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Liberalisation or participation in a Tanzanian village
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The lowland parts of Kondoa District, Central Tanzania, are dry and hot. Rainfall is scarce and erratic (Ngana 2004; Yanda 1995). For half the year many villagers get their water from pits dug deep into dry riverbeds – sometimes 10 km or more away from their homes. Some families use as little as 20 litres per day for drinking and cooking, which leaves little for washing; you just do not wash yourself or your clothes regularly during the long dry season. A few villages have access to drilled boreholes or piped water through a gravity scheme, and there the situation is of course different. But for most villages water is a major problem.

Farming in Kondoa

Farming is at a perilous place. The staple crop is bulrush millet and the general strategy for farming is to plant as early as possible in the rains – “chasing the rains” as the local saying goes. In this precarious farming environment, safflower (Carthamus tinctorius L.) appears to be a “saviour” crop. It is unusually drought-resistant, recommended to be planted towards the end of the rains and thus does not compete for labour with the ordinary food crops. Nor is it susceptible to attack from birds, livestock or game. Safflower can grow on the heavy and sometimes saline soils in the flat depressions (mbuga), which otherwise are used for extensive grazing. It produces edible oil with characteristics at least as good as sunflower oil, and it fetches a high price on the international market.

Safflower is a newcomer to Kondoa and is now rapidly being adopted by small-scale farmers in the drier parts of the district. Villages where safflower is currently grown include Atta, Huruvi, Isare, Kinyasi, Kwamtoro and Seria, but suitable soils and climate are found in many additional villages (see Figure 19.1).

Safflower is the latest addition to a long list of cash crops that Kondoa farmers have tried. Immediately prior to its introduction, and retained as notable cash earners, are simsim, sunflower and pigeon peas. In the early 1990s some farmers made good money on the sale of finger millet for brewing traditional beer around Arusha and Moshi. Groundnuts and castor oil have also been major income earners. Through several shifts such as these, Kondoa farmers have shown themselves to be responsive to market changes. The case of safflower is no exception.
The promoters

More or less the entire safflower production in Tanzania ends up with Quality Food Products – from now on simply called the Company. In Arusha it runs a modern factory producing safflower oil for export under the trademark Safflo. The Company was started in the second half of the 1990s by former directors of the Dutch seed company Pop Vriend, together with the expatriate manager of its Tanzanian subsidiary Pop Vriend (T). The Company has a de facto monopoly on safflower business in Tanzania.

Safflower is produced by farmers under contract to the Company, which offers seeds, ploughing and harvesting services, all charged for. The Company can also provide pesticides and spray pumps if needed. It pledges to buy all safflower produced at a guaranteed price, which is noted in annual contracts concluded with willing farmers. It initially contacted the District Agricultural Office and public information meetings were arranged, but soon the Company’s

Figure 19.1 Kondoa District, showing major centres and roads. Map by Camilla Årlin.
Note: villages mentioned in the text are rendered in italics.
representatives made direct agreements with interested farmers and the Agricultural Office was not actively involved as the new crop became a reality in the district. The district office has no information on the crop (apart from what has been provided by the Company) and no independent advice or caution was provided to farmers trying the new crop. At the national level, the Ministry of Agriculture had not initiated research on safflower, neither did it have plans to start producing certified safflower seeds. In Kondoa, the initiative and competence regarding safflower production rested squarely with the Company.

Although enthusiasm over the new crop was considerable among the staff, opinions on the pros and cons of safflower were contradictory. Some agriculturalists in Kondoa described safflower as a pest-free crop, while others mentioned attacks by cutworms in the early stages of the crop and fungi in the late stages. In short, there were guesses, hopes and hearsay, but no established knowledge. The agricultural staff at Kondoa welcomed the new crop with a feeling of gratitude, almost submission, but they did not attempt to systematically create a knowledge-base independent of the information provided by the Company.

The conclusion so far is that the crop was introduced to the district without any well-informed assessment being made of its pros and cons. How great is, for instance, the risk of introducing new diseases to the district? Is it a predator crop? Will it exhaust the land? How reliable is the market? Is the Company financially sound, or do farmers take risks when they clear land and cultivate for it? The District Agricultural Office has no information to offer the district’s farmers on any of these matters.

Mkukuta

Following the country’s current policy directives, the administration has moved from being an organisation of experts that would lead developments in the district to becoming facilitators for villagers who collectively identify their development needs. The Ministry of Agriculture operates according to the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP) and the Participatory Agricultural Development and Empowerment Project (PADEP), which are applications of the overall National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, known in Swahili as Mkukuta. The basic idea is that villages should identify their development needs while specialists of the district administrations help them achieve these goals. “Basket funds” provide the means to carry out agreed interventions.

This line of thinking is nowadays so widespread in development work all over the world that analysts conclude that we have entered the “age of participation” (Oakley 1991). Some also talk of the “paradigm of people”. The era has been in the making for a considerable period of time (e.g. Chambers 1983, 1997; Gardner and Lewis 1996). The agricultural office is expected to actively cooperate with “stakeholders”, including non-governmental and community-based organisations, other government agencies and commercial interests.
The strategic position for the Company

The Company does not own or lease the land where safflower is grown. The task to acquire land is delegated to the farmers contracted by the Company. Thereby it escapes possible criticism against land grabbing. If safflower farming depletes the soil, such problems are passed on to the farmers. On the other hand, farmers retain control over the land, and they have no obligations to the Company beyond a contract that runs for one year at a time.

The Company dictates the conditions for safflower growing, and farmers can accept or reject the terms but not really negotiate. The power of the Company lies in it being the only buyer of the product, and that it also more or less controls the entire process from ploughing to selling safflower oil on the world market. Since a market value in Tanzania of safflower cannot be established – as the Company is the only significant buyer – the suspicion lurks that the Company monitors the price against sunflower and other alternative crops, putting it at a level where they expect to get deliveries and not in relation to profits they may realise on the world market.

Changing perceptions of the benefits of fat

Safflower oil has similar characteristics and uses as sunflower oil, e.g. salad dressing, production of margarine, etc. It helps to reduce blood cholesterol and related heart and circulatory problems. Dajue and Mündel (1996) provide references to several studies on this topic. It is non-allergenic, and therefore suitable for the cosmetics industry. While the oil is mainly used in the food industry, other industrial uses of safflower oil are expected to expand as environmental concerns demand replacements for products based on fossil fuels (Dajue and Mündel 1996).

The farm-gate price for sunflower has increased dramatically over the last few years, which has a direct bearing for safflower cultivation. In Kondoa District sunflower was sold for 3,000–6,000 Tanzanian shillings (TSh) per bag in 2005. A year later the price was 4,000–13,000 TSh, while in 2007 the price per bag reached 35,000 TSh in Kondoa Town by late December.

This dramatic increase in price goes together with an interesting change of attitudes in the country. Industrially produced cooking fats have for years been standard for most families, but no longer. The quality of cooking oil is a topic that engages almost everyone in Kondoa, as elsewhere in the country. Farmers are critical of fats “that clog your blood” and “give high blood pressure”. They prefer cooking oil pressed from seeds produced on their own farms, or at least bought from someone known to them. A common opinion is that industrially produced fats “are fit for making soap but dangerous to eat”. Also, people living on narrow margins tried to use sunflower oil (or safflower oil if available), although the price has skyrocketed in recent years. How this widespread change of opinion came about is worthy of a study in its own right. Those I asked, both in Kondoa, at the headquarters of the Ministry of Agriculture and at the
University of Dar es Salaam, insisted that there had not been major government propaganda on the issue, but that the message spread from mouth to mouth. In Kondoa, in its promotion meetings for safflower, the Company had emphasised the health aspect along with the economic benefits of the crop. It seems that this argument had caught an interested audience.

The Kwamtoro experience

Kwamtoro ward is a sparsely populated part of the district, least of all known for farming achievements. Instead, it has a legacy of hunting and honey production. The majority population, the Sandawe, speak a language with click sounds, related to the Khoisan languages of southern Africa. This affinity is further evidenced by the ancient rock paintings found in the area (Fozzard 1966; Kohl-Larsen and Kohl-Larsen 1958; Lewis-Williams 1986; ten Raa 1974), which are similar in style to those of southern Africa.

The major crops grown are millet, sorghum, maize, pumpkins, pigeon peas, cassava and sunflower. Fields are on average small in this area as land preparation is commonly done by hand with hoes. Charcoal and timber are important products, as is honey and beeswax. The road to Kondoa Town, some 60km away, is of poor quality, impassable during rains and passes through tsetse-infested forest, making Kwamtoro an isolated part of the district. Wild meat remains part of the diet for many households.

The area would seem an unlikely choice for an industrial crop, but land is available, the climate is suitable, and the growing of safflower began here in the 2005–2006 season. The chairman of the association of safflower growers in Kwamtoro, Ramadhani Saidi Kwenda, on a business trip to Singida had encountered the profitable and drought-resistant crop. He approached the Company and served as a facilitator for its activities in Kwamtoro.

The Company requires that farmers organise themselves into groups to facilitate mechanised ploughing and harvesting. Groups of up to 20 farmers clear land for the new crop. So far, every farmer wanting to open a new field has been granted land by the village government. The mbuga plots are vast compared to the number of people living in the area. This is particularly so in one of the five villages of the ward, Ndoroboni (which means “of tsetse fly” in Swahili). It was founded around 1976 to counter problems with tsetse flies (Madulu 2001: 13), while the Kwamtoro area more generally experienced tsetse-clearing campaigns during the 1950s (Kikula and Mung’g’o 1993: 24, 33). People from different parts of Sandawe country were at the time mobilised to come and clear forest harbouring the fly near the main village of Kwamtoro, which was becoming uninhabitable because of the fly. Today, clearings again characterise life around Kwamtoro as more and more land is allocated to safflower.

Farmers in Kwamtoro perceive themselves as being at the mercy of the Company. They have no prior experience of mechanised farming to fall back on, and the market value of safflower is not known to them, nor the exact prices of farm inputs provided by the Company. They feel that they have to accept the
conditions offered. Agribusiness interventions are by their very nature a top-down exercise. What is to happen, who is to be included and on what terms is decided by the investor and by national institutions. When local communities are invited to participate, this follows a “harmony model of power” (Mohan and Stokke 2000: 249). No restructuring of economic or political relations are assumed. If a mutually beneficial situation were to develop, this would require that all partners in the process had reasonable access to information and were able to make informed decisions. This is not the case in Kwamtoro. Here relationships are clearly asymmetrical.

Farmers received only rudimentary growing instructions from the Company and proceeded on a trial-and-error basis. They noted that they lacked knowledge of the characteristics of different varieties of the crop, and of how it performs under different weather conditions or over longer periods of time. An obvious conclusion is that professional agronomic advice is much needed, as is support during negotiations with the Company, if disappointments are to be avoided. As already noted, however, the District Agricultural Office has as yet acquired no competence on safflower.

Some farmers worry that the Company will not send tractors and combine harvesters at appropriate times. It is essential that the seeds be harvested when the oil content is at its maximum, and before seeds risk falling to the ground. Kwamtoro farmers realise that they are far from the centres where the machinery is based, and that the acreage they cultivate is small by comparison. They may not be the ones given priority in times of shortage.

Nevertheless, the number of Kwamtoro farmers growing safflower has increased dramatically. After two years there were 53 groups recognised by the association of growers at Kwamtoro (registered with approved minutes from meetings) and a further 13 groups that have listed themselves but await formal recognition. In all, 687 farmers were growing safflower by December 2007. Given that Kwamtoro ward in total had 1,761 households (in December 2007), this is an impressive figure after only two seasons. Furthermore, of these 687 households, well over 400 were headed by women. This high percentage is somewhat specific to Kwamtoro; although women are active in income-generating activities all over Kondoa District, their share is particularly high in Kwamtoro. They are active in all parts of the process, except forest clearing, for which they hire men. As in many parts of sub-Saharan Africa, women dominate farming both for subsistence and for sale, but what is emphasised here is that they formalise their role as they list themselves as being responsible for the family enterprise.

When asked why female farmers take the lead in Kwamtoro, both men and women mentioned cultural traditions as an explanation. There is a legacy of hunting in the area and many men retain the habit of being away from home for shorter or longer periods – not only to hunt, but also for other activities. Kwamtoro men are, for instance, prominent among charcoal providers for Dodoma Town. Men could not be relied upon to be present at any specific time, both men and women argued, and therefore women registered themselves with
the association to make things run smoothly. Another factor prompting women to grow a cash crop was said to be widespread drinking among men, which forced their wives to assume responsibility not only for the day-to-day care of the family’s needs, but also for larger expenses. Since Kondoa District generally is dominated by Muslims, while they constitute a minority at Kwantoro, it is to be expected that drinking may be more prominent in the latter ward, and hence the need for women to register themselves as independent growers is more acute. At least this was how informants in Kwantoro perceived the situation.

**Economics of safflower cultivation**

Table 19.1 provides a budget of approximate production costs and estimated incomes. It suggests that it is profitable to grow safflower. Alternative crops such as maize or sunflower may produce a better return if sold later in the season. Simsim is also an attractive option.

Although Table 19.1 indicates that it pays to grow safflower, many farmers worry that they may not recover their costs if the harvest is too small. For the 2007–2008 season they therefore asked to have the price increased from 250 TSh per kilogram to 400 TSh per kilogram. They received 300 TSh, an increase that corresponded to about three times the annual inflation.

One major difference with growing safflower compared to other crops is that the price is fixed in the contract between the growers and the Company. Payment is made at the time of harvest. In 2007 the safflower price was 25,000 TSh per bag. This is much better than sunflower at the time of harvest, when sunflower may in fact be sold at a loss.

*Table 19.1 Comparative economics for safflower and competing crops*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Sunflower</th>
<th>Safflower</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land preparation</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeds</td>
<td>5,000–9,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>6,000–8,000</td>
<td>6,000–8,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeding</td>
<td>6,000–12,000</td>
<td>6,000–10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertiliser, pesticides</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird-scaring</td>
<td>0–4,000</td>
<td>2,000–4,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvesting</td>
<td>4,000–10,000</td>
<td>4,000–10,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crushing</td>
<td>2,000–3,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport from farm</td>
<td>0–2,500</td>
<td>0–2,500</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses (bags, ropes)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production costs</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>42,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>600kg</td>
<td>450kg</td>
<td>480kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income at harvest</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>69,300</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>—3,300</td>
<td>77,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income December 2007</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>207,700</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>141,700</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: costs/income per acre, Kwantoro village, 2007, round sums.
By late December 2007, however, the price for sunflower in Kwamtoro reached 25,000 TSh for a bag weighing around 65 kg, which means that sunflower was then more profitable than safflower. A further option is to press a bag of sunflower seed to get 20 litres of oil, which sells for 45,000 TSh. In that case a small additional income can also be gained from the residues, which are used as livestock feed.

Simsim fetched an even higher price at 65,000 TSh per bag, but the crop requires very fertile land, and considerable work goes into producing a bag of simsim.

Thus, although there are other crops which, under optimal conditions, bring in more money than safflower, the latter is still an attractive option because of the moderate production costs and because it is grown on land otherwise not commonly used for farming. Most important, however, is the fact that money is secured at harvest: many Kwamtoro farmers cannot afford to store crops and sell after a couple of months. Pest attacks during storage is also a factor to consider.

Being paid per kilogram is a definite advantage compared to other crops that are bought per bag, which gives rise to difficult negotiations with traders. The traders often demand that bags are “properly filled”, which means that additional grains should be added to make the sack “full”. The problem of “lumbeza” (to add extra weight to a full sack) has for years been a major problem for farmers in many parts of Tanzania and considerably reduced their incomes. Buyers have only accepted their own sacks, where the top part is extended by another third or even more, while the price remained that of a normal bag. The practice is prohibited by law but discussions of what constitutes a full sack still occur at farmgate trading.

Making it without the Company

Mohammed Omari Lamlawa Moshi has an altogether different take on safflower growing compared to other farmers in the District. At 70 years of age, after a long career as a chemist and as an executive manager in both government agencies and private companies, he finds himself opening up new fields of activities. Together with his adult son Yai he runs the Lamlawa Agricultural Processing Company at Kiteo in Pahi Ward, Kondoa District. This is on the dry, hot plains below the Irangi escarpment. Here he has built a couple of simple structures containing a flour mill, an oil press, welding equipment, a mechanic’s workshop and also a mghawwa run by his wife, i.e. a place where passers-by can get tea, soft drinks, and food. He says: “We live simple. I earn 2,000–3,000 TSh a day [approximately US$2.5] as neighbours come here to have their cell phones charged on our solar outfit. It is very little, but I also need very little.”

This was said with a subtle smile by someone who has travelled the world, holds a degree from West Virginia University, and owns property in Arusha and Morogoro. To the visitor it rings true – because of the quiet, agreeable atmosphere on the compound – but at the same time as a gross understatement as the place is also the home of a tractor ploughing several hundred acres of land out
on the plains. There Mzee Moshi grows not only safflower, sunflower and
simsim, but also millets, groundnuts and several more crops. His priority,
however, is oil seed crops.

I first read about safflower in an agricultural magazine, the SACCAR News-
letter [published by the Southern African Centre for Cooperation in Agri-
culture and Natural Resources Research and Training, Botswana]. In that
article I learnt the chemistry of safflower, and I saw that it was high in oil
content and that the plant thrives in dry conditions. That impressed on me. I
started to look for seeds. That was back in 1998. We planted four acres as a
trial, broadcasting the seeds and harrowing them into the soil. We harvested
by hand, using gloves and protective clothes. We just pulled the pods off.
We only got a bag and a half because of the poor husbandry. But I had seen
that the crop could do well in this environment and my interest was sus-
tained. However, I do not want to be dependent on Quality Food Products in
Arusha. That is not my way of doing things. Therefore we have only grown
as much as we can harvest and process ourselves. I press my own oil here,
for our own use and to sell locally. We have nothing in stock now. All we
had is gone. Definitely, we could expand! I am ready to pack safflower oil
for the domestic market using my own trademark. I do not aim at exports. I
could not possibly compete with Quality Food Products. That is not what I
have in mind. But there definitely is a local market for safflower oil. You
will see me developing this step by step during the next few years.

Mzee Moshi shares characteristics with many African farmer innovators (Reij
and Waters-Bayer 2001). About three-quarters are men, they commonly organise
their enterprises as family undertakings, they are strong personalities, of mature
age, relatively rich, prepared to give their innovations time to mature, have been
exposed to other areas and are full-time farmers. “Instead of diversifying into
off-farm activities, they have chosen to diversify their agricultural activities”
(ibid.: 82). Another study, based on a survey of 505 farmers in three East African
localities, produced a somewhat different picture. Here the focus was more on
the farming system than on the innovators. Nielsen (2001: 96–100) found that
almost all farmers do various small innovations in their work every year and that
access to off-farm income contributed to innovations.

The empowerment ideology

Mzee Moshi is making it on his own. Few Kondoa farmers have that option.
Why did the District Agricultural Office not take a more active role with regard
to safflower? The answer is found in recent changes in the country’s develop-
ment policies. The time when the state and CCM, the ruling party, resolutely led
development is long gone. The ujamaa ideology, the Arusha Declaration, and
the “villagisation” policy of the 1970s, i.e. the radical land reform which con-
centrated people into development villages, were replaced by the structural
adjustment policies of the IMF and the World Bank, initially resisted by Tanzania, but eventually implemented. Today we have multi-party elections, a devalued currency, a liberalised economy and a drastically reduced infrastructure for rural development. Land has become a commodity. The former nationalist agenda has been replaced by openness to foreign investments. In the IFC/World Bank report *Doing Business 2007*, Tanzania appeared among the ten most successful “reformers”. The doyen of social comment in Tanzania, Issa Shivji, notes that the leading classes no longer seek legitimacy from their people but from donors and international financial institutions (Shivji 2006: 11). From such quarters also comes the reorientation of the development policy to “participation” and “empowerment from below”, which may appear as a paradox.

In theory, when a district establishes its plans for the coming year the procedure has started months before in the villages, where the real planning is supposed to take place. The district plan should be an aggregate of what has been thought and decided in villages, wards and divisions. But in practice what happens is that some villagers participate in meetings where they are consulted rather than “holding the stick”, as Robert Chambers (1997) once formulated it. At the district level, of course, officers continue to hold internal meetings as before, follow instructions from the Ministry, and are careful to register the opinions of the District Commissioner as well as those of senior officers at the regional level. As Jules Pretty (1995) has observed, planners fear people’s participation as much as they need it after decades of collapsed development efforts. It is rare that local communities in any real sense take part in decision-making, monitoring and evaluation processes.

Nevertheless, it is also true that things have changed. We now have an ideology of “good governance”, and the previous authoritarian atmosphere is largely gone, as also is to a large extent the staff. Successive years with budget cuts have had an impact; for instance, the agricultural service of a division that used to be manned by some five members of staff today only has one person remaining, and she/he neither has independent transport nor power to intervene. New policies and lack of resources have led to a situation where many local offices no longer hope to be able to influence developments as entrepreneurial individuals make use of the area’s land, water and forest resources. According to the neoliberal agenda the lives of people would naturally improve as the state withdrew. For some it did.

It is this new situation that paved the way for a private company to by-pass the Agricultural Office. The responsibilities for environmental protection and development policies at the district level have become diffuse. Public offices, NGOs, private companies and international agencies all contribute and in the process they cross each other’s boundaries and it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish who is responsible for what. In theory, the Kondoa Agricultural Office could decide to become actively engaged in safflower if farmers actively requested support from the office in their dealings with the Company. However, this is not likely to happen, because the resources for new activities are just not there and because the new political climate stipulates that commercial interests are to be promoted and not just regulated.
Whatever the case, precious time has already been lost. Large areas have been cleared. Facts have been established on the ground before the district authorities have had time to reflect over how desirable this is. The Company has already set the agenda.

Conclusions

Safflower has high market value and the overseas demand is increasing. Both farmers in Kondoa and the District Agricultural Office harbour great expectations that safflower cultivation will bring substantial incomes to some parts of the district. Climatic conditions are favourable and suitable land is available in abundance, according to both villagers and the staff at the district headquarters. However, farmers worry about becoming dependent on the Company. The level of mechanisation in safflower growing makes it difficult for small-scale farmers to take command over the work on their fields. Harvesting is a major obstacle. If simple machinery for harvesting, crushing the pods and separating the grains could be developed, this would help small-scale farmers to start thinking along similar lines as Mzee Moshi does, envisaging possibilities to sell their own oil.

Clearly there is scope for the District Agricultural Office to become more active with agronomic advice, but also to support farmers in their dealings with the Company, to link up with colleagues in other districts where safflower is grown and to explore additional possibilities to market the crop. Farmers would feel more confident with the new crop if the District Agricultural Office staff were firmly on their side. In its absence the Company has become the dominant actor regarding safflower. When no independent fact-gathering on safflower is undertaken, not to mention proper research, farmers take risks as they adopt the new crop on an ad hoc basis.

This account of how safflower was introduced to Kondoa District is not reported as an administrative failure but as a reflection of the country’s political reorientation and how a new regime in rural development has yet to find its institutions. The fact that the Kondoa Agricultural Office so comfortably entrusted a private company with the commanding role when a new crop was introduced into the district’s farming landscape demonstrates how neoliberalism has become hegemonic both as a mode of thought and as political-economic practice. This is how we now understand the world (Harvey 2006: 145). In such a world, concepts like “popular participation” and “empowerment from below” take on qualities of Orwellian Newspeak.
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