Evaluating Eden Series
Discussion Paper No 3

An Overview of the Social, Ecological and Economic Achievements and Challenges of Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE programme.

Richard Hasler

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

1. Social Analysis

Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) is now over ten years old and has been a critically important learning experience for Southern Africa in a rapidly changing world. This paper analyses the different phases of the CAMPFIRE project from an early discourse about "*community-based wildlife management"* through to "*co-management*" of different stake-holders (state, community, private sector) and on to the later phase of the project described in recent reviews as "*the CAMPFIRE social movement*". The paper argues that the evolution of ideas about CAMPFIRE have corresponded to its growth from birth (CWM) through adolescence (co-management) to middle-age (social movement). Understood in this way, the project has missed out on a crucial episode of adulthood during which contradictions within the assumptions made about the programme could have been worked out. Such design flaws as the paternalistic emphasis upon the District Council as the appropriate authority for local wards and villages should have been resolved during the adulthood period. Missing out on adulthood has had some severe consequences for middle-aged CAMPFIRE and has impacted negatively on its greatest achievement.

The greatest achievement has been the broad scale of implementation of the project. A large number of districts, wards and villages belonging to the project have created the political space in which wildlife and wildlife habitat have become important human development issues. Without the project, it is unlikely that this complimentary land use management strategy would have been considered. However, because of contradictions and flawed assumptions, the large scale of the project is also a major weakness as many problems concerning bureaucratization, equity and political sustainability remain unresolved.

2. Economic Issues

The CAMPFIRE project has developed from three key pilot project sites (Masoka village, Mahenye village and Nyaminyami District) into a fully fledged social movement articulated at international, national, district, ward, village and household levels and involving 36 of Zimbabwe's 57 districts. 12 of the districts are high potential districts for wildlife. 185 local communities representing 200,000 households in wildlife producing wards are involved. Several million people live in the participating districts and therefore the project has a potentially large constituency.

CAMPFIRE has attracted two phases of grants from USAID. The first phase (NRMP1) was for US7.6 million, which was funded for four districts in Matabeleland. The second phase of support (NRMP-11), beginning in September 1994, was for US20.5 million plus US16 million in bilateral aid. The attraction of this aid by a programme that really had very humble beginnings in villages and wards is a considerable achievement. However, the funding has also created problems associated with an over-bureaucratized district and national level programme which has not devolved meaningful rights of ownership to ward and village.

CAMPFIRE records provide extensive economic data on allocation of revenue and income statements prepared by the WWF office in Harare (pers com Bond 1998). A summary of the data from the WWF office between 1989-1996 is included in the paper. The extent of the data available is impressive as records have been kept for all years and all participating districts. The tables indicate the large scale and significance of the CAMPFIRE program at district and local level. The benefit from wildlife utilization at the household level is highly variable and sparsely populated wards and districts adjacent to protected areas have the potential to earn more income than those which are densely populated and removed from the core biodiversity areas.

3. Ecological issues

In 1980 12% of Zimbabwe's land was devoted to wildlife management, all within officially protected areas. Today (1999), 33% of total land in Zimbabwe is under wildlife management or has wildlife management as one of its key activities. The CAMPFIRE program and the establishment of conservancies on private land have been responsible for this change in land use strategy.

Wildlife numbers vary according to the techniques used to obtain them. African wildlife ecological systems are also subject to great variation depending on drought and other environmental factors. Loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat is the most serious threat to conservation in Zimbabwe. One of the achievements of the CAMPFIRE programme is that monitoring of wildlife populations in communal areas is carried out at all. The paper outlines a number of recent and on-going ecological studies, which indicate stability in wildlife populations in CAMPFIRE areas. The increased clearing of wilderness areas for cash crop production causes loss of wildlife habitat. This threat has not been resolved and is intertwined with the history of land use in Zimbabwe and more recently with macro-economic changes, which influence the need for increased crop production in marginal areas.

4. What the reviewers say:

As CAMPFIRE has evolved it has attracted increasing scrutiny from a range of different stakeholders. The critiques have moved it away from the comfort zone of being a new and innovative programme, to one where it must rigorously account for itself to continue enjoying acclaim as an internationally recognised experiment in resource management. Donor agency reviews assessed in this document indicate that CAMPFIRE is a qualified success in terms of its social, economic and ecological impacts. Some highlights include: *"the achievements of the overall CAMPFIRE programme thus far are valuable and significant. Substantial progress has been achieved vis a vis building up institutional capacity at provincial and community level and gaining a broader based support for project activities."* (Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998)

The USAID project review states that "*In favoured habitat, the CAMPFIRE programme sports a ten year track record of producing meaningful benefits (from wildlife) for local people residing in Zimbabwe's agriculturally marginal communal lands."* It does also indicate that "*devolution of resource management authority below the level of the District remains problematical*"(USAID 1998).

H.Patel's (1998) report attacks the CAMPFIRE project for, amongst other things, not being "community based". Her mainly desk-top study does the service of illustrating how data and findings from those monitoring and evaluating the project since its beginnings goes way beyond advocacy to provide balanced critical analysis. It is noted, however, that Patel uses this material selectively to present mainly the negative critique.

In fact all of the current and previous scrutiny points to one major analytical critique: that the CAMPFIRE movement needs to rigorously accept the ultimate goal purpose and spirit of the fledgling project: the devolution of legal rights and management functions to local (village) level in order to foster the sustainable management of wildlife by people affected by wildlife.

1.INTRODUCTION

1.1 A Spark of Enthusiasm

In 1989 great excitement swept through Masoka, a small, economically marginalized village situated in one of Zimbabwe's State-owned communal lands in the Zambezi Valley (personal observation). For the first time in Africa, a community project funded from hunting revenue was initiated and a household dividend was distributed to village households for their participation in the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). At the village celebration, traditional leaders spoke out in support of CAMPFIRE's concept of community proprietorship of wildlife resources in return for direct economic benefits. District and national officials gave speeches supporting the need for devolution of authority to allow communities to actively participate in the management and benefits of wildlife. Donor agencies sat up eagerly awaiting the emergence of a model, which simultaneously addressed community empowerment, conservation of highly valued wildlife species (particularly elephant) and democratisation. Local Africa-based researchers and NGOs continued to pack Toyota Landcruisers destined for remote areas in the Zambezi and Limpopo Valleys to conduct surveys, monitor, evaluate and facilitate. The private sector took stock of the business opportunities presented. Local conservationists held up CAMPFIRE as the only hope for the nations natural resource heritage as it was thought that it provided the economic motivation to sustainably use natural resources (Zimbabwe Wildlife, 1990). Zimbabwean politicians watched and waited and soon claimed the collaborative research programme as their own.

This was the beginning phase of the CAMPFIRE project, which was designed to involve local communities in the sustainable use of wildlife on communal lands. The CAMPFIRE programme is specifically concerned with the decentralisation of management of wildlife resources on communally held state lands and has attracted growing international recognition as a unique experiment in common property resource management

Funds are generated from the concession leasing of hunting, safari and tourism areas in communal lands, as well as from trophy and bed night fees. Joint venture and contract agreements are usually drawn up between Rural District Councils and private sector operators. CAMPFIRE project guidelines advise Councils to withdraw a management fee (maximum 35%) and a levy (15%) before forwarding funds to wards and villages where they are usually distributed as household dividends and\or funding for community projects.

The key characteristics of the project are:

- availability of revenue generating wildlife resources often contiguous to national parks or safari areas;
- legislation which empowered District Councils to administer funds accruing from mainly safari operations on communal land;
- local village, ward and district institutions (wildlife committees and local development committees) with which the District Council could negotiate;:
- the identification and creation of resource management areas;
- the monitoring and management of wildlife; and
- the distribution of revenue from wildlife.

(For a more detailed account of CAMPFIRE see Murphree 1998)

1.2 A Key Assumption

In arid or semi-arid areas, land use strategies such as dry land cropping and or extensive cattle grazing may pose specific problems for both the environment (deforestation, soil depletion) and people (low yields, lack of economic development) if undertaken at the expense of the full range of sustainable indigenous natural resource utilisation options (Murphree and Cumming 1991, Hasler 1996). Wildlife resource utilisation, often in combination with these other forms of land use, has been gaining currency as a sustainable, ecologically sound and economically beneficial land use strategy. CAMPFIRE is based on the assumption that involving local people in economic benefits and management of wildlife will help ensure the long-term sustainability of the resource and its habitat. The assumption is made with the historical hindsight that the residents of colonially designated communal areas (formerly Tribal Trust Lands) were prevented from utilising wildlife by the state. In this sense the CAMPFIRE programme is an attempt to restore historical rights of access and an attempt to enhance the economic value of wildlife for local people and to foster appropriate and sustainable decisions about the resource and its habitat.

The legal framework for CAMPFIRE is based on the amended Parks and Wildlife Act (1982) which gives Rural District Councils in the communal lands the same rights over wildlife that large-scale commercial farmers enjoy (i.e. devolved user rights). “Appropriate Authority” status conferred on District Councils allows them to manage and benefit from wildlife resources occurring in communal areas.

The CAMPFIRE programme is now over ten years old. It has been a critically important learning experience for Southern Africa, and for the world, concerning the evolution of community-based wildlife management in a rapidly changing world.

1.3 Early design flaws.

The CAMPFIRE programme was initiated in the late 1980s in an attempt to address the social and environmental problems associated with “protectionist”, state controlled conservation. Amidst growing recognition that for conservation to be successful local people needed to be involved in it and to benefit from it, Zimbabwe went part of the way towards local empowerment by devolving authority over wildlife resources on communal land to District Councils. The fact that devolution stopped at this level and did not get as far as legislating for local village or ward control of revenues generated by CAMPFIRE is regarded by many analysts as a key design flaw in the project: indicating that CAMPFIRE is not a "true" community-based programme (Murombedzi 1992,Thomas 1991). This paper argues that the evolution of CAMPFIRE and its various successes and failures is fundamentally more complex than the identification of "community-based programmes" as it is linked to the development of Zimbabwean political culture and the evolution of the project itself.

1.4. Evolution of the CAMPFIRE project

All projects have a lifecycle, which can be traced over time. Frequently, the ideas which developed the project in its initial stages change and a process of adaptive management is necessary (Murphree 1998). This is particularly true of the CAMPFIRE project. The project's evolution can be compared to the development of a living organism: birth (conceptualising community-based wildlife management), adolescence (the realisation that the programme is fundamentally more complex and involves a range of stake-holders in the co-management of resources), adulthood (a phase in which contradictions between different vested interests and flawed assumptions should have been resolved) and middle age (the establishment of CAMPFIRE as a social movement). The three discrete analytical discourses: community -based wildlife management, co-management and social movement which have so far characterised evaluations of the CAMPFIRE project warrant further discussion. It is important to note that CAMPFIRE has missed out on a crucial period of adulthood.

1.4.1 Birth: The discourse about community.

Soon after its initiation, CAMPFIRE was an enthusiastically received fledgling programme; conceived in the mid-eighties as a project that promoted community management and control of wildlife, the initial enthusiasm about "**community-based wildlife management**" or communities as institutions for natural resource management (Murphree 1989, 1990, 1991) led to a period of adolescence in which it became clear that "**co-management**" between different vested interest groups (commonly called stake holders eg the state, community, private sector, international wildlife lobby groups, national politicians etc) was the critical focus of the programme (also see the work of Able and Blakie 1986, Lawry 1990, Murphree 1998, Murombedzi 1992, Hasler 1996 which emphasise this perspective).

The idea of "community management" that CAMPFIRE promoted relied on the fact that discrete bounded and relatively homogenous communities existed in parts of rural Zimbabwe adjacent to national parks and safari areas that were capable of playing an active part in wildlife management. As Martin pointed out in the initial project design document, the CAMPFIRE programme was initially aimed at "cohesive communities with common goals" (Martin 1986). A key issue in the early stages of CAMPFIRE was the identification of such communities for the programme and several baseline studies were conducted for this purpose and were later used to monitor the impacts of the project (for example Cutshall 1990, Nhira 1989, Buchan 1989,Hasler 1993). One of Murphree's key principles which are now used as guidelines throughout the regional NRM programme refers to the need for communities to be as "small as practicable within socio-political and ecological constraints" (Murphree 1991) Assumptions were made that a degree of autonomy could be reached by communities despite internal differentiation and despite also the enormous external pressures exerted by political and economic forces such as the state, the private sector and international lobby groups. However, the early phase of the CAMPFIRE project indicated that the spatial or geographical definition of communities was not in itself sufficient criteria for guiding implementing authorities. Relations between geographical communities and political and economic hierarchies (i.e. the stakeholders) would determine the direction of the programme through a process of “co-management

”.

1.4.2 Adolescence: The Discourse about Co-Management.

"Co-management" emphasises the different vested interests/"stake holders" and by doing so acknowledges that multiple jurisdictions exist in the management of the wildlife resource as well as just "communities". In the case of CAMPFIRE, the institutional development of the association of District Councils, the collaborative research group (Zimtrust, World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), Centre for Applied Social Science (CASS), Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management), the donors, the politicians and the wildlife lobby groups were all involved in one way or another in CAMPFIRE outcomes.

For example it became clear that CITES debates concerning regulations on trading in ivory had a direct impact on household revenues from CAMPFIRE. Similarly, as local government structures (district and ward development committees) were used as parallel structures for the implementation of CAMPFIRE (district and ward wildlife committees), it became clear that one could not discuss community rights in isolation from the various state and private sector interests in natural resources and governance. The implication that communities could own or manage wildlife by and for themselves became questionable. Ownership, use and control of wildlife were analysed as a set of complex and competing tenurial rights and jurisdictions (Hasler 1996). The notion of community management also became watered down by the reality of centralised politics in the Zimbabwean legal and administrative context (Hasler 1995, 1996).

1.4.3 Middle Age: The discourse about social movement.

CAMPFIRE missed out on the crucial development phase of adulthood because the state would not devolve further legal rights to wards and villages allowing them to administer their own programmes, instead keeping control for itself and its representatives at local and district level (District Council, Ward Development Committees (WADCOs) and Village Development Committees (VIDCOs). During the adulthood phase, the District Councils and the Department of National Parks and Wild Life Management (DNPWLM) should have worked out some of the conceptual contradictions in the programme arising from the emphasis upon empowering "community" and the simultaneous and contradictory empowerment of District Councils through the conferment on them of "appropriate authority" status over wildlife on communal lands.

CAMPFIRE moved rapidly beyond the adolescence of co-management into the middle age of "social movement" in a very short space of time (1989- 1995). The term social movement refers to the collective organising of people for a particular issue or cause. The CAMPFIRE programme in middle age linked local, district, national and international levels (Hasler (1995) USAID 1997, Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998). The USAID midterm review refers to this as "the Greater CAMPFIRE movement". . The term implies effective broad based support, inter-institutional linkages within and between local, national and international levels, a political and social awakening, a process of democratisation, a revolution in thinking about ecological resources, a formidable political trend that sweeps across society as a whole. None of these social movement trends have yet been seriously analysed or quantified by analysts but the "CAMPFIRE movement" is considered real in the latest reviews undertaken by outsider observers. This "movement" has been capped with donor funding and the entrenchment of key institutions such as the "CAMPFIRE Association" which represents a mix of local community, District Council and national political interests.

The complex competing and conflicting rights of ownership, control and use exerted by the state, the private sector, and local people, as well as those exerted by international wildlife lobby groups illustrate that more clarification and more legislation empowering local communities is necessary if the program is to achieve its goals. These ambiguities make the link between wildlife management and distribution of benefits difficult to identify especially for the poor and marginalised members of the society[1]. However, social analysts have long indicated that the resilience of CAMPFIRE lies in its link to governance, democratisation and political issues. The fact that the political structure in rural areas is developing capacity to manage wildlife resources is a great achievement of the programme.

2. POLITICAL IMPACTS AND EXTERNAL FACTORS

There exists a definite hierarchy of qualified powers in the CAMPFIRE project. These actors and organisations are associated with the different levels on which the project operates as a socio-political movement:

[1] A 1998 visit to my research site in Kanyemba (see Hasler 1996) indicated that CAMPFIRE household dividends and community projects had regularly occurred since 1992 and that institutional formation and capacity building at local level had strengthened. Much infrastrusctural improvement in the area was noted development of school, clinic, business centre roads and much of this was associated with the development of the CAMPFIRE program. Some of the most impoverished household heads did not know what CAMPFIRE was. These marginalized foragers and former hunters are largely excluded from the program and yet have most contact with wildlife, as they live right on the boundary of the Chewore Safari Area. The Acting Chief indicated that though people would not openly say it, they were not happy with the CAMPFIRE program and felt that dividends were insufficient and that the program was imposed on them from above (ie from the authorities). Direct links between program benefits and management of wildlife were not easy for the average ward resident to identify.

. International level: donor agencies, United States Congress, CITES, and international wildlife lobby groups.

- National level: politicians, civil servants and technocrats (DNPWLM, local government officials), the CAMPFIRE Collaborative Group (Zimtrust, CASS, CAMPFIRE Association, WWF (Harare) and the DNPWLM) as well as the private sector.

District level: local government and Rural District Council officials, ward councillors, district wildlife committees, technocrats (eg extension agents).

Ward and village level: chiefs, councillors, ward and village development committees, ward and village wildlife committees and other local interests that affect decision-making.

2.1 International politics

Since the majority of CAMPFIRE's external funding comes from USAID, if US tax payers or lobby groups, through the US Congress, oppose the project's reliance on consumptive utilisation of wildlife, they can, and do, exert considerable influence over the amount of funding available. Similarly, international wildlife lobby groups have the power to credit or discredit CAMPFIRE through their propaganda and lobbying at international level. CITES [2] lays down rules of trade concerning wildlife products, which influence the amount of income accruing to local households. For example, in June 1999, five District Councils received their first tranche from revenue accrued from stockpiled ivory from problem animals (usually life threatening or crop raiding animals). Former CITES agreements had prohibited this sale.

2.2 National politics

National officials and politicians provide a more obvious political arena in which decisions are made about policy and implementation. These actors are critically important in terms of facilitating or obstructing community participation and real devolution. They are the "gatekeepers" of the programme and can influence outcomes through becoming middlemen or brokers between the CAMPFIRE collaborative group (the designers and implementers of CAMPFIRE) and local people. Likewise the CAMPFIRE collaborative group constitutes a set of middlemen or brokers between local communities, donors, policy makers and politicians. Both national government and the CAMPFIRE collaborative group have power to influence outcomes and their objectives may be radically different. For example, provincial and local government in Matabeleland (probably correctly) favour the establishment of local development projects rather than the distribution of household dividends (common in the mid-Zambezi valley). Their decision about this makes it very difficult for local communities to vote for a household dividend. Researchers and implementers might not

2 CITES, (The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species), was established in […..] to control the international trade in endangered animal and plant species. It is an unfortunate fact that international animal rights groups have started abusing the Convention to further animal rights outside of the context of biodiversity conservation.

have the same approach preferring local village communities and even individual households to decide for themselves about such matters. 2.3 Local politics

District authorities such as Rural District Councils and District Administration are also highly effective at influencing the outcomes of CAMPFIRE. Many villages have indicated a reservation about the fact that local government is involved in administering revenues from the resource (personal observation). Instances of corruption of officials and embezzlement of funds have occurred and dissatisfaction about the transparency of the elected councillor's deliberations with local officials through the District Wildlife Committees is widespread. However, raising these issues at the village level has effectively challenged the status quo of top down decision making throughout government. This is an important democratisation process for Zimbabwe.

2.3.1 Differentiated Power at local level.

Local people are not an homogenous and autonomous group. In all CAMPFIRE areas local people are marginalised and impoverished and lack power to achieve their objectives. Despite this political marginalisation, the social variability within communities is as great or greater than the variability between communities. Rural elites are usually better educated or more powerful than other members of the community and are therefore better placed to capture project benefits. Two key players in the Zimbabwean context are the chiefs/headmen (i.e. the traditional authorities) and the democratically elected authorities i.e. the councillors and the Village and Ward Development Committees. At local level they, the religious functionaries and other respected (usually male) elders are the most powerful people. In the Zimbabwean political context their power is often mediated through their links with power at higher levels of authority. Thus the local ward councillor attends wildlife planning meetings at district level and then informs his electorate about decisions that may have been made. Sometimes meaningful consultation takes place for example in regard to the identification of resource areas for the CAMPFIRE project, but there have been several instances where insufficient consultation has taken place and district authorities have imposed their will on wards and villages through manipulating rather powerless councillors.

While the retention of control over wildlife issues at the district level has been held up as one of the major weaknesses of CAMPFIRE, analysts need to be cautious about emphasising a false dichotomy between councils and the communities they represent. While local people regularly emphasise this dichotomy and blame many of their problems on the council, they themselves often do not have the capacity to undertake the administrative functions required. Indeed the capacity of the Councils in doing so is often stretched to the limit. The capacity building and training undertaken is therefore a key benefit from the CAMPFIRE programme

2.4 The Impact of Zimbabwean Political Culture on CAMPFIRE

From its incipience, political issues have primarily determined the evolution and outcome of the CAMPFIRE programme. A substantive reason for this is that the institutions used by CAMPFIRE for its implementation are primarily political institutions; namely the district council and administration and the ward and village development committees. These structures are the chief organs of both the state and the dominant political party (ZANUPF) for the maintenance of control of the rural areas, With district, ward and village wildlife committees based on structures set up by local government. The political culture in Zimbabwe throughout the life of CAMPFIRE has been one of centralised control of remote rural areas and the people and natural resources within them. Similarly, the dominant political party has used the centralised control mode to further its own interests in terms of vote accumulation in remote rural areas. CAMPFIRE, by proposing alternative models to centralised control, has challenged and extended political culture within Zimbabwe and by so doing has contributed greatly to a

needed process of democratisation. Many of the problems of CAMPFIRE, such as those identified by Patel (1998) are endemic to the political and economic structures within Zimbabwe.

2.5 Animal Rights Activists and the Role of International Lobby Groups

A key revenue earner in CAMPFIRE has been trophy hunting of elephant and other large animals. However, Zimbabwe's elephant population is seen as a world, rather than national, heritage and its future has been subject to much international lobbying from different philosophical perspectives. The extent of local village control of wildlife management under CAMPFIRE has therefore been significantly influenced by trading agreements such as the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). This agreement is important because it sets the rules about trade and confers legitimacy or sanctions local production and utilisation of wildlife. The Ivory Trade Review Group released a study in 1989 which was a key factor in the imposition of a global ban on trade in ivory despite the existence of well managed elephant populations in Botswana, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa. In 1997, after much lobbying and discussion, this decision was overturned and elephants were placed on Appendix 2 of the convention allowing limited trade in ivory and elephant products by the above nations. These changes directly affected the amount of revenue accruing under the CAMPFIRE project to support conservation objectives and local livelihoods.

Lobbyists fall on either side of a fairly clear divide. The Southern African Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SASUSG) advocates for involvement of local people directly in the management and benefits from wildlife resource. They argue from an African perspective that sound, socially, politically and environmentally acceptable management practices by and for those who live with wild animals will ensure the long-term sustainability of African wildlife resources. "The premise is that zero use is not an option and that use will take place illegally and unsustainably if facile attempts are made to debar it. The challenge is to make use sustainable" (Martin quoted in Kalen and Tragardh 1997).

The largely northern based anti-hunting lobby argues from a less pragmatic and more utopian, emotive, ethical and philosophical stance that hunting and harvesting animal products is morally wrong in itself. Animal rights activists are particularly concerned about both species extinction and the treatment of individual animals. While such ethical concerns about animal welfare are important, to date such groups have not been meaningfully involved in designing poverty alleviation programmes which might meliorate animal suffering in Africa. Many of their objections are not contextualised within the social and ecological reality of African wildlife management. Instead such groups tend to emphasise the rights of individual animals or species, often at the expense of the animal populations and ecosystems as a whole and also at the expense of human populations that co-exist with wildlife (also see Adams and McShane 1996).

CAMPFIRE has been held up as a model for other NRM projects in the region and therefore has the potential to threaten both the funding resource base and the philosophical traditions of protectionism and pure conservation upon which this approach has historically been based.

2.6 The resounding dollar crash and the clearing of new fields

In 1989, when CAMPFIRE started one US dollar was the equivalent of 2.4 Zimbabwean dollars After a long slide downwards, the Zimbabwean dollar hit an all time low of Z$26 per US$ in November 1997, dropping further to Z$37-40 per US$ in mid 1999. This crash has had a ripple effect throughout the whole of the economy and has impacted directly on CAMPFIRE. On the positive side since fees from international hunters are collected in foreign exchange, the Zimbabwean dollar equivalent of trophy fees and camp nights has escalated. However, on the negative side, migrant workers are losing the incentive to work in towns because of falling real incomes (personal observation in Kanyemba 1998), and are being drawn back to those communal areas where it is still possible to clear new fields and plant cash crops such as cotton in the Zambezi Valley. . These hitherto unutilised areas have provided a spillover or buffer zone for wildlife from the key national parks and so an increase in this trend could therefore result in significant habitat loss. In-migration also dilutes the benefits from CAMPFIRE whether they are community projects or household dividends as the revenues have to divided between a larger community.

3. CAMPFIRE'S KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

3.1 The Scale of the Social Movement.

The CAMPFIRE programme has developed from three key pilot project sites (Masoka village, Mahenye village and Nyaminyami district) into a fully-fledged social movement involving 36 of Zimbabwe's 57 districts. Twelve of the districts are in areas of high wildlife potential with 185 local communities representing 200,000 households in wildlife producing wards. Several million people live in the CAMPFIRE districts and therefore the project has a potentially large constituency. While international forces) for and against the CAMPFIRE project coalesce around philosophical debates, national and district politicians have to incorporate (or at least recognise) the CAMPFIRE model in their land use planning. The scale of the social movement is by far the most important achievement of the CAMPFIRE programme to date. The CAMPFIRE social movement has created a political space in which wildlife management has become a prominent issue at ward, district and national levels. Without political will, wildlife management in communal areas would have become increasingly unpopular and wildlife itself would have become increasingly less tolerable to local people as well as to land use decision-makers and politicians. From this perspective CAMPFIRE has been a resounding success.

3.2 Providing Regional Lessons

The ongoing regional USAID funded NRM programmes have drawn heavily for their inspiration from the analysis and achievements of CAMPFIRE. CAMPFIRE is also frequently held up as a model from which other countries can learn, although it is pointed out that there is a danger in a rigid “blue print” approach (Murphree 1998). The influence of the CAMPFIRE project in affecting policy in neighbouring African countries has been great and this is one of its more important achievements. However, it is ironic now that the policy and legislative environments in neighbouring countries such as Botswana and Namibia have long left Zimbabwe behind. Both these countries have in place legislation that empowers local communities to manage and benefit from wildlife directly. Zimbabwe has lost the lead in this respect and until it takes decisive action to reform legislation the CAMPFIRE project will not achieve its initial goals. While capacity building issues at local and district level continue to be stumbling blocks, the national political environment and the prevailing political culture have been the key obstacle to real devolution of management functions to village and ward levels.

3.3 The Economic Dimension

The first pilot CAMPFIRE projects started with relatively small amounts of funding in areas where there was a relative abundance of wildlife (Masoka, Nyaminyami). The initial incentive was the potential revenue from wildlife utilisation, mainly trophy hunting.

Funding for the CAMPFIRE social movement has since arisen from two main sources: donor funds support the technical and advisory services associated with the programme and funds generated from the utilisation of wildlife provide the remainder. By far the greater proportion of funds generated through the CAMPFIRE movement have been donor funds, with two phases of grants from USAID. The first phase (NRMP1) was for US$7.6 million , which funded four districts in Matabeleland. The second phase of support (NRMP-11) beginning in September 1994 was for US$20.5 million plus US$16 million in bilateral aid. The attraction of this aid by a programme that really had very humble beginnings in villages and wards is a considerable achievement.

Income in US dollars rose from US$349,811 in 1989 to US$1,757,978 in 1996, with 92 per cent deriving from the lease of sport hunting quotas (of which 60% is earned directly from sport-hunted elephant) (Bond and Taylor 1997). During 1989-1996 only very small percentages of income are earned from tourism, and other incomes such as the sale of ivory and hides. In 1999 an additional form of funding became available for the first time as a result of the 1997 CITES agreement allowing limited trade in ivory. Five rural district councils received funds for the sale of stockpiled ivory that had been stored by the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management.

Allocation trends indicate that the revenue is roughly split between communities and the Rural District Councils responsible for natural resources on communal lands. This situation could be changed if legislation empowered local communities to administer their own CAMPFIRE projects. The rural district council portion of the revenue accrues mainly from a levy (15%) and a management fee (not to exceed 35%). WWF in Harare also collects data on the amount allocated to wards, villages and households. These figures are variable as they depend on the amount of wildlife utilised in any particular year and are therefore very different from area to area. High potential areas adjacent to national parks and safari areas obviously earn a lot more wildlife revenue than areas that do not have wildlife resources. The average CAMPFIRE ward dividend benefit per household (excluding indirect benefits) was US$19.40 per household in 1989 but dropped in 1991 to US$5.97 and then to US$4.49 in 1996. The drop in this figure is largely due to the increasing number of households joining the programme in low wildlife potential areas. High potential areas such as specific wards in Guruve and Nyaminyami have earned much higher averages as indicated by the 1989 average benefit. Wildlife revenues in these high potential areas can contribute significantly to household incomes and to enhancing peoples' livelihoods.

During the period 1989-1996 a total of US$16,498,221 was disbursed under the CAMPFIRE project. The total dividend to wards during this period was US$4,842,318 with an average ward dividend of US$34,588. In 1996 a total of 89,475 households received benefits under the programme. At local level the people who are most satisfied with CAMPFIRE are those who have benefited from it meaningfully through household dividends, community projects such as the building of schools, clinics and grinding mills or those who in some official capacity can draw a subsistence allowance or stipend as a game monitor, councillor or ward wildlife committee member. The programme gives most returns to sparsely populated wards and districts adjacent to protected areas. Densely populated wards removed from the core bio-diversity areas gain the least. Those who oppose and are dissatisfied with the project are those who bear the costs of wildlife presence in terms of crop raiding and/or loss of access to former grazing or foraging and hunting areas which have been designated as CAMPFIRE resource areas. Frequently these households are the most impoverished and the most dependent on local natural resource harvesting.

The ratio between the amount of revenue accruing through donor funding and the amount of revenue generated by the programme itself since its inception is approximately 4 to 1 (approximately $US 45 million in total aid versus US$ 9.4 million in total revenue accrual (see Appendix 1). It should not come as a great surprise therefore that the funding itself has created its own momentum and the impact of the funding has not necessarily furthered the goals of the project. A group of "middlemen" or political brokers of the programme have been associated with it in all its phases but this is now becoming a problem in its middle age. For example the CAMPFIRE Association, (the lead agency) annual salary charges are US$60,000 equivalent to twice the current levies raised from Rural District Council contributions (Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998)

The CAMPFIRE Association, which represents the collective interests of the CAMPFIRE programme and particularly Rural District Council interests, is a major recipient of grant funds. Rural District Councils also keep approximately half of the programme-derived revenue (see Appendix 2). The other key recipients of grant funds have included:

- The Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management.
- The Ministry of Local Government and National Housing
- Zimbabwe Trust.
- University of Zimbabwe's Centre for Applied Social Sciences.

- World Wide Fund for Nature.
- Africa Resources Trust.
- Action Magazine.

The USAID (1998) review makes the important point that many of the agencies have underspent their allocations, some quite considerably. For example the DNPWLM had only spent 5% of its total allocation at the end of February 1998. Likewise the Ministry of Local Government which was expected to advise and assist on CAMPFIRE policies and practices at the District level but had spent none of its allocation at the end of February 1998. NGOs have also underspent their allocations and hence the need to redefine and rethink the goals of the CAMPFIRE project.

.3.3.1 Indirect Economic Benefits

The total economic benefits from CAMPFIRE include far more than just the direct economic benefits that are described in Appendices 1 and 2. The indirect economic benefits of building a school, a clinic or a grinding mill (the most common community projects undertaken using CAMPFIRE revenues) are much more difficult to assess and quantify. These indirect economic benefits are also much more intricately tied to the general health and prosperity of the national economy and the level of benefit they produce changes over time, depending on the degree to which such assets are maintained and invested in. For example community projects are often associated with the adding of incremental value to existing structures or systems and so, to use education as an example, building additional school blocks on government funded schools will initially allow the expansion of local education, but the education system as a whole may become subject to greater stresses and resource shortages as a result of macroeconomic changes. Indirect economic benefits from CAMPFIRE have been most affected by the national economic crisis and the associated depletion of national infrastructure such as the health and education systems in recent years.
Macroeconomic issues also directly impact on the investment in grinding mills at local level (a common form of community project). The introduction or removal of state subsidies on maize, the fixing or floating of the buying and selling price of maize directly impacts on the need to maintain local grinding mills. In a macroeconomic climate in which fixed prices may be introduced to prevent food riots, economic incentives to maintain local grinding mills may be low if the cost of purchasing maize is lower than the cost of production. At the time of writing the government has indicated that price controls on maize will be reintroduced. Conversely, when price controls are removed incentives for local production and processing may be increased.

Indirect economic benefits may also be invisible to project participants (for example if a school is funded in part by CAMPFIRE revenue and in part by a government grant). Such indirect benefits are very important indicators of the impact of the CAMPFIRE project, but quantitative economic data on this does not yet exist.

3.4 The Ecological Dimension

In a political climate where species extinction are media events, a key indicator of the achievement or non-achievement of the CAMPFIRE project from a biodiversity perspective is wildlife numbers. Wildlife numbers, however, vary according to the techniques used to obtain them. In addition, African wildlife ecological systems are subject to great variation depending on drought and other environmental factors. Indicators of wildlife health and exploitation cannot therefore be used to test a cause and effect relationship between CAMPFIRE practices and wildlife sustainability because other factors (i.e. climatic conditions, activities originating in non-CAMPFIRE areas and stochastic factors) also effect long term sustainability. It is therefore not only difficult to obtain data on wildlife numbers that is complete and absolute, but interpretation of the data that is available is also problematic. Far-reaching conclusions are at best tentative.

Despite this complexity there is considerable pressure placed on scholars to make general statements. WWF, the ecological watchdog for CAMPFIRE indicated that numbers of key species have been relatively stable and that habitat loss has been held back in those areas where CAMPFIRE exists. Evaluations of CAMPFIRE conducted by both USAID and the Netherlands Embassy concluded that the monitoring and evaluation of wildlife species and habitat is generally inadequate, the Netherlands report noting particularly that while detailed inventories are carried out on Zimbabwe's megafauna (elephants and large ungulates) the plight of smaller ungulates and carnivorous species, including endangered species is not well documented.

According to a study commissioned by the MET and DNPWLM (Anon 1996) the elephant population in Zimbabwe increased from 46,000 in 1980 to 67,000 in 1995. The study showed an increase in the Matabeleland and mid-Zambezi valley populations, a small increase in the Sebungwe population and relative stability in the south east lowveld population. The 1997 annual off-take of 250 elephants under the CAMPFIRE project, through safari hunting, had no impact on current population trends (Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998). In fact, hunting quotas in CAMPFIRE areas are considered to be conservative. A review of aerial survey techniques and data collection completed in the run-up to the CITES convention in 1997 concluded that the system of data collection was an "effective means of providing data for management of Zimbabwe's elephants" and that "Zimbabwe possessed one of the best sets of elephant data in the world".

A review of the results of aerial censuses of elephant and buffalo which have been undertaken since 1988 in selected CAMPFIRE districts (high potential areas in the Zambezi Valley) concluded that the census results indicate high levels of variability between annual surveys (Taylor and Mackie 1997). This variability is accounted for by the fact that wide-ranging herbivores such as elephant and buffalo function "at a scale often somewhat larger than the size of a ward or survey stratum". Another factor is the distribution of the animals being counted. Large groups may often be missed not because they are not seen but because they do not fall with in the sample transect or block. This clumping factor is particularly noticed amongst buffalo. They also emphasise that aerial survey techniques can be useful complimented by other sources of information, for example local ground monitoring by communities. Despite their critical review and their reluctance to make general statements about trends, the data they present indicates a remarkable stability in the populations considering the high levels of human in-migration into the surveyed areas. For example, elephant number estimates in Siabuwa, Gokwe North, Omay and Guruve North all indicate a relative stability in the population. Elephant number estimates for Mukwiche and Chewore show growth.

Cumming and Lynam (1997) present similar findings in a study on the Zambezi valley wildlife and livestock populations. Comparing data from the Sebungwe area and the Dande Chiswiti area, their results illustrate that elephant densities between 1980 and 1996 for both communal areas and for protected areas, illustrate remarkable stability despite high levels of human in-migration. The in-migration they refer to has caused rapid extension of land clearance for agriculture, which is thought to be the key threat to wildlife habitat in the area. Cummings and Lyman's findings indicate that the survival of large wild herbivores in the communal lands of Sebungwe and Dande Chiswiti thus far may be because "critical thresholds of human population density have not yet been reached". The Netherlands Government evaluation identifies the same trend in the south east lowveld and claims that this will have serious repercussions for the CAMPFIRE programme and for long term sustainability of the nature based tourism sector in the next 10 to 15 years: "CAMPFIRE's land use planning exercises through WWF are important initiatives to ensure that sufficient large wilderness areas remain." (Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998).
Cumming and Lynam also present data on a range of other species in the Zambezi valley including black rhino, sable, zebra as well as livestock species. The case of the black rhino is particularly informative as it illustrates how an animal population crashed as a result of an orchestrated international poaching syndicate at a time when CAMPFIRE was still in its infancy. For example, out of an estimated population of 100 black rhino in the Western Dande, by 1989 only rhino carcasses were evident in the aerial survey data. In Sebungwe, during 1991 and 1992 the estimated 500 black rhino were largely decimated from poaching. However, in those areas where CAMPFIRE has been

successfully adopted by local people a decrease in poaching of all species is now evident (Murphree 1993).
Sable populations in the Sebungwe have shown a clear decline and Cumming and Lynam indicate that the main reason for this is due to the changing habitat conditions resulting from high elephant densities and their impacts on woodlands. The same trend is evident in many national parks where elephants exceed their carrying capacity of five individuals per square kilometre and woodland habitats are under severe pressure (Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998).

Conybeare (1998) has also compiled data concerning habitat and animal numbers in three key CAMPFIRE districts, providing another indicator of the complex issues involved. He indicates that "habitat in the three areas was in fairly good condition, herbaceous cover was generally good, plant litter was present on the ground surface and there was not excessive amounts of bare ground. Severe modification of the environment by elephants is limited to the escarpment areas of Kanyurira ward, saluvial areas of Gokwe North and some riverine habitats in Negande and some gully erosions are mentioned as negative factors. Animal species diversity was compared using a simple scoring method, but trends in animal populations were difficult to identify since aerial results fluctuate perhaps indicating that species concerned move in and out of the areas, probably influenced by conditions in any particular year" (Connybeare 1998). According to workshops conducted to set safari hunting quotas in the CAMPFIRE districts, populations of most species were thought to be stable or increasing. Notable exceptions were rhino, sable and eland in Gokwe and impala in Omay which have been subject to a heavy cropping regime. Game counting transects walked by CAMPFIRE game guards in each Communal Wildlife Area will help to monitor these trends in the future (Connybeare 1998), and in fact one of the achievements of CAMPFIRE is the ongoing monitoring of wildlife populations in communal areas, which would not have been possible with the limited state conservation budget..

The conclusion of Conybeare's study concurs with that of the Netherlands Government and of Cummings and Lynam: "The CAMPFIRE programme appears to be successful in the three project areas and the WWF support to CAMPFIRE project is contributing to that success..... there has been no significant loss of or apparent change to any of the habitats other than possibly some habitat modification attributable to elephants. Animal populations are generally stable or increasing with a few exceptions but poaching in Negande and to a lesser extent Gokwe North may be adversely affecting population growth. The major threat to maintenance of the CWAs is demand for cropland as a result of increasing human populations".

The issue of demand for cropland is a complex historical and political issue in Zimbabwe and takes us full circle back to the beginning of this paper and the discussion about the political processes affecting CAMPFIRE. Land was the key factor behind the guerrilla war for independence in the early 1980s and the land issue has not yet been resolved. However, as a result of CAMPFIRE wildlife utilisation on communal lands is becoming a viable alternative to cropland and there is every reason to hope that increasing value will accrue from these scarce resources. In 1980 12 per cent of Zimbabwe's land was devoted to wildlife management, all within officially protected areas. Today, wildlife management accounts for 33 per cent of total land in Zimbabwe. The CAMPFIRE programme and the establishment of conservancies on private land have been responsible for this change or augmentation in land use strategy.

4. Scrutiny and Critique: What the reviews say

Three high profile reviews of the CAMPFIRE project had recently been completed at the time of writing: The USAID mid term review, the Netherlands Government review, and the review of Heena Patel a quasi independent researcher representing the Indigenous Environmental Policy Centre.

4.1 The Netherlands Government Review

The Netherlands government (1988) report makes the following overall statement about the social, ecological and economic achievement of the CAMPFIRE project:

“the achievements of the overall CAMPFIRE programme thus far are valuable and significant. Substantial progress has been achieved visa vis building up institutional capacity at provincial and community level and gaining a broader based support for project activities. The CAMPFIRE project has implemented a large number of initiatives to strengthen the operations of relevant ward and District Wildlife Committees as well as supporting and involving other relevant institutions. The programme has contributed to the establishment of local governance systems that resulted in increased accountability and responsiveness in conserving natural resources, conflict resolution and distribution of benefits. CAMPFIRE producer communities have become empowered to manage their resources collectively and are capable to articulate their development needs. Nevertheless some critical issues have emerged which concern the overall design and direction of the CAMPFIRE project" (Royal Netherlands Embassy 1998). These critical issues can be summarised as: lack of devolution of authority beyond the district level, bureaucratisation at national and district level and a lack of adequate focus on landscape ecology and wildlife management.

4.2 The USAID project review

The USAID (1988) mid term project review states that:

"In favoured habitat, the CAMPFIRE programme sports a ten-year track record of producing meaningful benefits for local people residing in Zimbabwe's agriculturally marginal communal lands. In other areas the returns have been mixed and show less promise. By conferring proprietorship of wildlife resources through the mechanisms of appropriate authority, the benefits accrue to populations residing in proximity to favoured wildlife habitat and its rich endowment of charismatic megafauna. Most revenues still derive from consumptive use of this resource.” (The evaluation makes the point, important to many US taxpayers, that CAMPFIRE is diversifying its resource base into non-consumptive utilisation of wildlife)

“Appropriate Authority resides administratively at the District, a level generally much higher and removed from that of producer communities. CAMPFIRE functions best where Rural District Councils have devolved some authority and the majority of the revenues to the producer level. Where benefits are minimal or have been generalised to a wider population, the essential link to improved conservation can break down.

The positive sense of empowerment of CAMPFIRE's philosophy and approach is well entrenched among local populations as it is across government departments. Non-wildlife resources, including some mineral resources are coming under the CAMPFIRE umbrella, and thus under the District as the responsible administrative unit.

Devolution of resource management authority below the level of the District remains problematical. While existing policy and legislation enable some devolution and transfer of benefits towards those groups actually bearing the burden of management responsibility. RDCs have a mixed record in actually applying CAMPFIRE principles of revenue sharing. On average about half of the CAMPFIRE revenues are returned to actual producer communities" (USAID Mid term evaluation report 1998)

4.3 H. Patel's report

H. Patel's (1988) strongly worded attack on CAMPFIRE has been widely distributed but has created much contention. The report has been discredited for its weak methodology and insufficient depth of

financial analysis (Bond 1998). The report is also attacked for quoting problems that exist in the CAMPFIRE project out of their proper political and economic context. The report selectively quotes the highly critical parts of the large amount of evaluative literature available on the CAMPFIRE project and largely ignores the project's achievements.

Despite these caveats the report does provide a useful function. Largely a desk top study, it relies heavily on literature provided by members of the CAMPFIRE Collaborative Group. Much of this literature was provided by African scholars involved in producing critical analysis (and PhDs) on the subject and illustrates the success of capacity building for natural resource management. The literature cited also indicates that evaluations of CAMPFIRE by such agencies as WWF and the Centre for Applied Social Sciences at the University of Zimbabwe has gone way beyond advocacy for the programme and have raised critical analytical issues which have been discussed and debated since the origin of the programme. Patel's report highlights some of the key issues in this literature that CAMPFIRE needs to address. The report also indicates the kind of criticism which a high profile project, accustomed to praise, has to be able to answer. Her report does the service of taking CAMPFIRE out of its comfort zone.

The key points Patel raises have all been discussed and analysed at length in the literature. Her first point is that CAMPFIRE is not a community-based, community- directed project. As pointed out in the beginning of this overview, evaluative discourse has shifted in the life of the project from "community management" to "co-management" to "social movement" as the project has grown into its middle age and as the adaptive management process has unfolded. Declaring the project community-based or non community-based is a form of political correctness that is absent from most of the evaluative literature written about the CAMPFIRE project during its birth and adolescence. Instead this literature has focused on the goal of making the project "community-based" through the analysis of the differentiation within "communities", their relations with centralised state power and the private sector and problem solving for the future (For more on the complexity of communities and community management under CAMPFIRE see Hasler 1996). As mentioned above CAMPFIRE in its middle age, has to be able to make the important leap of faith to institutionalise community-based management and this is therefore a sound criticism.

Patel's second point also widely discussed in the literature available on CAMPFIRE, is the allegation that the project is a business agreement between Rural District Councils and the private safari operating industry. While it is not in debate that CAMPFIRE encourages joint ventures as a mode of revenue generation, Patel goes on to argue an inaccurate conspiracy theory that the white dominated private wildlife industry (Zimbabwe's white population is about 1 per cent of the total population of 12 million, the wildlife industry is about 1 per cent of the total white population i.e. about 120 people) is somehow manipulating CAMPFIRE and that "CAMPFIRE has been used as a strategy to increase the profits of the trophy hunting industry" that "the rural development" theme has been used as an effective tool by programme implementers to increase donor funds, influence wildlife policies in other African countries and keep international markets open for trade in endangered (Patel's words) species products.

On one level, Patel is completely accurate. The limelight CAMPFIRE has enjoyed has produced various spin-offs in terms of increasing donor funds (usually considered a positive outcome), influencing sensible regional wildlife policy reform (also positive) and opening markets for trade to enable Africans to accrue revenue from their wildlife resources and to build stewardship for the resources (again a positive outcome). The criticism therefore turns out to be a compliment about the broad scope of the programme and its far-reaching impacts. The tone of the statements is however full of invective against the programme and its proponents and does not recognise the very real achievements that CAMPFIRE has made.

One criticism, which does need qualification and further debate, is the allegation that forced eviction and coerced resettlement is used as a programme strategy. This illustrates the need for caution concerning the confusion between the CAMPFIRE programme itself and the political culture that it is attempting to challenge and extend. In several CAMPFIRE areas there has been contention and conflict about land use, settlement and agreement about designated resource areas. Conflicts have often been linked to socioeconomic change, while the dominant top-heavy style of governance in Zimbabwe has also caused problems. It is also true to say that the project can be co-opted and manipulated by local, district, national and international power politics and that this has always been the case.

All of the above scrutiny points to one major analytical critique: that the CAMPFIRE movement needs to rigorously accept the ultimate goal purpose and spirit of the fledgling project: the devolution of legal rights and management functions to local (village) level in order to foster the sustainable management of wildlife by people affected by wildlife. This crucial leap of faith, required from the State and embedded in the origins of the CAMPFIRE programme has not yet been taken. The main reason is that the centralised political and governmental context has not provided an environment in which this devolution could actually take place. CAMPFIRE is therefore at a critical stage in its development and the direction it takes is primarily determined by national Zimbabwean politics and international donor agencies.

5.CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

The world of the late nineties is undergoing structural adjustment of established power and financial linkages. The CAMPFIRE project continues to be of great interest and relevance to a region grappling with environmental degradation, resource access inequalities and poverty. CAMPFIRE has achieved much in promoting wildlife resource utilisation as a complimentary land use strategy on marginal agricultural lands for local people. It has done even more in providing a social, political and economic context in which wildlife resource use can be discussed and debated and decisions implemented. It has gone far in safeguarding species and their habitats by providing economic incentives.

The main contradiction in the CAMPFIRE project concerns the devolution of legal rights to local communities. Districts are generally large units, which are made up of several sub-units called wards and villages. In most CAMPFIRE districts the distribution of wildlife resources are not evenly spread and therefore conflicts arise as to how benefits should be distributed. The District Council is the institution, which has the often impossible job of reconciling these different interests. Evidence from CAMPFIRE itself and other countries indicate that the spatial or geographical definition of communities is not in itself sufficient criteria for guiding implementing authorities. Evidence from Botswana indicates that the notion of geographical communities can actually lead planners astray. Later CAMPFIRE analysis has illustrated that the unit of analysis is much more concerned with the political community, that outcomes are in fact largely determined in this sphere (Hasler 1995,1999).

As the scale of CAMPFIRE has increased, the political dimension of the project has become more important. The transformation into a social movement has challenged the goals upon which the initial project was conceived. The project has adapted to take this transformation into account but still faces a primary challenge: Is it possible to empower local communities with enabling legislation and at the same time retain the support and interest of national and local government and district council authorities? Will the culture of centralised control and administration permit and support this? This is the key evaluative question for CAMPFIRE. The proposed drafting of a new Zimbabwean constitution scheduled for the end of 1999 prior to national elections to be held early in the new millennium should provide some answers. If this constitution centralises and monopolises power there will probably be an attempt to instrumentals and reinvent CAMPFIRE for that purpose. If the constitution puts in place the legal foundation for real devolution of rights over wildlife to local level, CAMPFIRE will be set to achieve the initial goal of the project: community-based natural resource management.

References

Abel N. and P. Blaikie (1986) "Elephants, People, Parks and Development: The case of the Luangwa Valley, Zambia"
Environmental Management, 10/6:735-51.

Adams and McShane (1996) **The Myth of Wild Africa:**
Conservation without Illusion, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Buchan, A.J.(1989) **An Ecological Resource Survey of Chapoto ward, Guruve District with Reference to the Use of Wildlife**. Harare WWF, working paper.

Cumming D.H and T. J.Lynam (1997) **Land Use Changes, Wildlife Conservation and Utilization and the Sustainability of Agro-ecosystems in the Zambezi Valley.** WWF Harare.

Cutshall C.R.(1989) **Masoka/Kanyurira Ward: A Socio-economic Baseline Survey of Community Households**, Centre for Applied Social Science University of Zimbabwe.

Cutshall C.R.(1990) **Kanyemba - Chapoto ward- A Socio-economic Baseline Survey of Community Households**, Centre for Applied Social Science University of Zimbabwe.

ConyBeare (1998) **Assessment of Habitat Maintenance, Diversity and Productivity under Communal Management**, WWF Harare Office.

Kalen C and Tragardh N (1998) **Sustainable Use of Wildlife-A Case Study from the CAMPFIRE Programme in Zimbabwe**, Minor Field Studies No.40 Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, International Office, Uppsala.

Lawry,S (1990) "Tenure Policy towards Common Property Natural Resources in Southern Africa" **Natural Resources Journal,** 30;403-22

Royal Netherlands Embassy Harare(1998) **Combined Review of Strategic Support through Zimtrust to the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous resources (CAMPFIRE) and Institutional Support to CAMPFIRE.** Royal Netherlands Embassy, Harare, Arcadis, Euroconsult.

Hasler (1999) **The Okavango Delta and the End of Progress: Global Transformation and Community Based Wildlife Management,** Paper Presented at Kalahari Transect Workshop, University of Botswana June, 1998.

Hasler (1996) **Agriculture Foraging and Wildlife Resource Use in Africa: Cultural and Political Dynamics in the Zambezi Valley.** London and New York Kegan Paul International and Columbia University Press.

Hasler (1995) **Political Ecologies of Scale: The Multi-Tiered Co-Management of Zimbabwean Wildlife Resources**, International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Hawkes R.K (1995) **The Socio-economic Base of Communities in the NRM Area.** University of Zimbabwe, Centre for Applied Social Science.

Lawry,S (1990) “Tenure Policy towards Common Property Natural Resources in Southern Africa” **Natural Resources Journal,** 30;403-22

Martin (1986) **The Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources.** Zimbabwe Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management)

Murphree M.W. and Cumming D.H.M. (1991) **Savanna Land Use: Policy and Practice in Zimbabwe,** WWF Multi-Species Project, Harare.

Murombedzi J.C (1992) **Decentralization or Recentralization?** Implementing CAMPFIRE in the Omay Communal Lands of the Nyaminyami District, University of Zimbabwe, Centre for Applied Social Science.

Muromebedzi J .C. (1997) **The Implications of the Land Tenure Commission for Rural Land Tenure Systems**, Renewable Resources and Development in Zimbabwe. University of Zimbabwe,Centre for Applied Social Sciences.

Murombedzi J.C. (1998) **Paying the Buffalo Bill: The Implications of External Aid on the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources**, Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe.

Murphree M.W. and Metcalfe S.C (1997) **Conservancy Policy and the CAMPFIRE Programme in Zimbabwe**, Centre for Applied Social Science University of Zimbabwe.

Murphree M.W. (1998) **Congruent Objectives, Competing Interests and Strategic Compromise:** Concept and Process in the Evolution of Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE programme. Paper submitted for publication to Community Conservation in Africa Project, Centre for Applied Social Science University of Zimbabwe and University of Manchester.

Murphree M. W. (1993) **Communities as Resource Management Institutions.** International Institute for Environment and Development, Wildlife and Development Series, London.

Murphree M.W. (1990) **Decentralizing the Proprietorship of Wildlife Resources in Zimbabwe's Communal Lands: An Outline of the Central Issues.** University of Zimbabwe, Centre for Applied Social Science.

Nhira,C (1989**) A Socio-economic Appraisal of the Chapoto ward-Guruve District, University of Zimbabwe: Centre for Applied Social Sciences.**

Patel H. (1998) **Sustainable Utilization and African Wildlife Policy: The case of Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indegenous Resources (CAMPFIRE): Rhetoric of Reality?** Indigenous Environment Policy Centre, Cambridge USA.

Taylor R.D and Mackie (1997) **Aerial Census Results for Elephant and Buffalo in Selected CAMPFIRE areas.** Project paper No 51. WWF Resource Management Support to CAMPFIRE project and WWF Multi-Species Production Systems Project. WWF Harare.

Thomas S.J (1995) **The Legacy of Dualism in Decision Making Within CAMPFIRE.** International Institute for Environment and Development, Wildlife and Development Series, London.

Bond I (1995) **Wildlife and Livestock as Options for Land use in Zimbabwe,** Imntegrating People and Wildlife for a Sustaianble Future (proceedings)

Bond I and Taylor R.D.(1997) **Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Programme, Implementation, Progress and Prospects.** World aid and Joint Venture Finance -1989/99"

USAID (1998) **Mid Term Review of the Zimbabwean Natural Resource Management Project Phase II**, USAID, Harare.

Zimbabwe Wildlife Society(1990) **Zimbabwe Wildlife**, 17th March.