

# The Development-Security Nexus

The Management and Administration of 'Underdeveloped' Populations Within  
Tanzania

Thomas Wright

# Abstract

The increasingly interwoven landscape of development and security (often referred to as the ‘development-security nexus’) has become a salient feature of contemporary international relations. This thesis will investigate what this nexus entails and how it impacts the reality of developmental projects ‘on the ground’. From a theoretical perspective, this thesis will utilize the Foucauldian inspired concepts of biopower and biopolitics to unpack the development-security nexus and to examine its impact on different developmental practices. Following this, frame analysis will be employed to investigate two developmental case studies focusing on ‘the camp’ and ‘the park’ within the Tanzanian context. Specifically, the analysis of each case will be divided into three sections (i) spatial management (ii) management by community (iii) management via contingency (in the case of the camp) and self-management (in the case of the park). Together, both cases demonstrate how developmental practices control and administer ‘underdeveloped’ populations via limiting their spatial movements and statistically (re)producing such populations to better and more efficiently manage them.

**Key words:** security, development, biopower, biopolitics, underdeveloped, populations, contingency, frame analysis

**Word Count:** 18,316

# List of Figures

<i>Table 1.1 Spatialized prohibitions and permissions. ....</i>	<i>52</i>
---	-----------

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose, Aim and Research Question(s).....	2
1.2	Limitations .....	3
1.3	Contextualising the ‘development-security nexus’ .....	3
1.4	Thesis Outline .....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Theory: Involving Biopolitics .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	Introducing Biopower and Biopolitics .....	8
2.2	Biopolitics and ‘the Camp’ .....	17
2.3	Biopolitics and ‘the Park’ .....	22
<b>3</b>	<b>Methods and Material .....</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1	Using Case Studies .....	26
3.2	Case One: Situating ‘the Camp’ Within Tanzania .....	27
3.3	Case Two: Situating ‘the Park’ Within Tanzania.....	28
3.4	A Good Fit?: Motivating the Cases.....	29
3.5	Frame Analysis .....	31
3.6	Empirical Material.....	32
<b>4</b>	<b>Case One: ‘the Camp’ .....</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Spatial Administration.....	36
4.2	Management by Community .....	38
4.3	Management via ‘Contingency’ .....	43
3.2	Case Summary.....	48
<b>5</b>	<b>Case Two: ‘the Park’ .....</b>	<b>49</b>
5.1	Spatial Administration.....	50
5.2	Management by Community .....	55
5.3	Self-Management .....	59

3.2	Case Summary.....	62
<b>7</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Empirical Material .....</b>	<b>73</b>

# 1 Introduction

Within recent decades, the intersections between development and security, or what is referred to as the development-security nexus,<sup>1</sup> has gained a great deal of academic and practitioner attention. Sometimes cited as constituting “two sides of a coin.”<sup>2</sup> Former UN security-General Kofi Annan boldly asserted that development and security are “inextricably linked” and that;

A more secure world is only possible if poor countries are given a real chance to develop. Extreme poverty and infectious diseases threaten many people directly, but they also provide a fertile breeding ground for other threats, including civil conflicts. Even people in rich countries will be more secure if their Governments help poor countries to defeat poverty and disease by meeting the Millennium Development Goals.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, from a policy perspective, the intersections between development and security seem rather obvious. Insofar as development is capable of reducing poverty and general well-being and is thus considered to possess concomitant potential in promoting local and international security.<sup>4</sup> By reducing alienation through the provision of basic individual needs, it would seem to reduce risk of social tension and resulting conflict. Consequently, discernable efforts have been made towards better managing risks and populations; particularly development interventionism within fragile or failed states. This incorporates the pursuit for new policy mechanisms to improve state reach and stability, alongside attempts at delivering basic economic and welfare provisions to the populations involved.<sup>5</sup> Through this lens, development

---

<sup>1</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1)

<sup>2</sup> Beall J and Goodfellow T (2006) Introductory article: On the discourse of terrorism, security and development. *Journal of International Development* 18(1), p.52

<sup>3</sup> United Nations, (2004) A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. New York: United Nations, p.vii

<sup>4</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.57

<sup>5</sup> Leader, N., & Colenso, P. (2005). *Aid instruments in fragile states* (No. 668-2016-45530), pp.16-8

is assumed to be some kind of ‘enlightened self-interest’, whereby effective states have a moral imperative to protect and better the conditions of life within ineffective states; a process which also so happens to consolidate international security.<sup>6</sup>

## 1.1 Purpose, Aim and Research Question(s)

While many would be drawn to the humanitarian impulse within human security discourse as anathema to emergent patterns of world order, I instead argue that, by rendering life in biopolitical terms, security discourse in fact produces fertile ground upon which the process of sovereign power can lay claim to the entire world as its field of operation.<sup>7</sup> Simply put, developmental practices institutionalize the management of populations world-over in the pursuit of security. In this thesis I will attempt to travel along the intersections between biopower, sovereign power and human security discourses, exploring these phenomena within the context of international development projects. Central to this discussion is the question of:

- *How is the development-security nexus expressed in the management and administration of ‘underdeveloped’ populations?*

Such ‘developmental practices’, however, are extremely complex and varied. Thus, in an attempt at better understanding the intricacies and nuances involved within such developmental practices, the specific cases of ‘the camp’ and ‘the park’ will be explored within the Tanzanian setting. In this context, the camp refers to refugee camps as sites through which populations become objects of biopolitical scrutiny and spatial management. In turn, the park denotes spaces of wildlife conservation, particularly the establishment of so-called Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) within Tanzania. Similarly, the park will be explored in an attempt at fleshing the complexities in which underdeveloped populations become the object of spatial and biopolitical administration within ‘sustainable development’ practices.

---

<sup>6</sup> Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples*. Polity, p.2

<sup>7</sup> De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.534

Already alluded to within this introductory section, Foucauldian inspired concepts of biopower and biopolitics will be carefully employed as a lens through which to explore questions of security-development. Biopolitics, at its most basic, referring to the “subjugation of bodies and . . . control of populations.”<sup>8</sup> Indeed, by having the health and welfare of populations as its primary referent, the development-security nexus casts the problematique of (in)security in stark biopolitical terms.<sup>9</sup> The subsequent study delving into the particulars of ‘the camp’ and ‘the park’ within the Tanzanian context will then draw upon frame-analysis as a methodological anchor. The ways in which a particular problem is defined or *framed* is critical for it dispenses responsibility and (re)produces rationales that authorize and filter some policy solutions and not others.<sup>10</sup> So then, the following analysis will explore the ways in which both cases of the camp and the park (or Wildlife Management Areas) within Tanzania are *framed* in biopolitical terms and subsequently the avenues of action both opened and closed through this process of biopolitical framing. As such, two sub-questions are as follows;

- *In what ways do ‘the park’ and ‘the camp’ within Tanzania present sites of spatial and biological management of underdeveloped populations?*
- *How are underdeveloped populations within Tanzania **framed** biopolitically?*

## 1.2 Limitations

Before moving onto the outline of this thesis, perhaps a clarifying is necessary. The aims of this thesis is to navigate the ways in which international actors engage underdeveloped populations within the field of development, and the biopolitical nature of this engagement. So then, whilst this thesis recognizes the undeniable importance and involvement of local authorities (in this case, the Tanzanian government), likely acting in both antagonistic and mutually exclusive ways, the role of such authorities will not be dwelt on in any depth within this study.

---

<sup>8</sup> Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. Vintage, p.93

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p.534

<sup>10</sup> Coburn, C. E. (2006). Framing the problem of reading instruction: Using frame analysis to uncover the microprocesses of policy implementation. *American educational research journal*, 43(3), p.344



## 1.3 Contextualising the ‘Development-Security Nexus’

Apparent to some, perhaps, contemporary development-security dynamics intersect with the expanding scope of human security quite profoundly. The field of security studies has progressed beyond its traditional focal: the “threat, use and control of military force” primarily operated by states.<sup>11</sup> Originating from such a concerted core, the subject matter of security studies has experienced both a broadening and a deepening of scope.<sup>12</sup> Broadening refers to the consideration of non-military security threats including mass refugee movements, nationalism, terrorism, environmental ruin, disease proliferation, overpopulation and resource scarcity.<sup>13</sup> The deepening of security studies refers to the increased consideration of individuals and communities beyond the traditionally limited attention on external threats to the state. This wider conception of security as *human* security, involving biopolitical processes of development, appears to become simply a natural extension of contemporary security matters. Indeed, policy discourse associated with human development and human security underwrite a biopolitical vision of development and underdevelopment, insofar as it’s concerned with how life itself is actually sustained and promoted, the conditions for community existence and the parameters within which people are expected to live.<sup>14</sup>

Whilst not overstating the novelty of such processes, globalization has certainly intensified and accentuated the risks inherent within populations and the fluidity of spatial relations. Logics which underwrite processes of security-development: altogether “deepened, broadened, humanized and cyclical” are also embedded within an ontology of globalization –one that no longer relies on ‘methodological territorialization’.<sup>15</sup> Held et al perceives globalization as a:

---

<sup>11</sup> Walt Stephen M, (1991) “The Renaissance of Security Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.35, No.1, p.212

<sup>12</sup> Paris, R. (2001). Human security: paradigm shift or hot air? *International security*, 26(2), p.97

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*, p.97

<sup>14</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.64

<sup>15</sup> Stern, M., & Öjendal, J. (2010). Mapping the security—development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence?. *Security Dialogue*, 41(1), p.20

process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions—assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact— generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power.<sup>16</sup>

Further, Held et al elucidate that ‘flows’ denotes the migratory patterns “of physical artefacts, people, symbols, tokens and information across space and time,” whereas ‘networks’ articulates the “regularized or patterned interactions between independent agents, nodes of activity, or sites of power.”<sup>17</sup> These processes are best conceived as fragmented and irregular rather than static and linear. This demands the rephrasing of returning questions regarding the organization and experience of political, cultural, social and individual life, in addition to the structures and institutions created to govern society and interact with the natural world.<sup>18</sup> In short, this encapsulates an empirical reading of the world in which social categories are blurred. The development-security nexus acts as a vector for representing the interconnected and mutually constitutive human global survival concerns, whether that be food security, climate change, natural disasters, global energy and water crisis, risk and threat associated with terrorism.<sup>19</sup> Uncertainty and contingency –both factors inherent within questions of contemporary security- become central within global developmental practices.

Situated within the broader strokes of human security discourse and globalization processes, Foucault’s reading of security is particularly useful. Foucault details security as a sequence of political rationalities and technologies with the objective of policing circulation in an attempt to manage contingency.<sup>20</sup> Today, unfettered circulation and contingency has emerged as the primary architect of insecurity. Former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair stresses that;

---

<sup>16</sup> Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). Global transformations. *ReVision*, 22(2), p.16

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, p.16

<sup>18</sup> Stern, M., & Öjendal, J. (2010). Mapping the security—development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence?. *Security Dialogue*, 41(1), p.20

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, pp.20-1

<sup>20</sup> De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.524

Today the threat is chaos, because for people with work to do, family life to balance, mortgages to pay, careers to further, pensions to provide, the yearning is for order and stability and if it doesn't exist elsewhere, it is unlikely to exist here. I have long believed this interdependence defines the new world we live in.<sup>21</sup>

Certainly, the obsolescence of the walled city is somewhat metaphorical of broader shifts in human security and processes of globalization, insofar as it has become superfluous in the face of economic development and the intensification of transnational 'flows' and 'networks' throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Accordingly, nowadays, the insecurity of cities stems from the "influx of the floating population of beggars, vagrants, delinquents, criminals, thieves, murderers, and so on."<sup>22</sup> In response to shifting patterns of insecurity, techniques of security thus aim towards "organizing circulation, eliminating its dangerous elements, making a division between good and bad circulation and maximizing the good circulation by diminishing the bad."<sup>23</sup> Here, security mechanisms do not aim for complete surety and mastery, but rather an average optimality, or a "bandwidth of the acceptable."<sup>24</sup> Elimination of insecurity is neither a possibility nor an aim. From this Foucauldian security perspective, development practices, such as the refugee camp, are intimately entwined within 'organizing' processes aimed at untying 'good and bad circulation' (in the case of the camp, the circulation of populations).

## 1.4 Thesis Outline

This thesis will be structured into five following chapters. Initially, I will explore the theoretical undercurrents of the security-development nexus in tandem with efforts towards navigating the theoretical terrain surrounding concepts of biopower and biopolitics and their intersectionality with developmental practices (such as the camp and the park). In the second chapter I will then lay out the methodological parameters of this thesis. This will involve a detailing of the specifics of the park and camp within Tanzania as case studies and their utility in complimenting this thesis's broader theoretical inquiry. This section also involves further

---

<sup>21</sup> Blair, T., (2001). 'This is the Battle with Only One Outcome: Our Victory', *Guardian*, 3 October, pp. 4–5.

<sup>22</sup> Foucault, Michel, (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*, trans. Graham Burchell. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, p.18

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid*, p.18

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid*, p.6

justification and exploration as to why frame-analysis is particularly appropriate for the aims of this study. Moreover, this section introduces the specific policy documents which will be analyzed within each case. Following on, the third and fourth chapters will each involve the analytical reviews into the cases of the camp and the park, respectively. These chapters will each provide an introduction into the historical context of the respective case before delving into the developmental specifics and biopolitical micro-practices within each practice. Finally, in the concluding chapter, I will attempt to tether the findings from both cases, examining both the similar and multi-directional ways in which developmental practices manifest in pursuit of securing underdeveloped populations.

## 2 Theory: Involving Biopolitics

If the containment of informal migration shapes the new spatial order of the development–security nexus, at least in comparison with the Cold War, the object of international security has also changed.<sup>25</sup>

Within the context of globalization processes and the salience of human security discourse, the proliferation of developmental projects and the relaxing of restrictions on UN interventionism within national disputes, the object of international security has transferred from states to the populations within them. Accordingly, the following chapter will explore this shifting emphasis towards biopolitical aspects of governance and the expanding scope of biopolitical techniques and considerations which have become intimately entangled within processes of development-as-security. To begin this chapter, I will flesh out concepts of biopower and biopolitics before attempting to draw-out the intersections between such concepts and developmental practices. Specifically, these intersections will be explored in relation to developmental practices of the camp and the park.

### 2.1 Introducing Biopolitics

In order to adequately capture the nature and complexities of the present development-security nexus, I will firstly attempt to reconceive development and underdevelopment biopolitically.<sup>26</sup> Primarily, this involves teasing out the ways in which aid policy itself is now attentive

---

<sup>25</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.63

<sup>26</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.55

towards the issues of life and community; the ways in which it can be sustained, preserved and improved and assessing the limits and level of need individuals are necessitated to live. For instance, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) released its annual *Human Development Report* in 1990, which was committed to “ending the mismeasure of human progress by economic growth alone.”<sup>27</sup> Thus, mirroring formal changes within security towards human security, human development denotes a transference from earlier economic approaches towards a ‘people-centered’ practice.<sup>28</sup>

By the 1970s, some academics were already been directing our attention towards such shifts in emphasis and were articulating dynamics which, nowadays, are perhaps well on their way to being accepted as common-place. For instance, Foucault famously cited the now well-rehearsed fact that *life* itself has become the beating heart of contemporary political and economic struggles.<sup>29</sup> Similarly, Hannah Arendt observed the processes whereby biological life has gradually come to assume residence at the very center of the political scenes of modernity and can be seen as an increasingly central concern of the state.<sup>30</sup>

So then, what exactly is biopower? In essence, biopower involves the “subjugation of bodies and ... control of populations.”<sup>31</sup> It is a form of power which defuses and disseminates through society as an effective mechanism in power relations to normalize social acts and the conduct of populations.<sup>32</sup> From this perspective, the power of authorities proliferates and increasingly permeates the depths of the social by inhabiting a broadening array of social fields in attempts at better managing and administrating the life of the population.<sup>33</sup> Rather than focusing on the individual, biopolitics intervenes at the aggregate level.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], (1996) *Human Development Report 1996*. New York: UNDP, p.iii

<sup>28</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.55

<sup>29</sup> Lazzarato, M. (2002). From biopower to biopolitics. *Pli: The Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, 13(8), p.99

<sup>30</sup> Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.

<sup>31</sup> Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. Vintage, p.93

<sup>32</sup> De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.520

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid*, p.520

<sup>34</sup> Duffield, M. (2006). Racism, migration and development: the foundations of planetary order. *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(1), p.69

Besides having the aggregate population as its referent, the mechanisms and strategies of biopower additionally vary from alternate technologies of power insofar as they aim at improving life. Biopower can be viewed as a field of interventions enacted upon the central features of human life; living beings who are born and raised with cerebral capacities and within a body, both of which can be trained and enhanced before sickening and eventually dying.<sup>35</sup> Biopolitics thus encapsulates the myriad of particularized strategies and technologies employed within arenas of “collective human vitality, morbidity and mortality” and within forms of knowledge, regimes of authority and practices of intervention that are deemed legitimate, advantageous and effective.<sup>36</sup> So then, biopower is ultimately concerned with “the power to make live” whereas sovereign power employs “the right to kill.”<sup>37</sup> Worded differently, biopower involves the “administration and production of life, rather than threatening death” infusing questions of security, territory, population.<sup>38</sup> However, because this concern for life is directed at the aggregate population, the aim is not to secure individual life but to maintain the equilibrium of a non-sustainable population by compensating for differences or ameliorating risk.<sup>39</sup>

Biopolitical systems of classification and calculation (e.g., statistics on birth and death rates) allow human life to be understood and administered at the aggregate scale of the population (man as species), but at the same time, such systems assist in (re)producing norms which mobilizes human subjects to discipline their own behavior.<sup>40</sup> In particular, the production of scientific knowledge has become an important animated feature within the administration of life as species, and within effective disciplinary society. Governing life involves the “construction of certain truths and their circulation via ... techniques, methods, discourses and practices that extend beyond the state and stretch across the social body.”<sup>41</sup> Here, the emergence of public health, demography and the ‘social sciences’ now constitute quintessential

---

<sup>35</sup> Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2006). Biopower today. *BioSocieties*, 1(2), p.199

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, p.199

<sup>37</sup> Foucault, Michel (2003) *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–1976*, trans. David Macey. New York: Picador, pp.240-50

<sup>38</sup> Dillon, M. and J. Reid, 2001, ‘Global liberal governance: Biopolitics security and war’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1, p.41

<sup>39</sup> Duffield, M. (2006). Racism, migration and development: the foundations of planetary order. *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(1), p.69

<sup>40</sup> Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and society*, 19(1), 1-31.

<sup>41</sup> Rutherford, S. (2007). Green governmentality: insights and opportunities in the study of nature's rule. *Progress in human geography*, 31(3), p.293

examples, primarily concerned with the quality of populations and prospects for their improvement.<sup>42</sup> From this perspective, it becomes clear that each of these disciplines are not merely descriptive, but rather they actively (re)produce normative visions for how both individuals and populations *should* behave. It has become well documented that development, both discursively and in practice, operates within particularized Eurocentric logics and western fields of power.<sup>43</sup> Along similar lines, Post-development theory essentially views discourse on development as an articulation of “First World knowledge and power within the Third World.”<sup>44</sup> That is, development is considered an important discourse of power, whereby “discourses of development help shape the reality they pertain to address, and how alternative conceptions of the problem have been marked off as irrelevant.”<sup>45</sup> Moreover, post-development scrutinizes the construction of the non-western world (global south/third world) in relation to its western counterpart; disciplined and naturalized through processes of othering whereby development colonizes the world ‘by ordering it into ‘us’ and ‘them’, ‘the developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’.’<sup>46</sup>

Moving forward, how then, is biopower to be historically situated? Moreover, does biopower represent a novel expression of power? Using Foucault as a starting point, he writes that;

For millennia, man remained what he was for Aristotle: a living animal with the additional capacity for political existence; modern man is an animal whose politics calls his existence as a living being into question.<sup>47</sup>

Indeed, for Foucault, the “introduction of life into history” corresponds with the ascendancy of capitalism, whereby, from the 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards in Europe, the modes of power and knowledge begin to account for the “processes of life” and the possibility of governing and

---

<sup>42</sup> Cavanagh, C. J. (2018). Political ecologies of biopower: diversity, debates, and new frontiers of inquiry. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1), p.405

<sup>43</sup> For instance of such works, view: Crush, Jonathan. (1995). *Power of development*. Psychology Press; Said, E. W. (1985). Orientalism reconsidered. *Race & class*, 27(2), 1-15; and Escobar, A. (1995). Imagining a post-development era. *Power of development*, 211-227.

<sup>44</sup> Peet, Richard. (1997) In “Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity”, (eds.) George Benko and Ulf Strohmayer. Oxford: Blackwell, p.75

<sup>45</sup> Nustad knut (2004). “The Development Discourse in the Multilateral System.” Pp. 13–23 in Bøås and McNeill 2004, p.13

<sup>46</sup> Nustad, Knut G.(1998) “Community Leadership and Development Administration in a Durban Squatter Settlement.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge, p.42

<sup>47</sup> Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. Vintage, p.188



modifying them.<sup>48</sup> Following this, it is perhaps tempting to frame biopower as the modern successor to traditional modes of power. This notion, however, flattens nuances within biopower and the fact that it often intersects and compliments rather than supplants ‘former’ power structures.

We need to see things not in terms of the replacement of a society of sovereignty by a disciplinary society and the subsequent replacement of a disciplinary society by a society of government; in reality one has a triangle, sovereignty-discipline-government, which has as its primary target the population and its essential mechanism the apparatuses of security.<sup>49</sup>

The ‘shifts’ in the nature of power are “at most shifts in emphasis” instead of “linear transitions.”<sup>50</sup> Thus, contemporary analysis of power relations within international development necessitate a focus on the ways in which sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower intersect and complement one another at both the individual level and at the level of the aggregate population.<sup>51</sup> Foucault accentuates a view of power which is not universal - applicable to everything across space and time – but instead involves various expressions which are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but instead coexist in both mutually supportive and antagonistic ways.<sup>52</sup>

Following this, perhaps the most striking intersections between sovereign and bio modes of power are rendered visible by sovereign mechanisms of boundary (re)production and the introduction of ‘new’ or ‘coded’ racism into biopolitical considerations. Racism allows biopower to discriminate between sectors of the population – and indeed, human life more broadly.<sup>53</sup> Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in what was to become the developed world, the solution to the problem of surplus life embraced population-wide welfare regimes involving

---

<sup>48</sup> Lazzarato, M. (2002). From biopower to biopolitics. *Pli: The Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, 13(8), p.99

<sup>49</sup> Foucault, M., 1991, ‘Governmentality’, in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller, eds, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, p.102

<sup>50</sup> Schlosser, K., 2008, ‘Bio-political geographies’, *Geography Compass*, Vol. 2, No. 5, p.1624

<sup>51</sup> Cavanagh, C. J. (2014). Biopolitics, environmental change, and development studies. In *Forum for Development Studies* (Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 273-294). Routledge, p.279

<sup>52</sup> Dillion Michael in; Larner, W., & Walters, W. (Eds.). (2004). *Global governmentality: governing international spaces*. Routledge.

<sup>53</sup> Kelly, M. (2004). Racism, Nationalism and Biopolitics: Foucault’s Society Must Be Defended, p.62

social insurance as a foundational principle. Thus, the celebration of life becomes critical for so-called developed societies, whereby politicians stake immense investments and commitments towards the insurance, protection and promotion of life. Within this context, racism becomes a means through which the state can both permit and author death.<sup>54</sup> Racism becomes a mechanism through which populations are filtered, allowing particular classes of life to be omitted - thus facilitating their death both literally and figuratively, through various processes of social control (for instance, carefully censored migration) – in pursuit of the betterment and strengthening of society as a whole. Hence, the conditionality of biopolitical considerations expresses itself within dialectic processes of both promoting life through various technologies of development and human security, and permitting death when the aggregate population is threatened by insecurity in the face of ‘bad’ global circulations. Duffield neatly captures this biopolitical paradox within the case of New Labour: a government which both invested heavily within education, health and international development, whilst also overseeing an erosion of domestic civil liberties, rights to asylum and international restraint unprecedented outside total war.<sup>55</sup>

So, as demonstrated, liberalism both as forms of governance and power is deeply embedded within processes involving the production and administration of life, rather than simply exercising a monopoly over the threat of death and violence.<sup>56</sup> For liberalism, people - their very life and freedoms- become its central referent.<sup>57</sup> As such, liberalism is considered a technology of government involving specific designs or means of strategizing power.<sup>58</sup> However, whilst biopower is arguably a ‘necessary condition of liberalism’, liberalism and biopower are not necessarily interchangeable.<sup>59</sup> Liberalism constitutes but one manifestation of biopower in practice (biopolitics). Moreover, liberalism shelters interesting power structures within which “sovereign power remains, and indeed circulates, within biopower.”<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Foucault, M. (1980). Two Lectures Lecture One: 7 January 1976, pp.137-8

<sup>55</sup> Duffield, M. (2006). Racism, migration and development: the foundations of planetary order. *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(1), p.78

<sup>56</sup> Dillon, M., & Reid, J. (2001). Global liberal governance: Biopolitics, security and war. *Millennium*, 30(1), p.41

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, p.5

<sup>58</sup> Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples*. Polity, p.5

<sup>59</sup> Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage publications, p.113

<sup>60</sup> De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.520

Even as the geopolitics of border control remains a central mechanism of spatial ordering, new sovereign frontiers and biopolitical operations have unlocked within liberal mass-consumer societies and the global borderlands. With a past embedded within processes of decolonization, a global security framework has arisen which now operates across the collapsed national/international, or inside/outside duality.<sup>61</sup> The struggle against potential threats internal to liberal society and the tactics employed against external networks or the ungoverned spaces of the global borderland now operate within the same strategic terrain.<sup>62</sup> The barefaced geopolitical violence exhibited within the preliminary stages of the ‘War on Terror’ has now given way to an “unending war that, rather than extermination, privileges the biopolitical management and regulation of life within its appropriate social habitat.”<sup>63</sup>

Intersections between biopower and liberalism have become somewhat well-documented within the context of ‘advanced liberal democracies.’<sup>64</sup> However, the further afield you travel from this western geographic center, the thinner and less frequent research becomes. The nature and varied ramifications of this biopolitical dynamic between states, territories and populations is thus studied to a much lesser extent within international and developmental arenas.<sup>65</sup> In part, this deficit relegates the importance of global liberal governance, as vast plural and complex undertaking which involves a “considerable strengthening and expansion of liberal modes of power across the globe.”<sup>66</sup> Whereas once, liberal internationalism sought after an ideal form of world government, nowadays global liberal governance “pursues the administration of life and the management of populations through the deployment of biopolitical techniques of power.”<sup>67</sup> And so, inquiry into the biopolitical structures within the ‘global south’ becomes an important undertaking. Since the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the very methods of *how* communities and populations are acted upon in the promotion and securitizing of collective life has (re)produced and deepened

---

<sup>61</sup> Bigo, D. (2001). Migration and security. *Controlling a new migration world*, 4, 121.

<sup>62</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.69

<sup>63</sup> Ibid, p.69

<sup>64</sup> Examples of seminal work in this area include: Rose, N. (1993). Government, authority and expertise in advanced liberalism. *Economy and society*, 22(3), 283-299 and; Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (1991). The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality

<sup>65</sup> Jahn, Beate, 2005. ‘Barbarian Thoughts: Imperialism in the Philosophy of John Stuart Mill’, Review of *International Studies* 31(3): 599–618.

<sup>66</sup> Dillon, M., & Reid, J. (2001). Global liberal governance: Biopolitics, security and war. *Millennium*, 30(1), p.41

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, p.42

a biopolitical distinction between ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’ species-life.<sup>68</sup> This distinction has subsequently become a salient feature within racial discourse, global insurgency and relentless war.

Examining development through this lens, as a liberal problematic of security, requires emphasis on the ways in which political economy has defined the object of development. According to Cowen and Shenton, development surfaced alongside the unstable rise and chaotic proliferation of industrial capitalism.<sup>69</sup> Indeed, within the work of Malthus, development provides a remedy for the inevitable disorder created within the wake of industrial and capitalist progress: the disruption and redundancy of traditional trades and occupations, mass unemployment and pauperism, the erosion of former class systems and responsibilities.<sup>70</sup> Conversely, progress also produced undeniable social improvements and new opportunities. Consequently, for liberalism, the catch with capitalism is rooted in the fact that the redundant and marginalized communities were in excess of those who could gain from capitalism and thus, progress. As such, the relentless quest for progress (re)produces a constant surplus population, that is to say, a population whose skills, status and even very existence is in excess of prevailing conditions and requirements.<sup>71</sup> Essentially, a problematic and transitory ‘surplus’ population (often referred to in development as an underdeveloped population) was created which required immediate attention, not merely for the sake of the population itself, but also for the security and stability of wider society. Within the contemporary international system, Bauman refers to this phenomenon as ‘waste-life’.<sup>72</sup> Whereby latter stages of modernity have transformed society from one of producers to “a society of consumers, and accordingly from a society guided by the work ethic to one ruled by the aesthetic of consumerism.”<sup>73</sup> Within this new climate, mass-production does not necessitate mass labor and thus the poorer populations become obsolete from a societal perspective, re-cast as flawed consumers. Stripped of societal worth, poor and underdeveloped (surplus) populations become redundant and potentially dangerous, thus requiring management both domestically and, globally.

---

<sup>68</sup> Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples*. Polity, p.5

<sup>69</sup> Cowen, M. P. and Shenton, R. W (1996). *Doctrines of Development*, London: Routledge

<sup>70</sup> Malthus, T. R. (1872). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*.

<sup>71</sup> Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples*. Polity, p.9

<sup>72</sup> Bauman, Z. (2004). *Work, consumerism and the new poor*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK), p.3

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid*, p.3

Within a global setting development has emerged and been preserved to this day as an international “practice to deal with surplus population.”<sup>74</sup> Development provides a kind of mentoring system over an otherwise redundant and risk-hazard population which requires assistance in adapting in accordance to the potential that modernity and progress creates. By safeguarding this transition, development as a security mechanism is charged with reconciling ‘the moral, intellectual and material qualities of progress with social order.’<sup>75</sup> As such, development exists as a global-liberal biopolitical alternative (or at least compliment) to modernity’s more traditional judicial-sovereign power answers to the problem of surplus life: violence (conflict), eugenics, or death (war).

So then, returning to the opening quotation used at the very beginning of this thesis’ introductory chapter, strong biopolitical nuances can be spotted within the links established by Former UN security-General Kofi Annan, between that of security and development:

Development and security are inextricably linked. A more secure world is only possible if poor countries are given a real chance to develop. Extreme poverty and infectious diseases threaten many people directly, but they also provide a fertile breeding ground for other threats, including civil conflicts. Even people in rich countries will be more secure if their Governments help poor countries to defeat poverty and disease by meeting the Millennium Development Goals.<sup>76</sup>

Here, security and development are implied to be known and knowable processes or states of being which intersect.<sup>77</sup> What is inferred by security and development, although not overt, is shaped through the ways in which they are employed throughout the text. The call for giving poor countries “a real chance to develop” is realized as the only viable method of extruding themselves from current states of insecurity. Moreover, the sentence which begins “extreme poverty [...]” clearly alludes to the deepening, broadening and humanizing of security discourse and is underwritten by biopolitical notions of human insecurity as being symptomatic

---

<sup>74</sup> Cowen, M. P. and Shenton, R. W (1996). *Doctrines of Development*, London: Routledge, p.xi

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid*, 27

<sup>76</sup> United Nations, (2004) *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, Report of the Secretary-General’s High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. New York: United Nations, p.vii

<sup>77</sup> Stern, M., & Öjendal, J. (2010). Mapping the security—development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence?. *Security Dialogue*, 41(1), p.22

of underdevelopment.<sup>78</sup> Mitigating threats or ‘bad’ circulation becomes a primary concern of development governance, whereby the implied control of populations aims at discerning and sustaining life that is desirable whilst ensuring that the circulation of threats (such as unfettered migration) never reaches the “rich countries” or rather, “[less] fertile breeding grounds” for insecurity. And so, *even [western] people* become increasingly secure through developmental practices.

## 2.2 Biopolitics and ‘the camp’

One fundamental difference separating past iterations of the development-security nexus from its present manifestation, is the global containment of informal or undocumented migration. Nowadays, informal migration represents a contingency which needs to be secured. That is to say, the ability of the world’s poor and marginalized to circulate has become subject to extensive limitation.<sup>79</sup> The global containment of informal circulation is the backdrop, time and again accepted tacitly, against which current development-security operates.<sup>80</sup> Within this narrative, the refugee camp plays a central role.

By design, refugee camps are meant to ensure spaces of security for individuals and populations who are at their most vulnerable; existing with the explicit purpose of ensuring the survival of those in greatest need.<sup>81</sup> Certainly, the Sphere Project states that:

Shelter is a critical determinant for survival in the initial stages of a disaster. Beyond survival, shelter is necessary to provide security, personal safety and protection from the climate and to promote resistance to ill health and disease. It is also important for human

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, p.23

<sup>79</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life–chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.62

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, p.63

<sup>81</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.63

dignity, to sustain family and community life and to enable affected populations to recover from the impact of disaster.<sup>82</sup>

Ironically, these spaces of security are needed precisely because refugees are themselves victims of the spatial organization of modern nation-states.<sup>83</sup> Refugees are thus the unfortunate human surplus, threatening the “national order of things” by being “matter out of place.”<sup>84</sup> As Arendt suggests, refugees are individuals who have been stripped of the right to have rights; situated within a non-space between clear-cut sovereignties.<sup>85</sup> However, following the Foucauldian logic that ‘the insane’ is a necessary other in constructing ‘the sane’, refugees are similarly constructed as a necessary other by the nation-state.<sup>86</sup>

Developing on Foucault’s reading, Giorgio Agamben further accentuates the blurring sites between sovereign and biopower. Citing what has now become well-rehearsed, Agamben expresses his understanding of sovereign power through the character of *homo sacer*, or sacred man.<sup>87</sup> According to Agamben, *homo sacer* stands for life which can be killed without this act of killing being either murder or sacrifice. The starkest instance of *homo sacer* being the death camp whereby life is completely stripped of any political standing and is subjected to death at the whim of authorities without ceremony.<sup>88</sup> Throughout his writing, however, Foucault never dwelt on the reality of the camp within modernity.<sup>89</sup> This is somewhat curious, for the camp arguably presents one of, if not the ‘purest’ incarnation of biopolitics in action in the modern world. Setting aside the starker dimensions of Agamben’s reading, this thesis will draw upon his work in an attempt at theorizing the refugee camp as a site of intersection between sovereign and bio modes of power.

---

<sup>82</sup> Sphere Project (2011) Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, 3rd edn. Northampton: Practical Action Publishing, p.244

<sup>83</sup> Stepputat F, (1994) ‘Repatriation and the politics of space: the case of the Mayn diaspora and return movement’ *Journal of RefugeeStudies* 7, 2-3

<sup>84</sup> Malkki, L. H. (1995). Refugees and exile: From "refugee studies" to the national order of things. *Annual review of anthropology*, 24(1), p.495

<sup>85</sup> Arendt, H. (1973). *The origins of totalitarianism* (Vol. 244). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, pp.297-8

<sup>86</sup> Soguk, N. (1999). *States and strangers: Refugees and displacements of statecraft* (Vol. 11). U of Minnesota Press.

<sup>87</sup> De Larrinaga, M., Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of humansecurity. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.521

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid*, p.521

<sup>89</sup> Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press, p.10

Agamben has become particularly instrumental within attempts at theorizing the spatialization of exception; through his understanding of the camp, bare-life and the state of exception. Indeed, it can be said that researching spaces of exception today inevitably leads, in some capacity, towards an engagement with Agamben's legacy.<sup>90</sup> The formation of the camp, according to Agamben, is an event in which the political spaces of modernity are made concrete:

inasmuch as its inhabitants have been stripped of any political status and reduced completely to bare life, the camp is also the most absolute biopolitical space that has ever been realized – a space in which power confronts nothing other than pure biological life without any mediation.<sup>91</sup>

Thus, the camp becomes a site where the *state of exception* is translated into a *space of exception*. What is at stake within the camp is not death or justice, but instead the (volatile) demarcation of the threshold between life and death. Sovereign power, therefore, in the state of exception, requires the physicality of the camp as a “material and mappable space” whereby the state of exception and the normal situation remain isolated in both space and time meaning “both remain opaque, though they secretly institute each other.”<sup>92</sup>

Within the camp, the *external* and the *internal* are not formulated in an attempt to expunge the ‘outside’ but rather to (re)produce it “*as the serial spacing of the exception*, forever inscribing exclusion through inclusion.”<sup>93</sup> The birth of sovereignty is thus situated within a state of exception, the ban: the abandonment of human beings to a state of bare-life, stripped of their political rights.<sup>94</sup> The threshold of apathy between inclusion and exclusion, between internal and external is (re)produced and left to the discretion of sovereign decision-making:

sovereign power is (consists of) this very impossibility of distinguishing between outside and inside, nature and exception, *physis* and *nomos*. The state of exception is thus not so much a spatio-temporal suspension as a complex

---

<sup>90</sup> Among others, see Hanafi and Long (2010); Hyndman and Mountz (2007); Orford (2007) and; Perera (2002)

<sup>91</sup> Agamben, G. (2000). *Means without end: Notes on politics* (Vol. 20). U of Minnesota Press, p.40

<sup>92</sup> Minca, C. (2005). The return of the camp. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(4), p.407

<sup>93</sup> Gregory, D. (2004). The angel of Iraq, p.258

<sup>94</sup> Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press, p.29



topological figure in which not only the exception and the rule [norm] but also the state of nature and law, outside and inside, pass through one another.<sup>95</sup>

So then, the space of exception becomes a troubling intersection between broader (re)constructions of the norm and the individual, between geography and biography.<sup>96</sup> Such a reading of the figure of the refugee is permeated with biopolitical considerations of the liberal state. In addition, the logics surrounding the governance of refugee have slowly reoriented from what can be considered traditional disciplinary mechanisms towards the use of modern advanced liberal tactics.<sup>97</sup> One tactic increasingly employed within the management and (re)production of the camp is a “particular and highly instrumentalized” account of community.<sup>98</sup> Citing this as a liberal project is accurate owing to its attempts at “governing through encouraging the autonomous existence and self-regulation of populations.”<sup>99</sup> Refugee camps are consequently embedded within broader technologies of ‘global liberal governance’ which utilize security as a method of (re)creating and regulating political subjects.

It is important to note, however, that the apparent necessity of citing Agamben within the context of the refugee camp has been subject to criticism. The increase in the currency of Agambenian political thought has, Nicholas de Genova claims, “entailed a certain inflation and consequent devaluation.”<sup>100</sup> In part, this devaluation is accredited to Agambenian exceptionalism which silences the idiosyncratic and varied spatialities of uneven migration and the various sociopolitical forces involved within the production of the camp across the world. This simply results in the replication rather than contestation of orientalist mappings.<sup>101</sup> Additionally, an Agambenian narrative is constituted by “a rather one sided and flattened conception of the migrant subjects” whereby, “things are always done to them, not by

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, p.37

<sup>96</sup> Minca, C. (2005). The return of the camp. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(4), p.408

<sup>97</sup> Lippert, R. (1999). Governing refugees: The relevance of governmentality to understanding the international refugee regime. *Alternatives*, 24(3), pp.308-14

<sup>98</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.64

<sup>99</sup> Dillon, M., & Reid, J. (2001). Global liberal governance: Biopolitics, security and war. *Millennium*, 30(1), p.47

<sup>100</sup> De Genova, N. Nathalie Peutz, eds. 2010. The deportation regime: Sovereignty, space, and the freedom of movement, p.37

<sup>101</sup> Nyers, P., & Rygiel, K. (2012). *Citizenship, migrant activism and the politics of movement*. Routledge, p.808

them.”<sup>102</sup> Agamben, as such, is charged on two accounts of depoliticization, firstly upon his depoliticization of the camp (expunging sociopolitical struggles contained within) and secondly, his depoliticization of the refugee (rendered simply a passive recipient). However, as Huysmans suggests, one can draw from Agamben’s reading without necessarily subscribing to its starker and more essentialist dimensions.<sup>103</sup>

Yet, Agamben’s reading of the relationship between sovereign power and biopower brings to the fore an element of analysis which has been neglected by Foucauldian biopolitical thought. In that, through his articulation of *bare-life*, Agamben allows us to reintroduce the interconnections between the institution of the juridico-political order and biopower. Life through the lens of human security is understood primarily in terms of providing for the basic sustenance of day-to-day life. Nowadays, this facilitates an opening towards mapping global order in a manner that appropriaes this bare-life in relation to zones of exceptionality amenable to the logic of an exercise of sovereign power.<sup>104</sup> Today, this is evidenced through the way in which development objectives tend to more readily submit more directly to the dictates of the management of global order. So,

instead of targeting populations that are most insecure as measured by the human security discourse and viewing the provision of security to those populations as an end in itself, the targeting is now overridden by the hard security concerns of homelands and ends understood increasingly in terms of the aims of the security of the global north.<sup>105</sup>

And whilst human security discourse could always be read critically in that it prioritizes its responses to populations that are threatened in relation to servicing the maintenance of global order, the transition here can be understood as one where this servicing reveals a much more intimate relation between sovereign power, biopolitics and the maintenance of post 9/11 order. This relation being the way in which the human security discourse prepares conceptually, a

---

<sup>102</sup> Walters, W. (2008). Acts of demonstration: mapping the territory of (non-) citizenship. *Acts of citizenship*, p.188

<sup>103</sup> Huysmans, J. (2004). Minding exceptions: the politics of insecurity and liberal democracy. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 3(3), 321-341.

<sup>104</sup> De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.530

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid*, p.530

form of life – *bare-life* – that is at hand for the escalation of proactive interventions of pre-emption and prevention.<sup>106</sup>

So then, this thesis will attempt to situate the upcoming analysis of the Tanzanian refugee camp within the wider theoretical terrain provided by Foucault and Agamben’s reading of biopolitics and sovereign power. The analysis will be established upon three interrelated levels. To begin, following Agamben’s understanding of the camp as a site where the *state of exception* is translated into a *space of exception*, the analysis will consider the spatial methods through which displaced populations within the Tanzanian context are administered and controlled. Secondly, the analysis will study the various strategies involving a “particular and highly instrumentalized” account of community which is employed within the management and (re)production of the Tanzanian camp.<sup>107</sup> Finally, the analysis of the Tanzanian camp will scrutinize the biopolitical technique and tactics involved within the (re)production of displaced populations. Namely, focus will be drawn to the ways in which the population is statistically created as a known, calculable and amenable entity.

## 2.3 Biopolitics and ‘the park’

Wildlife conservation presents an interesting developmental arena shaped by biopolitical concerns over security, territory, population. As Biermann and Mansfield explain, “Nature is no longer ruled by the sword, but by science; the wild natural landscape is no longer tamed but instead protected, improved, and even produced.”<sup>108</sup> Inherent within expanded biopolitical concerns for both human and non-human populations is the necessity for “security mechanisms ... be installed around the random element inherent in a population of living beings so as to optimize a state of life.”<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid. p.530

<sup>107</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.64

<sup>108</sup> Biermann, C and B. Mansfield. 2014. Biodiversity, purity, and death: conservation biology as biopolitics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32(2): p.269

<sup>109</sup> Foucault, M. (2003). *Madness and civilization*. Routledge, p.246

Increasingly, conservation narratives have characterized protected areas as “win-win” scenarios - both neoliberal and biopolitical in nature- whereby wildlife “is not merely allowed to remain; rather, life is actively fostered by promoting biodiversity, mitigating climate change, and facilitating economic growth.”<sup>110</sup> Protected areas have thus become infused with liberal aims of ‘making live’, reflecting the complimentary and fluid nature of sovereign power, disciplinary power, and biopower. Protected areas provide a lens for a “way of seeing, understanding, and (re)producing the world,” reinforcing the view that the biological necessities for certain human populations are incompatible with the assumed necessities of both non-human life and humanity at large.<sup>111</sup> As such, demarcating space in the name of conservation is accentuated by exclusionary and marginalization practices whereby certain human and non-human populations are selected to prosper whilst “others are marginalized from access to the means of subsistence or ‘let die’.”<sup>112</sup>

Certainly, protected areas have greatly transformed patterns of resource access, land tenure and displaced rural populations – especially within the underdeveloped world – often in the name of the global good.<sup>113</sup> However, critically, marginalization is not simply experienced as an economic loss but, crucially, is about the ability to live and make life. For instance, in their study surrounding local resistance towards a Ugandan protected area, Cavanagh and Benjaminsen comment on the impact spatial management imposed by protected areas have on some rural populations, making their lives more precarious and less livable.<sup>114</sup> This heightened precarity is created through the protected area itself, yet is justified and facilitated by a wider sense that life on the global scale is increasingly under threat within the 21st century. That is to say,

---

<sup>110</sup> Biermann, C. and R.M. Anderson. 2017. Conservation, biopolitics, and the governance of life and death. *Geography Compass*11(10), p.7

<sup>111</sup> West, P., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2006). Parks and peoples: the social impact of protected areas. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 35, p.252

<sup>112</sup> Cavanagh, C. J., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Guerrilla agriculture? A biopolitical guide to illicit cultivation within an IUCN Category II protected area. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3-4), p.726

<sup>113</sup> Biermann, C. and R.M. Anderson. 2017. Conservation, biopolitics, and the governance of life and death. *Geography Compass*11(10), p.8

<sup>114</sup> Cavanagh, C. J., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Guerrilla agriculture? A biopolitical guide to illicit cultivation within an IUCN Category II protected area. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3-4), pp.726-8

the precarity of humanity and the planet demands that certain forms of nature or certain milieu be forcefully protected from some humans for all humans, thus producing and reinforcing biopolitical precarity among particular groups in an effort to secure life in general.<sup>115</sup>

Indeed, a broad spectrum of private, institutional and state actors have become progressively more involved within global processes of conservation, whereby expansive territorial control has long been a prominent aim through varied mechanisms.<sup>116</sup> Territoriality is best conceived as a multi-headed means of control over populations and resources through the organization of territory or land. From this perspective, the process of territorialisation can be considered integral within the governmentality mechanisms.<sup>117</sup> Perhaps the predominant mechanism of territorial power is the ability to stratify boundaries around objects (often defined as ‘resources’) and populations. The partitioning of resources and landscapes in ways that manage, and often exclude local people is a very visible method of reregulation, often (re)producing new kinds of values and then making those values available to national and transnational elites.<sup>118</sup> Put simply, territoriality as a form of governance constitutes a process whereby power relations are writ across the land.

When filtered through this lens, territoriality both produces and is itself a constellation of powers and methods for restricting access. For instance, when carbon trading policy (re)produces international commodities out of village woodlots or when land is developed into partitioned aristocratic zones these new spaces become exposed to claims of them being ‘global’ or ‘national’ market goods.<sup>119</sup> Essentially, these territories are valuable spaces of commodity production. Perhaps most notably, these new labels institute contemporary discursive strategies for the (re)production of common sense and attempts at normalizing commodity or conservation logics.<sup>120</sup> McAfee pithily refers to these developments in an often-

---

<sup>115</sup> Biermann, C. and R.M. Anderson. 2017. Conservation, biopolitics, and the governance of life and death. *Geography Compass* 11(10), p.8

<sup>116</sup> Cavanagh, C. J., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Guerrilla agriculture? A biopolitical guide to illicit cultivation within an IUCN Category II protected area. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3-4), p.726

<sup>117</sup> Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Springer.

<sup>118</sup> Brockington, Dan, and Igoe, Jim. 2006. “Eviction for Conservation: A Global Overview.” *Conservation and Society* 4 (3)

<sup>119</sup> Peluso, N. L., & Lund, C. (2011). New frontiers of land control: Introduction. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(4), p.674

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, p.674

cited mantra; “selling nature to save it.”<sup>121</sup> Be it immediately or over time, the power and rights of previous users are stripped away. And so, contrary to statements by international development agencies and foreign governments hoping to influence law and policy ‘from a distance’ and paralleling the increasing production of fictitious commodities<sup>122</sup>, opportunities and benefit flows are unequally (re)produced for differing populations.

Territoriality as a technology of governmentality is deftly demonstrated by Kelly and Ybarra, who scrutinize the construction of ‘protected areas’ as localized sites which combat global crises including anthropogenic climate change and the ‘war on terror’. Thus, when these sites become spaces for securitization, they articulate state and subject formations through violence.<sup>123</sup> Indeed, “communities once deemed putative eco-destroyers have been interpellated as potential threats in wars on drugs and/or terror” a process in which the recasting of environmental crime as organized crime has substantial implications for expanding the scope of legitimate force deemed permissible within protected areas policing and prosecution.”<sup>124</sup>

Following this theoretical review, will be an attempt towards the understanding of such realities ‘on the ground’ regarding ‘the [wildlife] park’ within Tanzania. Drawing upon central elements within the discussion of conservation logics, biopower and sovereignty power, the analysis will be built upon three intersecting realities. Like with the camp, this analysis will start by examining the ways in which wildlife conservation features within the spatial administration of rural (underdeveloped) populations, whereby the intersections between populations-state-territory are heavily featured. Again, following the study of the camp, analysis into the Tanzanian park will examine the biopolitical tactic concerning the management and (re)production of rural populations through a “particular and highly instrumentalized” account of community.<sup>125</sup> Finally, analysis into the park will assess techniques of educating rural populations in efficient, self-reliant and living.

---

<sup>121</sup> McAfee, K. (1999). Selling nature to save it? Biodiversity and green developmentalism. *Environment and planning D: society and space*, 17(2), 133-154.

<sup>122</sup> Polanyi, K., & MacIver, R. M. (1944). *The great transformation* (Vol. 2). Boston: Beacon press.

<sup>123</sup> Kelly, A. B., & Ybarra, M. (2016). Introduction to themed issue: “Green security in protected areas”, p.171

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid*, p.171

<sup>125</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.64

# 3 Methods and Material

Initially, this chapter will briefly introduce case studies as a method before moving on to the specifics of the particular cases to be analyzed within this thesis: both ‘the camp’ and ‘the park’ within Tanzania. Perhaps most importantly, this introduction involves an exploration and clarification as to why and how each case best suits the purposes of this study. Proceeding this, I will motivate the use of frame analysis as a broad methodological framework and will explore its compatibility with the thesis subject. Finally, I will detail the reasoning behind the empirical material chosen.

## 3.1 Using Case Studies

Case studies are perhaps the most suitable method of research when attempting to “understand social complex phenomena” because they allow for a holistic and comprehensive analysis of such phenomena.<sup>126</sup> In line with this thesis’ theoretical inquiry, the two cases chosen pertain to two differing aspects of development; ‘the park’ and ‘the camp’. As a method, case studies are realized in a variety of ways, ranging from micro approaches located within particularized techniques of data gathering and analysis to more macro inspired approaches with broader focal lens.<sup>127</sup> Regarding the design of my thesis, the latter of the two approaches is more compatible when considering the wide-angle focus on biopolitical techniques of governing within development.

Whilst each case focuses on a different aspect of development, both concern biopolitical technologies of spatial governance. The reason for including two interrelated, but distinct cases comes down to the aims of this study being an attempt at demonstrating the complex and

---

<sup>126</sup> Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Sage, p.4

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

multifaceted manner in which spatial governmentality manifests within the context of development. Such an aim would therefore not be achievable by analyzing this phenomenon in simply one context (either within a refugee camp *or* within conservationism). More specifically, these two cases can help illuminate both the spatial management of underdeveloped populations and the biopolitical regulation of relations between individuals within such populations. Moreover, these two cases allow exploration of different aspects of biopolitics; such as management via contingency (in the case of the camp) and enhancing the capacity for self-management (in the case of the park).

Gerring describes a case as “a spatially and temporally delimited phenomenon of theoretical significance.”<sup>128</sup> In accordance, this study has made the conscious choice of geographically confining its case studies within the context of Tanzania to articulate how these relational yet discrete operations of developmental spatial technologies both intersect and unfold within a socioeconomic and geographically limited area.

### 3.2 Case One: Situating ‘the Camp’ Within Tanzania

The United Republic of Tanzania has hosted refugees for over 50 years.<sup>129</sup> During this time, the number of refugee camps within Tanzania has fluctuated significantly. For the purposes of this thesis, a few camps will be studied, however, camp Nyarugusu will serve as one of the primary sites through which to explore developmental methods of spatial governance and the control of ‘surplus’ populations. Nyarugusu, a United Nations refugee camp in north-western Tanzania is incidentally one of the largest camps within northern Africa. With the aid of the UNHCR, the Tanzanian government opened Nyarugusu camp in 1996 in response to the influx of thousands of Congolese refugees. Twenty-two years later, more than 150,000 refugees reside within Nyarugusu camp making it one of the largest refugee camps within the 21<sup>st</sup> century.<sup>130</sup> Initially, the population primarily originated from South Kivu province in eastern DRC,

---

<sup>128</sup> Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American political science review*, 98(2)

<sup>129</sup> UNHCR. (2017)a. “Tanzania – Nyarugusu Camp Profile – 31 March” Accessed from: <https://www.unhcr.org/524d87c99.pPDF>

<sup>130</sup> Ibid



whereby the ongoing conflict has been cited as a continuation of what is referred to as ‘Africa’s World War’ -a title earned by the fact militias from eight African countries have contributed to violence perpetrated on Congolese soil.<sup>131</sup> However, the persistent magnitude of camp Nyarugusu can also be attributed to the fact that in 2015 in excess of 110,00 Burundian refugees arrived in Tanzania to escape riots and civil unrest within Burundi. Still today, approximately 65,000 Burundian refugees remain within Nyarugusu, whilst 55,000 have been relocated to Nduta camp and another 19,000 within Mtendeli camp, both also within Tanzania.<sup>132</sup>

### 3.3 Case Two: Situating ‘the Park’ Within Tanzania

The second empirical contribution from which this study will grapple with the phenomena of spatial governance within development will be the case of Wildlife Management Areas within Tanzania. Broadly, wildlife has contributed considerably towards Tanzania’s economic growth and including its annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth of 4 per cent.<sup>133</sup> Certainly, the Wildlife Policy of Tanzania (WPT) explicitly recognizes this relationship and actively promotes the “conservation of biological diversity” and “sustainable utilisation of wildlife resources” in attempts to “improve the quality of the life of the people of Tanzania.”<sup>134</sup> In short, Tanzania seemingly embodies the notion that conservation is good business.

Within this context, Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) denote a community-oriented wildlife conservation method in which several villages reserve sections of their village lands for wildlife protection. Often cited within win-win narratives, WMAs “have the potential to enhance livelihoods of their [associated] communities and secure valuable areas for wildlife

---

<sup>131</sup> For example, see; Prunier, G. (2008). *Africa's world war: Congo, the Rwandan genocide, and the making of a continental catastrophe*. Oxford University Press and; Turner, T. (2007). *The Congo wars: conflict, myth and reality*. Zed Books.

<sup>132</sup> Accessed from: <https://www.unhcr.org/524d87c99.pPDF>

<sup>133</sup> Igoe, J., & Croucher, B. (2007). Conservation, commerce, and communities: the story of community-based wildlife management areas in Tanzania’s northern tourist circuit. *Conservation and Society*, 5(4), p.535

<sup>134</sup> Ibid, p.535

protection.”<sup>135</sup> Financial and so-named ‘technical support’ for WMAs is sourced from a variety of aid agencies and NGOs including but not limited to; Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF), African Wildlife Fund (AWF), PAMS foundation, and Honeyguide Foundation (HGF).<sup>136</sup> In tandem with the responsible government ministries, these institutions partner with wildlife tourism agencies which invest in WMAs in the form of land leases for hunting and photographic tourism as well as the construction of lodges and retreats.<sup>137</sup> As such, community-orientated conservation is truly embedded within the broader industrial nexus of conservation, development and economy.

Specifically, the case of Burunge WMA is in many respects an interesting and paradoxical case.<sup>138</sup> It is situated within the center of northern Tanzania’s wildlife tourism circuit, thus occupying an ideal position from which to realize the WMA promise of reaping local benefits and development prospects through wildlife-related tourism. Indeed, it is often cited by aid agencies as the best example of community-based conservation (CBC) within Tanzania.<sup>139</sup> Therefore, in some senses can be considered a ‘white swan’—or best case scenario.<sup>140</sup> However, it is rife with conflict with recent instances of violence between village inhabitants and WMA game scouts.<sup>141</sup>

### 3.4 A Good Fit?: Motivating the Cases

So, to what extent can the WMA parks and refugee camps within Tanzania be considered representative cases for the dynamics of development as a technology of spatial governance?

---

<sup>135</sup> WWF. (2014) Tanzania’s wildlife management areas—a 2012 status report. *World Wildlife Fund for Nature Tanzania*, Dar es salaam, p.39

<sup>136</sup> Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), p.233

<sup>137</sup> Ibid, p.233

<sup>138</sup> Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), p.233

<sup>139</sup> WWF. 2014. Tanzania’s wildlife management areas—a 2012 status report. *World Wildlife Fund for Nature Tanzania*, Dar es salaam.

<sup>140</sup> Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), p.233

<sup>141</sup> Ibid, p.233

Most importantly, the selected cases must closely reflect the phenomenon with which the study contends with at large. In this sense, both selected cases can be considered centrally involved within development patterns of spatial governance. Firstly, as a refugee camp, Nyarugusu is perhaps one of the more obvious spatial techniques of development and humanitarian aid. Explored within the proceeding section, the idea of the refugee as being excluded from the domain of the law whilst also remaining subject to it. As such, “radically internal to the processes of ordering; order does not only seek to ‘purge’ the ambivalence of the refugee but emerges and expands in a relation to this ambivalence.”<sup>142</sup> Thus, the refugee walks the fine line of being included whilst excluded, and similarly excluded whilst being included. This balance between inclusion and exclusion is mirrored within the Nyarugusu camp as a spatial unit; both excluded from urban centers and located on the periphery of state borders. Similarly, Nyarugusu has been (re)produced and expanded but never removed. Indeed, Nyarugusu’s current inhabitants have “lived through the closure of all Tanzania’s other refugee camps— ten in total—and many were moved from camp to camp during these closures.”<sup>143</sup>

Secondly, WMAs in Tanzania are arguably situated deep within spatial governance techniques deployed under the rubric of development. On the surface WMAs cooperative approach to land is well received, yet it becomes quickly apparent that such projects are rife with conflict. In the case of the WMA within Burunge, Tanzania, one of five original member villages has yet to acknowledge the legality of the WMA and several violent confrontations between village residents and village game scouts have resulted from disputes over land ownership.<sup>144</sup> Indeed, the case of Tanzanian WMAs is “rigorously engaged in the reregulation and territorialisation according to neoliberal imperatives that emphasised the commodification of nature to promote conservation.”<sup>145</sup> Thus, in the name of sustainable development, territorial forms of governance and control are implemented.

---

<sup>142</sup> Diken, B. (2004). From refugee camps to gated communities: biopolitics and the end of the city. *Citizenship studies*, 8(1), p.84

<sup>143</sup> Thomson, M. J. (2014). Mud, dust, and Marougé: precarious construction in a Congolese Refugee Camp. *Architectural Theory Review*, 19(3), p.379

<sup>144</sup> Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), p.233

<sup>145</sup> Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2007). Neoliberal conservation: a brief introduction. *Conservation and society*, 5(4), p.440

In general practice, the sampling of cases is tactical rather than accidental. This ensures that selected cases are rich areas of inquiry with the capacity to both assess and aid in the progression of theory.<sup>146</sup> Preferably, the use of single cases should be somewhat indicative or demonstrative of broader trends within the wider occurrence of the phenomenon in question.<sup>147</sup> As such, a nuanced case study should address both the idiosyncrasies and the commonalities of the case in a broader context.<sup>148</sup> From this, it would be misguided to conclude with certainty that the cases selected for this thesis are wholly representative of a wider set of cases regarding the dynamics of spatial governance within development. However, they do share important commonalities with broader trends within similar cases. For instance, the WMAs within Tanzania mirror trends of proliferating neoliberal conservation and state-sponsored protected areas on a global scale; “Tanzania, with approximately 30 per cent of its total land set aside as protected areas; Belize with 50 per cent; Guatemala with 30 per cent; and Panama and Costa Rica, each with 25 per cent.”<sup>149</sup> Similarly, the case of Nyarugusu reflects broader patterns within refugee camps, such as mirroring their general location being that of “outside cities, in suburbia or in rural areas, as a rule in demonstratively peripheral sites, the contemporary strategy behind which is the dispersal of the asylum seekers.”<sup>150</sup>

### 3.5 Frame Analysis

According to Laclau and Mouffe, ‘discourse’ shelters not simply language but all social phenomena. Indeed, as with language, the social is never truly fixed, but instead a fluid and ever-changing entity.<sup>151</sup> Thus, what becomes important is not what can be considered truly true, rather the exploration of how this truth is created and how it appears to be natural, given and

---

<sup>146</sup> Ibid

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, pp.46-8

<sup>148</sup> Ibid

<sup>149</sup> Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2007). Neoliberal conservation: a brief introduction. *Conservation and society*, 5(4), p.437

<sup>150</sup> Diken, B. (2004). From refugee camps to gated communities: biopolitics and the end of the city. *Citizenship studies*, 8(1), p.91

<sup>151</sup> Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, 2.

simply objective. Herein lies the crux of what power means for discourse theory; Laclau and Mouffe articulate power not as something which people can possess or exert over others but rather the ability to (re)produce language, the social and consequently our reality.<sup>152</sup> Our knowledge, identities and relationships are all contingent; thus all are susceptible to the dictates of power. Objectivity thus refers to the world out of mind and sight, a world which we take for granted is irrevocably constructed by power and politics. Here, the ways in which particular policy problems are defined or *framed* is critical because it assigns responsibility and produces rationales that authorize some policy solutions and not others.<sup>153</sup> Precisely how individuals and groups frame a problem subsequently opens up and legitimizes particular avenues of action whilst fencing off and delegitimizing others.<sup>154</sup>

So then, the following analysis will adopt frame analysis as a method through which to explore the ways in which both cases of the camp and the Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) within Tanzania are *framed* in biopolitical terms and subsequently the avenues of action both opened and closed through this process of framing. This thesis has intentionally decided against adopting a particular set of concepts or a previously articulated framework when it comes to utilising frame analysis within the following case studies. Instead, the following analytical chapters will lean on biopolitics as a theoretical concept through which to explore the processes of framing within the texts in question. Moreover, this thesis will make good use of previous research to flesh out what the consequences created as a result of the way things are framed within the discourses produced by the international institutions in question (mainly the UNHCR in the case of the camp and the AWF in the case of the park).

### 3.6 Empirical Material

To perform frame analysis and thus locate actors within important sites of power, one must look towards the policy documents produced by said actors. So then, both cases within this

---

<sup>152</sup> Ibid, p.111

<sup>153</sup> Coburn, C. E. (2006). Framing the problem of reading instruction: Using frame analysis to uncover the microprocesses of policy implementation. *American educational research journal*, 43(3), p.344

<sup>154</sup> Ibid, p.344

thesis will be built upon public documents created by the different international agencies involved within each case respectively. In the context of the Tanzanian refugee camp, this study will be primarily concerned with UNHCR's *'Handbook for Emergencies'* and in the case of the WMAs, AWF's *'A practical handbook for setting up and managing a wildlife management area in Tanzania'* will be the foci. However, it is important to note that this is not to say that other documents will not be used within the analysis of each case, yet other texts used will be more auxiliary in nature.

The narrow selection of documents produced only by international agencies reflects the aims of the thesis as a whole; in that this study attempts to explore the ways in which these international actors engage in spatial and biopolitical developmental activities as a method of securing 'surplus' or underdeveloped populations. Thus, whilst the Tanzanian government is undoubtedly involved within similar practices, most likely in both antagonistic and mutually exclusive ways, its role will be considered only in relation to the actions and discourse of the aforementioned international actors.

The reasons for both selected texts are twofold. Firstly, both documents are produced by the principal international agency involved within the management and funding of each respective case. Within both Nyarugusu specifically and Tanzanian refugee camps more broadly, the UNHCR is the primary international actor involved within the administration of the camps. Despite being under the directive of the Tanzanian Ministry of Home Affairs, it is the UNHCR who takes "care of the day-to-day government of the camp, by providing facilities, laying down guidelines..."<sup>155</sup> Similarly, the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) has been the chief facilitator within the establishment and management of WMAs throughout Tanzania, including the Burunge WMA in Babati District.<sup>156</sup> Moreover, AWF has become one of the wealthiest and most influential conservation organizations working in Tanzania due to the support of the US Agency for International Development (USAID). Indeed, by 2004, AWF had become increasingly dependent of US government funding, which accounted for 40% of the annual

---

<sup>155</sup> Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the 'big nations': Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), p.234

<sup>156</sup> Sachedina, H. T. (2010). Disconnected nature: the scaling up of African Wildlife Foundation and its impacts on biodiversity conservation and local livelihoods. *Antipode*, 42(3), p.613

organizational budget and 78% of AWF's restricted budget.<sup>157</sup> Thus, "AWF values began to be intertwined more fully with US foreign policy goals."<sup>158</sup>

Secondly, to ensure the feasibility of both case studies, the vast empirical material produced by both agencies has been necessarily condensed in accordance to some criteria relative to medium, stage of organization and time. Both documents have been selected as examples of public papers which are both written explicitly as policy instruction and guidance to be utilized within each respective context. Moreover, both documents are written at the perspective of the general which is then to be adapted and molded to the specifics of the case on the ground. This allows for the analysis of each case to be both rooted within each respective particulars whilst also enclosing some level of wider relevance and extrapolation.

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid, pp.607-8

<sup>158</sup> Ibid, p.608

## 4 Case One: ‘the Camp’

[Camps are] sites of neo-colonial power relations where refugees are countered, their movements monitored and mapped, their daily routines disciplined and routinized by the institutional machinery of refugee relief agencies.<sup>159</sup>

[... they are] the segregation of nationalities; the orderly organization of repatriation or third-country resettlement; medical and hygienic programs and quarantining; ‘perpetual screening’ and the accumulation of documents on the inhabitants of the camps; the control of movement and black-marketing; law enforcement of public discipline; and schooling and rehabilitation were some of the operations that the spatial concentration and ordering of people enabled or facilitated. Through these processes, the modern, postwar refugee emerged as a knowable, namable figure.<sup>160</sup>

These disciplinary and routinized biopolitical technologies of governing are to be the foci of this chapter; the refugee camps within Tanzania providing a particularized empirical lens through which to explore such practices. The following analysis will then be conducted within three separate yet intersecting sections. Firstly, within this chapter I will study the spatial methods of managing populations within the context of the Tanzanian refugee camp. Secondly, I will investigate at the ways neoliberal governmentality (re)produces underdeveloped populations into self-managing, self-regulating entities and will analyze how ‘community’ is operationalized within and outside the camp to control the relations and interaction between individuals. Latterly, this chapter will turn its attention towards the biopolitical technologies

---

<sup>159</sup> Hyndman, J. (1997). Refugee self-management and the question of governance. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 16(2), p.17

<sup>160</sup> Malkki, L. H. (1995). Refugees and exile: From "refugee studies" to the national order of things. *Annual review of anthropology*, 24(1), p.498



involved within the statistical (re)production of underdeveloped populations (otherwise referred to as management via contingency).

## 4.1 Spatial Administration

The first impression one gets of Lukole refugee camp in northwestern Tanzania is of extremely organized space. The long, straight rows of blue and white blindés (huts) with evenly distributed feeder roads and water stands provide a striking contrast to the surrounding countryside where scattered clusters of homesteads are connected by winding footpaths.<sup>161</sup>

Physical spaces, both inside the camp but also embodied by the camp itself, is a striking and ostensible articulation of biopower within contemporary international governance. UNHCR strategies regarding the spatial management of the camp are detailed within the so-dubbed “master-plan” which is subsequently used as the primary guide towards the mapping of UNHCR governance within the camp.<sup>162</sup> Specified therein; the social administration of the refugees, the clear demarcation of borders both within and outside the camp, and the itemization of infrastructure in order to “show the overall configuration of the site, its surroundings and characteristics.”<sup>163</sup> In creating a series of minimum standards, the master plan ensures steady control over the refugee population regardless of the recurrent staff turnover. The UNHCR stresses the importance of implementing “mechanisms for the enforcement of law and order, such as [...] the physical aspects of the camp (e.g. design layout, maximal size, capacity, and location).”<sup>164</sup> As such, the spatial planning of the camp becomes explicitly involved in processes of securitizing displaced populations. Moreover, the spatial security techniques within the camp are an illustrative microcosm of wider technologies of spatial control (e.g. the camp as a whole).

---

<sup>161</sup> Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the ‘big nations’: Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), p.234

<sup>162</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) *Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.215

<sup>163</sup> Ibid, p.215

<sup>164</sup> Ibid, p.54

Interestingly, once established (and combined with local authority regulations), the particularized spatial configuration of the camp becomes a routinised form of administering and controlling the refugee population. For instance, in Lukole camp, Tanzania, refugees are not allowed to construct fences around their respective compound, eligibly for “security reasons.”<sup>165</sup> Yet, this ban cements the spatial administration of the population, who have all ‘private’ space stripped away. By banning the building of barriers, the camp in its entirety becomes ‘public’ space under the jurisdiction of the international community.

Upon entering the camp, refugees are cataloged through a series of classification procedures (including former occupation, place of origin, ethnicity and various biometric identifiers).<sup>166</sup> Throughout this procedure, refugees are confined to a ‘staging area’ and are not permitted to enter the camp proper until they are fully processed. Again, space is exercised as a method of control, ensuring that every refugee in the camp has been appropriately classified. Here, different spaces correspond with different ‘kinds’ of displaced people; namely those identified and catalogued by UNHCR and those presently ‘unknown’. Moreover, during this process individuals are subject to overcrowded and squalid circumstances before being relocated within their designated “zone.”<sup>167</sup>

Even beyond the camp, movement is closely administrated and monitored. To begin with, refugees are obligated to stay within their designated zones and to “remain within a four kilometre radius” of the camp unless permitted otherwise.<sup>168</sup> The Tanzanian Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) officials operate as camp leaders, providing permits to refugees on a “limited basis with priority given to those in need of medical treatment and those involved in NGO sponsored activities.”<sup>169</sup> Business permits are occasionally granted but are, however, usually limited to three-days. Moreover, non-compliance with these restricted movements results in a six-month jail penalty.<sup>170</sup> Through such restrictions, the refugee population is explicitly geographically managed. And yet, the spatial administration of the camp is not always so

---

<sup>165</sup> Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the ‘big nations’: Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), p.234

<sup>166</sup> UNHCR. (2017)a. “Tanzania – Nyarugusu Camp Profile – 31 March”

<sup>167</sup> Malkki LH (1995) *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory and National Cosmology Among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, p.137

<sup>168</sup> UNHCR (2002) “Review of CORD community services for Congolese refugees in Tanzania”, p.7

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid*, p.7

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid*, p.7

pronounced. For instance, the remoteness and isolation of Nyarugusu and Mishamo settlements has been a permanent factor in limiting movement. Indeed, these camps follow a discernable pattern within the construction of refugee camps, in that they are located far from urban areas and are often placed in remote, isolated settings. One often-cited explanation for this is that by placing camps in remote areas they limit the disruption and conflict caused to local populations. However, this also happens to severely limit the freedom of refugee populations who are often, quite literally, on state peripheries. In a biopolitical sense, two populations (the displaced/refugee and the Tanzanian) are (re)produced, with integration being geographically managed, primarily in order to ensure the security of the latter.

## 4.2 Management by Community

Previously emphasized within this thesis is the recent restructuring of governmental logics surrounding refugees, transitioning from what can be considered traditional disciplinary mechanisms towards the use of modern advanced liberal tactics.<sup>171</sup> One such tactic within management and (re)production of the camp being a “particular and highly instrumentalized” account of community.<sup>172</sup> Certainly, this shift towards the operationalization of community can be observed within the spatiality of the camp. Indeed, the camp is designed in a concerted effort at manufacturing community ~~organically~~ with recommendations that the structure of family shelters “are not closed form, e.g. square shaped” but instead bear a resemblance to “more of an H-shape, where both sides are open for better interaction with other communities.”<sup>173</sup>

The UNHCR identifies the family as the “basic planning unit” from which the “physical organization of the site should start.”<sup>174</sup> Thus, the spatial organization of the camp is built from the “bottom-up” and centers upon the family unit and construction is subsequently directed

---

<sup>171</sup> Lippert, R. (1999). Governing refugees: The relevance of governmentality to understanding the international refugee regime. *Alternatives*, 24(3), pp.308-14

<sup>172</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.64

<sup>173</sup> UNHCR's (2007) *Handbook for Emergencies* 'United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.213

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid*, p.216

outwards: into a community (consisting of roughly 16 families or 80-100 individuals), proceeded by a block (16 communities or 1,250 individuals), a sector (4 blocks or 5,000 individuals), and finally the camp in its entirety (consisting of 4 sectors or 20,000 individuals).<sup>175</sup> Importance is again placed on maximizing *efficient* governing, whereby every family unit is provided with a kitchen garden in an attempt to nurture “self-reliance and durable solutions.”<sup>176</sup> Similarly, in many Tanzanian camps, the use of foster families is extensive and viewed by the UNHCR as an attractive alternative to orphanages which are “perceived to be alienating, destroying the social and moral fabric of the children and, by extension, the camp.”<sup>177</sup> The case of foster families can be viewed as another element in securing the refugee population by attempting to secure the “social and moral fabric” of both the orphans, but most importantly the camp at large. Moreover, by promoting foster families, authorities are placing the burden of care onto the refugee population itself (rather than international or Tanzanian authorities).

So then, the community becomes a space of governing in which interaction between in-group members is operationalized as a means of efficiently managing the aggregate. This can also be viewed as a process of “privatizing responsibility” which has come to characterize many advanced liberal technologies employed within the management of the global poor.<sup>178</sup> This process facilitates the administration of displaced populations from a distance. Rather than governing through immediate force, this enables authorities to govern through the formation of networks, links, or partnerships with state and non-state actors.<sup>179</sup> Indeed, the UNHCR highlight the importance of;

Community activities such as educational programmes, health and social services, self-reliance activities, youth schemes, activities and services which engage the host community with the refugee community, and refugee-managed infrastructure projects.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> Ibid, p.216

<sup>176</sup> Ibid, p.216

<sup>177</sup> Turner, S. (2005). Suspended spaces—Contesting sovereignties in a refugee camp. *Sovereign bodies: Citizens, migrants, and states in the postcolonial world*, p.322

<sup>178</sup> Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen’s University Press, p.44

<sup>179</sup> Ibid, p.52

<sup>180</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) *‘Handbook for Emergencies’* United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.54

From this perspective, the aim is “to create locales, entities and persons able to operate a regulated autonomy.”<sup>181</sup> Though, as Rydin emphasizes, “the trick within governmentality is that the creation of autonomy actually enables the goal of government to be achieved.”<sup>182</sup> Encouraging the ‘displaced’ to participate voluntarily within the management of the refugee population consequently (re)produces them in the process as being more responsible for their own fate as a refugee. Similar treatment is directed at impoverished communities, whereby the poor are encouraged to voluntarily participate within anti-poverty measures, thus in term (re)producing a poor population which is more responsible for their own state of impoverishment.

The (re)production of surplus populations or refugee communities is not, though, only detectable as a top-down approach. Indeed, in a recognizable shift towards ‘advanced liberal’ biopolitical techniques, growing emphasis is placed on increased refugee participation within the (re)production of community within the camp. The UNHCR stresses that refugees “must be involved at the heart of decision-making concerning their protection and well-being.”<sup>183</sup> The so-called “community development approach” is central to UNHCR’s operations whereby ‘displaced’ populations are considered “resourceful and active partners” in their own security.<sup>184</sup> Certainly, the UNHCR actively supports the development of “refugee volunteer guards/neighborhood watch teams” in processes whereby “refugees themselves should have a role in ensuring their security.”<sup>185</sup>

Within Nyarugusu camp, refugee guards – identified locally as Sungusungu – are equipped with light weapons, including sticks and clubs, and have been involved in combatting crime and public order disturbances for over a decade.<sup>186</sup> This refugee force is placed under the direct supervision of a Tanzanian government official and works closely with UNHCR officials within the camp. Similarly, the Community Watch Team (CWT) in Mtendeli camp aims at “enhancing the physical safety/security of refugees by refugees themselves” which is carried

---

<sup>181</sup> Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen’s University Press, p.52

<sup>182</sup> Rydin, Y. (2007). Indicators as a governmental technology? The lessons of community-based sustainability indicator projects. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(4), p.611

<sup>183</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) *Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.82

<sup>184</sup> Ibid, 192

<sup>185</sup> Ibid, p.54

<sup>186</sup> Brankamp, H. (2016). Community policing in Kakuma camp, Kenya. *Forced Migration Review*, (53), p.51

out under the supervision of the UNHCR and other various stakeholders.<sup>187</sup> The reasons for such community-based approaches is said to ensure that traditional structures are “broken down” in an attempt to “mobilize communities” and increase community participation.<sup>188</sup>

Neither is the active inclusion of displaced individuals within securing the aggregate population simply confined within camp borders. For instance, from 17<sup>th</sup> June to July 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016, UNHCR Dar es Salaam organized an operation which combined workshops on the protection of refugees and border monitoring along Tanzania’s south-western boarder located near Malawi and Mozambique. These workshops included members of the Immigration, Prison, and Police Departments as well as selected individuals from the displaced communities and members of the Regional Defense Committee. The targeted regions were selected explicitly because “they are bordering Mozambique, where there is presently civil disturbances, and Zambia, where some of the Burundian refugees have fled to after transiting through Tanzania.”<sup>189</sup>

Such community-grounded and participatory techniques adopted by the UNHCR and Tanzanian government officials can be considered both admirable and questionable. Admirable, in the sense that these techniques attempt to foster unity and agency among the displaced populations, however, questionable in the extent to which these technologies simply speak to broader patterns of advanced liberal governance. Indeed, community-targeted empowerment is cited as a technique which simply operationalizes ‘community’ as another collective label (such as ‘farmers’ or ‘the rural poor’ which enables more effective and efficient governing.<sup>190</sup> The notion of efficient government is reflected by initiatives such as the CTW within camp Mtendeli and the Sungusungu refugee guard in Nyarugusu, whereby both ‘communities’ are employed as a smaller unit of the aggregate population in attempts to better manage it. Here, ‘community’ is extremely targeted and narrowly conceived as part of broader governance. Community is invoked in an explicit transfer of responsibility from UNHCR to the refugees themselves, centrally placing them within mechanisms of their own security

---

<sup>187</sup> UNHCR. 2016a. “A cross section of Refugees in Nyarugusu camp on the occasion of World Refugee Day.”, p.4

<sup>188</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) *Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.183

<sup>189</sup> Ibid, p.4

<sup>190</sup> Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen’s University Press, p.26

administration in attempts to “mobilize communities to take collective action to enhance their own protection.”<sup>191</sup> Malkki refers to this developmental method of spatial governance as a matter of both care *and* control; the health and security needs of the individual is generally acquired in pursuit of securing the aggregate.<sup>192</sup>

Another facet within the (re)construction of ‘the community’ is arguably the creation of a new kind of citizen -one which is tethered to the camp as a “microcosm for intensive modes of governing, outside the national order of things.”<sup>193</sup> Within Tanzania, the refugee camps are placed outside the authority of the District and Regional Commissioners and placed directly within the remit of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Yet, it is the UNHCR (in partnership with various other international agencies) which administer the day-to-day management of the camp. The UNHCR takes responsibility for community-building initiatives such as the empowerment and participation of women by providing “conditions/space and time for women’s groups” and the mobilization of the youth by establishing “informal focus groups with girls and boys to discuss their main concerns.”<sup>194</sup> Collectively, these initiatives contribute towards a de-politicized means of establishing the refugee as an almost-citizen situated within an isolated, rural Tanzania. It is here, where for the ‘citizen’;

Her passport is the ration card, guaranteeing/providing her identity and her rights - to food, to shelter, to legal protection, even to a territory (albeit very small). But this citizen is also a citizen of the UNHCR. It is the UNHCR that grants her the ration card and guarantees her identity as a ‘true’ refugee. It is the UNHCR that provides the various rights and entitlements. And it is from the UNHCR that she seeks recognition.<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>191</sup> Ibid, p.183

<sup>192</sup> Malkki, L. H. (2012). *Purity and exile: Violence, memory, and national cosmology among Hutu refugees in Tanzania*. University of Chicago Press.

<sup>193</sup> Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the ‘big nations’: Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), p.234

<sup>194</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) *‘Handbook for Emergencies’* United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, pp.187, 189

<sup>195</sup> Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the ‘big nations’: Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), pp.234-5

Thus, the camp can be located in an unstable site of exclusion, situated within the peripheries of the national setting both in a geographical sense but also on the level of community. Through this lens, the refugee is arguably within closer proximity to Geneva (in the way that the international agencies based there have more impact and bearing on their lives) than to Kigomo or Mwanza (the two closest cities for Nyarugusu camp and Lukole camp respectively). Yet, as already mentioned, displaced communities are regulated by international authorities 'at a distance' through the 'privatization of responsibility', thus further contributing towards their isolation.<sup>196</sup>

### 4.3 Management via 'Contingency'

Foucault describes biopolitically significant information as "phenomena that are aleatory and unpredictable when taken in themselves or individually, but which at the collective level, display constraints that are easy or at least possible to establish."<sup>197</sup> Subsequently, biopower is primarily concerned with the aggregate. Specifically, biopolitical mechanisms operate not, "to modify any given phenomenon as such, or to modify any given individual in so far as he is an individual, but, essentially, to intervene at the level of their generality."<sup>198</sup> Thus, within the Tanzanian setting, the camp becomes a mechanism for governing the security of the refugee – (re)producing the population, which is regulated through statistical calculations, aggregation and stratification via certain categories of relevance.

The first biopolitical act in the administration of the refugee camp concerns the act of processing the aggregate population and subsequently cataloging its members according to relevant biomedical indicators. This routinised screening exercise is highly visible within the treatment of the Tanzanian refugee population and is considered important "to understand the community structure of the beneficiary population" and fundamental "for planning and

---

<sup>196</sup> Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen's University Press, p.52

<sup>197</sup> Foucault 2003, p.246

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid*, p.246



managing efficient operations.”<sup>199</sup> The WFP, for instance, in partnership with UNHCR and UNICEF directed Standardized Expanded Nutrition Surveys (SENS) in August and September of 2016. This involved a ‘Community and Household surveillance (CHS)’ which attempted to assess “the food security and livelihood situation in the camps.”<sup>200</sup> This is but a small facet of broader patterns of “performance monitoring” whereby data on the refugee population is systematically collected and “disaggregated by beneficiary category, age, gender and transfer modality.”<sup>201</sup> So then, the Tanzanian refugee population is actively and statistically reproduced, becoming a known and calculated mass which is quantified and subsequently stratified. The UNHCR heavily stress the importance of this screening process whereby “every effort should be made to obtain individual information, progressively through phases” in an attempt to “systematize the information to build a picture of the population profile.”<sup>202</sup> Moreover, this statistical reproduction of displaced populations within Tanzania is not simply limited locally but is instead part of global efforts at securitizing displaced and surplus populations. The UNHCR actively encourages states and member organizations to “share these (statistical documentation) with a view towards developing a more standardized and worldwide registration system.”<sup>203</sup>

Yet again, this registration process accents the importance of *efficient* management in order to “better assist the population” and to “better identify protection needs and to deliver more appropriate assistance.”<sup>204</sup> Thus, interventions and technologies of governing are employed in the name of population, who are subsequently “counted, weighed, psychoanalyzed, vaccinated, trained, mobilized, etc.”<sup>205</sup> The refugee, Turner argues, is thus “made” into “a separate and manageable category.”<sup>206</sup> A category which requires carefully measured up-keep. For instance, their upkeep is defined by calorific consumption; the WFP distributes food to the Tanzanian refugee population with a minimum dietary necessity of 2,100 calories for an individual

---

<sup>199</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) ‘*Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, pp.157-8

<sup>200</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.16

<sup>201</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.17

<sup>202</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) ‘*Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, pp, pp.156, 185

<sup>203</sup> Ibid, p.178

<sup>204</sup> Ibid, p.156

<sup>205</sup> Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the ‘big nations’: Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411), p.234

<sup>206</sup> Ibid, p.234

daily.<sup>207</sup> Interestingly, this registration system additionally segments the population according to their level of ‘vulnerability’. Here, twenty categories of vulnerability are identified from “EA-elderly adult”, “SP-single parents and “UAMs-unaccompanied minors” to more complex categories such as “SP/MD-Single parent/mentally disabled” and “FF/UAM-Foster Family/Unaccompanied Minor”.<sup>208</sup>

This process of data-collection is ongoing, UNHCR noting that registration should be a “continuing process to record essential information at the time of initial displacement, as well as any subsequent demographic and other changes in the refugee population (such as births, deaths, new arrivals, departures, cessation, naturalization, etc.)<sup>209</sup> Just as registration is a “continuous process” requiring constant “verification and updating”<sup>210</sup>, the exercise of statistically (re)constructing the refugee population persists on a “monthly basis.”<sup>211</sup> An important feature of this screening process is the calculation of ‘influx rates’. Without which, camps fall short of providing security-as-optimization-of-life towards which their various mechanisms are focused.<sup>212</sup>

Once established through recurrent statistical analysis, the refugee population as a knowable and calculated mass can be efficiently managed. This is based upon contingency as a kind of “intelligible mechanism” whereby sciences of the aleatory or contingent (statistics and probability) are employed as “truth-telling practices of the life sciences, uncertainly and risk.”<sup>213</sup> Thus, the range of population statistics and their uncertainty produces situations of emergency which subsequently necessitate spatial governing mechanisms, including the camp itself. States of ‘crisis’ or emergency are (re)produced through statistical calculations of risk and probability. For instance, nutrition is a primary arena in which contingency as an

---

<sup>207</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.17

<sup>208</sup> Turner, S. (2005). Suspended spaces—Contesting sovereignties in a refugee camp. *Sovereign bodies: Citizens, migrants, and states in the postcolonial world*, p.318

<sup>209</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) ‘*Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.177

<sup>210</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) ‘*Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, pp.158, 165

<sup>211</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.17

<sup>212</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.71

<sup>213</sup> Dillon, M. (2007). Governing through contingency: The security of biopolitical governance. *Political geography*, 26(1), p.45

intelligibility mechanism is routinised, particularly with regards to malnutrition ‘crises’ among children.

In Nyarugusu, the current Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) undertaken in October 2015 saw a reduction in households with standard food consumption from 94% in 2014 to 75.8% in 2015, accompanied by an upsurge in the percentage of households which have poor consumption outcomes from 1.5% in 2014 to 13.1% in 2015.<sup>214</sup> Similarly, the nutrition assessment statistics gathered subsequent to the influx of Burundian refugees in May 2015 demonstrated “cumulating rates of acute malnutrition.”<sup>215</sup> MUAC, a quick and efficient screening technique (used to calculate the circumference of a child’s mid-upper arm), undertaken in July 2015, specified 1% Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) rates as well as 5.5% of Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) concentrations.<sup>216</sup> In response to the intensifying acute malnutrition rates, UNICEF managed a Rapid Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) in Nyarugusu Camp during September 2015.<sup>217</sup> In addition, treatment of Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) for children ages 6-59 was introduced in Nyarugusu camp in July 2015, whereby recipients were provided with a day-by-day ration of 200 grams of Super Cereal Plus (SC+).<sup>218</sup> Preventative measures were also implemented, the WFP guaranteeing the provision of take-home rations of Super Cereal (SC) for the first 1,000 days, targeting ‘at risk’ individuals including pregnant and lactating women as well as children ages 6 to 59 months.<sup>219</sup>

The case of malnutrition within Nyarugusu camp demonstrates how calculative practices have become a biopolitical staple within the administration of displaced populations. The aim is not to secure the health of the individual refugee, rather it is to ensure that malnutrition, as a statistical occurrence, falls beneath a predefined benchmark: an emergency which becomes a reality when “10% (*of children*) with less than 80% weight for height.”<sup>220</sup> Thus, a ‘crisis’ only exists when a certain numerical threshold is reached and subsequently action is only deemed necessary once a particular *number* of individuals are affected. Moreover, preventative

---

<sup>214</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.17

<sup>215</sup> Ibid, p.13

<sup>216</sup> Ibid, p.13

<sup>217</sup> UNICEF. (2015) “UNICEF Tanzania Sitrep.”

<sup>218</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.13

<sup>219</sup> Ibid, p.13

<sup>220</sup> UNHCR’s (2007) ‘*Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition, p.546

measures are implemented with the primary aim of avoiding this numerical threshold. In this sense, preventative measures are targeted towards individuals cataloged as ‘at risk’, thus allowing the most cost-effective and efficient method of ensuring the nutrition standards of the aggregate refugee population are met. From this perspective, the wellbeing of the individual refugee is of little concern and is only rendered visible in accordance with specific measures and risk assessments.

Similarly, mortality rates present another important statistical consideration which is closely monitored at that the aggregate level. The UNHCR reported that approximately 20 metric tonnes (mt) of Super Cereal Plus (SC+) were distributed to 5,268 children ages 6-23 months within Tanzania as part of WFP’s Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programme,<sup>221</sup> which attempts to “reduce excess mortality among those at risk by providing a food/micronutrient supplement for all members of the group (e.g. children under five or under three, pregnant women and nursing mothers, etc.)”<sup>222</sup> Again, the emphasis is placed on administrating the aggregate population; the very language of reducing “excess mortality” is indicative of how the aim is not to secure the individual refugee but rather to make certain that mortality rates fall. Likewise, once again the preventative measures are biomedically targeted in attempts at maximizing cost-efficacy. Indeed, the WFP stresses the importance of ‘value for money’ and places “strong corporate emphasis on cost efficiency and makes every effort to ensure that food is delivered at the lowest possible cost.”<sup>223</sup> This reflects broader biopolitical mechanisms within liberalism whereby efficacy features as a central tenant.<sup>224</sup>

---

<sup>221</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.17

<sup>222</sup> UNHCR (2017) ‘Food and Nutrition Needs in Emergencies’

<sup>223</sup> WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”, p.11

<sup>224</sup> Harvey, D (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press

## 4.4 Case Summary

To summarize, this chapter has investigated the biopolitical methods through which underdeveloped populations are framed and managed within developmental practise of the camp. Firstly, the spatial methods of managing populations within the context of the Tanzanian refugee camp are very pronounced both inside the camps but also represented by the very geography of the camps. Secondly, this chapter has explored the ways in which neoliberal governmentality (re)produce underdeveloped populations into self-managing, self-regulating entities – incorporating them into managing their own security (through patrols) and welfare (through foster families). Finally, the analysis of the camp has drawn attention towards the biopolitical technologies involved within the statistical (re)production of underdeveloped populations (or management via contingency). This is seen in the way each refugee is screened, how states of crisis are statistically determined and the identification of sectors of the population as risk factors to be managed (be it the elderly, orphans or single mums).

## 5 Case Two: ‘the Park’

The complexity of relations between nature-society, state-society and local-international regarding the (re)production of space have an extended and intricate history. Indeed, what Neumann refers to as ‘nature-state-territory’ has been widely explored both in Tanzania<sup>225</sup> and within the African setting more broadly.<sup>226</sup> The first geopolitical instances of nature-state-territory relations are perhaps most visible within colonial practices of enclosure, displacement and accumulation-by-dispossession. Neumann identifies colonial processes of social control and spatial segregation whereby protected-zones demarcated borders between nature and culture, and ultimately between society and state.<sup>227</sup> Colonial histories of eviction and appropriation of land have unsurprisingly shaped stressed and uneasy relations between the state, local populations and international donors. The consolidation of power over nature and its resources has been normalized in Tanzania ever since the first national reserve was gazetted in 1896 and, even now, the state retains tenure over all wildlife resources, even if rural communities now have the right to administer them through Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs).<sup>228</sup>

The administration of Tanzanian wildlife and relations between state, international and local bodies underwent significant transformations within the 1980s as a product of neoliberal reforms, international pressures regarding human rights and emerging party democracy. The IMF Structural Adjustment Programme was embraced by the Tanzanian state in 1985 and thus introduced large-scale privatization and opened the country to vast influxes of foreign capital

---

<sup>225</sup> For examples, see: Goldman, M. 2003. Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: community-based conservation in Tanzania. *Development and Change* 34, no. 5: 833–62 and; Nelson, F. 2007. Emergent or illusory? Community wildlife management in Tanzania. *International Institute for Environment and Development*, issue paper no. 146.

<sup>226</sup> For examples, see: Nelson, F., and A. Agrawal (2008) Patronage or participation? Community-based natural resource management reform in sub-Saharan Africa. *Development and Change* 39, no. 4: 557–85.

<sup>227</sup> Neumann, P (2004) *Nature-state-territory: Toward a critical theorization of conservation enclosures*. In *Liberation ecologies: environment, development, social movements*. London: Routledge.

<sup>228</sup> Green, K. E., & Adams, W. M. (2015). Green grabbing and the dynamics of local-level engagement with neoliberalization in Tanzania's wildlife management areas. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(1), p.101

and internationally funded developments within conservation. Within the same period, Tanzanian environmental policy also underwent significant transformation. In 1984, an amendment was passed which formalized the institutions and rights of local government, thereby establishing village land as a legal category and authorized village governing bodies (known as Community-Based Organizations), to administer the natural resources pertaining to such land.<sup>229</sup> The neoliberalization of conservation, however, has not broken with former colonial state-society relations colored by state-led coercion and land alienation. Instead, neoliberal reforms have aided in producing a ‘splintered’ Tanzanian environmental-state; expanding the space of environmental governance to subsume new actors who engage, biopolitically, with rural populations through paternalistic and often coercive methods in the name of community-based conservation.<sup>230</sup>

Thus, this chapter will analyse the contemporary biopolitical dynamics involved within nature-state-territory in the Tanzanian context. Specifically, this chapter will study these biopolitical dynamics on three levels. Firstly, this chapter will start by looking at the administration of space within wildlife conservation as a method of controlling rural populations. Secondly, this chapter will detail the ways in which community is systematically invoked as a method of controlling the relations between rural communities and external actors as well as between the rural populations themselves. Lastly, this chapter will look at paternalistic techniques within neoliberal environmentalism and methods of educating local populations in the ‘art of self-management’.

## 5.1 Spatial Administration

Akin to the camp, the administration of local populations through spatial mechanisms is strikingly apparent within Tanzanian wildlife conservation. The initiation of WMAs has produced opportunities for new partnerships between rural communities and NGOs, for each

---

<sup>229</sup> Ibid, p.101

<sup>230</sup> Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania’s community-based conservation. *Geoforum*, 83, p.103

WMA is allocated an NGO facilitator whose role is to support the WMA and its community-based organization (CBO). The NGO facilitator is involved within processes of applying for and gazetting the WMA, producing a management plan and providing technical support for the community-based organization.<sup>231</sup> Intimately involved within processes of territorialization, WMAs involve a series of actions both “including and excluding of people within particular geographic boundaries, and about controlling what people do and their access to natural resources within those boundaries.”<sup>232</sup> Thus, through their administration of WMAs, international agencies (re)produce and reorder socio-ecological space under the pretext of conservationism. Particularly within the context of the General Management Plan (GMP), inhabitants within WMAs have many aspects of their lives catalogued and partitioned through detailed spatial planning. For instance, the provision of a spatial plan is central to the Burunge GMP which divides the WMA into different resource spaces which are allocated respective limitations and permitted uses. Burunge inhabitants have prescribed zones for livestock grazing, to fuelwood, constructing temporary settlement and the collection of non-timber forest products, whilst felling timber, agricultural expansion and the construction of permanent structures are permanently prohibited.<sup>233</sup> The complete list of permitted and prohibited activities within Burunge WMA are delineated in Table 1 (inspired by Bluwstein et al.) This not only constitutes routinized and highly regulated spatial dynamics but is also referential to broader conservation logics which attempt to govern the rural populations in the art of ‘sustainable living’.

---

<sup>231</sup> Green, K. E., & Adams, W. M. (2015). Green grabbing and the dynamics of local-level engagement with neoliberalization in Tanzania's wildlife management areas. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(1), pp.105-6

<sup>232</sup> Bluwstein, J., & Lund, J. F. (2018). Territoriality by conservation in the Selous–Niassa Corridor in Tanzania. *World Development*, 101, p.454

<sup>233</sup> JUHIBU (2011) Burunge wildlife management area general management plan 2010-2020. Babati, Burunge WMA



Activity	CUZ*	GUZ^	HUZ+
Dry fire wood collection	A†	A	P‡
Tree felling (poles for house construction)	P	P	P
Collecting Non-Timber Forest Products	A	A	P
Charcoal burning	P	P	P
Livestock grazing	P	A	P
Agriculture	P	P	P
Permanent settlement	P	P	P
Temporary settlement	P	A	P
Tourist hunting	P	P	A
Photo safari/game viewing	A	A	A
Local hunting	P	A	P
Entry without permit	A	A	P

Table 1.1 Spatialized prohibitions and permissions. This table is based on Burunge General Management Plan 2010-2020 (JUHIBU 2011).<sup>234</sup> \*Corridor Use Zone, ^General Use Zone, +Hunting Use Zone, †Allowable and ‡Prohibited

The corridor-use zone (CUZ) is located within village lands of Minjingu and Vilima Vitatu and links the western and eastern sections of the WMA, serving as an ecological fixture between Tarangire National Park and Lake Manyara National park (see: Figure 1).<sup>235</sup> The general-use zone (GUZ) contains the villages Olasiti, Minjingu, Vilima Vitatu, Maweni, Magara and Manyara, serving as a buffer zone for Lake Manyara National Park and houses two tourist lodges, situated within Minjingu and Vilima Vitatu, respectively (see: Figure 1).<sup>236</sup> By design, the WMA is a continuous strip of land which cuts across numerous villages establishing a wildlife buffer zone for a protected area. Thus, possibilities for local land-use and WMA land allocation is necessarily limited, since the central aim is not to create a series of disconnected spaces but rather to establish a block of unbroken protected land. Finally, the hunting-use zone (HUZ) hosts the villages Kakoi, Vilima Vitatu, Ngolei, Mwada and Sangaiwe, serving as a buffer zone for Tarangire, housing Burunge's hunting block and three tourist lodges (again, see: Figure 1).<sup>237</sup> Again, the inclusion of tourists within Burunge's spatial planning is interesting, in the sense that different categories of human (be it local or international) are

<sup>234</sup> Bluwstein, J., Moyo, F., & Kicheleri, R. P. (2016). Austere conservation: understanding conflicts over resource governance in Tanzanian wildlife management areas. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), pp.224-5

<sup>235</sup> Bluwstein, J., Moyo, F., & Kicheleri, R. P. (2016). Austere conservation: understanding conflicts over resource governance in Tanzanian wildlife management areas. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), p.225

<sup>236</sup> Ibid, p.225

<sup>237</sup> Ibid, p.225

subject to different spatial levels of management. Access to the western shore of Lake Burunge, for instance, is off-limits for villagers, instead housing a tourist lodge in Mwada.

In 2004, Tarangire National Park officials re-surveyed the parks boundaries for the first time since its creation using updated BIS technology. Upon inspection, they found that the national park was actually not 2,600 km<sup>2</sup> as initially presumed but instead 2,850 km<sup>2</sup>. As a result, hundreds of families were forcibly removed and required to surrender agricultural land and housing situated within officially recognized and delineated as space belonging to Tarangire National Park.<sup>238</sup> In the same way, south-east of Tarangire, Maasai individuals within Kimotorok village were relocated during 2005 when the boundary re-survey found the park to be bigger than originally mapped.<sup>239</sup> These cases are interesting in that they quite visibly demonstrate the intimate relation between discursive or ‘imagined’ geographies and actual geographies experienced ‘on the ground’. What is more, these processes of reterritorialization accentuate physical geopolitical operations of power and the “privatization” of sovereignty.

The reality of WMAs being primarily situated within buffer zones or so-called ‘corridors’ (between national parks or game reserves), is indicative of traditional conservation policy based upon the notion of creating a functional separation between village settlements and demarcated spaces of nature. Land which is considered important for wildlife conservation is partitioned from village settlements and subsequently falls under the jurisdiction of the Tanzanian government and international partners. Indeed, the very process of creating WMAs necessarily involve “decisions about how best to use each section of land: which part (or zone) to keep for settlement (houses, clinics, schools), which for grazing, which for farming, and which will be designated as conservation land and form part of the future WMA.”<sup>240</sup> In this sense, WMAs under the direction of donors, catalogue, stratify and administer space and their populations – a practice which is clearly displayed within the management of the Mafia Island Marine Park. As the largest marine park in the Indian Ocean, spanning 822 square kilometres, Mafia Island encloses 10 villages populated by 18,000 residents of which 45-60% are heavily reliant upon

---

<sup>238</sup> Bluwstein, J. (2018). From colonial fortresses to neoliberal landscapes in Northern Tanzania: a biopolitical ecology of wildlife conservation. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1), p.160

<sup>239</sup> Ibid, p.160

<sup>240</sup> AWF (n.d). A practical handbook for setting up and managing a wildlife management area in Tanzania. African Wildlife Foundation, p.23

marine resources.<sup>241</sup> Firstly, the park demarcated ‘core zones’ of coastal forests, mangroves and coral reefs within which local populations were denied all access to resources regardless of the fact these spaces consisted of the richest traditional fishing grounds.<sup>242</sup> Secondly, the park created ‘specified use’ spaces whereby fishers were only permitted to use particular types of fishing gear (basket traps and hand-lines).<sup>243</sup> Finally, remaining spaces are denoted ‘general-use zones’ permitting net fishing activities, albeit mesh-sizes are more regulated than in general coastal waters.<sup>244</sup> So then, in the case of Mafia Island Marine Park, space is catalogued and filtered in accordance to conservation logics. Rural populations are biopolitically administered through the spaces they are permitted and not permitted to occupy. Moreover, even spaces denoted free-access are subject to particular regulations.

The application of conservation regulations including restricted movement is routinely enforced. For instance, Makupa has noted that a 300,000 Tsh. fine (equivalent to 200 USD) is imposed for any local inhabitant found grazing livestock within the WMA.<sup>245</sup> According to the 2011 Ikona WMA Annual Report, in the same year 657 patrols were organized in partnership with Grumeti and Ikorongo Game Reserves, which resulted in twenty-eight livestock-associated arrests, fourteen individual arrested in connection with illegal practices within the WMA –six of whom were charged in district court and eight receiving punishment using traditional rules.<sup>246</sup> Moreover, the enforcement of WMA territory is often ‘splintered’ among many various private actors. This can be seen when ecotourism company CCS, who hired more than 50 private guards to secure concessions against local access and use of neighboring wildlife spaces. Within Burunge WMA, CCS went on to arrest more individuals for environmental-related crimes than any other state-sanctioned public authority.<sup>247</sup> Over an 18 month period (between June 2014 – December 2015), 55% of local arrests made were by CCS

---

<sup>241</sup> Bryceson, I., Jiddawi, N., Kamukuru, A., Kulindwa, K., Mwaipopo, R., Onyango, P. and Sebastian, M. (2006) Fisheries study in Tanzanian coastal waters: the effects of trial export of finfish from Mafia Island on ecological-social resilience and vulnerability

<sup>242</sup> Benjaminsen, T. A., & Bryceson, I. (2012). Conservation, green/blue grabbing and accumulation by dispossession in Tanzania. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(2), p.346

<sup>243</sup> Ibid, p.346

<sup>244</sup> Ibid, p.346

<sup>245</sup> Robinson, L. W., & Makupa, E. (2015). Using analysis of governance to unpack community-based conservation: a case study from Tanzania. *Environmental management*, 56(5), p.1220

<sup>246</sup> Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (2012) The wildlife (Wildlife Management Area) Regulations, p.2

<sup>247</sup> Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania’s community-based conservation. *Geoforum*, 83, p.108

guards and other private actors whilst only 22% and 16% were made by WMA game scouts and the police respectively.<sup>248</sup> Additionally, contrary to the CCS claims that guards were primarily employed for ‘anti-poaching’ purpose, figures indicate that the policy of the local population was their foremost concern. Indeed, only 4% of total arrests were made on account of illegal hunting, whilst 50% were due to livestock grazing and a further 19% and 19% of arrests were on account of trespassing and non-sanctioned activities within park parameters (felling wood and charcoal).<sup>249</sup>

## 5.2 Management by Community

However, the spatial management of local populations is not merely linear, but instead embodies a set of practices which are both complex and multidirectional, simultaneously involving instances of inclusion and exclusion. Dating back to 1989, AWF has been extensively funded by USAID. The inclusive objective of USAID being to “improve the quality of life in Tanzania” by encouraging suitable “conservation behavior” within local populations through both “economic and other livelihoods incentives.”<sup>250</sup> This departs from more traditional conservation logics by asserting that “human development” is indeed, “compatible with biodiversity conservation.”<sup>251</sup> Interestingly, this denotes broader biopolitical patterns of population management within the context of conservation and ‘sustainable’ development whereby rural communities are (re)produced through notions of nature and culture. Due to their apparent peaceful coexistence with their surroundings, rural populations are constructed as primitive yet principled and considered combatable with the environment and thus are deemed worthy of being “conserved” along with the rest of nature as “fauna” and permitted to inhabit

---

<sup>248</sup> Ibid, p.109

<sup>249</sup> Ibid, p.109

<sup>250</sup> USAID (2004) USAID/Tanzania Country Strategic Plan FY 2005-2014. Improving the quality of life in Tanzania. Washington DC: USAID, p.71

<sup>251</sup> Ibid, p.71

enclosed spaces and wildlife reserves.<sup>252</sup> These subtle instances of coded-racism imitate wider western paternalistic sentiments towards populations within ‘underdeveloped’ regions. In essence, these rural communities were not permitted to alter their ‘nature’ (so defined by the west) in order to remain within spaces targeted for wildlife conservation.<sup>253</sup>

So then, the inclusion of *some* rural community’s (with limited or no agricultural development) becomes central within conservation efforts. The AWF stresses the importance of working “outside of protected areas” and “involving all the players” in order to “be successful in conserving natural resources in the long run”, classifying “subsistence agriculture, unplanned settlements, and inadequate land use” as the main threats to the “ecological viability of landscapes.”<sup>254</sup> Thus, the underlying governmentality produces new patterns of human inclusion and exclusion, whereby select communities are tolerated because of their perceived ‘primordial’ nature, whilst others are altogether banished from spaces of conservation.

Perhaps one of the most visible top-down attempts at establishing community within rural Tanzania is achieved within legal spaces where, by presenting collective legal titles to rural communities, WMAs (re)produce rural communities so that they may become identifiable partners in business practices. The AWF stipulates the importance of the “facilitating agency and the Wildlife Division lawyer” in supporting “you (*the rural community*) through the legal part of the process.”<sup>255</sup> Direct partnerships between ecotourism companies and village governing bodies were actively discouraged through a prohibitive tax, requirements to seek ministerial consent, and outright criminalization in spaces where hunting companies operated.<sup>256</sup> In its place, ecotourism investors lacking documented land titles were expected to work under the supervision of the established WMA community-based organizations. Thus, WMAs were to operate as ‘businesses’ under CBO management, necessitating both a favorable business setting and appropriate property rights over land and wildlife to draw-in tourism

---

<sup>252</sup> Neumann, R.P (2001) Africa's 'last wilderness': reordering space for political and economic control in colonial Tanzania. *Africa*71(4):641-665

<sup>253</sup> Li, T.M (2014) Fixing non-market subjects: governing land and population in the Global South. *Foucault Studies*18:34-48

<sup>254</sup> AWF (n.d.-b.) AWF Heartland Conservation Process (HCP). African Wildlife Foundation.

<sup>255</sup> AWF (n.d.) A practical handbook for setting up and managing a wildlife management area in Tanzania. African Wildlife Foundation, p.18

<sup>256</sup> Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania’s community-based conservation. *Geoforum*, 83, p.104

investment.<sup>257</sup> Despite both land and wildlife remaining the official property of the state, WMA regulations enabled CBOs to engage with ecotourism companies to create incomes for rural communities based on the use of village land and the wildlife roaming it.

Each village is expected to send elected representatives to join a community-based organization (CBO) consisting of “between 1 and 5 representatives, depending how many villages make up your CBO” tasked to “manage and monitor the work of the WMA” and “the natural resources on behalf of – and for the benefit – of the entire community.”<sup>258</sup> Interestingly, what is omitted from the AWF handbook is that, in many cases, these individuals selected for CBOs are strongly recommended by the district game officer.<sup>259</sup> This can be seen as establishing a structure for control by appointing and supporting the leaders and vesting them with certain authorities. Yet again, the use of community within the administration of WMAs involves maximizing the efficacy of governing as an ever-present focus within liberalism’s biopolitical operations. Certainly, in the case of WMAs, efficacy is explicitly cited by aid agencies; the precise reasoning provided behind CBO being that “If every single member of the WMA voted on every single issue, not much could be done. Just as you have a committee to run a village, so you need a committee to run your WMA effectively and efficiently.”<sup>260</sup>

Such legal processes can be read as efforts towards the neo-liberalization of conservation, whereby rural communities are involved within global liberal economic strategies and logics. Interestingly, the management and processes involved within WMAs renders visible dialectic patterns of neoliberal conservation and liberal biopolitical structures more broadly. Notably, the creation of WMAs and so-called ‘green grabs’ should not be considered homogenous or single events but instead embody persistent techniques of (re)production involving “a series of changing contexts, emergent processes, forces and contestations, and are under constant negotiation regarding access.”<sup>261</sup> The role of local actors, as such (be it rural communities or

---

<sup>257</sup> Ibid, p.104

<sup>258</sup> AWF (n.d). A practical handbook for setting up and managing a wildlife management area in Tanzania. African Wildlife Foundation, pp.16-7

<sup>259</sup> Igoe, J., & Croucher, B. (2007). Conservation, commerce, and communities: the story of community-based wildlife management areas in Tanzania’s northern tourist circuit. *Conservation and Society*, 5(4), p.546

<sup>260</sup> AWF (n.d). A practical handbook for setting up and managing a wildlife management area in Tanzania. African Wildlife Foundation, pp.16, 18

<sup>261</sup> Green, K. E., & Adams, W. M. (2015). Green grabbing and the dynamics of local-level engagement with neoliberalization in Tanzania’s wildlife management areas. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(1), p.102

refugees within the camp), are central to these struggles. Thus, population management through WMAs does not simply ‘happen’ to local communities as a united entity but instead involves persistent renegotiated among local actors themselves. WMAs have contributed towards this situation, bringing areas of wildlife land into a capitalist network of market-based exchange, thereby creating opportunities for development, and, quite literally, ‘beggar thy neighbor’ competition.<sup>262</sup> These shifting contexts have been written into struggles over land, power and access at the local level as different groups try to find ways to best position themselves in attempts to benefit from the opportunities made accessible by neoliberalization. The character of community is thus invoked within uneven biopolitical practices involving instances of both control and resistance. Community, reconceived within neoliberal terms, is a form of biopolitical control, yet its logics have become adopted by local actors as well. Therefore, the biopolitical conditions of community come to frame its conceptualization and utilization on all levels of its negotiation.

To explore these dynamics in a little more depth, this thesis will briefly examine the case of MBOMIPA WMA (Kiswahili short form for Matumizi Bora Maliasili Pawaga na Idodi, meaning ‘sustainable use of natural resources in Pawaga and Idodi’). MBOMIPA is a community-based organization sheltering 21 villages and working with 56,000 individuals living adjacent to Ruaha National Park in Tanzania on sustainable natural resource management and anti-poaching efforts.<sup>263</sup> Since established, member villages have donated a total of 777 hectares of land for the purposes of establishing the WMA.<sup>264</sup> Importantly, within the park “revenue generated from the wildlife management area is split among member villages.”<sup>265</sup> Tension has arisen, however, from the fact that only 14 member villages have actually donated towards the 777 hectares of WMA wildlife zones. As such, some of the villages with legal title to land within the WMA have disputed that, seen as the financial gain which shore up the park takes place on their land, they ought to receive a bigger share of the revenue.<sup>266</sup> Their position was further compounded by the fact that their closer proximity to

---

<sup>262</sup> Ibid, p.102

<sup>263</sup> UNDP (2015) WBOMIPA Wildlife Management Area. Equator Initiative Case Studies [accessed from: [https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case\\_1459269477.pdf](https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case_1459269477.pdf)], p.3

<sup>264</sup> Ibid, p.6

<sup>265</sup> Ibid, p.3

<sup>266</sup> Green, K. E., & Adams, W. M. (2015). Green grabbing and the dynamics of local-level engagement with neoliberalization in Tanzania's wildlife management areas. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(1), p.109

Ruaha National Park has resulted in greater levels of crop damage and human-wildlife conflict.<sup>267</sup> Representatives within the WMA Authorized Association attempted to bring about a change in the revenue-sharing organization, whereby the 14 village members with land inside the WMA would receive 90% of the revenue whilst the remaining villages were allocated just 10% on the basis that these “landless” villages were “eating for free”.<sup>268</sup>

Within MBOMIPA, the commodification of wildlife resources and the introduction of global market-based forms of exchange has accentuated a shift within nature-society relations brought about by neoliberal governance. The inclusion of rural populations within the technologies and logics of neoliberalism denotes yet another process of “privatizing responsibility”.<sup>269</sup> Paralleling the camp, this process facilitates the administration of rural populations from a distance, thus enabling authorities to govern through the formation of networks, links, or partnerships with state and non-state actors.<sup>270</sup> As previously stated, the aim is “to create locales, entities and persons able to operate a regulated autonomy.”<sup>271</sup> Though, as Rydin emphasizes, “the trick within governmentality is that the creation of autonomy actually enables the goal of government to be achieved.”<sup>272</sup>

### 5.3 Self-Management

An interesting facet of neoliberal governmentality which surfaces within the context of conservationism is attempts made towards the education of rural populations in the art of self-management. Profoundly biopolitical, neoliberal *environmentality* is implemented through a variety of different mechanisms, be it through a series of disciplinary, educational techniques

---

<sup>267</sup> Ibid, p.109

<sup>268</sup> Ibid, p.109

<sup>269</sup> Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen’s University Press, p.44

<sup>270</sup> Ibid, p.52

<sup>271</sup> Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen’s University Press, p.52

<sup>272</sup> Rydin, Y. (2007). Indicators as a governmental technology? The lessons of community-based sustainability indicator projects. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(4), p.611



or, though positive economic incentives to direct human behavior towards productive ends. Disciplinary environmentality as an authoritative technique of government involves the moralization of individual human behavior.<sup>273</sup> This often parallels paternalistic teaching with the aim of (re)producing a population comprising of environmentally aware, self-sufficient and self-managing individuals. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) stresses that a central aim of establishing WMAs is to provide awareness and education to the people of the 21 villages on the environment, natural resources (wildlife, forestry, fisheries, water and soils, etc.) and vital issues such as disease.”<sup>274</sup> Similarly, AFW proposed that pastoralists living within and around Tarangire National Park would be “sensitized” in order to “counter inappropriate immigration and agricultural development.”<sup>275</sup> The aim being the creation of “conservation compatible livelihood diversification” in the shape of “wildlife or biodiversity enterprises” under the supervision of strict land use directives.<sup>276</sup> This shows, quite explicitly, attempts at educating or ‘sensitizing’ rural communities in the art of sustainable development. As such, rural communities are mobilized in attempts to “counter” processes deemed adverse to conservation efforts, including the movement of other rural communities outside spaces demarcated by Tarangire National Park. Moreover, these same communities were involved within their own management through the restriction of agricultural expansion. Nowadays, AFW claims that “whereas wildlife was previously seen a source of conflict, it is now regarded as a treasured resource to be promoted.”<sup>277</sup>

Chem Chem Safaris (CCS) -one of the major tourism companies within Burunge WMA- is deeply involved within conservationist logics, working in partnership with The Wildlife Society and promising “community development” through ecotourism. Both CCS and The Wildlife society actively participate within a combination of neoliberal and disciplinary techniques which attempt to (re)produce rural communities as a responsible, self-managing and environmentally conscious population. They seem to suggest that people merely need

---

<sup>273</sup> Fletcher, R. (2017). Environmentality unbound: multiple governmentalities in environmental politics. *Geoforum*, 85, 311-315.

<sup>274</sup>UNDP (2015) WBOMIPA Wildlife Management Area. Equator Initiative Case Studies [accessed from: [https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case\\_1459269477.pdf](https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case_1459269477.pdf)], p.5

<sup>275</sup> GEF (2003) Novel forms of livestock and wildlife integration around protected areas in Africa. Medium-Sized Project. Global Environmental Facility, p.21

<sup>276</sup> Ibid, p.21

<sup>277</sup> AFW (January -March 2012) “African Heartland News” *A newsletter for Partners of the African Wildlife Foundation*, p.12

instruction to identify both the innate importance and economic opportunities involved within conservation:

“Sustainable environmental protection is only possible when people are able to recognize, through education, the importance of wildlife and the potential it has for their future.”<sup>278</sup>

“We have to contribute actively to the process of transformation of the mindset of the society in which we live.”<sup>279</sup>

“We have to firstly uplift and make a meaningful difference to the lives of the people who live adjacent to these wilderness areas. Unless and until rural communities can see the benefit of wild animals to them, they will not protect and conserve them and wild animals will be lost forever.”<sup>280</sup>

The use of positive economic incentives to direct human behavior on an aggregate level towards ends deemed productive is similarly visible within the administration of WMAs. One assumption being that “entire populations are thus deemed to be rational economic actors who follow their self-interest and are responsive to externally set incentives.”<sup>281</sup> Significant instances include revenue-sharing techniques and externally funded humanitarian action directed at compensating the costs of community-based conservationism, be it the restriction of land, resources or the increase of human-wildlife conflicts. Sources of income for WMAs may include photographic tourism, research fees, international and national donations, fines and game hunting fees. Nevertheless, ecotourism (with its accompanying revenue and labor opportunities), is perhaps the only real revenue which has a chance of offsetting the village costs in joining and remaining within a WMA. These economic incentives have thus increasingly become a point of contention for rural communities.

---

<sup>278</sup> Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania’s community-based conservation. *Geoforum*, 83, p.108

<sup>279</sup> Accessed on 2019-05-03: [www.livewildlife.org](http://www.livewildlife.org)

<sup>280</sup> Twitter, Chem Chem Safari Lodges, 2016-7-14

<sup>281</sup> Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania’s community-based conservation. *Geoforum*, 83, p.103

Member villages of Burunge, the second highest earning WMA within Tanzania, have each received USD 7,606 annually which corresponds to roughly USD 2.2 per person, per year.<sup>282</sup> The past decade has seen substantial growth in the potential for agricultural-led development within Burunge. The price of crops has grown significantly in Tanzania over this period, moreover Burunge has witnessed a rise in infrastructure improvements and state-led agricultural development.<sup>283</sup> Nowadays, rural communities perceive the WMA restrictions on land and agriculture as increasingly harmful towards their development opportunities. For instance, wetlands within the Magara, Manyara and Maweni village regions have become known as highly valuable agrarian spaces for rice production.<sup>284</sup> This resentment regarding the insufficient economic benefits of remaining within the WMA are compounded by rising human-wildlife conflict. The elephant population density within the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem has grown by over 60% since 2009, reaching approximately 1 elephant per sq. km in 2014.<sup>285</sup> Unsurprisingly, this had led to a substantial increase in human-wildlife conflict. This is made worse by the fact WMA revenue is not used to compensate communities for damages caused by wildlife.<sup>286</sup> Summarized, WMA authorities attempt to regulate and (re)produce rural populations as sustainable communities, processes which often frame human development, such as agricultural, as environmentally unsustainable.

## 5.4 Case Summary

To summarize, this chapter has analysed the management of underdeveloped populations through WMAs as a developmental practise on three levels. Firstly, it examined the administration of space within wildlife conservation as a method of controlling rural

---

<sup>282</sup> Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), pp.236-7

<sup>283</sup> Ibid, p.237

<sup>284</sup> Adam, C., D. Kwimbere, W. Mbowe, and S. O'Connell. (2012) Food prices and inflation in Tanzania. African development bank groups Working Paper No. 163.

<sup>285</sup> TAWIRI. (2015) Aerial census of elephant in the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem, dry season, 2014. Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute, Arusha, Tanzania.

<sup>286</sup> Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3), p.237

populations. These spatial processes involve exclusionary and marginalization practices insofar as certain human and non-human populations are selected to prosper whilst “others are marginalized from access to the means of subsistence or ‘let die’.”<sup>287</sup> Secondly, this examine the biopolitical tactic concerning the management and (re)production of rural populations through a “particular and highly instrumentalized” account of community.<sup>288</sup> Within WMAs, community is particularly (re)produced within legal contexts and thus introduces and circulates rural communities within wider capitalist structures. Finally, analysis has been directed towards the techniques of educating rural populations in efficient, self-reliant and sustainable living. This has demonstrated processes whereby ‘the park’ provides a lens through which to “see, understand, and (re)produce the world,” reinforcing notions that certain human populations are incompatible with the assumed necessities of both non-human life and humanity at large.<sup>289</sup>

---

<sup>287</sup> Cavanagh, C. J., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Guerrilla agriculture? A biopolitical guide to illicit cultivation within an IUCN Category II protected area. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3-4), p.726

<sup>288</sup> Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1), p.64

<sup>289</sup> West, P., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2006). Parks and peoples: the social impact of protected areas. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 35, p.252

## 6 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to investigate how the development-security nexus has manifested in the management of underdeveloped populations by utilising the two Tanzanian cases as an empirical anchor. So then, in what ways do the cases of ‘the camp’ and ‘the park’ speak to each other? Moreover, what do the cases, when considered together, say about the development-security nexus more broadly? Firstly, when considering similarities, three prominent biopolitical features present within both the camp and the park are: (1) the management of underdeveloped populations through spatial administration; (2) controlling underdeveloped populations through the management of community and finally; (3) reproducing the underdeveloped populations into knowable and quantifiable entities.

Possibly the most striking biopolitical aspect of both developmental projects is the fact that human life itself (and how it is subsequently categorized) is written onto the land and woven into the administration of physical space. Certainly, the camp itself is an example of a physically demarcated space which corresponds to human life with the label ‘refugee’. This parallels broader biopolitical realities present within both cases whereby variously demarcated and discrete categories demarcation between underdeveloped populations (be it refugees or the rural poor) and broader structures of citizenship. In the case of the park, the classification of rural populations and tourist populations match with corresponding categories of spatial existence. Demonstrated within the case of Burunge WMA, particular zones are designated tourist spaces and still others are assigned to local Burunge inhabitants. Still more, there are prescribed zones for livestock grazing, to fuelwood, constructing temporary.<sup>290</sup> Perhaps most indicative of biopolitical operations is the fact that hunting is permitted within assigned spaces depending just on how you are catalogued (local or tourist populations).

---

<sup>290</sup> JUHIBU (2011) Burunge wildlife management area general management plan 2010-2020. Babati, Burunge WMA

The second biopolitical aspect spanning the cases of the camp and the park is the management of community. Interestingly, this has surfaced within both cases, whereby the very relations between humans (or even between humans and non-human species), are subject to biopolitical consideration and consequent administration. Within both contexts, community is invoked and carefully nurtured as a method which maximizes the *efficiency* of administering such populations. This can be seen in the promotion of foster families and community-led security within the camp, or within the push for WMAs to be locally led by CBOs (community-based organizations).

Finally, the act of (re)producing underdeveloped populations in an attempt to better understand and control them has become a central feature within such developmental projects. Within both cases the populations in question have been identified and labeled, whether it is ‘refugees or displaced peoples’ in the case of the camp, or ‘rural or village populations’ in the case of the park. This is not, however, merely a matter of identifying and demarcating sectors of society but this act also allows for the statistical (re)production of such populations. This act of ‘management via contingency’ is evidenced within the case of the camp, whereby each member undergoes a screening process. Here, once established through recurrent statistical analysis, the refugee population as a knowable and calculated mass can be efficiently managed. Thus, the range of population statistics and their uncertainty produces situations of emergency which subsequently necessitate spatial governing mechanisms, including the camp itself. States of ‘crisis’ or emergency are (re)produced through statistical calculations of risk and probability. For instance, nutrition is a primary arena in which contingency as an intelligibility mechanism is routinised, particularly with regards to malnutrition ‘crises’ among children.

So then, returning to the primary research question (*How is the development-security nexus expressed in the management and administration of underdeveloped populations?*), I will attempt to situate the Tanzanian cases of the camp and the park within the broader strokes of the security-development nexus.

As previously outlined within chapter two: *Theory: Involving Biopolitics*, given the centrality of life itself within political considerations and the circulatory nature of contemporary development, the struggles over acceptable and unacceptable ways of life within the

underdeveloped world interconnects with the security of the global north.<sup>291</sup> And thus, the old dichotomy between the national and the international - which still structures academic life – collapses. This has signaled the emergence of new sovereign frontiers and biopolitical campaigns both within mass consumer societies *and* the global borderlands. Confronted with such global complexity, the development-security nexus seeks to regulate and manage political risk within both of these interwoven spaces. As such, development can be considered a practice which privileges the biopolitical management and regulation of life within its appropriate social habitat.

So, what does this mean in practice? Interestingly, when considering the cases of the camp and the park within Tanzania, it is the *differences* that are perhaps the most indicative of these wider patterns within the development-security nexus. Together, both cases render visible the dialectic nature of development – involving biopolitical processes of *both* inclusion and exclusion. In the case of the camp, displaced underdeveloped populations are excluded - kept separate from wider society in attempts to better manage them and secure developed sectors of society. This mirrors broader developmental trends whereby post-Cold War refugee policy has become increasingly restrictive. Unwanted migration is framed as a security risk – a contingency which requires management. Moreover, the practice of making refugee status temporary excludes such populations from access to citizenship and joining and circulating within broader society.<sup>292</sup> On the contrary, however, in the case of the park, rural underdeveloped populations are included and actively encouraged to participate within international neoliberal and capitalist structures in order to better mediate them. Again, this can be observed more generally, whereby the new human security terrain “makes it possible to strategically align the resilience of mass consumer society’s welfare bureaucracies critical infrastructure with international efforts (development) to transform the fragile states into human security states.”<sup>293</sup> Worded differently, the consumption patterns of the developed world have come to be dependant upon establishing sustainable forms of adaptive self-reliance beyond its borders – involving and necessitating surplus populations within liberal capitalist structures.

---

<sup>291</sup> Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1), p.69

<sup>292</sup> Ibid, p.70

<sup>293</sup> Ibid, p.70

Thus, in a world where global populations can be envisaged as a complex systems of flows and circulations tying homeland (the global North) and borderland (the global south), development can be conceived as some form of filtering mechanism. In this sense, development vectors the circulations of populations, disentangling rewarding and risk-induced flows. The former is allowed to intergrate (albeit in a controlled and limited capacity), whilst the latter is excluded and confined to the peripheries.

Moving forward, for a more holistic and comparative perspective, case studies in other regions of the underdeveloped world should be carried out. However, one fruitful line of inquiry for future research to explore would be the role of local authorities within the international developmental arena. Certainly, over recent years there has been a recent shift within UN policy away from what was meant to be shared responsibility between the international community and the host state towards a much stronger emphasis upon the responsibility of the latter.<sup>294</sup> In light of such trends, it would be interesting to study the roles of local authorities (such as the Tanzanian state) within the broader international biopolitical management of underdeveloped populations and the extent to which they operate within the wider logics of the development-security nexus.

---

<sup>294</sup> De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5), p.531



## 7 References

- Adam, C., D. Kwimbere, W. Mbowe, and S. O’Connell. (2012) Food prices and inflation in Tanzania. African development bank groups Working Paper No. 163
- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press
- Agamben, G. (2000). *Means without end: Notes on politics* (Vol. 20). U of Minnesota Press
- Arendt, H. (1973). *The origins of totalitarianism* (Vol. 244). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
- Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Work, consumerism and the new poor*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK)
- Beall J and Goodfellow T (2006) Introductory article: On the discourse of terrorism, security and development. *Journal of International Development* 18(1)
- Benjaminsen, T. A., & Bryceson, I. (2012). Conservation, green/blue grabbing and accumulation by dispossession in Tanzania. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(2)
- Beate Jahn,, 2005. ‘Barbarian Thoughts: Imperialism in the Philosophy of John Stuart Mill’, *Review of International Studies* 31(3): 599–618
- Biermann, C and B. Mansfield. 2014. Biodiversity, purity, and death: conservation biology as biopolitics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 32(2)
- Biermann, C. and R.M. Anderson. 2017. Conservation, biopolitics, and the governance of life and death. *Geography Compass* 11(10)
- Bigo, D. (2001). Migration and security. *Controlling a new migration world*, 4
- Blair, T., (2001). ‘This is the Battle with Only One Outcome: Our Victory’, *Guardian*, 3 October
- Bluwstein, J. (2017). Creating ecotourism territories: Environmentalities in Tanzania’s community-based conservation. *Geoforum*, 83
- Bluwstein, J., Moyo, F., & Kicheleri, R. P. (2016). Austere conservation: understanding conflicts over resource governance in Tanzanian wildlife management areas. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3)
- Bluwstein, J., & Lund, J. F. (2018). Territoriality by conservation in the Selous–Niassa Corridor in Tanzania. *World Development*, 101
- Bluwstein, J. (2018). From colonial fortresses to neoliberal landscapes in Northern Tanzania: a biopolitical ecology of wildlife conservation. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1)
- Brankamp, H. (2016). Community policing in Kakuma camp, Kenya. *Forced Migration Review*, (53)
- Bryceson, I., Jiddawi, N., Kamukuru, A., Kulindwa, K., Mwaipopo, R., Onyango, P. and Sebastian, M. (2006) Fisheries study in Tanzanian coastal waters: the effects of trial export of finfish from Mafia Island on ecological-social resilience and vulnerability

- Brockington, Dan, and Igoe, Jim. 2006. "Eviction for Conservation: A Global Overview." *Conservation and Society* 4 (3)
- Bulley, D. (2014). Inside the tent: Community and government in refugee camps. *Security Dialogue*, 45(1)
- Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*
- Cavanagh, C. J. (2018). Political ecologies of biopower: diversity, debates, and new frontiers of inquiry. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1)
- Cavanagh, C. J. (2014). Biopolitics, environmental change, and development studies. In *Forum for Development Studies* (Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 273-294). Routledge
- Cavanagh, C. J., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2015). Guerrilla agriculture? A biopolitical guide to illicit cultivation within an IUCN Category II protected area. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(3-4)
- Coburn, C. E. (2006). Framing the problem of reading instruction: Using frame analysis to uncover the microprocesses of policy implementation. *American educational research journal*, 43(3)
- Crush, Jonathan. (1995). *Power of development*. Psychology Press
- Cowen, M. P. and Shenton, R. W (1996). *Doctrines of Development*, London: Routledge
- Dean, M. (2010). *Governmentality: Power and rule in modern society*. Sage publications
- De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign power and the biopolitics of human security. *Security Dialogue*, 39(5)
- De Genova, N. Nathalie Peutz, eds. 2010. *The deportation regime: Sovereignty, space, and the freedom of movement*
- Diken, B. (2004). From refugee camps to gated communities: biopolitics and the end of the city. *Citizenship studies*, 8(1)
- Dillion Michael in; Larner, W., & Walters, W. (Eds.). (2004). *Global governmentality: governing international spaces*. Routledge.
- Dillon, M. and J. Reid, 2001, 'Global liberal governance: Biopolitics security and war', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1
- Dillon, M. (2007). Governing through contingency: The security of biopolitical governance. *Political geography*, 26(1)
- Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: governing the world of peoples*. Polity
- Duffield, M. (2006). Racism, migration and development: the foundations of planetary order. *Progress in Development Studies*, 6(1)
- Duffield, M. (2010). The liberal way of development and the development—security impasse: Exploring the global life-chance divide. *Security dialogue*, 41(1)
- Escobar, A. (1995). Imagining a post-development era. *Power of development*, 211-227.
- Foucault, M., & Ewald, F. (2003). *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-1976*. Macmillan.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. Vintage
- Foucault, M., 1991, 'Governmentality', in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller, eds, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two Lectures Lecture One: 7 January 1976

- Foucault, M. (2003). *Madness and civilization*. Routledge
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Springer.
- Fletcher, R. (2017). Environmentality unbound: multiple governmentalities in environmental politics. *Geoforum*, 85, 311-315.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American political science review*, 98(2)
- GEF (2003) Novel forms of livestock and wildlife integration around protected areas in Africa. Medium-Sized Project. Global Environmental Facility
- Goldman, M. 2003. Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: community-based conservation in Tanzania. *Development and Change* 34, no. 5: 833–62
- Green, K. E., & Adams, W. M. (2015). Green grabbing and the dynamics of local-level engagement with neoliberalization in Tanzania's wildlife management areas. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 42(1)
- Gregory, D. (2004). *The angel of Iraq*
- Harvey, D (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). Global transformations. *ReVision*, 22(2)
- Huysmans, J. (2004). Minding exceptions: the politics of insecurity and liberal democracy. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 3(3)
- Hyndman, J. (1997). Refugee self-management and the question of governance. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 16(2)
- Igoe, J., & Croucher, B. (2007). Conservation, commerce, and communities: the story of community-based wildlife management areas in Tanzania's northern tourist circuit. *Conservation and Society*, 5(4), p.546
- Kelly, A. B., & Ybarra, M. (2016). Introduction to themed issue: "Green security in protected areas"
- Kelly, M. (2004). Racism, Nationalism and Biopolitics: Foucault's Society Must Be Defended
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). 2001. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, 2.
- Ilcan S and Lacey A (2011) *Governing the Poor: Exercises of Poverty Reduction and Practices of Global Aid*. London: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Lazzarato, M. (2002). From biopower to biopolitics. *Pli: The Warwick Journal of Philosophy*, 13(8), p.99
- Leader, N., & Colenso, P. (2005). *Aid instruments in fragile states* (No. 668-2016-45530)
- Li, T.M (2014) Fixing non-market subjects: governing land and population in the Global South. *Foucault Studies* 18:34-48
- Lippert, R. (1999). Governing refugees: The relevance of governmentality to understanding the international refugee regime. *Alternatives*, 24(3)
- Malkki, L. H. (1995). Refugees and exile: From "refugee studies" to the national order of things. *Annual review of anthropology*, 24(1)
- Malkki LH (1995) *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory and National Cosmology Among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Malthus, T. R. (1872). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*

- McAfee, K. (1999). Selling nature to save it? Biodiversity and green developmentalism. *Environment and planning D: society and space*, 17(2), 133-154
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and society*, 19(1), 1-31
- Minca, C. (2005). The return of the camp. *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(4)
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism (2012) The wildlife (Wildlife Management Area) Regulations
- Moyo, F., Ijumba, J., & Lund, J. F. (2016). Failure by design? Revisiting Tanzania's flagship wildlife management area Burunge. *Conservation and Society*, 14(3)
- Nelson, F. 2007. Emergent or illusory? Community wildlife management in Tanzania. International Institute for Environment and Development, issue paper no. 146.
- Nelson, F., and A. Agrawal (2008) Patronage or participation? Community-based natural resource management reform in sub-Saharan Africa. *Development and Change* 39, no. 4: 557–85
- Neumann, P (2004) Nature-state-territory: Toward a critical theorization of conservation enclosures. In *Liberation ecologies: environment, development, social movements*. London: Routledge.
- Nustad knut (2004). “The Development Discourse in the Multilateral System.” Pp. 13–23 in Bøås and McNeill 2004
- Nustad, Knut G.(1998) “Community Leadership and Development Administration in a Durban Squatter Settlement.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge
- Nyers, P., & Rygiel, K. (2012). *Citizenship, migrant activism and the politics of movement*. Routledge
- Neumann, R.P (2001) Africa's 'last wilderness': reordering space for political and economic control in colonial Tanzania. *Africa*71(4)
- Paris, R. (2001). Human security: paradigm shift or hot air? *International security*, 26(2)
- Peet, Richard. (1997) In “Space and Social Theory: Interpreting Modernity and Postmodernity”, (eds.) George Benko and Ulf Strohmayer. Oxford: Blackwell
- Peluso, N. L., & Lund, C. (2011). New frontiers of land control: Introduction. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(4)
- Polanyi, K., & MacIver, R. M. (1944). *The great transformation* (Vol. 2). Boston: Beacon press.
- Prunier, G. (2008). *Africa's world war: Congo, the Rwandan genocide, and the making of a continental catastrophe*. Oxford University Press and; Turner, T. (2007). *The Congo wars: conflict, myth and reality*. Zed Books
- Rabinow, P., & Rose, N. (2006). Biopower today. *BioSocieties*, 1(2)
- Robinson, L. W., & Makupa, E. (2015). Using analysis of governance to unpack community-based conservation: a case study from Tanzania. *Environmental management*, 56(5)
- Rose, N. (1993). Government, authority and expertise in advanced liberalism. *Economy and society*, 22(3), 283-299
- Rutherford, S. (2007). Green governmentality: insights and opportunities in the study of nature's rule. *Progress in human geography*, 31(3)
- Rydin, Y. (2007). Indicators as a governmental technology? The lessons of community-based sustainability indicator projects. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 25(4)

- Sachedina, H. T. (2010). Disconnected nature: the scaling up of African Wildlife Foundation and its impacts on biodiversity conservation and local livelihoods. *Antipode*, 42(3)
- Said, E. W. (1985). Orientalism reconsidered. *Race & class*, 27(2), 1-15
- Schlosser, K., 2008, 'Bio-political geographies', *Geography Compass*, Vol. 2, No. 5
- Sphere Project (2011) Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, 3rd edn. Northampton: Practical Action Publishing
- Soguk, N. (1999). *States and strangers: Refugees and displacements of statecraft* (Vol. 11). U of Minnesota Press.
- Stern, M., & Öjendal, J. (2010). Mapping the security—development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence?. *Security Dialogue*, 41(1)
- Stepputat F, (1994) 'Repatriation and the politics of space: the case of the Mayn diaspora and return movement' *Journal of Refugee Studies* 7, 2-3
- Thomson, M. J. (2014). Mud, dust, and Marougé: precarious construction in a Congolese Refugee Camp. *Architectural Theory Review*, 19(3)
- Turner, S. (2004). Under the gaze of the 'big nations': Refugees, rumours and the international community in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 103(411)
- Turner, S. (2005). Suspended spaces—Contesting sovereignties in a refugee camp. *Sovereign bodies: Citizens, migrants, and states in the postcolonial world*
- United Nations, (2004) A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. New York: United Nations
- United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], (1996) Human Development Report 1996. New York: UNDP
- United Nations, (2004) A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. New York: United Nations
- Walt Stephen M, (1991) "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol.35, No.1
- Walters, W. (2008). Acts of demonstration: mapping the territory of (non-) citizenship. *Acts of citizenship*
- West, P., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2006). Parks and peoples: the social impact of protected areas. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*, 35
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Applications of case study research*. Sage

## 8 Empirical Material

- AWF (n.d.-b.) AWF Heartland Conservation Process (HCP). African Wildlife Foundation.
- AWF (n.d). A practical handbook for setting up and managing a wildlife management area in Tanzania. African Wildlife Foundation
- AFW (January -March 2012) “African Heartland News” *A newsletter for Partners of the African Wildlife Foundation*
- JUHIBU (2011) Burunge wildlife management area general management plan 2010-2020. Babati, Burunge WMA
- TAWIRI. (2015) Aerial census of elephant in the Tarangire-Manyara ecosystem, dry season, 2014. Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute, Arusha, Tanzania
- Twitter, Chem Chem Safari Lodges, 2016-7-14
- UNHCR. (2017)a. “Tanzania – Nyarugusu Camp Profile – 31 March” Accessed from: <https://www.unhcr.org/524d87c99.pPDF>
- UNHCR’s (2007) ‘*Handbook for Emergencies*’ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Geneva, Third Edition
- UNHCR (2002) “Review of CORD community services for Congolese refugees in Tanzania”
- UNICEF. (2015) “UNICEF Tanzania Sitrep.”
- UNHCR (2017) ‘Food and Nutrition Needs in Emergencies’
- UNDP (2015) WBOMIPA Wildlife Management Area. Equator Initiative Case Studies [accessed from: [https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case\\_1459269477.pdf](https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case_1459269477.pdf)]
- USAID (2004) USAID/Tanzania Country Strategic Plan FY 2005-2014. Improving the quality of life in Tanzania. Washington DC: USAID
- UNHCR. 2016a. “A cross section of Refugees in Nyarugusu camp on the occasion of World Refugee Day.”
- UNDP (2015) WBOMIPA Wildlife Management Area. Equator Initiative Case Studies [accessed from: [https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case\\_1459269477.pdf](https://www.equatorinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/case_1459269477.pdf)]
- WFP. 2016. “Cash Based Transfer Options: Nyarugusu Camp, United Republic of Tanzania.”
- WWF. (2014) Tanzania’s wildlife management areas—a 2012 status report. *World Wildlife Fund for Nature Tanzania*, Dar es salaam
- WWF. 2014. Tanzania’s wildlife management areas—a 2012 status report. World Wildlife Fund for Nature Tanzania, Dar es salaam.
- [www.livewildlife.org](http://www.livewildlife.org)