

PERSISTENCE OF LAND CONFLICTS BETWEEN MAASAI COMMUNITY AND NGORONGORO CONSERVATION AREA AUTHORITY (NCAA) IN NGORONGORO CONSERVATION AREA (NCA)

Z. Aisia Lawuo¹, Bonamax Mbasaa¹, and Stephen Mnyawi²

¹Institute of Rural Development Planning - Lake Zone Centre, P.O.Box 11957, Mwanza, Tanzania

²Institute of Rural Development Planning - Lake Zone Center P.O.BOX 11957, Mwanza, Tanzania

Copyright © 2014 ISSR Journals. This is an open access article distributed under the *Creative Commons Attribution License*, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT: This study aimed at examining root causes leading to persistence of land conflicts between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) and Maasai community in Ngorongoro Conservation Area. Specifically, the study examine causes for land conflicts between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority and Maasai community and examines efforts made by the government and other stakeholders to resolve land conflicts between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority and Maasai community. Both primary and secondary data were collected. Primary data were collected through interview, questionnaires and observation. Secondary data were collected from various reports. A total of 109 respondents were drawn from Oloirobi and Moklari /Misigyo villages out of 13,940 populations. The findings concluded that Maasai have little awareness on laws/by-laws on environmental conservation that led to the persistence of land conflicts between Maasai community and Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority. Moreover, the study find that, the number of livestock increase yearly compared to the area located for pastoralists to graze their livestock as a result pastoralists graze in areas which is not allowed.

KEYWORDS: Land Conflict, Maasai Community, Ngorongoro Conservation Authority.

1 INTRODUCTION

Land resource conflict in Tanzania is mainly between pastoralists and conservators, peasants and pastoralists, Government and villagers, villagers and investors, mostly in Morogoro, Mbeya, Arusha and Mara regions (Olengurumwa, 2009). These land conflicts have caused harm to communities lives and animals, destruction of properties, insecurity, low productivity, accelerated food insecurity, generation of a landless class, increased poverty, and rapid environmental degradation (NGONET, 2008; Versteegen, 2001).

In Ngorongoro District, the land conflict is mainly between Maasai community and Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority due to Maasai demand of land for cultivation and livestock while Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) demand land for environment conservation and wildlife protection. Not only that but also Maasai community was forced to leave their local areas to areas where there is no enough water and pastures for their livestock (Michael, 2008). These is contributed by the presence land use plans at the community level and within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area which is not implemented and lead to ongoing conflicts over land use for agriculture and livestock (UNESCO, 2007). Foreign companies are permitted by the Ngorongoro Conservation Area to hunt different animals within the area as a result; the foreigners destruct the local property of the Maasai and lead to conflict between the local Maasai community and Ngorongoro Conservation Area officials (Shivji, 1993).

In response to this, various stakeholders including the Government, International Organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations and Community Based Organizations have made several efforts to combat the problem including: Preparation

of land use plan, establishment of policies on pastoralist and natural resources management. Introduction of Community Based Conservations (CBC) to ensure pastoralist's benefits from conservation and community are directly involved in conservation issues (Wright 1993; Western *et al.* 1994; Adams and Hulme 2001, Hackel 1999, Hulme and Murphree 2001; Mattee, 2007).

Despite of all these initiatives made by the government and other stakeholders like Ngorongoro Conservation Authority, land conflict is still persisting in Ngorongoro Conservation area. In view of this, the study aims at finding out the factors contributing to the persistence of land conflict between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) and Maasai community specifically, to identify and determine causes for land conflicts between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority and Maasai community within Ngorongoro Conservation Area, to determine land resources available within Ngorongoro Conservation Area and to examine efforts made by the government and other stakeholders to resolve land conflicts between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority and Maasai community within Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA) by using Oloirobi and Moklari/Misigyo villages as study area

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 STUDY AREA

Ngorongoro district lies in the north of Tanzania 90 km west of Arusha, adjoining the southeastern edge of Serengeti National Park between 2°30' to 3°30'S and 34°50' to 35°55'E. Contiguous with Serengeti National Park (1,476,300 ha) and Maswa Game Reserve on the west (220,000 ha) and Loliondo Game Controlled Area (400,000 ha) on the north; it is also 15 km northwest of Lake Manyara National Park (32,500 ha). While Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) is found in Ngorongoro District in Arusha Region. The Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority was established in 1959 under the ordinance 413 given that the main objectives were to conserve and develop the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA's) natural resources, to promote tourism and to promote and safeguard the interest of Maasai community within conservation area (UNESCO, 2007). About 129,000 people lives within Ngorongoro Conservation Area (2002 census). Also Ngorongoro ward is within Ngorongoro district, in Arusha region located in Northern Tanzania, which comprises of Oloirobi and Misigyo/Moklari villages. The choice of this ward has been influenced by the frequently occurrence of land conflicts between Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority and Maasai community.

The Maasai pastoralists were estimated to be 60,000 with 300,000 cattle (UNESCO 2007) in Ngorongoro Conservation area this means the population growth is high compared to the total area, which is 8290 square kilometers that is for both pastoralists and Ngorongoro conservation Area Authority (NGONET, 2008).

2.2 CLIMATE AND PHYSICAL FEATURES

Ngorongoro ward has topographical variation. Weather in this area varies in the highlands, it is generally moist and misty, while temperatures in the semi-arid plains can fall as low as 2°C, and often rise to 35°C. The annual precipitation falls between November and April and varies from under 500mm on the arid plains in the west, to 1,700mm on the forested slopes in the east, increasing with altitude. Ngorongoro Crater is found in Ngorongoro ward. It is the largest unbroken caldera in the world which is neither active nor flooded, though it contains a small saline lake, Lake Makat, and the Gorigor swamp. Its floor, at an elevation of approximately 2,380m, measures 17.7 by 21 km and is 26,400 ha in area (3% of the NCA), with a steep rim rising 400-610m above the floor.

2.3 DATA COLLECTION

Both primary and secondary data were applied; Primary data were collected through interview, questionnaires and observation. Secondary data were obtained from various documents related to the problem of the study to supplement the information from primary data sources. These data were collected from, police office, WEO, Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority offices, Division Office, reports and other documents.

Sampling unit were Heads of households and key informants including Village Executive Officers, Ward Executive Officer, Police officer, Ngorongoro Conservation Authority officers, Pastoralist Council and Division Officer who were selected purposeful as indicated in Table 1. A total of 109 sample size was obtained from 13940 households from Oloirobi and Misigyo/Moklari villages.

Table 1. The distribution/composition of the sample size

S.N	Category of Respondents	No. Of individuals
1.	Households members	100
2.	Village executive officers	2
3.	Ward executive officer	1
4.	Ngorongoro Conservation Authority representative's	3
5.	Police	1
6.	Division Officer	1
7.	Pastoralist Council	1
	Total	109

2.4 SAMPLING PROCEDURES

Probability and non-probability sampling were used during this study whereby simple random selection procedure was used to ensure that each unit of the sample (household) is chosen on the basis of chance and purposively sampling procedure was used to select Village Executive Officer, Ward Executive Officer, Ngorongoro Conservation Authority officials, Police officials, Division Officer and Pastoralist Council.

2.5 DATA PROCESSING, ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

The collected data were edited, compiled, classified and coded for data analysis. The processed data were analyzed through descriptive statistics. The processed and analyzed data were presented by using table and word statements.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 OCCUPATION OF THE SAMPLE RESPONDENTS

About 100% of sampled respondent in Oloirobi and Moklari villages were livestock keepers. But there were sample respondents who have other sources of income other than livestock keeping for instance 73.8% were casual labour, 19.7% small businesses; 4.9% were employed and only 1.6% of the sample respondent were tour guides as indicated in table 2. The result shows most of the respondents depend on livestock keeping rather than other income generating activities. It is concluded that most of respondent depend on livestock which lead to land conflicts because sometimes their livestock do not get enough water and land for pasture.

Table 2: Income-generating activities done in the area

Frequency	Percentage
Casual labour	45 73.8
Small business	12 19.7
Employee	3 4.9
Tour guide	1 1.6
Total responses	61 100.0

Source: Field data, 2010.

3.2 SOURCES OF LAND CONFLICTS BETWEEN MAASAI COMMUNITY AND NCAA.

3.2.1 AWARENESS ON LAWS/BY –LAWS ON ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

This is one among the sources of land conflict between Maasai community and NCAA. The result shows 53% of the total sampled respondents were not aware of the laws/ by-laws on environmental conservation (Table 3). For instance some of respondents (47%) reported that

“It is not allowed to cut trees without permission from the NCAA, dumping is not allowed, cultivation is strictly prohibited inside the NCAA, grazing of livestock inside crater and the forest without permission is not allowed”

These results imply that environment destruction will increase and lead to persistence of conflict between Maasai community and the NCAA.

Table 3: Awareness on Environmental Conservation

Awareness level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Aware	47	47.0
Not aware	53	53.0
Total	100	100.0

Source: Field data, 2010.

3.2.2 NUMBER OF LIVESTOCK

This is among the reason for land conflict between Maasai community and NCAA. The result on number of livestock revealed that cattle were 3995, sheep were 3955, goats were 3014 and donkeys were 488, this made a total of 11452 livestock (Table 4). These results signify that number of livestock is bigger compared to the area located to them since the livestock are not allowed to be grazed within the crater and the forest of NCA without the permission from NCAA but the pastoralists pastured their livestock within the crater and the forest that lead to increase and persistence of land conflict.

Table 4: Number of livestock

Livestock type	Frequency
Cattle	3995
Sheep	3955
Goats	3014
Donkey	488
Total	11452

Source: Field data, 2010.

3.2.3 NUMBER OF WILDLIFE

According to Wildlife census of 2008 number of wild herbivores was 18,983 (Table 5). These huge number of animals in a given area lead to high demand of natural resource base for their survival while the supply tend to decrease due to the static of the land and other natural resources necessary for the animals (Wamburwa, 1998). Number of livestock is 11,452 which is bigger compared to the area located, these livestock affect the wild herbivores in searching for water and pasture because the wild herbivore are free to move from all over the NCA even to the area located to the livestock (Table 4). This situation enhanced the persistence of land conflicts because the NCAA tells the Maasai pastoralists to graze their cattle in located areas but the Maasai wanted their livestock to be free all over the conservation.

Table 5: Number of herbivores

Herbivores type	Number in 2008 census
Wildbeest	8325
Zebra	5433
Gazelle	1195
Eland	49
Elephant	122
Black rhino	17
Buffalo	3686
Waterbuck	8
Hippo	53
Warthog	95
Total	18,983

Source: NCAA, 2008

3.3 LAND AVAILABLE WITHIN THE NGORONGORO CONSERVATION AREA AUTHORITY

3.3.1 LAND AREA FOR GRAZING

The results on adequacy of land for grazing of livestock indicated that 33% of the sample respondent reported that land for grazing is adequate meaning that, they do not have enough land to graze their livestock. Still results on land for pasture and water for livestock indicates 84% of respondents interviewed emphasizes that it is not adequate and 82% insisted that the water for livestock is not enough (Table 6). These imply that land conflict between Maasai community and NCAA will continue to harm lives of local community.

Additionally, results on arable land for cultivation indicates 96% of the interviewed respondents said land for cultivation is not adequate (Table 6). During the establishment of NCAA cultivation was allowed in the Conservation area later NCAA realized that the people through cultivation are competing with wildlife for crater resources where by in 1976 cultivation was banned as incompatible with conservation (UNESCO/IUCN 2007). It is concluded that scarcity of the land for grazing, for pasture and area for watering animals, Maasai pastoralists tends to shift to reserved and controlled area in order to get enough land, water and pasture for their livestock and lead to persistence of the land conflicts. These findings are in relation with what Kratli and Swift, (1998) already concluded that competition for access to range resources leads to conflict among pastoralists and between them and other livelihoods and land use systems that seek the use of the same resources.

Table 6 Availability of resources in Ngorongoro ward

Resources	Adequate (%)	Not adequate (%)	Not sure (%)	Total (%)
Land for grazing	33	66	1	100
Land for cultivation	4	96	0	100
Land for pasture	11	84	5	100
Water for livestock	18	82	0	100

Source: Field data, 2010.

3.4 LAND CONFLICTS RESOLUTION

3.4.1 GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Results on government involvement in conflict resolution indicates 30% of the respondents reported that government through NCAA is involved in land conflicts resolution through various means; For instance 14% reported that government is involved in meeting for agreement, 10% said, the government through NCAA provide social services and 6% said, NCAA weaken some conservation laws such as to allow the pastoralist to graze their livestock within the crater and the Northern highland forest during the dry season (Table 7). However 70% of the respondent insisted that the government did not involved in resolving land conflicts between NCAA and the Maasai community (Table 7). This signify that Government to some areas have participated in resolving land conflict but to some areas not. These lead to persistence of conflicts between Maasai Community and NCAA.

Table 7: Involvement of NCAA in land conflict resolution

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Meeting for agreements	14	14
Means for provision of social services	10	10
Weakening some conservation laws	6	6
Not involved	70	70
Total	100	100

Source: Field data, 2010.

In respect to Government involvement in solving land conflict between Maasai Community and NCAA, 65% of the respondent emphasized that the government through NCAA did not succeed in resolving land conflicts (Table 8).This still

signify that there is a persistence of land conflict caused by some of Government leaders who are not responsible in resolving these conflicts. These findings are supported by what Mwamfupe and Mg'ong'o, 1998 concluded. They concluded that, persistence of land conflict in many villages of Kilosa District is an indication of the weaknesses in the reconciliatory bodies. The negligence in settling lands use plan has led to the persistent of conflicts for long time without any solution. These include undermining of local tenure arrangement, land misuse and misuse of leadership position to grab land (Kapinga, 1995).

Table 8: Perception of community on success of NCAA in land conflict resolution

	Frequency	Percentage
Effective	35	35
Not effective	65	65
Total	100	100

Source: Field data, 2010.

3.4.2 STAKEHOLDERS' INVOLVEMENT IN LAND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Similarly, 23% of the sample respondent explained that there were other stakeholders involved in conflicts resolution, for example Ereto-Ngorongoro Pastoralist Project was the bilateral project between Denmark and Tanzania government. It was reported that this project provides various services to Maasai community like animal medicines, education to pastoralist on better method of livestock keeping and construction of animal deep (Table 9). This project phased out in 2008 however it has reduced land conflict though conflicts still persist.

Table 9: Involvement NGOs in land conflict resolution

	Respondents	Percent (%)
Means for provision of social services	23	23
Not involved	77	77
Total	100	100

Source: Field data, 2010.

On the other hand, Most of respondents (68%) reported that the project was not effective in resolving the conflict (Table 10) though others (32%) reported that it was effective. These signify that organizations are trying to participate in resolving these conflicts but still these conflicts harm lives of local Maasai Community.

Table 10: Perception of the community on success of NGOs in land conflict resolution

	Respondents	Percent (%)
Effective	32	32
Not effective	68	68
Total	100	100

Source: Field data, 2010.

3.4.3 RESETTLEMENT STRATEGIES IN PLACE

The resettlement strategy was done by NCAA in collaboration with other stakeholders in order to diminish land conflict by reducing the number of people with their livestock. These was planned to be done however according to Tourism Officer of NCAA he reported that about 100 households showed their willingness to shift to Oldonyo Sambu village in Sale division which is still a small numbers as compared to NCAA expectation. These situations in one way or another still lead to land conflict persistence between Local Maasai Community and NCAA.

3.4.4 RE-STOCKING POLICY EXISTING IN NGORONGORO CONSERVATION AREA AUTHORITY

The restocking policy aims at improving the livelihood of Community as well to enhance the livestock keepers to benefit from their livestock (Michael, 2008).The government of Tanzania through the NCAA with other stakeholders such as Ereto

Project have restock the destitute Maasai families by providing them with livestock including cattle and goats. The Ereto project restocks over 3400 destitute families in the whole NCA. These have helped to reduce land conflicts as well as to improve the livelihood of the community. Moreover this project supported some private veterinary services that provided pastoralists with modern and accessible options for treating livestock diseases.

4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

4.1 CONCLUSION

It is concluded that the persistence of land conflicts between NCAA and Maasai community is contributed by many reasons including inefficiency of NCAA to make follow up of its rules and regulation on environmental conservation; Little awareness of the community on the environmental conservation which is influenced by low level of education of the community; for instance 61% of the sample respondent do not have primary school education; Poverty continues to increase as the number of Maasai pastoralists increases while the land resource are declining; The increase in number of livestock is very high compared to the area which was located for pastoralists to graze their livestock as a result still people are grazing their livestock within the crater and Ngorongoro Conservation Area forest which affect wild herbivores in terms of water and pasture.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

With regards to findings and conclusion the researchers gives the following recommendations

- The Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) should provide the better livestock keeping methods to the pastoralists such as good veterinary services to the livestock and to introduce sedentarization policy to the pastoralists in order to reduce the free movements of livestock all over the Ngorongoro Conservation Area to reduce competition over resource between livestock and wildlife.
- The pastoralists should be provided with the education in order to improve awareness on various matters like environmental conservation.
- Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) should be strong in implementation of its rules and regulation, for example the government was banned cultivation but the NCAA is not strictly to make sure that cultivation is prohibited.
- The government together with Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) should participate with the community from the first stage to the last stage in conflict resolution rather than just giving information, this will enable the local people to participate in decision making and get better solution.
- The Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority should educate the Maasai from the primary school to the University in order to reduce the dependence on livestock only.
- The Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority should provide employment to the Maasai residents in various hotels, Campsites, lodges, Tented Camps, and shops in order to reduce the dependence on livestock keeping only.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adams, W and Hulme, D. (2001). 'If Community Conservation Is the Answer in Africa, What is the Question?' *Oryx*, **35 (3)**: 193-200.
- [2] Bakari, J (2004): The Land Dispute between Farmers and Pastoralists in Tanzania, University of Dar es Salaam, Institute of Resource Assessment.
- [3] Gamasa, D.G.M (1996). The pastoral Massai and wildlife conservation in Tanzania *Nature Conservation* 4:107-111.
- [4] Ghimire, K (1992). Forest or farm?. The politics of Poverty in Land Hunger in Nepal. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Hackel, J. (1999) 'Community Conservation and the Future of Africa's Wildlife'. *Conservation Biology*, **13 (4)**: 726-734.
- [6] Homewood, K. and Rodgers, A. (1991). Maasai land Ecology: Pastoralist Development and Wildlife Conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK: 1-285. <http://www.diiis.dk/sw27372.asp> accessed on 12/2/2010)
- [7] Hulme, D. and Murphree, M. (2001). *African Wildlife & Livelihoods: The Promise and romance of Community Conservation*. James Currey, Oxford, UK.
- [8] Imbush, (1999) Land management and their implications on the down stream flow of the Great Ruaha river in Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam, Institute of Resource Assessment

- [9] Juma, A and Maganga, G (2000): Attacking Rural Poverty in Tanzania. University of Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.
- [10] Kaare, T.B (1996), 'The Tanzania National Land Policy: Reflections on Some of its Probable Consequences on the Pastoral and Hunter- Gatherer Communities', Institute of Finance Management, Dar es Salaam, (mimeo).
- [11] Kapinga, D (1995): The Practice of Participation in Rural Development, the case of Land Management in Tanzania, University of Dar-es-Salaam
- [12] Kiteto District Council (2007) Kiteto District Council, District Agricultural Development Plan and Budget, 2007/2008 – 2008/2009.
- [13] Kratli, L and Swift, M (1998): Hazards and Opportunities in Dry Land Africa, Zed Books Ltd, London
- [14] Leader-Williams, N., Kayera, J. and Overton, G. (1996) Community-based Conservation in Tanzania. IUCN Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. 266pp.
- [15] Mattee, A. Z. and M. Shem (2006) Ambivalence and contradiction: A review of the policy environment in Tanzania in relation to pastoralism. IIED Issue Paper No 140, March, 2006, London, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- [16] Mattee, A.Z (2007). Study on options for pastoralists to secure their livelihoods current policy making processes in Tanzania. Reported submitted to CORDS.
- [17] Michael, O. (2008) Conflicts in Ngorongoro district: causes, consequences and possible solutions. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [18] Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (1998) National Forest Policy, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Government printer
- [19] Mung'ong'o, C., and D. Mwamfupe (2003) Poverty and changing livelihoods of migrant Maasai pastoralists in Morogoro and Kilosa Districts, Tanzania. Research Report No. 03.5, Research on Poverty Alleviation, Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers Ltd Dar es Salaam
- [20] Nasha, O. W., (2004) Analysis of policy environment for pastoralist production in Tanzania. The World Bank, Washington.
- [21] NGONET (2008) A report of Consultancy Commissioned Jointly by ERETO Ngorongoro Pastoralist Project (ERETO-NPP) and the Ngorongoro Local Government and managed by ngorongoro NGO network (NGONET) Arusha
- [22] Olengurumwa, P (2009) Resource Based Conflicts in Northern Tanzania : the case of Sonjo and Maasai of Ngorongoro'' LLB Dissertation, university of Dar es Salaam
- [23] Pilgram, T., Siiriäinen, A. and Marshall, F. (1990), 'Archaeological Surveys and Prehistoric Settlement Patterns'. IN Robertshaw, P., *Early Pastoralists of South- Western Kenya: Memoir 11*. Nairobi, Kenya, British Institute in Eastern Africa: 36-51.
- [24] Sendalo, D.C (2009). A review of land tenure policy implications on pastoralism in Tanzania. Department of livestock research, training and extension, Ministry of livestock development and fisheries
- [25] Sorenson, C., (2006) Study on the main policy issues impacting on the livelihoods of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in Tanzania & mapping of key organizations, Report for IWGIA, April, 2006.
- [26] Shivji, I (1993). Not yet Democracy: Reforming Land Tenure in Tanzania. London, UK. International Institute for the environment and development.
- [27] Thompson, M. and Homewood, K. (2002). 'Entrepreneurs, Elites, and Exclusion in Maasailand Trends in Wildlife Conservation and Pastoralist Development'. *Human Ecology*, **30 (1)**: 107-138.
- [28] UNESCO/IUCN (2007). Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania Report of the WHC/IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission
- [29] United Republic of Tanzania (1998) The Wildlife Policy of Tanzania, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Government of Tanzania
- [30] United Republic of Tanzania (1999). Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development, Dar es Salaam
- [31] United Republic of Tanzania, (2005). The National Livestock Policy (draft) Government Printers, Dar es Salaam
- [32] Upreti, B (1991). Status of National Parks and protected area in Nepal. Tiger paper xviii (2): 27-30 April-June
- [33] Verstegen, S (2001) Poverty and conflict. An Entitlement perspective CPN Briefing paper. Conflict Prevention network, Berlin
- [34] Walsh, M., (2007) Pastoralism and Policy Processes in Tanzania: Case Study and Recommendations, Report to TNRF, September, 2007.
- [35] Western, D., Wright, R. and Strum, S. (1994) *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-Based Conservation*. Island Press, Washington, DC and Covelo, CA.
- [36] Wright, P. (1993). 'Ecotourism: Ethics or Eco-Sell? *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(3): 3-9