental and non-governmental development packages has to be replaced by the 'bottom-up' approach which recognises the needs and abilities of the local communities as the starting point in evolving solutions. Moreover, if planners can be exposed to better data to contrast the economics of pastoralism with other systems they might quickly change their views.

It has often been assumed, wrongly, that the development of livestock would lead to the development of livestock owners. Therefore, large sums of money have been spent on livestock development (livestock health, livestock routes, etc) instead of pastoralist development. Pastoralists have yet to be empowered to master their own welfare. They should be helped to appreciate their rights and obligations. Moreover, they need to deal with modern institutions of arbitration and negotiation. For example, they have to learn how to deal with courts and other judicial institutions. They have to adjust to new demands, confront new threats and struggle to retain their resources, particularly territory.

The future of pastoral peoples is more uncertain now than it was a decade ago. These people are at a crossroads. Tanzania and the other countries of Africa with pastoral populations stand to gain by acting upon the proposals of the Project for Nomadic Pastoralists in Africa (NOPA) put forward in 1992 (NOPA 1992) and amplified during the UNICEF/UNSO workshop held at Limuru in January 1993 (see NOPA

1993). Of immediate relevance here are the following three recommendations relating to policy reform and land tenure:

- Noting the fact that most pastoral development policies have been based on false assumptions, confused aims, and contradictory objectives which have had an adverse effect on pastoralists, the workshop recommended that support be offered to governments in order to review policies affecting the pastoral sector and to assess more comprehensively the full contribution of the sector to the national economy.
- Acknowledging the complexity of the existing land tenure arrangements, the ambiguous and at times conflicting overlay of customary pastoral practice and laws promulgated by the state, the widespread failure to recognize pastoral land usage models and priority rights, and the numerous tensions generated by conflicts over land in pastoral areas, the workshop recommended that support be offered to multidisciplinary teams of researchers to conduct analyses of existing laws and customary arrangements regarding pastoral land tenure in selected countries, including identification of the institutional management units at different levels, and analysis of possible trends and options. Subsequent support could be offered for the writing and codification of existing customary laws, and their incorporation into the formal legal system.
- Measures to support legal aid for pastoralists in their assertion of priority rights of access to and

control of pastoral lands should be sought through both national and international bodies, drawing upon existing instruments of international law to back up the efforts of national lawyers defending pastoralist causes in national courts and through national parliamentary and administrative procedures.

### Profitability, poverty and conditionalities

The recommendations of the NOPA Project are well thought-out and are likely to open new avenues to pastoralist development in Africa if carefully implemented. I say carefully because conditions in pastoral areas vary considerably from place to place and are changing fast. Moreover, most of the recommendations arising from workshops and conferences are usually made by people who believe they know pastoralists better than policy-makers and planners. Given the fact that policy-makers are normally absent at these fora, the subsequent observations and recommendations may have the unfortunate tendency of blaming national governments and policy-makers for all the failures in pastoral areas. We may, as a result, fail to see the other factors which shape events in pastoral areas, and over which policy-makers may have no control. Again, this same tendency may prevent us from identifying the responsibilities of pastoral communities. What I am saying is that rather than continue talking to ourselves, researchers and specialists on pastoralism should realize that our deliberations are not likely to have much impact unless they are attended by policy-makers. For some time now, we have been advocating the participation of pastoralists in the making and implementation of

policies. Pastoralists are gradually getting access to policy-making fora, and policy-makers are also gradually getting access to the scholarly deliberations on pastoralism. I am of the opinion, though, that we researchers have not made sufficient effort to understand the difficulties faced by policy-makers and planners when drawing plans in situations where resources are scarce.

For example, the economic liberalization policies currently in force in Tanzania have been adopted by the Government as one of the conditionalities for getting International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank support. These policies require that land be put to the most profitable ventures, some of which are against the interests of the current local users. Any poor government in need of support from the financial giants will definitely be negotiating from a position of weakness. The pursuit of profitability by individual entrepreneurs, the abject poverty facing our countries, the conditionalities for securing international aid, and the different policy options have all to be clearly understood and taken into consideration when making recommendations on what should be done to improve pastoralist welfare. Of course arguments on the environment, conservation, and sustainable development are gaining importance in the policies of major creditors but the gains of pastoralism from this trend will depend on how it is understood.

Moreover, instead of researchers acting on what we think is happening in planning and policy circles, we should strive to make planners and policy-makers participate in our action-oriented meetings. However, given the fact that most of the African countries with pastoral populations are heavily dependent on foreign aid, the international community, especially the

policies of multinational corporations, should also be targeted.

### Conclusion

In spite of its contribution to the national economies, pastoralism is under great pressure. Drastic measures are needed to save pastoral territory from further alienation for other uses. Enough has been said on what has been done to pastoralists, but little has been said on what the pastoralists should do themselves to avoid being squeezed out of their resources. This should be taken up without further delay. In Tanzania, for instance, I do not see any future in customary land rights which are not supported by legal documentary evidence. Pastoralists of one part of the country cannot prevent people from other parts of the country from using their territory on grounds that they are of different ethnicity or occupation. Important as they may have been in the past, customary rights in land cannot stand on their own much longer, but should now be used as the basis for establishing legally recognised boundaries for the purposes of registration and titling, irrespective of the size of the territorial unit in question.

Along with the registration of their lands, pastoralists should be helped to draw land-use plans to avoid conflicts arising from the demands of various land uses. Many pastoralists now engage in some form of agriculture. Some are already participating in large scale commercial farming in pursuit of profit. And both large-scale and subsistence farming pastoralists are found in the same localities as other pastoralists, because they traditionally belong there. Unless clear land use plans are drawn in a participatory way, internal conflicts will heighten, weakening the pastoralists' capacity to contain pressure from

outside. In doing all this it should be impressed upon both national and international policy-makers that pastoralism is a sustainable form of land use, especially in arid areas.

The allocation of and competition for resources, the fight against poverty, the support for pastoral communities, the formulation of policies, and the relationship between national and international organizations constitute political factors and processes which have had a strong bearing on the future of pastoral peoples in Tanzania and, I believe, the rest of Africa. "Make no mistake: political factors will play a major role in the future of pastoral peoples", said Salzman in 1980. These factors call for greater attention today than they did a decade ago.

### References

- Behnke, R.H. and I. Scoones, 1992, *Rethinking Range Ecology: Implications for Rangeland Management in Africa*. World Bank: Environment Working Paper 53.
- Ekvall, R.B., 1968, *Fields on the Hoof: The Nexus of Tibetan Nomadic Pastoralism*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fiocco, L., n.d., *The Maasai Society: Conditions of Reproduction and Transformations*. a draft paper for discussion, Università Degli Studi Della Calabria.
- Hardin, G., 1968, "The Tragedy of the Commons", *Science*, No. 162: 1243-1248.
- Helland, J., 1990, *Finding a New Sustainable Pastoralism or Sustaining Pastoralists? The Dilemma Facing East African Pastoralists*. Forum for Utviklingsstudies No. 2:167-182.
- Herskovits, M., 1926, "The Cattle Complex in East Africa", *American Anthropologist*. 28:230-272.

James, R.W. and G.M. Fimbo, 1973, *Customary Land Law of Tanzania*. Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau.

Lamosai, A.S. and H.J.S. Crees, 1992, *The Contribution of Livestock to the National Economy*. A Paper written for the Workshop on 'The Role of the Veterinary Profession in the Promotion of Animal Health and Production'. Dar es Salaam.

Lane, C. and R. Moorehead, 1993, *New Directions in African Range Management, Natural Resource Tenure and Policy*. London: IIED.

Loiske, V.B., 1990, "Political Adaptation; the Case of the Wabarbaig in Hanang District, Tanzania", in *Adaptive Strategies in African Arid Lands*. M. Bovin & L. Menger (eds.). Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies: 77-90.

Mustafa, K., 1989, *Participatory Research and the "Pastoralist Question" in Tanzania*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Ndagala, D.K., 1978, "Operesheni au Hatua kwa Hatua?", A Working paper written for the Rift valley Project, Research Department, Ministry of National Culture and Youth, Tanzania.

Ndagala, D.K., 1982, "Operation Imparnati: the Sedentarization of the Pastoral Maasai in Tanzania", *Nomadic Peoples*. No.10:3-8.

Ndagala, D.K., 1986, *The Ilparakuyo Livestock Keepers of Bagamoyo: Persistent Fighters But Ultimate Losers*. Uppsala: Department of Cultural Anthropology.

Ndagala, D.K., 1990, "Pastoral Territoriality and Land Degradation", In G. Palsson (ed.) *From Water to World-Making*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies: 175-187.

Ndagala, D.K., 1991b. "The Unmak-

ing of the Datoga: Decreasing Resources and Increasing Conflict in Rural Tanzania", *Nomadic Peoples*. No. 28:71-81.

Ndagala, D.K., 1992, *Territory, Pastoralists and Livestock; Resource Control Among the Kisongo Maasai*. Uppsala: Department of Cultural Anthropology, University of Uppsala.

Nyerere, J.K., 1966, *Freedom and Unity: Uhuru na Umoja*, Dar es Salaam. Oxford University Press.

NOPA Project, 1992, *Pastoralists at a Crossroads: Survival and Development Issues in African Pastoralism*. Nairobi: UNICEF/UNSO.

NOPA Project, 1993, *Nopa Workshops on Pastoral Development in Africa*. Nairobi: UNICEF/UNSO.

Parkipuny, M.L., 1979, "Some Crucial Aspects of Maasai Predicament", In Coulson, A. (ed.) *African Socialism in Practice, the Tanzania Experience*. Nottingham: Spokesman.

Peterson, D.D. and T.R.T. Peterson, 1980, *Range Management in Arusha Region*. Discussion Paper for Arusha Planning and Development Project. Arusha: Regional Commissioner's Office.

Raikes, P., 1981, *Livestock Development and Policy in East Africa*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Salih, Mohamed, 1991, *Pastoralists and Planners*. Issue Paper No. 32, London: IIED.

Salzman, P.C., 1981, "Political Factors in the Future of Pastoral Peoples", In Galaty, J.G., Aronson, D., Salzman, P.C., and Chouinard, A. (eds.) *The Future of Pastoral Peoples*. Ottawa: IDRC: 130-134.

Western, D. and T. Dunne, 1979, "Environmental aspects of settlement site decisions among pastoral Maasai", *Human Ecology* 7 (1): 75-98.

Dr. D. K. Ndagala is the Commissioner for Culture in the Government of Tanzania, serves as Representative of the Tanzania Country Team of the ALARM network, and is a member of the Organizing Committee of PANET