Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (SJHSS) **ISSN 2415-6256 (Print)**
Scholars Middle East Publishers **ISSN 2415-6248 (Online)**
Dubai, United Arab Emirates
Website: http://scholarsmepub.com/

Comparative Analysis of Wildlife Policies in Three East African Countries

Bayisa Feye Bedane*
PhD Candidate at the Department of Cultural Anthropology: KU Leuven, Oude Markt 13, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

***Corresponding author**
Bayisa Feye Bedane

Article History
Received: 15.11.2018
Accepted: 25.11.2018
Published: 30.11.2018

DOI:
10.21276/sjhss.2018.3.11.10

Abstract: Global interests in both pre and post-colonial periods dominate conservation practices in Africa. The argument that human beings and their activities are the drivers of environmental degradation served as a bedrock for the formation of early-protected areas across the continent. Other stakeholders who do not necessarily bear the costs realize the huge benefits of conservation. Equally important is the fact that, in both the colonized and non-colonized geographies, replication of similar, though not identical conservation policies evolved and dominated the biodiversity conservation patterns and the current scene of policies at least in some East African countries. This paper seeks to analyze the historical incidents that triggered these countries, namely (Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Kenya) to adopt Fortress Conservation approach from the outset and unable to change under growing pressures from local and global stakeholders interested in resource use and conservation alike. To that end, the historical survey of literatures devoted to conservation practices and approaches of these countries, comparative analysis of the actual conservation policies at work, and the different interests mobilized by different actors were identified and systematically analyzed.

Keywords: Fortress conservation, Tanzania, Kenya, Ethiopia, wildlife policies.

INTRODUCTION

According to Bonner [1], Africans did not respect wild animals and treat them savagely without concern for conservation. Such a conception was developed by early explorers and missionaries arrived to East Africa, who by then witnessed the wilderness nature in which both wildlife and human beings dwell peacefully and later disturbed by both human and natural factors. The historical drought happened in 1890 in East Africa that ravaged large livestock of eastern African pastoralists and forced them to live on wild beasts brought about an inverted image among colonial officers that people are environmental distractors in that part of the world [2]. Seemingly shocked by this later experience, the colonial officials called for an immediate interference to save an elephant, and generally the wildlife and wilderness in Eastern Africa. Consequently, the Germans (in 1895) and Great Britain (in 1898) in traduced a game law that ban indigenous Tanganyika and Kenyans from hunting trophy. Banning traditional hunting was coupled with eviction of local people from resource bases for the formation of the first game reserves and hunting grounds for colonial masters, where only modern weapons of the 'white men' used for hunting.

That story did not confined to Tanganyika and Kenya alone, rather came to be shared by Ethiopia, but in a different fashion and motive. Through missionaries and a British councilor in Addis Ababa, King Menelik, (the then king of Ethiopia, and ruled from 1889-1913) also 'copied' those game laws as a mark of modernity, and start to enforce it in his country [3, 4]. Parallel to this, global concern about the devastation of wilderness in under-developed countries gradually rise and yield the formation of some mega global environmental NGOs like IUCN and World Commission For Protected Areas (WCPA) since end of World War II. At the core of such and other mushroomed Conservation organizations, almost in the west, produced a scientific and monetary upper hand in the global formation and expansion of Protected Areas. It is well acknowledged by the organization about its role as "IUCN has been at the forefront of the creation and management of protected areas since its establishment in 1948" [5].

Through the decades of 1960s and 70s, there were publications romanticizing the clear danger that African environmental problems are bringing in to an end the old refugees for wildlife and forests known by early missionaries and colonial soldiers. In the same vein of argument, it also goes further to lobby for immediate intervention by the global community to stop its extinction rate, and a further expansion of protected areas and securing the already established ones. As a 'scientific' strategy, community participation (though

introduced at later years in 1980s), gender equity in such protected area governance, and partnership between governments and International NGOs, and a commodification proposals were played out on an international forums meant to address environmental and developmental issues conjointly. Though grass root realities and challenges are far from being redressed for challenges of both wildlife and local communities, a further formation of Protected areas in a Fortress Conservation approach took the dominant scene of the last three or more decades in Africa. On the other hand, the further animosity between benefit seeking locals and defenseless wildlife in those protected areas continued at odds against each other. Arguably, in many places, wildlife laws used in current policy stem from hunting regulations and game-damage control measures developed in the early 1900s and the subsequent environmental policies developed in the 1970s. Many of these policies fetched from principles similar to those embodied in the animal rights movement and the popularization of unsafe environment and wildlife in Africa-the received *false* or *distorted* wisdom.

In this paper, therefore, I argue that in the face of dominant philosophies on prioritization of wildlife and in the absence of a strong political commitment at ensuring those labeled community issues, the local and global special interest groups and indigenous communities became adversaries, essentially pitting the rights of people against the rights of animals, and continued reinforcing colonial/ideological control from a position of presumed moral superiority at the physical absence of the colonialists or their policies either.

This paper basically raises the following questions in relation to wildlife and conservation policies in three eastern African countries: Ethiopia, Tanzania and Kenya. Central to the questions is how the received wisdom about imagined African environment and developed narratives affected the conservation policies of these countries.

Accordingly, it raises two basic questions:

- Do colonial experiences and later "received wisdom" about the environment of Africa influenced or shaped wildlife and environmental policies of these countries?
- Are the wildlife policies of these countries similar? What common characteristics do they share? What are the points of departures in their wildlife policies?

Methodologically, I fully relied on gray literature taking Africa as its topic and treating conservation issues at the center. A clear survey and synthesis of the literatures and related environmental conservation policies of the three eastern African countries also closely analyzed in time frames so as to put how far global discourses and local interests are producing deliberations in the respective environmental laws of these countries.

WILD LIFE POLICIES OF KENYA, ETHIOPIA AND TANZANIA

The selection of these countries arose from their colonial experience under different countries except Ethiopia which sought a brief period of invasion and conquest by Italian fascist regime. Tanzania saw a German and later British colonial administration and of course, different forms of governance philosophies. East Africa was also a place where a number of environmental narratives born and grew up beginning from the first missionary reports around the end of 18th century. Except Ethiopia, the two countries are also high-earners from the wildlife-related tourism which they developed from time to time. As clearly set forth in the above research question, the main focus in the coming sections is how nature and conservation-related narratives developed in to global discourses, movements, and propagations elsewhere catch up the attention of contemporary African leaders and policy spaces. By way of analysis, the major theme, focus, and strategy adopted by these countries to ensure sustainable environmental conservation shall also dealt with in the later sections of this paper.

WILDLIFE POLICY OF KENYA

To start with some basic facts, Kenya generates more than 25% of its GDP revenue from wildlife conservation and related conservation commodification practices. This sector also accommodates more than 10% of the civil servant in the country. It is the sixth high earner from tourism industry next to Tanzania in the continent of Africa.

In relation to the history of wildlife conservation practices in Kenya, it is worth mentioning the 1895 first ban of elephant hunting in Kenya. Later on, with a narrow and arguably self-serving set of animal rights principles put in place by the Royal Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Society for the Preservation of the Wild Fauna of the Empire 1903 to favor European-style hunting with guns, versus African-style hunting, including pit-traps, bow and arrows, and snares, which were then and are today, deemed cruel to the wild animals [1, 6]. In 1907, the British government also established a Game Department vesting in it some authorities as administering game reserves, enforcing hunting regulations, and protecting settler farmer communities' property from wildlife damage [7]. Formalization of hunting policies, followed by the establishment of game reserves modeled after the European-style reserves, and the Maasai Mara, the Southern, the Northern, and the Eastern Reserves were established. The latter three are now home to Amboseli National Park, Meru National Park and the Tsavo National Parks, respectively, while the Maasai Mara retained its name up to date [8].

Another global shock, the Second World War delayed the formalization of the Royal National Parks of Kenya, which was an integral part of the London Convention for the Protection of Fauna and Flora, but also set the stage for Kenya's game department to emerge, functioning even now in the modern Kenya Wildlife Service. Kenyan veterans returned home from WW II served as training for game rangers and scouts. When the war ended and military personnel returned to their existing activities, game rangers retained the military approach to patrol the game ranges already established at the end of the WW II.

Following this historical time, the National Parks Ordinance was issued in 1945 to establish and protect formal game reserves, national parks, wildlife sanctuaries, and similar protected areas in Kenya. It was consummated in the formation of Kenya's first national park, Nairobi National Park, in 1946, followed by Amboseli National Park in 1947, and the Maasai Mara Wildlife Sanctuary in 1948 [9]. In this manner, Kenya saw exclusionary policies for local Kenyans at the expense of the wealthy resident Europeans and U.S. expatriates and international tourists [9]. The Game department established and run by colonial figures assumed duties of monitoring the wildlife ranges, and the wild animals within. After three decades, The London Convention for Protection of Flora and fauna of the Empire triggered the formation of a wildlife Agency, and shared the responsibility with the already established game department in developing and controlling game reserves in Kenya. The department was comprised of explorers, hunters, naturalists, and other European aristocrats, as it is not at that time expected to be run by colonized Kenyans.

Following this development in the conservation history of Kenya, funding came partly from Europe's high society, especially hunting parties, and partly from the sale of wildlife and game-related revenues. Sale of rhinoceros horn and ivory proved particularly lucrative [1, 10]. In the meantime, the early rangers (Bill Woodley, David Sheldrick, Jack Barrah, and George Adamson), who were hunters and safari guides themselves and Kenya's first four game wardens, took posts as game warden partly to protect their own colonial assets. When Kenya gained independence from colonial rule in 1963, the campaigns against and for game reserves escalated between locals and resident colonialists. The country experienced a rise in social conflicts regarding wildlife and a surge in protection campaigns. Elite control was uploaded and supported by colonial representatives and redirected into strengthening the NGOs and tourism industry. The Kenya Society for Wildlife, together with their Tanzanian counterpart agreed and enacted the formation of East African Wild Life Society (EAWLS), while the World Wildlife Foundation established a Kenyan-based office. Maintaining the romanticized image of nature proved more of a challenge without enforcement so the NGO community worked to influence policy by acting as donors to the Kenyan government [11]. Since independence, even with Kenyans in control, indigenous people were still deemed barbaric and unethical in their hunting practices and banned from hunting for any purpose [11]. Kenya's Game Department was reconfigured into the Game Counsel, though many of the goals remained the same: addressing problem related to wildlife, regulating hunting and tourists activities, preventing illegal off-take, and mitigating human-wildlife conflict. As a means to reinvigorate the tourism industry, Kenya asked for a loan from the World Bank, (which exactly was done by the Ethiopian minister attended the UNESCO conference in 1963), as a result of which higher donor financial institutions and the wild life protection organizations collaborated on the facilitation of this loan and insisted that Kenya ban hunting altogether. This indeed is how the wests in history twisted the hands and minds of most post-colonial governments in the name of development or technical aid and intertwine their political and economic ambitions. On top of this, elephant killing increased significantly in the 1980s, in response to an economic boom in Arab nations from increased petroleum sales [10, 1] and the Kenyan elephant population fell by close to 90 percent from 160,000 to 19,000 [12].

The international community was well aware of the decline in elephants so when Kenya asked the World Bank Organization for assistance a second time, the offer once again came with contingencies [10]. The World Bank maintained strong ties with WWF and other wildlife protection organizations as it was before. Concern for elephants had been on the rise and reached a tipping point with the international community; the focus on the decline in elephants and rhinos in east Africa expanded to include all of the sub-Saharan elephant range states and drew more international attention in the early 1980s than did east Africa's general wildlife troubles in the 1970s. An initiative was put forth to list the African Elephant as an endangered species, through the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species, an initiative that would seriously restrict the trade in elephant ivory [1, 8]. The huge money that comes with statements of preconditions from donors in the framework of wild life protection, exerts strong political influence on practical approaches on how wildlife conservation and management are carried out [8].

After independence, Kenya produced "its own" wildlife policy as a mark of departure from the past colonial laws, yet with minimal change or revision of the previously enacted laws. In that 'new' policy introduced in 1975, (named as session paper no. 3 of 1975: a statement on the future wildlife management

policy of Kenya), it was pledged to put in place an integrated management and fair distribution of wildlife revenue for all Kenyans. In 1976, the already established Game department and Kenyan National Parks were merged together and came to be known as Kenyan Wildlife conservation Department-underlining the need to further enhance management practices in conservation. After put in motion for 13 years, that same law was revisited through introduction of multiple changes and amendments in 1989. Among others, "strict anti-poaching regulation, reducing wildlife-human conflicts, further achieving the agenda of integrated management principles, and a further expansion of protected area network" was stressed as a mechanism to address Kenya's wildlife under-utilization in boosting the economy of the country [13]. A Kenyan Wildlife service Institute was also established on that same year to assist in producing technical personnel that can help in the effort of improving protected area management.

Kenya recently introduced an 'improved' Wildlife and conservation policy in 2013. This current policy divided in to 14 sections and 116 pages of detailed provisions. From the outset, the policy outlines some core problems that the country is facing in relation to wildlife conservation. Among others, poor scheme of compensation for human-wildlife conflicts and damages; bio-piracy; threats of invasive alien species; inadequate incentives; poor protected area management; lack of meaningful partnership; absence of integrated wildlife management plan; destruction of wildlife habitat; local and regional insecurity; insecure tenure to land and illegal allocation; inadequate and often insufficient scientific data; and illegal hunting and bush meat trade [14]. Only a section deals with some brief provisions about "reasonable compensations" to be paid as a result of damage from wildlife-human conflict; benefit sharing principles; and community involvement in conservation practices at multiple levels. On the other hand, offence and punishment details; commercialization strategies and financial management from wildlife revenues; and attracting foreign tourism investment strategies almost consumed most sections of the policy document. When summed, however, there is no mention in any part of the policy document about pastoral livelihood, pastoralism and farming communities attached or use those present day game reserves and protected areas in general.

WILDLIFE POLICY OF ETHIOPIA

The history of conservation of wildlife and ecosystem in Ethiopia goes back to the imperial period with the issuance in 1900 of hunting regulation, prompted by external development. The 1900 London conference of African colonial powers to prohibit hunting in big animals, especially elephants, and its subsequent agreement amongst themselves reached to the palace of king Menelik through foreigners residing in the palace [3]. The king urged the foreigners and the British councilor in Addis Ababa to get him the agreement so that he implements the objectives in them. It was only in 1944 that Ethiopia saw the first proclamation prohibiting hunting without a license from emperor Hailesilasse. That historic time was the time when the emperor re-established his government after droving out the Italian invaders with the military help of Great Britain. The UNESCO conference of 1962 also brought a momentum to Ethiopian wildlife conservation and policy. In that conference, it was declared that "member states should incorporate in their respective countries the zones and sites to be protected, national parks intended for the education and recreation of the public or natural reserves, strict or special" [3]. The Ethiopian state minister, named Akalework Habtewold, also said to have submitted a letter seeking assistance from UNESCO to realize the declared agenda in his country. Pursuant with that letter, the then Director General of UNESCO sent in 1963 a team led by Sir Julian Huxley, who himself was a former director general of UNESCO and led a team to survey wildlife areas and biodiversity corridors in Eastern and central Africa in 1960. In that year, a team composed of Mr. L. Swift (USA), Dr. Barton Worthington (director General of Nature Conservancy), and Professor Theo Monod from the National History Museum of Paris. The team finally submitted their assessment and recommendation to both Ethiopia and UNESCO stressing the formation of protected areas and its governance draft policy. A wildlife board was established in 1965 and adopted the first conservation policy in the country's history of conservation. However, it should be noted here that two "experienced" figures-Mr. Leslie Brown and Major Ian Grimwood (former director of Agriculture in Kenya and chief warden of Kenya, respectively), were sent as a volunteer further in the meantime to assist the Ethiopian government to provide a concrete wildlife policy [3]. Former game warden from Tanzania (Peter Hey) came to be the first chief warden of Awash National Park, and through the technical assistance of UK, Mr. Guth (from USA) and Mr. Nicole (from Canada) made their way as a biologist to Ethiopian wildlife board. Eviction for conservation soon started in The Ethiopian pastoral corridors such as Awash valley, Sothern Omo and Afar areas for the establishment of protected areas proposed in 1965. With change of regime, a new proclamation promulgated in 1980 to replace the old decree introduced in 1944 by the emperor [4]. The curtailment of human population and forced evictions continued irrespective of change of regime. The conservation discourse of the time took a policy space through the medium of UNESCO, and later Technical Assistance of UK, and continues to remain the same for decades in Ethiopian conservation history. In 2008, the current regime introduced a new institution-Ethiopian Wildlife Development and Conservation Authority- authorized with governing wildlife and protected areas of the country [3, 4]. In that proclamation, the power to: make

policy, develop and administer protected areas, issue hunting permits and development activities near and in protected areas; control and utilize wildlife products; and "ensure that wildlife conservation areas are established in accordance with international standards"; forge international relations with all bodies to garner assistance; ensuring that forest and ensure the implementation of treaties that Ethiopia has signed [15]. The involvement of local communities affected by conservation practices are also pledged to be considered in the planning and management of protected areas in the country. But, when evaluated, except recent news that Simen Mountain National park is being 'embraced' by the local communities, all the reserves and national parks in all parts of the country are under fire from deprived locals. Bringing some kind of local participation where the voices of the deprived communities could be heard and fair benefit sharing is not sought as a remedy for the problems. But, some degree of community involvement and a share of benefit for local conservation affected populations are clearly stipulated in the current wildlife policy of the country [15].

WILDLIFE POLICY OF TANZANIA

Although the notion of conservation among the pre-colonial traditional societies is highly debated between different sources, Tanzania has a long history of wildlife conservation before the coming of the colonial powers to that land [16, 17]. In those old days, the concept and practice of conservation were related closely with totemic links and spiritual affiliation to particular animals, plants or sites [18]. As a first blueprint, the German colonial administration (1885–1919) enacted the first formal written wildlife law to regulate hunting in 1898, which was followed by the creation of a number of protected areas [19]. By 1911, about 5% of the colony had been included within 15 protected areas [20]. The British colonial administration lasted from 1919–1961 also established Selous Game Reserve as the country's first game reserves in 1922, followed by Ngorongoro Crater and Serengeti game reserves in 1928 and 1929, respectively [19]. In that same year (1922) also came the aspiration and practical move towards prohibiting all human activities except research and game-viewing tourism, in those places designated as national parks and reserves. Strong advocacy for this idea came from the politically powerful conservation societies in England, spearheaded by the Society for the Preservation of the Flora and Fauna of the Empire (SPFFE) [21]. Prominent figures that are frequently mentioned in this regard, such as Major Richard Hingston, who was sent to Tanganyika by the SPFFE in 1930 to investigate the needs and potential for developing a nature protection programme, recommended the creation of national parks as a matter of urgency [18].

The London Convention for Flora and Fauna of Africa, held in 1933, obligated all signatories (including Tanganyika) to investigate the possibilities of creating a system of national parks [22]. Pressures from powerful individuals in London, who consistently overstated the problem of what they termed 'indiscriminate slaughter' of wildlife by Africans, forced the colonial government to yield the first game ordinance that gave the governor a mandate to declare any area a national park was enacted in 1940 [22]. After independence in 1961, no radical changes were made to wildlife conservation policies to address the previously lost customary rights [22, 18, 23]. The economic justification of wildlife-based tourism, rather than ecological reasons, triggered more support for creating protected areas. Julius K Nyerere, the first President of Tanzania, backed this economic motive, as he was quoted saying:

> *I personally am not interested in animals. I do not want to spend my holidays watching crocodiles. Nevertheless, I am entirely in favor of their survival. I believe that after diamonds and Sisal, wild animals will provide Tanganyika with its greatest source of income. Thousands of Americans and Europeans have the strange urge to see these animals* [23].

Nyerere further affirmed the position and commitment of Tanzania to wildlife conservation through a statement he released at the International Symposium on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources held in September 1961 in Arusha, Tanzania. This statement has become known as the Arusha Manifesto, and has since become an important landmark statement for wildlife conservation in the country [19].

Tanzania's wildlife policy, enacted in 1998, demonstrates an ambition to include more areas with rich and unique biological values within the protected area system, fostering ecological conservation and economic prosperity [19]. Udzungwa national park (1900 km^2) was established immediately following the signature of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in 1992. The size of Katavi national park was doubled in 1998 from 2253 to 4471 km^2 [18]. Despite these historical conservation efforts, the wildlife habitats and species in Tanzania are increasingly threatened. The mounting pressures attributable primarily to socio-economic factors such as demographic growth, poverty and market forces have led to poaching and habitat destruction and consequently impaired the ecological integrity of many Tanzanian ecosystems. This has ultimately led either to the loss of species or has driven them to the verge of extinction [18].

Coming to the current wildlife policy enacted in 2013 and at work, the policy preamble underlines the urgent problems such as:

- loss of wild life habitat to settlement and agriculture, grazing, mining and logging due to human population increase
- Inadequate finance to fully utilize management strategies, and
- State ownership of land as it is hindering investment in conservation sector and protected areas

Despite recognition of centralized administration as a problem, the state continued to exercise full control over wildlife resources of the country in all times and dimensions. However, it is progressive in its pledge to "create the opportunity for Tanzanian people to become involved in the wildlife industry and ensure a direct benefit to local communities" [24]. Reporting that high population growth and concomitant pressure on protected areas, however, the Tanzanian government commit itself to "establishing new category of protected areas…for the purpose of community based conservation [24] which of course a positive move towards ensuring benefits to the masses though in contradiction with the already shrinking space for pastoralists and farmers of the country. As far as law enforcement in and around protected areas is considered, the Para-military is authorized by that legislation to take measure against illegal hunting and trade in wildlife, and the government took responsibility to "protecting wildlife staff from liabilities resulting from injuries and death against suspects during their official duties" [24].

Explicitly, it put that local communities living in and around protected areas should generate "meaningful benefit through either accessing natural resources or sharing the benefits from them" [24]. However, as a way to realize it, the state put in its hands the monopoly of controlling, managing and related administrative activities in the name of "ensuring and addressing national priorities" [24].

The participation of local communities and other stakeholders is clearly stated under section 3.3.4 of the law under discussion. But, at no single space that the concern of pastoralists addressed as unique losers from both past and present expansion of protected areas in Tanzania. The term 'pastoralist' is not found in any section of the current wildlife policy of the country. It acknowledges farming and farmers as the only livelihood groups affected by and profited from protected areas. As a means to tackle the underfunding of protected areas, the government through its policy stipulated its commitment to encourage private investors and concessionaries for appropriate period in observance to principles of conservation in order to maximize benefit " to the people of Tanzania" [24]. Clear inclination of commodification in wildlife resource is set forth in the policy: "compelling all potential investors and their companies to operate in Tanzania… and that the wildlife resource not undervalued by setting appropriate competitive prices and fees for various types of wildlife utilization" [24]. A s a way to realize a benefit from wildlife revenue to rural communities, forming partnership with them, allowing licensed hunting (to get license, sometimes it takes 10 years), recognizing and employing their knowledge and giving special consideration to traditional hunting for some ethnic groups is acknowledged.

In general, the legislations, Ordinances and later conservation laws were all initiated in colonial offices first in German and later from London. They were also a reflection of the outcomes of conflicts of interests between colonialists and conservationists on the one hand and local people and local governments on the other hand. Post-colonial Tanzania inherited the colonial political apparatuses and institutions erected by British and German masters so much so that the replication and enforcements of resource exploitation by the government at the expense of local pastoralists and farmers as well as gatherers continued.

The political elites who were in charge of revising those laws and old decrees were also western-educated (usually in Great Britain) and retained the ideological frameworks of the former colonial intentions. To get utmost support, of their former 'chiefs' in Europe to remain in political power, Tanzanian leaders in the post-colonial time also passively adopt colonial interests in to the country's, in which conservation policy is not the exception [18].

HOW THE "RECEIVED WISDOM" IMPLICATED AND COMPLICATED THE POLICIES

As it was true in the post 1980 period elsewhere in Africa, the concern for community-based management of natural resources also caught the attention of the 1989 Kenyan wildlife policy. It is articulated as: "…the need for decentralization and devolution of wildlife management to the lowest level possible and enlist the participation of NGOs, and community based organizations, and other non-state organizations in the management of wildlife resources in the country" is the point of attention in the policy frame, as opposite to the previous ones. The concept of biopiracy was also introduced in the policy as a new form of poaching that should be fought against. To its positive dimension, this policy document devoted a section for addressing the concern of children, women, disabled and marginalized social groups so as to extend a special advantage and representation in conservation practices. As a strategy, initiating and supporting women self-help projects though supporting maternal

care in the villages surrounding protected areas, educating or supporting education for children, and insuring access to resources for women from protected areas. In all the previous Acts and ordinances (of 1959, 1974 and 1980) no mention and provision was made about community participation and partnership, benefit sharing, and wildlife use rights by rural Kenyans. However, all these concerns won a policy article in the current wildlife policy of the country enforced in 2013. Though commerce in wildlife is clearly sought to bring capital inflow, (to increase GDP contribution of wildlife conservation from 2% to 5% by 2017), the government takes almost all form of authority in regulating, administering, collecting revenue and royalties, fees and concessions but only spare a supportive role for private sector and NGOs.

As a unique departure from Ethiopian and Tanzanian wildlife and environmental policy, the Kenyan counterpart acknowledges at least in paper to "enhance the use of indigenous knowledge in the conservation and management of wildlife" [13]. However, it is clearly reported by another publication by the government in 2009 state that the generated revenue from wildlife conservation and tourism is used on security of visitors and wildlife, protected areas conservation, biodiversity research and monitoring, management of endangered species, rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems, conservation education, and enhancing the visitor experience through marketing and improving infrastructure. As a point of critique, still the wildlife policy of Kenya is blamed for over emphasizing wildlife than human population in and around its protected areas, causing the later to resent against the former [25]. Tanzania also shared a similar state of affairs; in 1977 both countries issued an amendment to their wildlife conservation and management acts that instituted a ban on all hunting to regain control until regulatory actions and wildlife populations could support off-take [10].

Historical events and the resulting policies frequently put local communities-pastoralists in particular-at odds with wildlife. Early European hunts, settlement and farming left much of the wildlife and many African peoples on the savannah landscapes with few permanent water sources and under conditions of uncertain rainfall [22, 10]. Today, pastoralists compete with wild animals for resources that were historically shared over large stretches of land prior to the encroachment of modern development and regulatory conservation laws. Like many postcolonial countries, Kenya's wildlife management estate displays tension between expatriate investments and national interests, a division that exists with porous boundaries. Though not frequently tried, the Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority also confronted the decentralization and commercialization of the conservation sector in Nechsar National park in 2004, but ended in immediate local rejection compounded by government confusions. What logically could one deduce from the scenario is that all such countless policies were not derived from the true demand of the local governments examining their local realities, rather, motivated and extended by western NGOs and mega institutions like World Bank, IMF, and World Wildlife fund. At an extreme, the conflict between people and wild animals over space and resource use, including habitat destruction in the name of development, is cited as one of the largest threats to wildlife [26]. Wildlife protection groups employ principles of animal rights by setting the rights of people with subsistence lifestyle against the rights of wild fauna, and the interests of people "for" nature against peoples' living "with" nature.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, attempt is made to explore the relationship between African environmental policy outcomes and major global political and ecological discourses in the west during and after colonial period. It is evident therefore that the conservation and wildlife policies were introduced primarily by European colonial agents, except the case of Ethiopia, whose king adopted the ready-made agreement among colonial powers and colonized nations, without any push. King Menelik (r-1889-1913), pressed the Europeans living in his palace to get him the first treaty signed in London, as a mark of his and his nation's modernity and absorbs it in to its local official decrees in prohibiting hunting of elephants-exactly what was introduced in a different mode to Kenya and Tanzania in 1898. The later changes made to conservation and wilderness narratives about African environment that it was at risk of devastation and extinction, produced about the formation of wilderness protection equally in these three African countries. At this stage, the colonized-non-colonized narrative does not proved a difference in the early and later conservation policies of Ethiopia and the rest two countries discussed here in. They also revise and modify their environmental and wildlife policies at critical junctures following the climax debates for environment at world conferences, for example, in the 1970s, and 1980s. Commodification of the neoliberal times also captured the recent policy article of Tanzania and Kenya while lately tested with failure in Ethiopia. The 2005-2006 Nechsar national park failed experience with privatization and commercialization to nature is a good example to mention in this relation. Local realities and cultures also put aside from conservation planning, wildlife governance and sharing of knowledge almost in all the policies of these countries. When evaluated based on the recognition and place they devote both in practice and policy provision about concerns of local conservation-affected communities, the wildlife policy of Tanzania is better than the rest two countries, of course, sharing all common odds. Practical legal frames are set out for benefit sharing schemes between local people and protected areas, where its Ethiopian

counterpart has made no detailed mention except future consideration for such practices. Surprisingly, all the three wildlife and conservation policies doesn't mentioned the term "pastoral", or its economy at even a single spot, as if the present day protected areas and game reserves were not once the holdings and free estates of the current dislocated and banned pastoralists. No wonder that this has been the result of the environmental narratives that depicts African pastoralists as devastators of their nature that put its elephants and big games at risk of extinction since the colonial period. At the worst conditions, it is evident however that local people are labeled as "law breakers", "poachers", "deforesters", and "barbaric hunters" in all the wildlife and conservation policies of these three countries. A detailed punishment and imposition of fines took much of their articles and provisions, as compared to their benefit from and to the environment to which they were partly friends in their long historical existence.

Finally, the times in which they introduce and sought revisions to their respective policies also somewhat lie in the similar periodization, and almost all bereft of local empirical realities. Paradoxically, these countries are labeled by IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature) as red-light regions from which wildlife poaching and resources are running out to the global market illegally, endangering wildlife conservation efforts. On the other hand, countries like Kenya and Tanzania are frequently reporting that they are making high income for their GDP from the wildlife sector and work hard to accelerate it in the coming decades. However, wildlife-human conflicts and squeezing of pastoralist economy are also widely reported almost as equal pace as the conservation celebrations these countries are reporting in recent times.

REFERENCES

1. Bonner, R. (1993). At the hand of man: Peril and hope for Africa's wildlife. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
2. Büscher, B., & Whande, W. (2007). Whims of the winds of time? Emerging trends in biodiversity conservation and protected area management. *Conservation and Society*, *5*(1), 22-43.
3. Abiyot, N. (2009). Resettlement and Local Livelihoods in Nech Sar National Park, Southern Ethiopia. M.Phil Thesis in Indigenous Studies, University of Tromsø Norway.
4. Bayisa, F. (2011). Local Livelihoods, conflict and its Impact on the sustainability of Nech Sar National park. *Proceedings of Cultural and biodiversity conference.* Arba Minch University: 1(1).
5. IUCN, S. (2010). Antelope Specialist Group 2008. *Kobus kob*.
6. Adams, R. A., & Fournier, J. J. (2003). *Sobolev spaces* (140). Elsevier.
7. Mkumbukwa, A. R. (2008). The evolution of wildlife conservation policies in Tanzania during the colonial and post-independence periods. *Development Southern Africa*, *25*(5), 589-600.
8. Nelson, R. H. (2003). Environmental colonialism: "Saving" Africa from Africans. The Independent Review VIII: 65-86.
9. Honey, G. D., Bullmore, E. T., Soni, W., Varatheesan, M., Williams, S. C., & Sharma, T. (1999). Differences in frontal cortical activation by a working memory task after substitution of risperidone for typical antipsychotic drugs in patients with schizophrenia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *96*(23), 13432-13437.
10. Gibson, C. C., & Marks, S. A. (1999). Transforming rural hunters into conservationists: an assessment of community-based wildlife management programs in Africa. *World Development*, *23*(6), 941-957.
11. Anderson, D., & Grove, R. (1987). The scramble for Eden: Past, present and future in African conservation.
12. Western, D., & Waithaka, J. (2005). Policies for reducing human-wildlife conflict: a Kenya case study. *Conservation Biology Series-Cambridge-*, *9*, 357.
13. Republic of Kenya. (1989). Development Plan 1989–1993.
14. Republic of Kenya. (2013). The Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, (2013) Kenya Gazette Supplement No. 181 (Acts No. 47).
15. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (2008). The Wildlife and Environmental Policy of Ethiopia.
16. Redford, K. H., & Sanderson, S. E. (2000). Extracting humans from nature. *Conservation biology*, *14*(5), 1362-1364.
17. Songorwa, A. N., Bührs, T., & Hughey, K. F. (2000). Community-based wildlife management in Africa: a critical assessment of the literature. *Natural Resources Journal*, 603-643.
18. Kideghesho, J. R., Nyahongo, J. W., Hassan, S. N., Tarimo, T. C., & Mbije, N. E. (2006). Factors and ecological impacts of wildlife habitat destruction in the Serengeti ecosystem in northern Tanzania. *African Journal of Environmental Assessment and Management*, *11*, 17-32.
19. United Republic of Tanzania. (1998). The wildlife policy of Tanzania. Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism.
20. Baldus, R. D., & Cauldwell, A. E. (2002). Tourist hunting and it's role in development of wildlife management areas in Tanzania. *Dar es Salam*.
21. Neumann, R. P. (1996). Local challenges to global agendas: Conservation, economic liberalization and

the pastoralist's rights movement in Tanzania. *Antipode*, 27:363-382.
22. Neumann, R. (1997). Polyoxometalate complexes in organic oxidation chemistry. *Progress in Inorganic Chemistry*, 317-370.
23. Levine, A. (2002). Convergence or convenience? International conservation NGOs and development assistance in Tanzania. *World Development*, *30*(6), 1043-1055.
24. Sherrod, D. R., Magigita, M. M., & Kwelwa, S. (2013). *Geologic map of Oldonyo Lengai (Oldoinyo Lengai) volcano and surroundings, Arusha region, United Republic of Tanzania* (No. 2013-1306). US Geological Survey.
25. Okecha, S. A. (2008). *The Nigerian University: An ivory tower with neither ivory nor tower*. Edu-Edy.
26. Peluso, N. L. (1993). Coercing conservation?: The politics of state resource control. *Global environmental change*, *3*(2), 199-217.