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Abstract

Purpose. The aim of the article is to broaden the understanding of slum tourism in Kenya by presenting the results of empirical research conducted in Kibera, Nairobi’s largest slum.

Method. The author conducted ethnographic research in Kibera (participant observation, in-depth interviews and group discussions) for three months in 2014.

Findings. The results of the research show that within the frame of slum tours, more varied vocabularies, semantics and meanings of poverty are produced. Inhabitants of Kibera are characterized less by apathy, stagnation and desperation, and more by economical industriousness, community, development and hope. Life in Kibera is normalized in the eyes of the visitors.

Research and conclusions limitations. Research is limited to Kibera tours organized by slum inhabitants in order to show their particular perspective. It cannot be referred to other Kibera tours organizers (bigger Kenyan or foreign tourism entities).

Practical implications. There can be practical implications for the Kenyan Tourism Board, however the research should be further developed on a broader scale.

Originality. The author focused in her research on Kibera inhabitants involved in the organization of tours around the place where they were born and raised, or where they lived for a large part of their life. They are often treated as passive victims of this kind of tourism. However, the results of the research reveal that they have fully internalized the idea of slum tourism and they use it in order to break the image of ‘being others’ in economic, social, cultural and political senses in the eyes of visitors.
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Introduction

The aim of this paper is to broaden the understanding of slum tourism in Kenya by providing the perspective of slum inhabitants involved in the organization of Kibera tours. They claim that they want to show visitors the positive side of Kibera, Nairobi’s largest slum. It is their home, the place where they were born and raised, or where they lived for a large part of their lives. The paper is divided into four parts. In the first one, I provide an introduction to slum tourism and research done on this phenomenon. In the second part, I provide narratives I have collected during my fieldwork within the frame of slum tours conducted in Kibera. I took part in them as an observer from June to August 2014. In this part, I demonstrate what these tours look like, taking into consideration not only their program but also numerous interactions with guides, representatives of visited organizations and slum inhabitants. In the third part, I outline the process of the construction of narratives. Moreover, I describe themes of stories and motives constructed and disseminated within the tours. In the last and concluding part of the paper, I attempt to answer the question of what is the Kibera tour, and if it can be framed beyond poverty tourism (meaning the experience in which poverty becomes a touristic commodity). The paper is an important input into the discussion on slum tourism, which is an emerging phenomenon in different cities all over the world.

From slumming to slum tourism

From the mid-1980s, we have observed the increasing importance of slum tourism in terms of both economics and the numbers of tourists visiting slums in many cities all over the world. The researchers trace the emergence of slumming back to the mid-19th century. At that time it was “a burgeoning practice of members of London’s higher classes visiting East End” [Frenzel, Koens, Steinbrink 2012, p. 2]. While the interest in “slumming” increased in the second part of the nineteenth-century in London and other industrial European cities like Paris, slums became a touristic commodity in the case of New York at the turn of the century. However, it is worth noting that slumming was “carried in mental luggage” [Steinbrick 2012, p. 224] to United States by well-to-do tourists from England. In this period, first tour companies offering guided slum visits started to operate, and some guidebooks already recommended walking tours in the impoverished districts of New York as a touristic attraction [Frenzel, Koens, Steinbrink 2012, p. 21]. The Lower East Side was inhabited by poor immigrants such as Italians, Jews and the Chinese, whose ways and conditions of living inflamed the imaginations and attracted the better-off Americans and foreign tourists.
“Slumming in New York was about particular sites in the well-known immigrant colonies, from the darkened Little Italy basements to the Chinatown opium dens” [Freire-Medeiros 2012, p. 16].

The more recent version of this phenomenon started in mid-1980s in South Africa, then in the beginning of the 1990s in Brazil it is defined as “the touristic valorization of poverty-stricken urban areas of the metropolises in so-called developing or emergent nations, which are visited primarily by tourists form the Global North” [Frenzel, Koens, Steinbrink 2012, p. 1].

Looking at the definitions of slumming and slum tourism, the phenomenon became ‘globalized’ through popular tourism, and each slum tour encounter is co-constructed by the actors being opposite in more various ways than in the nineteenth century, e.g., in the case of Kibera: white vs. black, rich vs. poor, colonizers vs. colonized, powerful vs. underprivileged. This differentiation makes the phenomenon to be often questioned from an ethical point of view, easily judged and as a consequence, often misunderstood.

Going beyond poverty tourism?

At the beginning, it is important to underline that tours to slums, townships (term used for shanty towns of South African cities) or favelas (term used for slums of Brazilian metropolies) can be viewed and understood from various perspectives. There are many different social actors involved in the construction of the context of each tour. Middle-class Londoners and Kibera slum inhabitants define poverty, the main characteristic of this phenomenon, in a very different way. Moreover, the motivations of visitors vary greatly. Touring townships and favelas is a part of almost each organized travel to South Africa and Brazil, comparing to still niche tours around Kibera. Tourists, tour operators, representatives of visited organizations and slum residents, all have a different understanding of slum tourism.

Two terms, poverty “tourism” and “poorism” (blending poverty and tourism) are used as synonyms of slum tourism. They express morally dubious socio-voyeuristic aspects of making a touristic attraction out of poverty. According to field research conducted in Cape Town, South Africa [Rolfes, 2009], Mumbai, India [Meschank, 2011] and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, [Freire-Medeiros, 2009, 2012], slum tour organizers are critical to voyeuristic safaris in the impoverished city areas. Their goal is to show informal settlements by relativization of poverty and all its characteristics. “Even though life there is presented as hard, nonetheless, positive impulses of development, success and normality of the situations of those living there are focused upon” [Rolfes, 2009, p. 439].

According to the results of the field research on township tours around the impoverished areas of Cape Town, local tour guides in their narratives
stress historical/political and cultural contexts of these places. Townships are the result of the ethnically segregated development of South African cities under the Apartheid regime. They were the areas of the Africans’ struggle for equal democratic rights during this period. Therefore, historically significant sites are visited during these tours. The cultural context of life in townships is evoked by showing the real African lifestyle and culture. Tourists visit and can get consultations from sangoma – a traditional healer, and at the end of tour they go to an informal pub called shebeen where they can taste umqombothi – a traditional beer [Rolfes 2009, p. 437].

Julia Meschank conducted her research in Dharavi, the biggest slum of Mumbai. The impoverished area is shown as a place full of the economic activities of its industriousness and entrepreneur inhabitants. In the eyes of tourists, Dharavi’s residents are very hardworking and enormously productive [Meschank 2011, p. 57]. There is a strong community understood as providing mutual support and assisting one another. Visitors are shown relatively good living conditions, and a well-functioning system of education. It makes them change their perception of the place. “More by chance, I might not automatically call it a slum, especially some of the areas. The area, where we saw the pottery and which he called the more Hindi area, seemed to be very clean, paved and with high-rise buildings” [Meschank 2011, p. 58].

The results of the field research conducted in the favelas of Rio de Janeiro follow the same pattern. Tours operators aim at showing relatively good standards of living, infrastructural equipment and a wide range of services. The guides make references to the traditional Brazilian cheerfulness, which is associated, for example, with the carnival and numerous samba schools. Favela is marketed as a place of “authentic” Brazilian culture, full of dance and music. However, Freire-Medeiros points out that “there is no ‘touristic favela’ as such, but only what all actors involved – tourism promoters, guides, tourists, artisans, residents, researchers and so on – define as being touristic. […] There are states of being that only make sense in relations to a series of interactions that are carried out within the touristic favela at the same time that ‘makes it alive’” [Freire-Medeiros 2012, p. 170].

My research focuses on Kibera, the biggest impoverished area of Kenya’s capital city, Nairobi. Slum tourism in Nairobi is a relatively new trend and there is a gap in research on this particular destination. There is at least one monograph I took into consideration in my research work: the book “Slum Tourism in Kibera, Nairobi, Kenya. Philanthropic Travel or Organised Exploitation of Poverty?” written by Kennedy Magio Obombo from Moi University in Eldoret. This Kenyan scholar conducted research in the same field as me – Kibera. Obombo mainly studied the interrelations between three categories of social actors: tour operators, slum tour guides and local leaders as the representatives of the Kibera community [Obombo 2012].
aspect of the phenomenon was the most interesting for Obombo, and the main conclusion of his research was to enhance the level of benefits for local communities in order to achieve slum tourism sustainability.

My research fills in various gaps in slum tourism studies. First of all, I use an anthropological approach which is rare among slum tourism researchers. Moreover, I focus on slum-dwellers actively involved in this activity because their perspective is often neglected by researchers, showing them as passive victims of this voyeuristic activity. My aim is to show their agency and efforts to build or strengthen their subjectivity disclosed not only in the involvement in slum tourism activity but also in very conscious deconstruction of the visitors’ imaginaries of Kibera and its inhabitants.

**Research method**

“Good ethnography is often the effect of triangulation, that means the use of variety of gathering data techniques in order to justify proposed conclusions” [Angrosino 2010, p. 78]. I conducted ethnographic research in Kibera (participant observation, in-depth interviews, interviews, group discussions), which is aided with the use of mobile methods (review of portals and travel blogs, observation of travel agent/tourist profiles on social networking websites).

First and foremost, in order to better understand the perspective of slum dwellers, I lived in a slum with the family of one of the Kibera tour organizers (I stayed in Nairobi for three months, in January and from June to August 2014). A researcher undertaking ethnographic research has ultimately just one tool – him/herself. Therefore, I started the research with a reflexive approach. I strengthened my self-consciousness that enabled to understand myself in deeper ways, which lead to a better understanding of others. It allowed to identify the filters through which we learn the reality under study, and to get over the judgments that are inscribed in the social and cultural background of the researcher. It helped me to be aware of ethnocentrism, and allowed to consider the factors constructing my perspective in order to take them into consideration, because it will never be possible to get rid of them. Moreover, living in a slum is important in the process of understanding it. According to Hastrup, “an ethnographer in the field remains strangely unaware to which extent the experience is embodied. Almost mythical status of field notes as written observations darkened the stubborn presence marked by emotional “footnotes in the head” – unforgettable memories from the field” [Hastrup 2008, p. 107].

Secondly, within the frame of research, I became a volunteer of two non-governmental organizations - Kibera Hamlets offering tours, and the Power Women Group, which is visited by most tour organizers. Due to the
fact that I was an outsider, and a white, rich, well-educated and relatively young woman, establishing relations was crucial in order to gather reliable data. My status slowly changed during the time I spent with people under my study. Initially, I was treated very objectively ‘like a walking ATM’, but after five months of the stay in Nairobi, I was treated more subjectively ‘like a sister from another mother’. Moreover, I was often ascribed different roles by my respondents – a friend, a supporter, an attractive women. However, it is worth noting that entering into various roles as a researcher or non-researcher allows to gather different data and to discover new perspectives which allow to describe the experience more fully.

Thirdly, as an observer, I took part in ten tours organized by various entities, with visitors coming from different countries all over the World (New Zealand, United States, Australia, Japan, Finland, Taiwan and others). One of the characteristics of observation-based research is noting the details in the most possibly descriptive and objective manner, trying to avoid interpretations and drawing conclusions, and putting aside one’s own opinions and prejudice. I noted the narrations of the guides and representatives of the organizations I was visiting. I tried to write down as many conversations, questions and comments as I could, also those exchanged between the tourists. I talked to the participants of the tours. I asked them what they were doing in Kenya and what inspired them to participate in such tours. In my notes, I tried to grasp various non-verbal gestures and behaviors. At the end of each tour, I interviewed the participants or conducted group discussions with them (if there were more than two visitors, we rather had group discussion). By asking various questions, I tried to invite the tourists to describe Kibera, its inhabitants and the experience of the tour.

Moreover, I interviewed slum tour organizers – guides, representatives of visited organizations (Power Women Group, Victorious Bones Craft) and some slum dwellers – community leaders (sixteen semi-structured, in-depth interviews). Some of the interviews were conducted in the form of oral stories. They were aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of the history of the interviewees and the history of their families, the reasons for which they live in Kibera, the manner in which they see this place through the prism of various life experiences, and the reasons for which they decided to show that place to visitors.

Kibera, the biggest slum of Nairobi

Nairobi is not only the capital city of Kenya, but also the most important city in the region of East Africa and home of the African United Nations headquarters. It has a well developed world-class infrastructure, which serves to organize conferences, summits and other gatherings of high-ran-
king officials. Nairobi’s airport connects Africa with Asia and Europe. At the same time, there are many districts inhabited by the impoverished Kenyans who live in conditions that represent a blatant contrast to the five-star hotels, restaurants and other facilities. According to the estimates, around two million one hundred and fifty thousand Kenyans are settled in the slums of Nairobi [Pamoja Trust 2009, p. 15].

Kibera is situated in the southwest part of Nairobi. It covers an area of 2.5 sq. km and is divided into twelve villages: Gatwekera, Kambimuru, Kianda, Kisumu Ndogo, Laini Saba, Lindi, Makina, Mashimoni, Raila, Silandanga, Soweto East, and Soweto West. The majority of the inhabitants of Kibera come from the Luo or Luhiya ethnic groups (living in western Kenya). For years, their number was estimated at even one million. According to the 2009 census, Kibera is inhabited by only around 170,000 people, as quoted by a *Daily Nation* journalist of Kenyan descent, despite the fact that it maintained the myth of the “largest slum in the world” for years [Karanja, 2010]. Other sources and slum dwellers themselves suggest that the total population may range from 500,000 to 1,000,000 depending on how Kibera is defined and who is defining it.

The beginning of slum tourism in Kenya can be traced back to the World Social Forum organized in Nairobi in January 2007. The idea of this international conference was to provide opportunities to meet and exchange ideas between social activists from all over the world. It was launched as an alternative to the World Economic Forum, in order to question the values of neoliberalism. The meeting in Nairobi brought together more than 20,000 visitors. A large part of them was accommodated in first-class hotels. The event was organized at a large football stadium, but the purchase of a ticket priced at 3 USD was required to enter the premises, which were guarded by armed policemen. In the act to protest against exclusion of the poorest from participation in the WSF, some delegates started to visit Kibera, known as ‘the biggest slum of Kenya’. The tours were organized by local NGOs operating in the slum, and very soon became a ‘must-do’ for the WSF participants [Frenzel, Koen, Steinbrink 2012, pp. 54-55]. Kibera started to be not only imagined, but visited as well.

Since that time, the number of slum tour organizers and people interested in touring the poorest areas of Nairobi has increased. However, reliable data showing the development of slum tourism in terms of both the number of tourists and economics does not exist. I think the major problem is that the Kenyan government is denying the emergence of slum tourism in the country. I interviewed a few representatives of the Kenya Tourist Board – a government entity responsible for tourism development, who manifested their disapproval for this form of tourism in Kenya. Similarly, it is difficult to point out the exact number of slum tour organizers. First of all, some of them are still informal initiatives of one or a few people. In
their recently published article, Frenztel and Blakeman have enumerated only three entities, namely Kibera Tours, Explore Kibera Tours and Kibera United for Everyday Slum Tours, and many no-name big tour operators [Frentzel, Blakeman 2015]. According to my findings, there are much more small entities which have emerged from Kibera Tours and Explore Kibera Tours, namely Diddy’s Kibera Tours, Beyond Kibera Tours, Kibera and Beyond Tours or provided by NGO’s e.g. Kibera Hamlets Reality Tours (Kibera Hamlets) or Kibera Social Slum Tours (Kibera Community Empowerment Organization), however, they have clients very rarely when compared to KT and EKT which are recommended by travel guides such as Lonely Planet and Rough Guide, and on the TripAdvisor portal.

Welcome to Kibera – “the friendliest slum in the world!”

The meeting is scheduled for twelve in the afternoon in front of Java Coffee House – a café at the small shopping centre Adams’ Arcade located close to one of the roads entering Kibera. Kevin, our guide, welcomes everybody – me and two vistors from Finland, Marta and Olen. Kibera Tours started operating in 2008. Its main goal is to show the positive side of Kibera because there are many negative images transmitted by the media. “The idea is to show how Kibera is in reality”. We start the tour with a visit at TOI market – Kevin spells, “T-O-I”. TOI is the second biggest market in Nairobi. “It is possible to buy everything there, apart from cars and guns” – Kevin laughs at his joke. We go through the market until we reach Kibera drive, the main road linking Kibera with other districts of Nairobi. There is matatu stop - small public transport buses which enable reaching different places in the city. Kevin asks the visitors if we know what matatu is. Marta confirms that they actually came to Adams Arcade’s by matatu, so Kevin continues the introduction. Going along Kibera drive we get to the office of the Power Women Group. It is a community-based organization of fifteen HIV-positive women. Their aim is to support each other and fight the stigma targeted towards people being seropositive. The women produce and sell jewellery and ornaments. After that visit, we go to the biogas center. It serves five purposes. There is a toilet, a bathroom, a big social hall where different meetings take place and during the World Cup, football games are screened. There is a big water tank and lastly, in the biogas center, gas is produced for cooking. The biogas centre is situated at the edge of scarp, from which there is a panoramic view covering

1 The parts of the article: Welcome to Kibera – “the friendliest slum in the world!”, Toi Market, Power Women Group, A view on chocolate city, Victorious Bones Craft and The last points of the program, are based on my field-notes collected during field work in 2014. I have changed the names of all the people involved in the described Kibera tour.
a large part of Kibera. Among different things, which we are able to observe, there are blocks of flats which are the result of one of the projects aimed at upgrading living standards in the slum. The project failed, but Kevin provides details when we reach the place. The next place we go is the Victorious Bones Craft. They produce jewellery and ornaments from animal bones, mainly cows and goats – “No, not humans! You don’t have to be afraid”, Kevin makes a joke. The last place we visit is Frank’s mother’s house. It is a good opportunity to see how an average family in Kibera lives, if they have a bathroom, kitchen, and what kind of furniture and equipment is inside the rooms. Kevin points out that while walking, we will be sometimes accosted by Kibera residents because they are curious who the visitors are. They are very friendly, and there is nothing to be worried about, he adds. If the visitors want to take photos, they should communicate it to him or Charles, and they enable them to do so. Kevin finishes by introducing the possibility of asking questions. There are no questions, so we started the tour.

**TOI Market**

When we start walking, we divide into smaller groups. I join Marta, and Olen approached by Kevin and Charles. Once again, we introduce ourselves to each other. I ask her what she is doing in Nairobi. She says that she works as a United Nations volunteer, and has already been living in Nairobi for seven months. Olen is her boyfriend and came to visit her. They travelled around Kenya together. Moreover, she has already taken part in slum tours in Brazil and India. I was interested to learn that Marta had taken part in slum tours in different countries. I ask her how she would compare these experiences. Marta says that they were similar and different at the same time. The programs were constructed in a similar way, however, in Brazil, they mainly saw how the gangs operate, and in India the economic activities of slum residents. I conclude that it would be interesting to hear how she would evaluate the tour around Kibera.

We enter narrow paths between stalls. We follow one another. From time to time, Marta asks about some products arranged on the stalls. She points to a small fish, and asks for its name. Charles replies that it is om-ena from lake Victoria, a kind of a fish often consumed by Kenyans from the Western part of the country. Then, she asks about charcoal assorted in same-size heaps. Kevin says that it is used for cooking in the kitchen. We enter the second part of the market with shops arranged in small barracks. Each of them is divided into several parts. Shops with various products are in the part close to the path, in these more interior rooms, there are homes of tenants and their families.
We reach the main road, called Kibera Drive. Kevin points to small buses passing close to us, and explains that they are called *matatu*. We continue along the main road until we reach a church with the name OLYMPIC painted with white paint. We turn left, and after around fifty meters we turn right. Marta and Olen are talking to each other, while I am joking with the guides. Slowly, we reach the Power Women Group’s shop.

### Power Women Group

The shop is in a blue barrack, with the paintings of three women and the name of the organization close to the entrance. When we enter, we are welcomed by Eva. She quickly arranges plastic chairs in a circle and invites us to sit down. When all of us are seated, she starts her narrative. The women gathered in 2004 in order to fight the stigma and discrimination targeted at people who were HIV positive. Since that time, every Monday, the women organize meetings aimed at raising awareness of members of the local community. During these meetings, the women educate themselves about other diseases, how to prevent them and how to treat them. The organization operates due to the production of handiwork. It was registered as a Community Based Organization in 2008. Meanwhile, the women started other activities as well. They organize vocational training in hairdressing and tailoring, and run a day care for children at the age of 6 months to 2 years. However, Eva emphasizes that they have constant problems with financing their activities. Girls who take part in the training have very often dropped out of school because they could not afford it, so they do not have money to pay for the training either. Women who teach hairdressing and tailoring have to make money for their own livelihood and their families’ expenses. However, they try to face daily challenges. The organization has the long-term goal to empower women in rural areas, from the places they come from. Eva finishes her narrative and encourages us to ask her questions.

Marta asks whose idea it was to establish the organization and start this activity. Eva replies that the idea came from one woman working for different organizations. She showed them that facing challenges was possible. The next question is about the sources of funding for the activities. Eva explains that they have money thanks to visitors and volunteers. Since the previous year, they have become a member of a volunteer network, which connects them with volunteers coming from different countries all over the world. The following question is about the activities of volunteers. They are mainly responsible for communication. They try to popularize the Power Women Group through Facebook page, Twitter and other channels. The former volunteers had an idea of workshops for some Europeans staying...
in Nairobi. Every Wednesday and Friday they organize them, and they are called, ‘Cook like a Kenyan’, during which newcomers to the country can learn how to cook Kenyan dishes. Marta’s following question is about the biggest challenge in their work. Eva claims that most difficult is the constant lack of money, the amount insufficient for materials or food to feed the children. The women organize workshops which are free of charge, because otherwise, nobody would be able to afford them and the organization would have to stop its activities. The Power Women Group is sustained from the products they sell. At the end of each month, the women divide the earned money into four parts. The first one goes for food, the second one is for materials in order to produce jewellery and ornaments, the third one is put aside in case of emergency, and the last, fourth one is divided among the fifteen members of the organization. Marta interrupts that she has heard about Massai women selling their products via e-bay. I add that the Power Women Group sells its jewellery in the United States. Eva confirms that they sell their products in different countries through the network of their former volunteers. Marta suggests that she could buy something. She stands up and walks around the tables on which different products are displayed. At the same time, Olen plays ball with a small boy, who comes in during our conversation. Marta decides to buy a bracelet and necklace. She pays for them and we continue the walk.

**A view of chocolate city**

After fifteen minutes of walking, we reach the railway track. Kevin explains that people use trains in the morning and in the late afternoon to get to the city center. Marta is astonished because she did not know that there are trains connecting different locations of Nairobi. She only knew about trains to Mombasa. Kevin continues that trains are cheaper than matatu, but less comfortable. I add that during rush hour (early morning and late afternoon), the price of matatu is twice as high as in the middle of the day and it must be a big cost for Kibera residents. Kevin agrees with me, and we continue our walk.

We walk one-by-one through narrow paths. At one point Kevin stops. He points to the pylon with many wires around it. They are illegal connections to electricity. Many residents steal power from the Kenya Power Authorities. Due to this fact, there are many incidental fires in Kibera. Recently, one preschool, often visited by Kibera Tours, was burnt down, the children’s parents are trying to renovate the classrooms, but they are still working on it, that is why the visit to pre-school was temporarily removed from the tour’s program. When we talk, two other visitors along with Philip – another Kibera Tours guide, pass by us and we greet each other.
We reach the biogas center and Marta asks about the number of Kibera inhabitants. Kevin says that according to the latest estimations, there are one million inhabitants, however, more than one family lives in some houses, so it is difficult to state the precise number. Kevin shows blocks of flats located opposite to the place where we are standing. He explains that they are the result of the slum upgrading project, which did not succeed. People had to pay 5,000 KES (around 200 PLN) of rent per month, while before, when staying in Kibera, they paid 1,000 KES (around 40 PLN) or even 500 KES (around 20 PLN). As they could not afford the new accommodation, they got involved in sub-renting. People from far more expensive districts of Nairobi moved to the flats constructed for Kibera residents, while they came back to the slums sub-renting flats donated to them by the government for around 5,000 KES. Moreover, the project was not finished because of political reasons. It was started by Raila Odinga, a former Member of the Parliament from Langata (a larger area, covering Kibera), but as he was not reelected, the project was stopped in the middle. The project idea was not good because people could not continue their comfortable life in the slum. There are kindergartens, public and private schools, churches. Frequently, on weekdays buildings are used as schools and at the weekends, as churches. “What about toilets?” – Marta interrupts. Ken replies that he will talk about it while describing the functions of biogas center. Before that, he would like briefly introduce the history of Kibera.

At the beginning, this area was covered by a forest. The Masaaais came as the first settlers in order to pasture their animals. Then, the area was occupied by the British, who used the Masai word – Nairobi, meaning forest (in fact, Kibera means ‘forest’ and it comes from the Nubian language because some settlers of Sudanese origin were given this area from the British administration in the beginning of the 20th century). The British started to develop the industry and open factories, for which they needed workers. From all over the country, people started to migrate to Nairobi in search of work.

The biogas center was constructed a few years ago. It serves several purposes. It is a water tank used by around two hundred families, there are toilets and bathrooms, a social hall for various meetings, and it produces gas used for cooking. At the beginning of the 1990s, there were no toilets in Kibera, so while visiting the slum, people were advised to take umbrellas. “Do you know why?” – Kevin asks. We all reply together – “flying toilets”. Kevin confirms that at that time, people defecated into foil bags, which were afterwards throw away, and it was possible to be hit by the bag with excrements.

Kevin continues his story. There are three kinds of inhabitants in Nairobi, those who live from one day to another, those who work here, and those who own everything. The last category are politicians and wealthy land owners. The second category are people living in various districts, mainly in the blocks of flats, e.g. in the Parkside district (the area where
Marta lives). The first group, are Kibera residents. Some of these people do not know what they are going to eat the next day. “Who is the owner of the Kibera land?” – asks Marta. Kevin explains that the structures – houses, belong to Kibera inhabitants, but members of the parliament and government own the land. At any given day, they can tell the people to move from Kibera to somewhere else. “Where do the people get their clean water?” – continues Marta. The water is provided by the government through pipes. You can pay 5 KES (around 0.20 PLN) for every 20 liters, or 200 KES (around 8 PLN) monthly – this option is much more affordable. “Are there people, who are starving in Kibera?” is another question from the visitors. Kevin explains that those people who do not have work, are often starving. There is a huge problem with corruption in Kenya. Moreover, many Nairobi inhabitants do not know anything about Kibera. They think the slum dwellers are ‘bad people’. These stereotypes make it difficult for people coming from Kibera to find a good job. We continue our walk, and the conversation between visitors and Kevin continues touching upon different subjects.

Victorious Bones Craft

While talking, we reach the workshop of the Victorious Bones Craft. There are two barracks, a few men are working in front of them. We say hello to everyone and enter one of the barracks. One young man approaches us, introducing himself as Dan. The main activity of the Victorious Bones Craft is manufacturing ornaments out of animal bones. There are around forty men working in the workshop daily. They use the bones of camels, goats and cows. The process starts with the purchase of bones at the slaughterhouse. The next step is cutting them into smaller pieces and cooking them in order to remove the meat and hair. Dan shows us two different bones, one is cream color – just before being boiled, the second one is white – just after being boiled. The next step is to cover the bones with wax, and put color on them. Once the bones have dried, the craftsmen scratch out different patterns in them. At this moment, most ornaments are white and black. The last step is to polish the bones, make small holes and join different elements. They produce necklaces, earrings, bracelets as well as many other items which are later sold. They do not manage to sell everything they have produced. Dan suggests that when we come back to our countries, we could help them to establish cooperation with some entities. Dan invites us to ask questions. As we do not have any, we are invited to the showroom where the final products are displayed.

When we enter the showroom, Jacob welcomes us and gives us small shopping baskets. He asks me how I am and how my life in the Satellite is. I reply that I am really fine and Jacob asks visitors about their names and
which countries they come from. They introduce themselves. Jacob is glad to hear that because they have a friend in Finland who is sells their products. He runs a website called *asantekoru*. Jacob invites us to buy something in order to support their activities. Marta looks at the earrings and at the same time, Olen asks how many ornaments they are able to manufacture in one day. It depends which item we take into consideration, e.g. they can produce 200 bracelets. Marta gives Jacob her shopping basket with some things inside. Jacob starts to count loudly, giving the amount of eight hundred. After a moment he adds – euro and smiles. Marta asks how much each item costs. They count together “this costs 150 KES, and this and this, and each of the two bracelets cost 200 KES”. That adds up to 750 KES Jacob summarizes and once again he adds – euro, and smiles. We laugh, Marta pays and we leave.

**The last points of the program**

The guides lead us to Kids Villa Education Center. Charles informs us that the school, which they often visit during the tours, is closed because it is Saturday. Kevin adds that even on weekdays, they often conduct activities in a different place because the building has recently burnt due to an illegal electricity connection. The guides suggest that we continue. While talking, we approach Frank’s mother’s house. It is the last point of the tour’s program.

**How the narratives are constructed**

Most descriptions of slum tourism provide the perspective of visitors. Bruner points out that the people who have power are the ones who have their stories. They decide on what stories should be told, by whom, when, and where. “Africans are seriously limited by the power of Western discourse, for there is no international forum for African narratives” [Bruner 1991, p. 241]. Bruner suggests that Africans have to base their stories on someone else’s. They construct their identity always taking into account Western imaginations and narratives.

The example of Kibera residents involved in the organization of slum tours partially contradicts Bruner’s analysis. On one hand, most of the tour organizers from Kibera that I have interviewed stated that they were inspired by the idea of slum tourism by their friends from the Netherlands, Canada or the United States who spent longer periods of time in Kibera because of a long adoption process or working as volunteers either in Kibera or in a different part of Nairobi. The outsiders were fascinated by the fact that life in Kibera was much different from what they had imagined before
their first visit. They framed this experience as “eye-opening” and “perspective-changing”. On the other hand, slum inhabitants aim at bringing new meanings to poverty. Slum tourism is an opportunity for the people from the margins of the society to define, describe and speak out for themselves within the frame of the encounters with outsiders.

Guides who construct narratives are often born and raised in Kibera or spent a large part of their life in the slum. Occasionally, there are guides who have lived in this area for a shorter period (e.g. during their university studies), however, they often intentionally prolong the period of their stay in Kibera while interacting with visitors. They are in their twenties and early thirties. Most of them still live in Kibera, but some moved to other parts of Nairobi – even though they do not avow it to visitors. They pay attention to their outfit, and in case of Kibera Tours, guides wear T-shirts with their name and the name of the company on the back. Before they started to show the slum to the foreigners, they often worked for various non-governmental organizations (e.g. Kibera Youth Programme or Kibera Youth Club), where they met people who inspired them and often supported their slum tourism activity at the beginning. Some of them are still involved in various initiatives, they are community mobilizers or leaders, project managers or have their own small businesses (e.g. a small computer center or a video game club). They stress that guiding is seasonal work (the peak season is from mid June to mid September) and they need to have different sources of income. However, people managing companies are more involved than the others, and often there are complicated power relations between them and other guides resulting in many conflicts. They are very much aware of the visitors’ ideas and imaginaries about the slum, varying motifs behind their decision of touring Kibera, as well as how to make the visit most attractive to them. Visitors listen to the stories of the representatives of various organizations, however, who they are and what they do is quite well described in the above mentioned narratives based on field-notes collected during field work.

Slum-dwellers involved in the organization of Kibera tours aim at showing the positive sides of Kibera, nonetheless, each tour is the context of self-referential communications, which connect with and build up on one another. Tourist-host relations are processual. Social actors having different vocabularies, stories and perspectives construct each slum tour. Moreover, the process is highly influenced by ‘mediascapes,’ which refer to the production and dissemination of information and images, mainly in the form of television, films, CD, DVD, the Internet, and social media in particular. “The lines between the realistic and fictional landscapes […] are blurred” [Appadurai, 2005, p. 35]. It is worth remembering that guides aim at contradicting images transmitted by the media and change the visitors’ perception of Kibera.
The themes in the narratives constructed within the frame of Kibera tours

I understand narratives as longer stories provided by guides or representatives of visited organizations, which construct the main images of Kibera and its inhabitants, as well as of the tours. The narratives are mainly about Kibera, the history and daily life of its inhabitants. Guides provide many details, their narratives illustrated by points of the landscape, which helps to sketch the slum borders in terms of past and present. The guides try to normalize images of life in Kibera in the eyes of visitors. They emphasize that in Kibera, there are kindergartens, schools, healthcare clinics, numerous shops, restaurants and bars, as well as other places which enable people to function and to normally bring up children. Most of the houses contain several rooms with nice furniture and hi-tech electronic equipment.

The guides provide narratives about governmental and non-governmental programs and projects aimed at improving living standards in Kibera. They describe initiatives of the construction of blocks of flats or the biogas center serving several purposes, among others improving sanitation conditions by offering toilets and showers, and gas production. The representatives of the visited non-governmental organizations – the Power Women Group and Victorious Bones Craft provide the background of their activities, focusing on the income generating part of it. There are other numerous themes touched upon by the guides and the representatives of visited organizations answering tourists’ questions. They refer to the education and healthcare systems in Kenya, the situation of and policies targeting youth, unemployment and the government’s plan to reduce the number of people without jobs, and many others issues interesting to people visiting Kibera.

The narratives of guides around Kibera contrast the stereotypical perception of “poor people,” they stress their action and agency while facing day-to-day challenges. The narratives of Kibera guides can be ascribed in aspects of agency distinguished by Ruth Lister. These are, 1) “making ends meet” or 2) “taking revenge” in everyday life, 3) “finding a way out of poverty” and 4) “organizing themselves” in order to make a change [Lister, 2007, p. 153]. The first two aspects express day-to-day and personal ways of coping with poverty, while the latter two are more strategic and long-term attempts to make a change. However, all of them are very much interrelated and interdependent. Without being sure that one can make a change in one’s own life, the involvement in civic and political activities is not possible and similarly, the achievements in these spheres build up the personal sense of agency [Lister 2007, p. 159.].

“Making ends meet” or in other words, coping in everyday life is an active process of management of limited resources and multiplying them. This can be realized in long-term planning as well as living from one day to
another, and in case of lack of resources, manipulating bills to be paid and debts. It is worth noting that another dimension of this aspect of agency deals with the attitudes associated with being treated in terms of “Other”. Making ends meet requires such qualities like resilience and resourcefulness, as well as the skills of planning the budget, shopping and meals [Lister 2007, p. 167]. Personal resources can be enhanced by the social ones in the form of networks, which are support for their members, and offering daily care for small children can provide ‘social leverage’ for women who use this opportunity to find a paid job. According to some researchers, women most frequently have personal qualities and they are involved in supporting social networks necessary for realizing this form of agency [Lister 2007, pp. 167-169]. Mutuality, which is inscribed in most transactions in the social networks, is not a sufficient way of multiplying resources. It is often carried out through finding a paid job (full time, part time or causal, legal or black market) or turing towards crime.

“Making ends meet” is well illustrated by the activities performed by the Power Women Group. As mentioned above, they divide their income into four parts. The first one is spent on materials, the second on food (meals planning), the third one is put aside in case of emergency and the fourth is divided among the group members. It is a model example of budget planning. Moreover, they try to multiply their resources by the constant production of jewellery and ornaments. “Making ends meet” is realized through ‘from hand to mouth’ everyday slum dwellers’ strategy of sustaining themselves. It means that Kibera inhabitants often buy alimentation products in small quantities, e.g. instead of a bottle of cooking oil, they buy a bag of 10 milliliters of it, which is just enough to prepare a few meals but is more affordable for them. They live from one day to another, trying to manipulate their limited budget. This strategy is well illustrated and described through narratives provided by guides while walking through the Toi market. There are small bags with sugar, salt, coffee, tea or cooking oil arranged in rows, which attracts the attention of Kibera visitors.

“Critics or taking revenge” is represented through everyday resistance or opposition to people who have power. These are informal activities which bring immediate profit or benefit, gained at the expense of those who are wealthy or have authority. Their aim is not a political change but almost always their own survival or perseverance [Lister 2007, p. 173].

Taking revenge in everyday life is presented in the narratives about slum upgrading projects, implemented by politicians in order to gain support during elections. The practice of sub-renting flats given to Kibera residents by the government is a good illustration of making a profit at the expense of people with authority. However, in this case, politicians lose their respect in the eyes of the citizens and international donors providing support to Kenya through the development cooperation programs, more than
being affected by material loss. This strategy is narrated in the story about illegal electricity connections as well. Slum inhabitants connect to the pylons and use electricity without the permission of Kenya Power Authorities and do not pay for it.

Education and employment are considered to be the two most effective ways to enable ‘getting out’ of poverty. The causative potential is expressed by negotiations in ways such as acquiring or changing relatively good education or permanent employment. In this case, the agency of slum inhabitants is influenced by cultural and structural factors (e.g. lack of facilities enabling childcare or difficulties with public transportation), which can strengthen or limit its potential [Lister 2007, p. 178].

This strategy is illustrated by the narration of the Power Women Group activities aiming at helping young girls acquire practical training in tailoring and hairdressing. Women organize courses for young girls who have dropped out of school due to lack of financial resources, pregnancy or other various reasons. The participation in courses is free of charge and members of the group teach girls voluntarily. Moreover, the Power Women Group organizes daycare for children aged from six months to two years, so that their mothers can go to work and become independent. Similarly, Victorious Bones Craft provides work for the unemployed youth. There are around forty young men involved in different phases of the manufacturing process, from removing meat and hair from cow or goat bones, to cutting, curving, coloring and polishing them, all the way to joining different elements of necklaces or bracelets. The workshop of the Victorious Bones Craft is located in the middle of Kibera so high public transportation fees and severe traffic jams during rush hours in Nairobi do not prevent the youth from going to work.

The last aspect of agency of people living in poverty is “organizing themselves” in order to make a change in the public area. It may take on the form of self-help (this is a more organized form of the making ends meet strategy), or it can be directed to political actions, in some cases going beyond the local community. The sense of political efficacy and effectiveness is lower among less educated people, living in the poorest districts of the city [Lister 2007, p. 185]. One of the reasons is the lack of collective categorical identity constructed on the basis of being poor. That is what unites them - being in the similar situation, and it is more difficult for people who lack common sense of identification to take action. The basis for collective action may be the fact of living in a common area such as a district [Lister 2007, p. 187]. Another impulse triggering the joint action among poor people can be related to being treated as “Others”, it can be stimulus to fight for their dignity and recognition.

The narratives about the Power Women Group activities aiming at fighting the stigma towards HIV positive people is a very good example of
this strategy. The women started to be active because they wanted to raise awareness in the Kenyan society about HIV and AIDS. They still organize meetings once a week in order to share knowledge about different diseases and various ways of preventing them. Women struggle for recognition and respect each day.

Another aspect of this strategy is related to the fact that Kibera inhabitants started to organize themselves in order to show visitors the place they were born and raised in, or where they spend a large part of their lives. It is the willingness to reconstruct the image of people living in poverty as being “Others”. Apart from the economic aspects of Kibera tours, which can be understood as their way to get out of the vicious cycle, its social dimension is the fight for their dignity and recognition through narrating stories about Kibera and its residents.

**The motifs of the narrations constructed within the frame of the tours**

The motifs used in the narratives within frame of Kibera tours are catchwords or slogans used as interludes or supplements of longer statements or stories. They are interjected by guides quite frequently, and at different moments in the frame of the entire tour. They are not inscribed into one longer narration, rather they build up or construct the general image of storytellers and Kibera and its inhabitants. I distinguished four functions that are fulfilled by the motifs recurring in the narrations. These are, 1) the motif of agency, 2) the motif of authenticity, 3) the motif of credibility, and 4) the motif of being attached to the place. However, it is worth noting that this categorization is fluent and some catchwords and slogans can fulfill several functions.

The motif of agency emerges through the use of slogans or very short stories depreciating effectiveness and efficiency of the Kenyan government and/or non-governmental organizations. The politicians are presented as corrupted criminals manipulating Kibera residents in order to gain as much as possible from them during the elections. The term ‘NGO’ – non-governmental organization, stands for “not good organizers” or “not well going on” in the narrations provided by Kibera tours guides.

The motif of authenticity is constructed through the use of such slogans like “I was born and raised in Kibera”, “we are all products of Kibera”, “Kibera is my/our home” or “we are Kibera”. These catchwords build up the authenticity of the narrations – underling their inner, inside and local context, as well as strengthening the legacy of storytellers to produce and disseminate narrations about this place.

The motif of credibility emerges through statements underling the experience and/or expertise in the slum tour organization. Guides claim that
they have “organized tours since 2009” or they make a reference to the opinions of ‘external tourist experts’ – authors of tourist guides like Rough Guide and National Geographic or the reviews of visitors who took part in their tours published on the TripAdvisor portal.

The motif of being attached to the place is constructed by the use of euphemisms describing Kibera. The most often used term is “chocolate city”. It refers to the fact that Kibera is a self-sufficient part of Nairobi – “city within the city”, and chocolate is the color of the roofs of the structures dominating Kibera’s landscape as well as that of soil, which after heavy rains transforms into slippery mud. A different term used by guides is “the city of opportunities” which means that everybody can find income easily generating activities in Kibera. Sometimes storytellers name Kibera “lower Karen”. Karen is the most upscale district of Nairobi neighboring Kibera, where the richest Kenyans and foreigners live.

The narratives are authentic because they are produced by slum inhabitants, the insiders share their local knowledge. Three out of four above-mentioned motifs, authenticity, credibility and being attached to the place, construct or build up the authenticity of the narratives. MacCannell divides the social space into front and back regions. The front regions are meeting places of hosts and guests or customers like hotel receptions, beauty parlors or offices. The back regions are kitchens, executive washrooms or toilets, namely places not accessible to outsiders [MacCannell 1973, p. 590]. The division is particularly social, “based on the type of social performance, that is staged in a place, and on the social roles found there” [MacCannell 1973, p. 590]. Visitors are eager to see the life in a place they visit as it is really lived by the natives. Authenticity is based on the production of a new kind of social space, when a visitor is permitted to view details of the inner operation of a domestic, industrial or public institution. “Apparently, entry into this space allows adults to recapture virginal sensations of discovery, or childlike feelings of being half in and half out of society, their faces pressed up against the glass” [MacCannell 1973, p. 596].

Visiting Kibera, “a part of Kenya unseen by most tourists” (www.kiberratours.com) or “unseen side of Nairobi” (www.explorekibera.com) can be understood as entering the back region of the country or its capital city. Visitors have access to the perspective of slum inhabitants. They are provided with local and inside knowledge about the slum. They visit non-governmental organizations, gain information about their activities as well as observe them. Women show visitors how they produce paper beads, and let them try to make some themselves. They enter the workshop of the Victorious Bones Craft, where young men are working regardless of the visitors’ presence. While observing the process of manufacturing jewellery, they can smell the unpleasant stench of cooked bones and hear loud noises of the machines.
The narratives of Kibera residents are ‘real’ for the visitors, because they are not produced by the media, but by people with whom they met and had the opportunity to interact with and talk. This aspect of the tour brings another meaning to the term ‘authenticity’. From ‘objective authenticity’ which we want to contemplate during the touristic experience because we are overloaded with the media representations and references, we move away to ‘existential authenticity’, understood as ‘hands-on experience’ which enables us to be somewhere and interact with local communities [Freire-Medeiros 2012, p. 26].

Concluding remarks

“I believe in people learning from each other, seeing different realities and that... it really changes you ... and I believe in this kind of experience whether done in respectful manner for people” [a quotation from an interview conducted after the tour]

The goal of slum tourism is to visit and experience poverty – this meaning is assigned or even inscribed in the term slum. “The ‘slum’ has always symbolized the ‘dark’, the ‘low’, the ‘unknown’ side of the city; it has always been a projection surface. From the bourgeois perspective, the poor urban areas have constantly been constructed as areas containing ‘the Other’ [Steinbrink 2012, p. 218]. Visiting impoverished areas has been done in order to meet and experience the lives of ‘the Other’. The construct of ‘the Other’ varied in different historical periods and depended on the respective social context in which it existed, however, ‘the Other’ always meant more than just the economic ‘Other’– it also stood for the social, the political and the cultural ‘Other’ as well [Steinbrink 2012, p. 229].

Kibera is represented in the narratives of the guides first of all, as a place of poverty, but more varied and positive semantics of poverty is evoked. The images of life in Kibera are being normalized in the eyes of visitors. Residents of the slum are characterized less by apathy, stagnation and desperation and more by economical industriousness, community, development and hope. They have agency realized in life and narratives in the four strategies mentioned above: “making ends meet” or “taking revenge” in everyday life and “finding a way out of poverty” and “organizing themselves” in order to make changes in the public area.

Concluding with the words used by Kevin, the main goal of Kibera residents involved in the organization of slum tours is not necessarily contradicting the level of poverty they live in but showing “how Kibera is in reality”. The word “reality” refers to the inner perspective of slum dwellers as well as to the production and dissemination of narratives not influenced
by the media of Kibera residents and meanings of the place where they were born and brought up or spend a large part of their lives. Slum tours have become the opportunity for Kibera residents to change their image as the economic, social, cultural and political ‘Others’.

“Critics have been there, people that have never taken a walk into a tour always think that we are exposing poverty, but ... yes, Kibera people are living, some are living below a dollar a day but they can still afford to dream, they can still afford a smile and they can still work hard to be able to provide for their family the little that they can” [a quotation from an interview with a Kibera tour guide].
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WYKRACZAJĄC POZA ‘BIEDA’ TURYSTYKĘ?
NARRACJE MIESZKAŃCÓW KIBERY I Ich ZNACZENIA
KONSTRUOWANE W RAMACH WYCIECZEK PO SLUMSIE.

Abstrakt

Cel. Celem artykułu jest poszerzenie rozumienia turystyki po slumsach w Kenii poprzez prezentację wyników badań terenowych prowadzonych w Kiberze, największym slumie Nairobi.

Metoda. Autorka przeprowadziła badania etnograficzne w Kiberze (obserwacja uczestnicząca, wywiady pogłębione, dyskusje w grupie) przez trzy miesiące 2014 roku.

Wyniki. Wyniki badania pokazują, że w ramach wycieczek po slumsie, bardziej zróżnicowane słownictwo, semantyka i znaczenia biedy są produkowane. Mieszkańcy Kibery są rzadziej charakteryzowani przez apatię, stagnację czy desperację, częściej przez ekonomiczną przedsiębiorczość, wspólnotę, rozwój i nadzieję. Życie w Kiberze jest normalizowane w oczach odwiedzających.


Implikacje praktyczne. Wyniki badania mogłyby być wykorzystane przez Kenya Tourism Board (agenda rządu Kenii odpowiedzialna za rozwój turystyki), należałoby je jednak przeprowadzić na większą skalę.

Oryginalność pracy. Autorka skoncentrowała swoje badanie na mieszkańcach Kibery zaangażowanych w organizację wycieczek, po miejscu w którym się wychowali i urodzili, bądź też spędzili w nim znaczną część swojego życia. Często, mieszkańców slumsów traktuje się jako ofiary tego rodzaju turystyki. Wyniki badania pokazują jednak, że w pełni zinternalizowali oni ideę turystyki po slumsach i używają ją w celu zmiany obrazu bycia “Innym” w ekonomicznym, społecznym, kulturowym i politycznym sensie, w oczach odwiedzających.

Rodzaj pracy. Artykuł prezentujący wyniki badań empirycznych.

Słowa kluczowe: turystyka po slumsach, narracja, Kibera, bieda, badania terenowe.