

Opiniones y ensayos

Community-based tourism and local culture: the case of the amaMpondo

Andrea Giampiccoliⁱ

North-West University (South Africa)

Janet Hayward Kalis

Walter Sisulu University (South Africa)

Abstract: Tourism, managed constructively, can play a role in poverty alleviation and community development. This paper suggests ways in which Community-based tourism (CBT) can be used as a strategy to develop poor communities. Looking at the specific social context of contemporary rural Mpondoland, which is characterised by high degrees of poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition and unemployment, the paper considers ways in which local culture itself can contribute towards positive CBT outcomes. Local culture is not only seen as a tourism attraction, but also a resource upon which CBT development can be built. This paper considers various ways in which the local cultural context can be linked to CBT development, thereby enhancing the CBT development process.

Keywords: Community-Based Tourism; Rural Mpondoland; Community Development; Local Culture; Livelihood strategies.

Título: Turismo de base comunitaria y cultura local: el caso de amaMpondo

Resumen: El turismo llevado a cabo de una forma constructiva puede jugar un importante papel en el desarrollo de las comunidades y en el alivio de la pobreza. Este artículo presenta distintas formas en las que el turismo basado en las comunidades (TBC) puede usarse como estrategia para el desarrollo de comunidades pobres. Basándonos en el contexto social actual del medio rural de Mpondoland, caracterizado por altos niveles de pobreza, analfabetismo, malnutrición y desempleo, este trabajo considera diferentes aspectos en los que la cultura local puede contribuir positivamente al TBC. La cultura local no constituye únicamente una atracción turística, sino un recurso sobre el cual el desarrollo del TBC puede construirse. El presente trabajo sugiere distintas vías en las que la cultura local puede vincularse a un desarrollo del TBC, mejorando de este modo el desarrollo del mismo.

Palabras clave: Turismo basado en la comunidad; Medio rural Mpondoland; Desarrollo comunitario; Cultura local, Estrategias de supervivencia.

ⁱ . E-mail: andrea70g@yahoo.com

Introduction

The community-based tourism (CBT) concept has been at the forefront of the promotion of rural development, both in developed world countries such as Ireland (Storey, 2004) and in the developing world (Honey, 2008). According to Cornelissen (2005:21) “[t]he theoretical premises of community tourism have a long history, originating from the participatory and empowerment development models that emerged as a new paradigm in development discourse in the 1970s.” CBT has been linked to local culture especially from the perspectives of tourism ‘impact’ and ‘attraction’ in the sense that CBT should respect local culture and find ways to enhance and rescue local culture and heritage (Telfer & Sharpley, 2008:124; Flacke-Naurdofer, 2008:252).

Globally, within the general tourism sector, the focus on CBT as a means of enhancing community development, poverty alleviation, cultural heritage, and conservation is increasing (Equation, 2008:62). Although CBT has been the subject of increased literature (Beeton, 2006:50), it does not have a clear definition (Flacke-Naurdofer, 2008:246). According to Ndlovu and Rogerson (2003:125) the term CBT “is contested and often means different things to different people” (see also Kiss, 2004:232). The CBT concept is becoming increasingly relevant in developing countries, especially in so far as it endorses strategies that favour greater benefits for and control by local communities. It can take a variety of forms, ranging from communally shared systems to individually owned village stays and can be linked to entities outside the community (for example, tour operators or NGOs), especially when it comes to promotion (Page et al., 2001:401). Wherever the CBT concept has been used, it has been acknowledged that “[t]here are many examples [of CBT] across the developing world” (Page et al., 2001:401). CBT can be seen as a way of linking the need to reduce poverty with the breaking of structural dependencies based on hegemonic control of the sector by tour operators or the wealthy elite (Timothy, 2002:150). Importantly, international cooperation and CBT for community development in many developing countries are linked because “[i]nternational agencies increasingly promote tourism, and specifically community-based tourism as a means to reduce poverty in developing countries” (Spenceley, 2008:286).

CBT in developing countries “tends to inevitably be located in rural areas” (Equation, 2008: 62) and most international literature and attention focuses the attention on the same topic: CBT in the rural setting of poor countries (Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2004:436). However, CBT can be both urban and rural. In the South African context, for instance, “so-called community based tourism initiatives include programmes for developing ‘township tourism’ in localities such as Soweto, Inanda (Durban) and Khayelitsha (Cape Town) and of several rural community-based eco-tourism initiatives” (Rogerson, 2004:26). In the specific rural settings of the developing world, CBT has been acknowledged having the potential to contribute to

the livelihoods of poor rural people. As Sebele (2009:140) points out:

Rural areas in developing countries are often characterised by a shortage of facilities and industries and are inhabited by the poorest people in the society; therefore, earnings from community-based tourism create an alternative means of survival for locals.

It is suggested here that a variety of factors already present within the socio-cultural milieu of rural Mpondoland can provide a basis from which CBT in the region can be facilitated and developed. Such a linking of the cultural context with the CBT development process not only bolsters the local economy but also enhances the culture itself and it can be achieved in a number of ways. Already existing community cooperative frameworks for example, provide a natural structural basis from which CBT ventures can be launched which in turn address the need to diversify livelihood strategies. CBT development also has the capacity to alter socio-economic conditions, as for example in the case of new elaborations of the concept of hospitality and should therefore be seen as a form of the autonomous cultural evolution. Moreover, given that CBT entails equal power relations and cooperative work, it has the capacity to facilitate or act as a countermeasure against unequal power relations and ‘big men’ within local communities. This paper searches for possible links between the CBT concept and a specific socio-cultural background by investigating ways in which the specific socio-cultural context of a local community can interact with CBT development.

Community-based tourism and community development and local culture

The concept of CBT can be traced back and associated with alternative development approaches formulated during the 1970s which were concerned with issues beyond strict economic reasoning, such as empowerment and self-reliance (Telfer, 2009:156). The original concept of CBT must be seen as linking the concepts of sustainability, empowerment and self-reliance. Telfer (2009:156) specifically argues that from an alternative development perspective originated during the 1970s,

[d]evelopment also began to focus on community-based initiatives stressing local participation and self-reliance [...] tourism development has followed many of the concepts associated with the alternative development paradigm with respect to empowerment and sustainability. One of the pillars of the alternative development paradigm is local empowerment and this has been the focus of research on indigenous tourism, community-based tourism, ecotourism and the empowerment of women through tourism.

Singh (2008:155) follows a similar line, interpreting CBT as a strategy able to foster natural and cultural re-

source conservation and community development, contribute towards more opportunities for the improvement of community livelihoods, provide alternative sources of income in rural areas, and open a variety of skills-based job opportunities, especially for women.

Definitions are always difficult to elaborate and are often only partial. CBT has not been immune to these problems, and has been defined in many different ways. In fact, some of the meanings attributed to CBT vary quite considerably from one another. For instance a basic and crucial difference exists at the level of community involvement. Some authors (Suansri, 2003:14; Sproule in Ramsa & Mohd, 2004:584) are inclined to see the community as owner and manager of the tourism venture while for others (Scheyvens 2002:10; WWF, 2001:2; Mearns, 2003:30), different levels or degrees of participation or partnership agreement are recognised as possible in CBT. Nevertheless it is necessary to propose a CBT definition (which will also have its limitations) to understand the CBT framework as envisaged in this paper. One of the reasons why a definition of the concept of CBT¹ is problematic is that “[c]ommunity-based ecotourism (CBET) means different things to different people” (Kiss, 2004:232). Following from the perceived origins of the concept within alternative development approaches of the 1970s and seeking an understanding of issues beyond strictly economic reasoning (Telfer, 2009:156), CBT must be understood as engendering concern for the development of poor communities and therefore “must be initiated, planned, owned, controlled and managed by the local community members towards the achievement of their needs and wishes” (Giampiccoli & Nauright, 2010:52). Although tourism ventures that belong to a number of community members are seen as closer to the original concept of CBT, private enterprises on the micro-level may also have a positive role to play and the focus should always be on communal well-being rather than individual profit. Other factors that should be considered when attempting a definition of the concept would include the following: benefits should also accrue to people not directly involved in the CBT venture, CBT should respect local culture and lifestyle, external actors should play a role as facilitators of CBT rather than as partners - in whatever form - of the CBT business itself, and finally, recognition that CBT is often informal (Giampiccoli & Nauright, 2010:52), especially in its initial stages. Micro-level individual or single family ventures should work cooperatively within similar entities, following CBT concepts to be seen as a proper CBT initiative. CBT should not be seen as a major contributor to national economic performances, as its aim is in contributing to community development at village/community level, as suggested in the case of Namibia where CBT was widely endorsed by government and while it “does not contribute to the national economy in terms of foreign exchange...it does have local economic significance” (Jänis, 2009:13).

Within the concept of CBT, it is important to underline the fact that those members of the community not directly

involved in tourism should also receive some benefit so that the advantages of CBT can be spread to the greatest possible number of people. This has been recognized by Sproule and Suhandi (1998:216; see also Singh, 2008:156; Ndlovu & Rogerson, 2004:446) when affirming that:

In any community-based tourism enterprise there will be the direct and indirect participants and beneficiaries.... Direct beneficiaries would be the employees, crafts producers, guides, porters and so on. Indirect beneficiaries would be community members as a whole as recipients who receive the benefits of development projects, educational projects, training and other programs funded by the tourism revenues.

Recently for example, evidence from Nicaragua has shown that “los fondos comunes generados por el TRC se convierten en becas para la educación superior para los hijos de los miembros; de igual manera, se invierte en la reparación de las escuelas y en el establecimiento de grupos culturales, deportivos y puestos médicos comunitarios²” (Pérez, Barrera, Peláez & Lorío, 2010:30).

Altogether, CBT can be identified as a strategy for community development by means of self-reliance, empowerment, sustainability and the conservation and enhancement of culture for improved livelihoods within the community. However, it should be noted that in the term ‘community development’, “[t]he word development [is], if anything, even more problematic than the word community” (Ife, 2002:86). Community self-reliance is a key issue and indications from African rural areas suggest that livelihood strategies of the poorest are shifting towards an increased dependence on local knowledge and production systems and livelihoods and that non-Western based approaches to local development are emerging (Binns & Nel, 1999:390). The local cultural context can thus be seen to be (re-)emerging into the forefront of community development in poor communities. However, while the aim is to achieve complete community self-reliance, communities need to be open to the external world, and self-reliance does not consist of political or economic isolationism, but it means that a community should depend on itself, not on others; while at the same time, trade and cooperation are possible when they are of mutual benefit (Nyerere, 1974:99).

Ife (2002:80-81) uses the term community in relation to five characteristics: (1) Human scale, which implies that the size of the community guarantees interaction that can readily be controlled and used by individuals. (2) Identity and belonging which entails the recognition by others and commitment to the goals of the specific group. (3) Obligations in the sense that belonging to a community means having rights and obligations within that community through active participation in a least some of the activities which favour preservation of the community structure. (4) *Gemeinschaft* which entails the possibility of people’s wide interaction and the significance given to different talents and abilities in order to contribute to the

improvement of the community as a whole. Finally (5), culture which refers to the expression of a space defined community-based culture with specific characteristics linked to the community itself, which facilitates active production as against people being passive consumers of their culture and promotes inter-community diversity among communities and broad-based participation. In his investigation into rural issues in Mpondoland (the same area as this case study), Kepe (1999) utilised the concept of 'community' in various ways, for example 'community' as a spatial unit, 'community' as an economic unit, and 'community' as web of kinship and social relations. Keeping the five characteristics proposed by Ife (2002:80-81) and outlined above in mind (human scale, identity and belonging, obligations, *gemeinschaft*, and community-based culture), and using them as a background, this paper follows the three concepts of Kepe (1999) and uses them in a cumulative way, following the specific spatial and cultural context of the case study. The community is seen as geographically circumscribed and individual community members are economically and socially interwoven through the specific cultural background. In the Mpondoland case study, the area is limited to that within the geographical boundaries of Mpondoland, while economic and social relations together form part of historical Mpondo culture with its space (natural resources) and livelihood strategies.

Without romanticizing the concept of community, it is here suggested that it is because of their common historical-geographic background that individuals in the same community should, at least in theory, be more able to work cooperatively. This does not mean that issues of power imbalance and the presence of 'big men' are not recognised but that power imbalances between external actors and community members are likely to be poorly understood and unmanageable for local people who are often poor and uneducated. Internal power imbalances on the other hand should at least be better understood both in terms of dynamics and possibilities of adopting countermeasures (although their success cannot be guaranteed) to achieve greater social equality. As a community based development strategy, CBT strives for equal power relations and a break from hegemonic actors, whether external or internal in that it is derived from concepts of alternative development through issues such self-reliance, empowerment and sustainability. However, as Telfer and Sharpley (2008:115) indicate "[a]n important question to consider is who controls community-based tourism and whether the benefits from tourism go to the local people or whether they are controlled by the local elite or external tourism development agents exploiting the local community". Timothy (2002:15) however points out that it is precisely because CBT "is a more sustainable form of development than conventional mass tourism ...[that] it allows host communities to *break* away from the hegemonic grasp of tour operators and the oligopoly of wealthy elites at

national level. Community tourism is about grassroots empowerment." (emphasis added). Ideally, CBT should facilitate and work against unequal power relations and elites at the various geographical levels.

Issues related to common cultural background, the role of leadership and community members' actions towards creating more equal power relations within the community have given rise to different and sometimes contrasting opinions. For example, on the one hand, Boggs (2004:157) asserts that literature indicates that community managed commons break down as a consequence of internal community conflict. Her case study on Botswana community-based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) shows that group cohesion and collective identity has been compromised by involvement in and consequential benefits from CBNRM projects (Boggs, 2004:157). She mentions however, that in order to try and overcome such internal mistrusts and conflicts, the community is now hiring external advisers (ibid:157) – who could be seen as facilitator actors – which could be seen as a positive development provided such advisers are properly equipped for the job (Boggs, 2004:157). In relation to cultural evolution, Boggs (2004:157) suggests that CBNRM "should incorporate mechanisms for change that allow ... [the culture] to adapt to changing environments."

On the other hand, other and different forms of cultural evolution and management process are visible. For example, Peredo and Chrisman (2006:321) suggest that in CBEs (community-based enterprises) "[g]overnance structures tend to be collective and management structures democratic." The same authors (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006:322) mention that CBE can be seen as a new innovative response in relation to specific conditions of "economic, environmental, and social stress; a sense of local vulnerability; and the forces of economic and social globalization [...] But its roots in culture and tradition make this response more an evolutionary step than a surprising novelty." Thus, the "effectiveness and energy (an element of social capital) of community reaction to these factors [conditions] may be facilitated by local community culture, which taps into ancestral values, practices, and collective learning from previous community mobilizations" (Peredo & Chrisman, 2006:322). In relation to their study on CBT in Peru Mitchell and Reid (2001:136) follow similar lines on democracy and cultural background by suggesting that...

[t]raditional power structures and processes on the island are largely responsible for transparent and consensual decision-making.... Collective management of local services is also high, especially for handicrafts, accommodation, and entrance fee collection. Participation in decision-making has been a relatively democratic and equitable process, with one major exception being accessibility of power for women.

Reid and Turner (2004:233) also identify the specific local context as a protagonist in CBNRM within a

land restitution claim process and an external entity (the South Africa National Parks) in the Makulele community area. Reid and Turner (2004:233) suggest that during the seven years since the land claim was launched, “great social and institutional empowerment for the community” has occurred, and these attainments “were not because of the contractual park process, as such. They were rooted in the particular social and political features of the community, and by the way in which they reacted to an array of threats and opportunities.” This cohesion is however now under threat due to new revenues from the programme and “tension between traditional and democratic forms of community governance.” However, counteracting tendencies are present and local community leadership “is acutely aware of the dangers” (Koch, 2004:80, 81).

These few examples show how specific forms of evolution and management of community-based development depend on specific contexts, often based on particular cultural heritage and historical forms of relationship within the community where elites can play both enhancing and disintegrating roles in terms of social cohesion when it comes to community development. As Ostrom (2000:149) noted, “[s]uccessful self-organized resource regimes can initially draw upon locally evolved norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness and the likely presence of local leaders in most community settings.” She added that if community cooperation is to be effective in the long-term, it needs to be characterised by a set of design principles (boundary rules, rules-in-use, and participation by the people in making and modifying their rules). However Ostrom (2000: 153) also refers to other literature to illustrate that as with other forms of economic and political organisation, community self-organized forms of organisation, are vulnerable to both exogenous and endogenous factors and threats³. She therefore goes on to conclude that “[c]ontextual variables are thus essential for understanding the initial growth and sustainability of collective action as well as the challenges that long-surviving, self-organized regimes must try to overcome Ostrom” (2000:153). The need is to “explain why some contextual variables enhance cooperation while others discourage it” (Ostrom, 2000:154).

These various issues should make it clear that CBT cannot be seen as a general panacea for community development and has its own challenges and problems. Timothy (2002; see also Tosun, 2000 in relation to community participation in tourism development) for example lists a number of problems and obstacles relative to CBT development. Although not always present, examples of obstacles to successful CBT development include: traditional power structures that foster power imbalance, power imbalance in relation to gender and ethnicity, lack of awareness and knowledge about the tourism industry, deficiency in marketing capacity; peripheral nature of communities; and unequal access to opportunities for local ownership. However, despite such problems and obstacles, there are also many documented examples of “successful community-based tourism projects in the Ame-

ricas, Asia, Europe, and Africa” (Nyaupane, Morais & Dowler, 2006:1374). A practice manual for effective CBT published in 2010 outlines various enabling and barrier conditions to CBT development but nevertheless sites a number of examples of successful CBT initiatives in both developed and developing countries (Asker, Boronyak, Carrard & Paddon, 2010).

The term development also needs explication on how it is used here. It is intended as a holistic and people-centred concept which should take into account the specificities of different historical-geographical situations (Brohman, 1996; Burkey, 1993; Pieterse, 2000). Thus, holistic perspectives on empowerment and self-reliance are basic points which permit the creation of a comprehensive perspective on development. The intention of development is to target the individual as well as the broader community at group and national levels, and to focus on an array of issues in the social, political, economic and cultural dimensions (Pino & Wiatrowski, 2006:119). Individual development must therefore be seen, first of all, as development within the community and thus a “community-based approach to personal growth and development would seek to find ways in which people’s individual needs can be met through community networks, structures and interactions, rather than through professionalised and packaged services” (Ife, 2002:195). It is necessary therefore to distinguish between conventional economic development and community economic development (CED) it is argued that the latter characteristics are guided by principles of “economic self-reliance, ecological sustainability, community control, meeting individual needs and building a community culture” (Fennell, 2007:157).

Another relevant notion to explore in order to understand the notion of community development as here intended, is the distinction between participation and facilitation. Thus, “[c]ommunity-managed projects attempt to let communities decide what type of growth they would like to see and then help them implement their plans” (Keyser, 2003:367). Proper support of CBT development happens “by facilitating the community themselves to own and operate ecotourism activities in their own homes through community-based initiatives, constraints arising from social discontent, unsustainable utilization of resources and economic leakages and other related problems could be reduced” (Ramsa & Mohd, 2004:584). The facilitation of community empowerment therefore means “providing people with the resources, opportunities, vocabulary, knowledge and skills to increase their capacity to determine their own future, and to participate in and affect the life of their community” (Ife, 2003:208). This was noted some time ago by Cernea (1985:10) who describes participation as “...empowering people to mobilize their own capacities, be social actors rather than passive subjects, manage the resources, make decisions, and control the activities that affect their lives.” Nyerere (1973) noted that “[d]evelopment brings freedom, provided it is development of people. But people cannot be developed; they can only develop themselves” (Nyerere 1973:60 in

Graham, 1976:70). External facilitators should contribute to long term community independence by providing the means for community self-reliance instead of continued dependence on external sources. One way in which this can be achieved is through an initial mentorship period, after which the local people involved take full responsibility (see van der Walt, 2008:17).

There is a need to re-establish CBT in its original form and to link it with community development strategies that consider local culture to be a pivot in the development process. The need is to promote the kind of tourism development that does not result in the community falling into a dependency trap through the neo-liberal reformulations of the CBT concept (see Giampiccoli, 2010). Similar conclusions have been reached in other studies in regard to community-based tourism enterprises (CBEs) and Manyara and Jones (2010:630) conclude that:

CBEs reinforce a neo-colonial model, with foreign control of tourism resources and heavy reliance on donor funding reinforcing dependency, and it advocates an urgent review of the support framework for community tourism development in Kenya in order to integrate the principles of sustainable development.

These issues are recognised when it is acknowledged that as “presented in the 1990s, CBT differs from general community development theory and process in that it does not have the transformative intent of community development and does not focus on community empowerment” (Beeton, 2006:50). Instead CBT should contribute to community independence through holistic sustainable development.

Local culture should be emphasised within community development and at grassroots level, the local cultural context must be taken into consideration and used as a starting point in community development projects. According to Ife (2002:183):

Community development with indigenous communities makes sense only if it is undertaken within indigenous cultural traditions. To attempt otherwise is to participate in the further oppression of Indigenous people, and to reinforce structures and discourses of domination. The primary aim of community development, therefore, is to legitimize and strengthen indigenous culture, through an effective empowerment strategy which enables indigenous people to have genuine control over their own community and their own destiny. Indigenous people themselves must set the agenda for development and have complete control over process and structures.

In the end, “[p]eople participate in what they know best” (Anacleiti, 1993:45). However, Chamber (1983) claims that the need is not to promote a full ‘reversal’, that is use only local expertise and knowledge, but to use a ‘balanced equilibrium’ of local and external knowledge

without any prejudice in any direction, thus respecting local knowledge as much as external expertise which is often considered to be superior. It is essential that the local cultural context is understood as a contributor and protagonist in the alternative development process and not as a static and impeding factor. According to Escobar (1995:226), what is required is

...the defence of cultural difference, not as static but as a transformed and transformative force; and the valorisation of economic needs and opportunities in terms that are not strictly those of profit and the market.

In terms of the African context, it has been argued by Anacleiti (1993:45) that local...

...knowledge will continue to be parochial, but specific to the realities of their daily lives. Most of this knowledge will continue to be transmitted through tradition from one generation to another. The tradition will continue to be guided mainly by cultural principles and values. Hence, the need is to study local culture as the starting point for dialogue about people’s development and their participation in bringing it about. Practically all rural communities still cherish their culture, as manifested by their traditional knowledge, skills, values, customs, language, art forms, organisation and management systems, and institutions these are what have enabled them to survive as communities in a physical and social environment that is sometimes very hostile. It seems obvious that research should be focused on developing this culture.

Within the context of community development, it has been asserted by Cloete (in Bhengu, 2006:61) that “*Ubuntu* and community development can be mutually supportive...starting with and particularly in communities that were traditionally socialized into its values and practices.”

It is therefore necessary to understand and explore the local culture in order to investigate possible relationships with CBT. Baker (2008) has shown how local specific cultural context can help CBT and management systems to improve CBT development. It is worth quoting Baker (2008:207) who explains that:

...where the cooperative *Kudumbashree*

scheme profits from a venture connected with tourism, there are strict rules as to how income is managed and profits shared so that, in theory at least, the problems faced by community-based tourism are minimized. Here, too, differences of opinion as to how profits should be divided are inevitable but, for the most part, the strength of Kerala's Communist culture and the acceptance that the rules of the scheme have to be adhere to, does limit such squabbles.

The link between CBT and local socio-cultural context has been also suggested in the Latin American context by Pérez, Barrera, Peláez and Lorío, (2010: 41) when they mention that

[e]s importante indicar que, en su mayoría, estas iniciativas mantienen la relación de encadenamiento entre la comunidad, la cohesión social, la cultura, el hábitat natural, la cultura productiva y los actores externos e internos de la comunidad. Su principal valor en la cadena es la organización colectiva en cuanto a la gestión, la propiedad y la diversificación del campo, así como la distribución de los beneficios. Estas iniciativas incentivan la coordinación entre los miembros de la comunidad en la distribución de las tareas de cara a la actividad turística⁴.

This leads us to realise the importance of understanding the socio-cultural context of the area as any form of community development must start from the local culture and evolve from that. It is therefore necessary to understand and explore the local culture when facilitating CBT as a form community development

The case study: the amaMpondo

The amaMpondo (Mpondo people) inhabit Mpondoland in the coastal north Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. The area is part of the marketing re-denominated Wild Coast (Antheaume, 2009:13).

Commentators have remarked on the continuity of the amaMpondo lifestyles with the past. Hayward (n.d.) notes that despite changes in post 1994 South Africa, Mpondoland remained a discrete region and that the lifestyles of many local inhabitants had not changed significantly from those of their forebears in the 16th and 17th centuries. Therefore, without investigating the reasons at length, it is sufficient to mention that due to their specific history, there has been "minimal impact of colonialism on the life of the Mpondo" (Kepe, 2003 a: 6; see also Beinart, 1982). Therefore "Mpondo culture was never lost because Pondoland was the last to be annexed and was never conquered by the Colonial power, even when it was annexed in 1894" (Mcetywa, 1998:25).

Mpondo culture is very much based on the tenets of the African concept of *Ubuntu* and this can be seen "by the logical fit between the various traditional institutions... and also the ingenious way that great care was taken to

ensure the welfare of every member of Mpondo society. *Ubuntu* was not just a state of mind: it was engineered into the very texture of social life" (Hammond-Tookey in Mcetywa, 1998:8). *Ubuntu* reflects the well-known saying, "I am because we are: I exist because the community exists" (Bhengu, 2006:38) and it can be contrasted with the homogenisation of cultures which annihilates diversity of thinking and works towards collectivism rather than individualism (Bhengu, 2006:72). Not that collectivisation necessarily denies individual aspirations in the context of *Ubuntu*, which engenders the coexistence of individual as well as communal values and requires interrelation between community and the individual in order to promote individual potential and community well-being. As Bhengu (2006:58 & 125) points out,

African traditional culture was not attuned to individualistic competition, but co-operation within community, the community interest always being put above individual interests, while at the same time individual rights were protected by community ethics.

Emphasis is ... placed on such communal values as solidarity, cooperation, mutual helpfulness, interdependence, and reciprocal obligations. At the same time, however, due recognition is given to the claims of individuality – individual initiative and responsibility.

This is not to suggest that the African context is misled in its perspective of *Ubuntu*. The idea of *Ubuntu* encompasses an understanding of mutual relationships between humans themselves as well as between humans, the universe and nature. For instance in Latin America "[w]ithin the Andean worldview – in PRATEC's [Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas]⁵ exposition – the peasant world is conceived of as a living being, with no separation between people and nature, between individual and community, between society and the gods" (Escobar, 1995:169).

This interrelation between the community and individuals has been recognized in the livelihood strategies practiced by the Mpondo. For example, Kuckertz (1990:180) in his chapter about socio-economic cooperation, acknowledges the complex interrelations that exist between different homesteads:

On the one hand there are *economic* considerations concerning the maximization of achievement; on the other hand there are *social* considerations concerning the family as a set of relationships between people who share common interests and values. Although different in nature, they are clearly interrelated.

However, McAllister (2003) rightly indicates the 'confusion' implicit in the way that Kuckertz (1990) tries to keep the social and economic milieus separate from one another and "seems also to assume that the two kinds of interest (individual and common) cannot co-exist and are

mutually exclusive” (McAllister, 2003:14). As previously indicated when discussing the concept of *Ubuntu*, there is coexistence of the individual and the community. Thus, as McAllister (2003: 14) points out, “[if] each homestead depends on the support of others it is in the common interest for all homesteads to survive and grow. Only by trying to keep the social and the strictly “economic” separate can this be ignored” (McAllister, 2003:14).

Such issues are practically visible in relation to land for example, which is a fundamental asset for poor people’s livelihoods and the community as a whole. Rights of utilization “indicate the independence of each homestead, whereas the actual cultivation – requiring, as it usually does, the co-operation of several homesteads – indicates the interdependence of these homesteads and their economic integration into the wider society” (Kuckertz (1990:186). The collaborative approach in Mpondoland was noted by Hunter (1979:73) in relation to the *amalima* (work-parties). Past and recent researches in Mpondoland remain within the same perspective, emphasizing the persistence and retention of the Mpondo of historical livelihood strategies. Thus Hajdu (2009:151) echoes the previous authors by noting that

...*amalima* agricultural workgroups are important for village co-operation and social networking. Natural resource use is thus socio-culturally embedded in rural lifestyles, even if it is not always an important factor when considering total household incomes.

According to Mcetywa (1998:72-75), historically the AmaMpondo had a number of systems to help each other, such as money-games (*Ibhundela*), work parties (*Isitshongo* and *Ilima*), resource rights (*Ukuphekisa*) and property sharing through property lending (*Ukusisa*). All these systems can be seen as a ways of helping each other and redistributing wealth amongst the people. Such cooperative mechanisms are still present today. McAllister (2003), for example argues that as part of collective identity, established norms continue, asserting that “a homestead mode of production characterized by a reliance on co-operative labour and a norm of reciprocity remains in evidence in Shixini and other parts of Transkei” (McAllister, 2003:17).

“Historically, land, trees, grazing resources and numerous other natural resources have been an important part of Mpondo peoples’ livelihoods” (Kepe, 2003 a:8). Increased livelihood strategies are important in rural Mpondoland and different studies have emphasized the varieties of livelihood strategies existent among the rural poor of Mpondoland (see Kepe, 2003 b:152; Simukonda & Kraai, 2009:54; Kepe & Wande, 2009:104). However, Hajdu (2009) studying two Mpondo Villages, points out that while a variety of traditional livelihood strategies still exist, various opportunities for local jobs are becoming more significant as specific local livelihood strategies. This issue has also been raised by Beinart (2009:164), who states that: “[w]e know from a number of surveys that livelihoods in the rural areas of the former Transkei are increasingly generated through access to wages, government

grants, and informal local employment and enterprise.” Although it has changed its specification and role, agriculture is still relevant today but households (especially poor households) focus on small vegetable gardens rather than large fields. These are basic safety nets because increased diversification of livelihoods has resulted in a higher dependence on money (Jacobson, 2009). The same author concludes that the main reason why development programmes have been disappointing “has been the failure to see local people as equal partners, to understand and integrate local knowledge and practices with development initiatives” and to understand other specific contexts such as the relevance of land redistribution when it comes to farming as a part-time activity (Jacobson, 2009:221).

It has therefore been suggested that in order “to produce superior outcomes of reducing poverty and sustaining the livelihoods of the people along the Wild Coast, there should be visible and clear strategies to promote a diversity of

livelihoods for the people” (Simukonda & Kraai, 2009:54). In line with the proposals put forward in this paper, the same authors have emphasized the argument that it is necessary to involve local people and that “[a] critical component of this participation is the recognition of the indigenous knowledge that people have in promoting their own livelihoods” (Simukonda & Kraai, 2009:54). Hayward (n.d.) writing on the Mpondo reality suggests a very similar concept as that quoted above by Escobar (1995:226). In fact according to Hayward (n.d.) the continuing determination of part of Mpondo people to use historical systems of livelihood “does not mean that modern ideas and innovations are rejected; instead they are incorporated and employed alongside traditional methods.” The local context must not therefore be confused with narrowness and rejection of new systems, but should be seen as part of an open approach of insertion, and possible re-reading or transformation within the historical local development context. For example, Beinart (2009:168) has noted that the use of livestock has changed in that the multipurpose utility of cattle has decreased when compared with the past and Kepe (2003 a:6) has asserted that although “Mpondos adopted many agricultural innovations, ensur[ing] that the kingdom’s economy remained vibrant, [and] were not totally opposed to the opportunities that came with colonization, they were always deeply concerned about the threats that commoditization through trade, and government intervention, would have on their patterns of land occupation.” Thus, any inclusion of new opportunities must keep in mind historical patterns of local culture.

The tendency for traditional practices to change over time is pointed out by McAllister (1997) when discussing the differences between beer-drinks which are community affairs as against ancestor rituals which are oriented around the family. He suggests that due to ‘changing conditions in the Transkei’ over the past century, beer drinks have evolved to become the ‘predominant ritual form.’ Specifically, changes in the social organisation of produc-

tion such as labour migration, and correspondingly, in the size and composition of households, have led to the replacement of kinship as the 'major organising principle' by 'neighbourhood and a sense of community'. Increases in beer drinking "coincided with, reflected and provided normative or ideological support for the changing nature of rural production," and since ancestor rituals were not community affairs, many were replaced by beer drinks. It was not so much that neighbourliness arose as a new social principle, but rather that "it became more important as the kinship system weakened" (McAllister, 1997:306).

In the same way that changing circumstances have altered economic and ritual practice, the passage of time has also brought differences to Xhosa notions of hospitality. Historically the Mpondo were well documented as being very hospitable. This was evident as early as 1689 when they hosted travellers in the area, often survivors of shipwrecks.

Neither need one be under any apprehension about meat and drink, as they [the Mpondo] have in every village or krall a house of entertainment for travellers, where these are not only lodged but fed also... (Bird, 1888: 46).

Hospitality and courtesy was not reserved for important people as even slaves "and castaways of little or no means were able to travel vast distances along the coast, largely due to the hospitality of the local people" (Cramp-ton, 2008:134). According to Hunter (1979:372), in Mpondo culture "[h]ospitality to travellers is obligatory even to persons of other clans and tribes." Originally Mpondo saw payment for food from other households as strange 'white' behaviour. The Mpondo were said to have observed that a "white man must carry food, or money to buy food, when he is travelling. We travel seven days without food or money, and never fear hunger. You Europeans eat alone: you will not eat with others. We eat two or three together out of one dish" (Hunter, 1979:373). The Mpondo, when staying as a visitor in other people's house, do not pay, but if staying for longer than one day, will help in the household works, thus contributing to the Xhosa maxim that "much work as possible is done in company" (Hunter, 1979: 356).

According to Hunter (1979:373), the traditional tendency not to pay for food as a traveller began to change when migrant mine workers increasingly travelled to and from the urban centres, with the result that she reported that the "sale of food to travellers is beginning to be usual." With tourism also, the Mpondo can be seen to have adjusted their culture to different circumstances and opportunities brought by changing life conditions. In the same way as the externally induced migrant system of miners facilitated by the Apartheid government altered local conceptions about hospitality, local culture can evolve in relation to tourism and integrate a new livelihood strategy in order to improve the quality of people's lives. As Briedenhann and Wickens (2004:198) have argued,

[c]harging for hospitality is an anathema in the African

culture of 'ubuntu'. A respondent identified 'the gradual move by rural African people to the legitimacy of charging for accommodation and food, things that historically should be freely given' as a major breakthrough. Local people have accepted the concept of tourism and want visitors because they aspire to generating economic activity and building pride in their product.

Today this change in attitude can also be explained by the fact that it has been "estimated that 72.2% of the population of O.R. Tambo live in poverty" (O. R. Tambo IDP, 2010:16) and it is therefore not surprising that local people charge visitors so as to make extra income. Evidence from Latin America also refers to the integrative character of community based tourism, as (Pérez, Barrera, Peláez & Lorío, 2010:41) noted: "en función de la obtención de un ingreso adicional a lo generado por la actividad productiva local". They suggest that it is in the context of improving and diversifying livelihood strategies that CBT can provide a 'new' sector to contribute, in addition to other livelihood strategies, to improved living conditions of the poor. CBT cannot be seen as a component of the main economic sector, at least not in the short term and not for the majority of the people. The previously cited authors from Latin America also see CBT as a diversification mechanism within the general livelihood strategy when they state that "[s]u principal valor en la cadena es la organización colectiva en cuanto a la gestión, la propiedad y la diversificación del campo, así como la distribución de los beneficios"⁸ as (Pérez, Barrera, Peláez & Lorío, 2010:41). The use of CBT as a livelihood diversification strategy in poor communities has already been noted. For instance Nelson (2003:10) argues in relation to his Tanzanian case study that "CBT is an essential tool in diversifying rural economies in northern Tanzania, particularly in semi-arid rangelands where land uses and livelihood opportunities are limited."

The extent to which external influences manipulate and distort the local historical flowing of community development is also dependant on how community development programmes, such as the ones with a focus on tourism, are planned and carried out. According to Hammond-Tooke (in Mcetywa, 1998:8), the challenge for the Mpondo in the future "will be to ensure that this humane mind-set is carried through into the very different society in which the Mpondo (and other black South Africans) now find themselves." This, in itself, often gives rise to difficulties. External influence of Christianity and agricultural betterment schemes of the 1960s and 1970s, for example, have tended to work against the maintenance of co-operative community works by favouring the decline of traditional forms of community co-operation such as the *amalima* (McAllister, 2003:16).

A number of conditions need to be in place for CBT enterprises to succeed. In a study on farmer cooperatives in South African poor communities, van der Walt (2008) mentions the necessary stages for success in a cooperative and it is here suggested that these can also be con-

sidered appropriate for CBT and community-based projects in general, which should include the establishment of a communal legal entity. According to van der Walt (2008:13-14-17) the needs are: effective management, initiative of local members, support and commitment of members, cooperative education, and government support. The stages he suggests are: an informative and establishing workshop about the cooperative, followed by training and a mentorship period until local members are in a position to take full responsibility. Interestingly the same author (van der Walt, 2008:5) also recognised the value of the concept of *Ubuntu*, arguing that “[a]n aspect that supports the principles of collective entrepreneurship is the value system from which African people have evolved, which implies that a person is a person through other people”.

An important aspect favouring the success of CBT is community leadership. Although hindered by many barriers, community leaders are an important element of any community, vital to successful community development, and key actors in facilitating tourism development in any specific destination (Aref & Redzuan, 2008:173). It has been acknowledged that “[c]ommunity leadership also is important for collaborative community based tourism development [and] community leaders are especially important in building community capacity for tourism development” (Aref & Redzuan, 2008:173). Leadership within the community can be also associated with inappropriate use of power by ‘big’ people such as headmen and chiefs. However it has also been noted by Kuckertz (1990:117) that “[n]o one, not even the chief, can make any profit by speculating in land”. The situation was historically an ambivalent one, and it remains so. One major reason for traditional attachment to communal land is the importance of access to communal resources which for poor people are often a means of survival in times of need. An extract from Beinart’s (1982) book, *The Political Economy of Pondoland 1860-1930*, clarifies the Mpondoland situation. The use of communal ownership of land has been important for the majority of people living in Mpondoland, even if chief’s control influenced certain aspects of land distribution and usage. As Beinart (1982:18-22) indicates:

Access to both arable land and pasturage was implied by the tributary relationship; though chiefs and their immediate supporters might secure the best sites and arbitrate in disputes, there is no evidence to suggest that commoners could be excluded from land. Chiefs did, however, exercise more direct control over communal resources such as the major forests.... The ethic of community should not disguise the fact that these could be unequal; homesteads with insufficient resources would be dependent on generosity in time of shortage.

The people in Mpondoland and the specific history of the place have both been influential in maintaining communal land as a characteristic of Mpondoland, with

only few areas having been alienated. Moreover, despite the control of chiefs over communal land, the population could always access what land was necessary and as Beinart (1982:44-95) points out, “[e]xcept for small areas around the magistrate centres, the land in Pondoland remained under communal tenure... The triumph of segregationist land policy in the Union [of South Africa] as a whole had the effect of maintaining the status quo: Pondoland remained reserved for African occupation under communal land.” The power of the chief was supported by the majority of people, with only a small minority wishing to fence the land for commercial farming. Once again Beinart (1982: 126) elucidates:

It would be misleading to suggest that communal tenure in Pondoland was defended by the chief alone. A small minority of wealthier, progressive cultivators who wished to fence land, grow winter crops and cash crops, and extend their arable land, found the implication of communal land inhibiting. But for the bulk of the population, communal tenure was their ultimate guarantee to access to both arable plots and grazing.... The allocation of land through chiefs and headmen, rather than by the state, enabled the mass of the people to exercise some control over land through the political process surrounding local decision-making.

Thus, despite the chieftaincy’s control of communal land, the mass of people continued to support its existence as a strategy to have available natural resource to survive. Recent research in coastal Mpondoland has shown that out of 33 people interviewed 81.8% opposed the privatization of communal natural resources against remaining 18.2 that were not opposed to the privatization process (Giampiccoli, 2010:155).

The leadership issue in Mpondoland must be understood within the context of traditional amaMpondo resistance to external and internal oppression. As Kepe (2003 a:8, in Beinart, 1982) put it: “The three instances where ordinary villagers challenged their traditional leaders, after accusing them of selling their land and people to outsiders, including during the Pondo Revolts, are an indication that defence and resistance for the sake of livelihoods has little regard for tradition and hierarchy.” Hunter (1979:393-4) indicates that “[a] stingy or cruel chief was liable to find his following dwindling, and his men attaching themselves to a chief outside this territory, or to a rival relative within his territory” and that this had occurred frequently in Mpondo history. Thus although the powers of a chief were ‘wide’, they were at the same time “limited by law and custom, the powers of his councillors, and the necessity of keeping on good terms with his people” (Hunter, 1979:393). As was suggested above, unequal power relations at the local level can be better understood by the people involved, and to some extent, controlled and redefined. For instance, earlier this year (2010), a group of seven villages, using a strategy which mostly followed customary procedures, were able to rule

out their local Chief and have begun procedures to select a new one (Personal communication, 2010).

This reflects the fact that where unequal power relations exist within a community, the matter is of concern, but it is here suggested that the relationship with external influences and power structures may be of even greater concern than the ones at community level which are limited, softened or absorbed by the characteristics of community previously mentioned. In the case of the latter, local people can better understand and interpret the situation in order to be able to produce their own countermeasures. On the other hand, it is much more difficult to oppose development project management that resides in a distant city and is run by people coming from different cultural backgrounds who are possibly working for international organisations that follow specific laws and approaches.

It is evident that some forms of management and organisation are excluded and not allowed to prosper. As Escobar (1995) points out, when it comes to alternative development principles, each socio-cultural context should be allowed to decide on its own form of management and organization. This is especially true at community level (with limited geographical impact), where communities should not be pushed to adopt external systems which could result in a lack of clarity or in the project not functioning as desired by external project implementers. On the contrary, a local system of organization should be utilised in order to better facilitate community development. Only in this way will poor local communities with weak skills bases and limited material resources be able to be part of the development process. A community evolves through understanding the process of development and not through the insertion of foreign development models that are unclear and do not fit within the local context. Of course, at the same time, local cultural differences must be understood “not as a static but as a transformed and transformative force” (Escobar, 1995:226).

For example, (Giampiccoli, 2010) has discussed the case of an international cooperation project which proposed the implementation of CBT, with the original intentions of facilitating village-based home stays and a community-owned and managed lodge trail system. However, the trail system was not successfully developed as originally planned, the village-based home stay was left along the way to die out and the community lodges were ultimately given out to a multinational private company in partnership with the community, instead of remaining under full community control and management. Despite the failure of the project, some local people, using skills acquired during initial facilitation of the same project, were able to go ahead alone, especially the community most exposed to the tourism sector (Giampiccoli, 2010). A number of people in this village had been part of the project and were able and committed. When they realised that the project had essentially come to an end / failed, they re-organised themselves in a more modest way and using their own capacities and resources, they are partnering with priva-

te companies that provide tourist accommodation in the nearby town who are delivering tourists to the village for horse trails and meals (Giampiccoli, 2010).

Conclusion

This paper suggests that CBT is not a panacea and cannot be seen as the only solution, but it should be included in the framework of strategies to promote rural development. As already noted, if CBT is properly managed it “can provide a range of development benefits to communities, especially in poor and disadvantaged areas. Tourism is often well situated in remote areas populated by people from poor or disadvantaged backgrounds who share distinctive cultures and attractive natural settings” and CBT can enhance their livelihood strategies (Hainsworth, 2009:113). This paper further proposes that specific cultural contexts should be valued as a pivot around which CBT and other development strategies can be established. External actors should provide a facilitative platform to allow community people to take independent actions and control of their own development. CBT can serve to promote individual and community development as in the same way as the *Ubuntu* concept has traditionally acknowledged the relationship and interplay between the individual and his or her community. In their study of community-based rural tourism in Nicaragua and Guatemala, Pérez, Barrera, Peláez and Lorío, (2010:67) reached the following conclusion:

[a] pesar de sus limitaciones actuales, las iniciativas de TRC sistematizadas son casos que ilustran la contribución de esta alternativa económica a la reducción de la pobreza. Al nivel individual, esta contribución se refleja en el ingreso, en la mejora de la vivienda y en el acceso a servicios básicos. A nivel colectivo, ella se refleja en la inversión en educación formal e informal, en inversión física en salud y en medidas de protección del medioambiente⁹.

CBT must be understood as an integrative livelihood strategy. It should be included in the contemporary pattern of livelihood diversification as a possible new and extra element to help poor families. It cannot be understood, at least in the short or medium term, as a main livelihood approach in poor Mpondoland households or poor and/or marginalized rural communities in general. It should be understood that CBT has its own characteristics, which, if properly facilitated, can be of incremental help in the livelihoods of poor people. This is because “[c]urrent and future livelihoods and development strategies on the Wild Coast can never be disaggregated into independent sectors. The joint dependence on nature conservation, ecotourism, agriculture, wild resource extraction, forestry and other activities will continue” (Kepe & Cousin, 2000:23).

At the same time, it must be remembered that the local cultural context cannot be the fundamental element

for sustaining CBT development, but must be understood as a condition that - together with other elements - contributes to CBT development through its specific cultural features. Therefore specific cultural contexts do not automatically imply positive CBT development and still less, the automatic desire of CBT development by a particular community. Specific cultural contexts with characteristics amenable to the concept of CBT can, along with other elements, contribute to a better understanding and positive outcome of CBT development.

It is of fundamental importance that CBT should not be externally controlled in its development but simply be facilitated by outsiders to provide necessary resources such as education (good education) and infrastructures before being handed over to communities. In Mpondoland, “[t]he endemic poverty and related unemployment along the Wild Coast is linked with a lack of access to clean water, sanitation, health care and schools. Levels of infrastructure development are well behind national averages and are poorest in the densely populated rural areas of the Wild Coast” (Simukonda & Kraai, 2009:36). Facilitators should provide these lacking infrastructures and, thereafter, they should “[l]et the locals decide on their own about their future” (Antheaume, 2009:14) whether this includes tourism or not. As Simukonda and Kraai (2009:54) clearly put it in their study of Pondoland,

[a] critical component of this participation is the recognition of the indigenous knowledge that people have in promoting their own livelihoods. Marginalisation of such knowledge undermines people’s ability to direct their own development and enjoying their own space and freedom of expression. 10

References

- Anacleto, O.
1993 “Research into Local Culture: Implications for Participatory Development”. *Development in Practice*, 3(1): 44-47.
- Antheaume, B.
2009 “Foreword”. In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 11-14). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Asker, S., Boronyak, L., Carrard, N. and Paddon M.
2010 Effective community based tourism: a best practice manual. APEC Tourism Working Group. Griffith University: Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre
- Baker, K.
2008 “Kerala’s Strategy for Tourism Growth: a Southern Approach to Development and Poverty Alleviation”. In Burns P. and Novelli M. (eds.), *Tourism Development: Growths, Myths, and Inequalities* (pp.192-216). Wallingford: CAB International.
- Beeton, S.
2006 *Community development through tourism*. Collingwood: Landlinks Press.
- Beinart, W.
2009 “Transhumance and Ticks in Pondoland: a Crisis in Livestock Management on the “Wild Coast””. In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 163-190). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Beinart, W.
1982 *The political economy of Pondoland 1860-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bird, J. B.
1888 *The annals of Natal* (2 volumes). Pietermaritzburg: P. Davis & sons.
- Bharucha Z. and Pretty J.
2010 “The roles and values of wild foods in agricultural systems”. *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society*, 365: 2913–2926.
- Bhengu, M. J.
2006 *Ubuntu: the global philosophy for humankind*. Cape Town: Lotsha Publications.
- Binns T. and Nel E.
1999 “Beyond the development impasse: the role of local economic development and community self-reliance in rural South Africa”. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 37(3): 389-408.
- Boggs, L.
2004 Community-based natural resource management in the Okavango Delta. In Fabricius C. (Ed.), *Rights, resources and rural development. Community-based natural resource management in Southern Africa* (pp.147-159). London: Earthscan.
- Boonzaaier C. C. and Philip L.
2007 “Community-based tourism and its potential to improve living conditions among the Hananwa of Blouberg (Limpopo Province), with particular reference to catering services during winter”. *Journal of Family Ecology and Consumer Sciences*, 35: 26-38.
- Brennan, M. A.
2009 The Importance of Incorporating Local Culture into Community Development. Family Youth and Community Sciences Department, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida. Original publication date October 2005. Reviewed: January 2009. Document number is FCS9232. [Web] Available from: <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pdffiles/FY/FY77300.pdf> (Accessed 1November 2010).
- Briedenhann, J. and Wickens, E.
2003 “Rural Tourism - Meeting the Challenges of the New South Africa”. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6: 189-203.
- Brohman, J.
1996 “New directions in tourism for Third World development”. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(1):48-70.
- Burkey, S.
1993 *People First: A Guide to Self-Reliant participatory rural development*. London: Zed Book.

- Cernea, M.
1985 *Putting people first: sociological variables in rural development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, R.
1983 *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Harlow: Longman.
- Cornelissen, S.
2005 *The global tourism system: governance, development, and lessons from South Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Crampton, H.
2004 *The sunburnt queen*. Johannesburg: Jacana Media.
- Dellier, J. and S. Guyot
2009 "The Fight for Land Rights Versus Outsider's 'Appetites': Wild Coast EcoFrontier Dynamics". In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 59-100). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Equations,
2008 "Community-based rural tourism in developing countries. Some insights & lessons from the Endogenous Tourism project in India. In Making a difference. Dossier on community engagement on nature based tourism in India, Equations, 2009, (pp.62-68). Equations, Bagalore. [Web] Available from: http://www.asl-foundation.org/documents/Making_a_difference_000.pdf (Accessed 1 November 2010).
- Escobar, A.
1995 *Encountering Development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fennell, D. A.
2007 *Ecotourism*. London: Routledge.
- Flacke-Neurdorfer, C.
2008 "Actors or victims? Actor oriented perspectives on new form of tourism. In Burns P. and Novelli M. (eds.), *Tourism Development: Growths, Myths, and Inequalities* (pp. 239-258). Wallingford: CAB International.
- Giampiccoli, A.
2007 "Hegemony, globalization and tourism policies in developing countries". In Burns P. and Novelli M. (eds.), *Tourism and politics. Global framework and local realities* (pp.175-191). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Giampiccoli, A.
2010 Globalisation, Development and Community-based Tourism in Developing Countries: A Case Study of Pondoland, Eastern Cape. Unpublished PhD thesis, Geography Department, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban.
- Giampiccoli, A. and Nauright, J.
2010 "Problems and Prospects for Community-based Tourism in the New South Africa: The 2010 FIFA World Cup and Beyond". *African Historical Review* 42(1): 42-62.
- Graham, J. D.
1976 "Julius Nyerere: A Contemporary Philosopher-Statesman". *Africa Today*, 23(4): 67-73.
- Hainsworth, D.
2009 "Community Tourism and Broad-based Local Development: The Case of Doi Village, Thua Then province, Vietnam". In *Tourism and community development. Asian practices*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Hajdu, F.
2009 "Questioning Homogenous Degradation Narratives in Transkei: Livelihoods and Natural Resource Use in two Pondoland Villages". In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 129-162). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Hayward, J.
(n.d) History of Pondoland. [Web] Available from: <http://www.portstjohns.org.za/history-pondoland.html> (Accessed 2 December 2009).
- Honey, M.
2008 *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development Who Owns Paradise?* Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Ife, J.
2002 *Community Development: Community-based alternative in the age of Globalisation*. Sydney: Pearson Education.
- Jacobson, K.
2009 "The Mismatch between Smallholder Realities and Agricultural Development Interventions: from 'Betterment' to the Massive Food Production Programme". In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 191-228). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Jänis, J.
2009 Tourism Development Strategies in Namibia: Private and Community Perceptions on the National Policy, in: P. Hottola (Ed) *Tourism Strategies and Local Responses in Southern Africa*, pp. 8-26 (CAB International, Wallingford).
- Kepe, T.
1999 "The Problem of defining Community: Challenges for the Land Reform Process in South Africa". Available from: <http://www.mekonginfo.org/mrc/html/cape-town/cape35.htm> (Accessed 18 August 2010).
- Kepe, T.
2003 a "Grasslands ablaze: vegetation burning by rural people in Pondoland, South Africa". Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. Fort Hare Institute of Social and Economic Research Working Paper No. 51 (pp. 1-19).
- Kepe, T.,
2003 b "Use control and value of craft material – Cyberus Textilis – perspective from a Mpondo Village, South Africa". *South African Geographical Journal*, 85 (2):152-157.
- Kepe, T. and Cousin, B.
2000 "Resource tenure and power relations in community wildlife contexts: the case of the Mkambati area on the

- Wild Coast of south Africa". Evaluating Eden Series. Discussion Paper No.16. International Institute for Environment and Development: London.
- Kepe, T. and Whande, W.
2009 "Ambiguous Spaces: Natural Resource Management Buffer Zones and Rural Livelihoods in Pondoland, South Africa". In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 101-116). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Keyser, H.
2003 *Tourism Development*. Oxford: Oxford University press
- Koch, E.
2004 Political economy, governance and community-based natural resource management. In Fabricius C. (Ed.), *Rights, resources and rural development. Community-based natural resource management in Southern Africa* (pp.78-92). London: Earthscan.
- Kuckertz, H.
1990 *Creating order: the image of the homestead in Mpondo social life*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Manyara, G. and Jones, E.
2007 "Community-based Tourism Enterprises Development in Kenya: An Exploration of Their Potential as Avenues of Poverty Reduction". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(6): 628-644.
- McAllister, P.
1997 "Ritual and social practice in the Transkei". *Special Issue of African Studies*, 56(2): 279-310.
- McAllister, P.
2003 "Xhosa co-operative agricultural work groups – economic hindrance or development opportunity?" Fort Hare Institute of Social and Economic Research Working Paper No.12 (pp. 1-24). The Eastern Cape historical legacies & new challenges. Conference 27-30 August 2003.
- Mcetywa, S. A. M.
1998 *Mpondo Heritage: An Expression of Ubuntu*. University of Natal: Institute of Black Research/Madiba Publishers.
- Mearns, K.
2003 "Community-based tourism. The key to empowering the Sankuyo community in Botswana. *Africa Insight*, 33: 29-32.
- Mitchell, R. E. and Reid, D. G.
2001 "Community integration. Island Tourism in Peru". *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1):113-139.
- Ndlovu, N and Rogerson, C.M.
2003 "Rural local economic development through community-based tourism: the Mehloping hiking and horse trail, Eastern cape, South Africa". *Africa Insight*, 33: 124-129.
- Ndlovu, N and Rogerson, C.M.
2004 "The local economic impacts of rural community-based tourism in Eastern Cape. In Rogerson C. M. and Visser G. (eds.), *Tourism and development issues in contemporary South Africa*, (pp. 436-451). Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Nelson, F.
2003 "Community-based Tourism in Northern Tanzania: Increasing Opportunities, Escalating Conflicts and an Uncertain Future". TNRF Occasional Paper No. 2 Sand County Foundation Community Based Conservation Network, Arusha, Tanzania. Paper presented to the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education Africa Conference, Community Tourism: Options for the Future, held in Arusha, Tanzania, February 20-22, 2003.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Morais, D. B. and Dowler, L.
2006 "The role of community involvement and number/type of visitors on tourism impacts: A controlled comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China". *Tourism Management*, 27:1373-1385.
- Nyerere, J. K.
1974 *Ujama Essay on socialism*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Page, S. J., Brunt, P., Busby, G. and Connell, J.
2001 *Tourism: A Modern Synthesis*. London: Thomson Learning.
- Ostrom, E.
2000 "Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms". *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(3):137-158.
- Peredo, A. M. and Chrisman, J. J.
2006 "Toward a theory of community-based enterprise". *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2):309-328.
- Pérez, F. J., Barrera, O. D., Peláez, A. V. and Lorío, G.
2010 Turismo Rural Comunitario Como Alternativa de educación de la Pobreza Rural en Centroamérica. Edificio Nitlapan Campus de la UCA Managua, Nicaragua. Personal communication
- 2010 Personal communication with local community member.
- Pieterse, N. J.
2000 "After Post-Development". *Third World Quarterly* 21(2): 175-191.
- Pino, N. and Wiatrowski, M. D.
2006 "Implementing democratic policing and related initiatives". In Pino, N. and Wiatrowski, M. D. (eds.) *Democratic policing in transitional and developing countries* (pp. 99-128). Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Ramsa, Y. A. and Mohd, A.
2004 "Community-based Ecotourism: A New proposition for Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation in Malaysia". *Journal of Applied Science*, 4(4):583-589.
- Reid, H. and Turner, S.
2004 The Richtersveld and makulele contractual parks in South Africa: Win-win for communities and conservation? In Fabricius C. (Ed.), *Rights, resources and rural development. Community-based natural resource management in Southern Africa* (pp.223-234). Lon-

- don: Earthscan.
- Rogerson, C.
- 2004 "Tourism, Small Firm Development and Empowerment". In: Rhodri, T. (ed.), *Small Firms in Tourism International Perspectives* (pp. 13-34). St. Louis: Elsevier Science.
- Scheyvens, R.
- 2002 *Tourism for Development Empowering Community*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Sebele, L.S.
- 2010 "Community-based tourism ventures, benefits and challenges: Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Central District, Botswana". *Tourism Management*, 31:136-146.
- Simukonda, N. and Kraai, M.
- 2009 "The Wild Coast: the Contested Territory". In Guyot S. and Dellier J. (Eds.), *Rethinking the Wild Coast, South Africa Eco-frontiers vs livelihoods in Pondoland* (pp. 117-128). Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller Aktiengesellschaft & Co. KG.
- Singh, L. K.
- 2008 *Ecology, Environment and Tourism*. ESHA Books: Delhi.
- Spenceley A.
- 2008 "Local impacts of community-based tourism in Southern Africa". In Spenceley A. (ed.), *Responsible tourism. Critical issues from conservation and development* (pp. 285-304). London. Earthscan.
- Storey, D.
- 2004 "A sense of place: rural development, tourism and place promotion in the republic of Ireland". In Holloway, L. and Kneafsey, M. (eds.), *Geographies of rural cultures and societies* (pp. 197-213). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Suansri, P.
- 2003 *Community based tourism handbook. Responsible ecological social tour – REST project, Thailand*.
- Telfer, D. J.
- 2009 "Development studies and tourism". In Jamal, T. and Robison, M. (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp. 146-165). London: SAGE Publications.
- Telfer, D. J. and Sharpley, R.
- 2008 *Tourism and Development in the Developing World*. London: Routledge.
- Timothy, D.
- 2002 "Tourism and community development issues". In Sharpley, R. and Telfer D. J., (eds.), *Tourism and Development Concepts and Issues* (pp. 135-178). Cleveland: Channel View Publications.
- Tosun, C.
- 2000 "Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries" *Tourism Management*, 21:613-633.
- Van der Walt, L.
- 2008 "Collective entrepreneurship as a means for sustainable community development: a cooperative case study", *Forum Empresarial* 13(2):3-20.
- WWF – World Wide Fund,
- 2001 Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development. Available from: <http://www.icrtourism.org/Publications/WWF1eng.pdf> (Accessed 1 November 2010).

Notes

- 1 The term community-based ecotourism (CBET) can be seen as similar to CBT with an additional emphasis on environmental issues such as nature conservation, biodiversity, environmental sustainability and so on.
- 2 "Communal benefits generated by the community-based rural tourism are used to pay for high-school scholarship for children of the people involved in the tourism venture; in the same way, they are used to repair schools and establish cultural and sport groups for community health centers."
- 3 These are: major migration (out of or into an area); efforts by national governments to impose a single set of rules on all governance units in a region; rapid changes in technology, in factor availability, and in reliance on monetary transactions; transmission failures from one generation to the next of the operational principles on which self-organized governance is based; turning to external sources of help too frequently; international aid that does not take account of indigenous knowledge and institutions; growth of corruption and other forms of opportunistic behavior; and a lack of large-scale institutional arrangements that provide fair and low-cost resolution mechanisms for conflicts that arise among local regimes, educational and extension facilities, and insurance mechanisms to help when natural disasters strike at a local level.
- 4 "[i]t is important to show that most of these initiatives maintain the chaining relationship between community, social cohesion, culture, natural habitat, productive culture and external and internal stakeholders in the community. Its main chain value lays on the collective organization concerning management, property and rural diversification, as well as benefits distribution. These initiatives encourage coordination between community members on tasks distribution facing tourism activities."
- 5 Andean Project of Peasants Technology.
- 6 Mpondoland was part of the former Transkei area.
- 7 "focuses on gaining additional income to that generated by local activity."
- 8 "Its main chain value lays on the collective organization concerning management, property and rural diversification, as well as benefits distribution."
- 9 Although there are current limitations, systematized

CBT initiatives are practices that illustrate the contribution of this economical alternative to poverty reduction. At individual level, this contribution is reflected on incomes, housing improvement and access to basic supplies. Collectively, these initiatives entail investments in formal and informal education, health and environmental protection measures.

Recibido: 07/03/11
Reenviado: 24/04/11
Aceptado: 28/05/11
Sometido a evaluación por pares anónimos