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ABSTRACT: What does it mean to do engaged anthropology? How is it different from that which is disengaged? Does it mean being some kind of activist or advocate? Is it a form of ‘action research’? More pertinently for the purposes of this article, are anthropologists who do consultancies also ‘engaged’? This article discusses what happened when in 2003 I accepted an invitation from a Scandinavian women’s organisation to go to Tanzania the following year and take part in an evaluation of the women’s group they had been funding. Here I consider not only some of the perhaps inevitable pitfalls, contradictions and difficulties of carrying out such a consultancy but also the extent to which anthropologists themselves are part of the encounter and thus inevitably part of the material of fieldwork. It is shown that being an engaged anthropologist is a risky business before, during and after such projects. This does not mean that engagement should be avoided, and indeed such a stance may provide exceptional insights which one of greater detachment might miss.
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Introduction: What Is ‘Engaged’ Anthropology?

What does it mean to do engaged anthropology? How is it different from that which is disengaged? Does it mean being some kind of activist or advocate? Is it a form of ‘action research’ (Huizer 1979)? More pertinently for the purposes of this article, are anthropologists who do consultancies also ‘engaged’? Over the last several decades, such questions have been endlessly debated. Some of these debates have become rather repetitive, while others reflect their time. For example, the book edited by Huizer (1979), which arose out of the big IUAES Congress in 1975, reflected many of the political concerns of 1970s anthropology and its social and historical context.

However, a decade later, Hastrup and Elsass argued that ‘the rationale for advocating a particular cause can never be anthropological’ because ‘anthropology seeks to comprehend the context of interests, while advocacy implies the pursuit of one particular interest’ (1990:301). Nonetheless, they go on to acknowledge that anthropologists do have moral responsibilities, and that advocacy may present itself as a ‘moral imperative’, a stance taken by Nancy Scheper-Hughes in much of her work (see particularly 1995).

In the 1970s and 1980s, feminism became increasingly influential in anthropology, a movement with which many anthropologists, particularly women, identified. However, Strathern uses the word ‘awkward’ in her characterisation of the relationship between anthropology and feminism (1987); she argues that the self of each is differently constituted because for each the Other is different. For feminists, the Other is men (sometimes glossed as patriarchy), whereas for anthropologists the Other is the subject being studied. I have argued elsewhere (Caplan 1988) that this apparent difference is not an unbridgeable divide, but in certain contexts, it may have salience, as this article will show.

The word ‘awkward’ used by Strathern was also used by both Wright (1995) and Firth (1996) to discuss
the extent to which anthropology is a questioning discipline. Anthropologists tend to ask questions that others do not, and so can make others uncomfortable.

A final strand that must be mentioned in discussing ‘engaged’ anthropology is the role of anthropologists involved in development aid and its projects. A number of studies written in the 1990s pointed to the complexities and contradictions in this area and particularly to the power relations involved, at both local and international levels (Escobar 1995; Gardner and Lewis 1996; Nelson and Wright 1995). As the more recent work of Mosse (2005, 2011) as well as Cornwall, Harrison and Whitehead (2007) suggests, these are far from being resolved. As I show below, the consultancy which is the subject of this article was not exempt from some of the problems inherent in trying to bring together anthropology, feminism and development projects. All of the people concerned saw themselves as acting from a desire to do some good, but their views were very different, for reasons which will be explored.

Why Do a Consultancy?

In 2003 I accepted an invitation from a Scandinavian women’s organisation to go to Tanzania the following year and take part in an evaluation of the women’s group they had been funding. The Scandinavian organisation was a radical feminist group and supported the Tanzanian Women’s Group in the name of international women’s solidarity.

My partner in this process was to be another anthropologist who like me had already worked on the Swahili coast of Tanzania, but she had actually done research in the village where the women’s group was located whereas my own work had been carried out elsewhere. Both of us considered ourselves to be feminists, a stance which helped define each of our standpoints in the sense used by Hartsock: ‘not simply an interested position (interpreted as bias) but interested in the sense of being engaged’ (1985: 159).

In short then, I accepted this offer not only because it enabled me to go back to ‘my’ area of Tanzania, but also because I thought that my colleague and I could do something useful and practical to assist a project we considered worthwhile. In this article, I discuss not only some of the perhaps inevitable pitfalls, contradictions and difficulties of carrying out such a consultancy but also consider the extent to which anthropologists themselves are part of the encounter and thus inevitably part of the material of fieldwork.

I had an initial meeting with the funders at their offices, and then one of the members of the Scandinavian women’s organisation came to London to meet the anthropologists. We thrashed out the Terms of Reference for our work, and negotiated a contract which gave us 28 days in which to do it: some preliminary desk work, fieldwork and report-writing. We were both well aware from the outset that this period of time was insufficient, but could not possibly have foreseen just how much work was to be involved.

The Contract and the Terms of Reference (TOR)

The team will seek to represent the viewpoints of all stakeholders in the society, to maintain objectivity in reporting, and shall notify the donor organisation of any problems that jeopardise these goals. (Contract)

The main objective of the planned assessment is to provide qualitative information on the reflections, lessons learned, visions for the future and lived experiences of different actors who have been involved in varying capacities with the women’s group. (TOR)

Once we had agreed on them, the Terms of Reference were translated into Swahili and copies sent to the Village Council, the Tanzanian Women’s Organisation and other ‘stakeholders’. However, as Keesing argued long ago (1987), texts are read differently depending upon one’s position and there is little doubt but that they were sometimes understood differently by anthropologists, funders and various categories of local people. In order to understand why this should be so, it is necessary first to explore the social context of the women’s group.

The Social Context of the Women’s Group

The women’s organisation was located in a village of around 600 people, which also contained a small lodge-style hotel run by expatriates. The hotel owners regarded the setting up of the hotel as a means of improving the lives of the villagers by providing jobs and assisting financially in other ways from its profits. A levy was paid by guests and much of this went to the village council. They also had a policy of employing and training local people to work in the hotel.

The village, like other administrative villages in Tanzania, had an elected Village Council, headed by a chair (Mwinyi Kiti) and with a representative (Diwan) on the District Council. It also had a total of three development organisations: a business group (Chama cha Biashara), a community group (Chama cha Jamii) and the women’s group. The first two were much less well resourced than the last, which had set
up the following projects with the help of the Scandinavian women’s organisation:

- kindergarten (*chekechea*)
- a building housing a learning centre (complete with computers powered by solar panels) and an office with an additional craft room containing sewing machines
- a market building for the sale of local products such as mats and imports like soft drinks
- an awareness of HIV/AIDS campaign
- savings and credit groups
- outreach with neighbouring villages to set up projects there

From our reading of the previous annual reports, there was little doubt that the women’s group had made remarkable progress in the space of only a few years, and this was confirmed on our arrival when we saw the buildings which had been erected using primarily local materials. In my diary I wrote as follows:

The building is fabulous – the learning centre has tables, 2 computers, electricity from solar power, and there will soon be a water tank … Half of the building is the women’s office with 2 desks, a lockable cupboard, chairs. Very smart and all new. There is also a room with 3 sewing machines where some women are working. (Field diary)

What was also impressive was the extent to which the women had organised themselves, although they had also received some help from one of the hoteliers who happened to be trained in development and was fluent in Swahili. She was able to act as consultant and project manager to the Women’s Group, including writing funding applications and reports in English.

**Doing the Fieldwork: Problems Encountered**

When my colleague and I arrived in the village we booked in at a small backpacker lodge owned by the paramedic at the village clinic – we did not want to stay at the hoteliers’ lodge for obvious reasons – and explained what we were there to do. The next three weeks were a whirl of individual interviews, focus groups and endless meetings: with the whole village, the Village Council, separate meetings for each ward, meetings with the aforementioned village development societies, especially with the Women’s Group: its committee and its members as a whole. Although we were there primarily to write an evaluation of the Women’s Group, it was clear that this could not be divorced from its wider context and the problems in the village. These can briefly be summarised as follows:

**The Economy**

Like much of the rest of the East African coast, the economy, based largely on fishing and the growing of coconuts, was in decline. Coconuts and other commercial crops were fetching low prices on both local and world markets, artisanal fishing suffered from competition for stocks by large commercial trawlers and also restrictions placed by state authorities in an effort to conserve fish stocks. These problems particularly affected male activities in an area where historically men were responsible for finding most of the cash needs of the household. Aside from the hotel in the village and a few others in the area, as well as the nearby national park, there were few other job opportunities for men, and this caused particular resentment among younger men who had been to school, a few even to secondary school, but saw little prospect of economic betterment.

**Education**

Like most villages in Tanzania, this one had a primary school, but not all children completed its seven years and the school needed much better facilities for both children and teachers, including toilets and teacher’s houses. Few pupils went to the district secondary school some miles away, although the numbers had begun to increase in spite of the costs.² A few scholarships were offered by the Women’s Group – all however were only for girls, who were very much under-represented in the school.³ This caused a great deal of resentment in the village – why were boys being discriminated against in this way? Even many of the women active in the Women’s Group argued that their sons should have the same opportunities as their daughters.

**Health and the Clinic**

Through the efforts of the Scandinavian women’s organisation, the hotel and some volunteers from outside, a clinic had been set up which was far superior to the health centres found in most villages, having more medicines and more staff. As a result patients flocked to it from far and wide. However, at the time of our visit the clinic was running out of money. As with many projects funded by Western donors, initial grants for capital costs had not been replaced by long-term funding from the donors, which had expected the government and local people to bear running costs. The Tanzanian government had not stepped in...
as had been anticipated and in the current economic climate villagers were finding funds difficult to raise. They were particularly concerned about this in the context of rising levels of HIV/AIDS. Many villagers felt that the Women’s Group, rather than spending money on items which were deemed less pressing, should direct some of its funds to the clinic.

The Hotel

The hotel was located on land leased from the Tanzanian government, with an interim agreement with the village. However, the hoteliers had not been able to complete a long-term agreement with the villagers because they themselves were in dispute about exactly who owned what share of the hotel’s assets. The person who had started the enterprise was no longer resident in the area but continued to claim his share of the project, while this was disputed by those who had taken over from him. So even though the hotel had given much help to village organisations and individuals and provided jobs for a significant number of villagers, a difficult relationship had arisen. This had impacted adversely on the Women’s Group because of the role played by one of the hoteliers, who also worked part time as Project Manager for the Women’s Group. She had eventually found her dual role situation impossible and resigned from her post as Project Manager, leaving the Women’s Group in a difficult position, although later, urged by the members of the women’s group, she agreed to return in a temporary capacity, pending the appointment of a new Project Officer.

Relations between the Village Societies and between Village Wards

There were also disagreements between the three development societies, with the Women’s Group being accused by the other two, and sometimes by the Village Council, of being secretive, discriminatory against men and of misusing their funds. There was no doubt that considerable jealousy was caused by the superior funding of the women’s group and this frequently led to criticisms of it.

Furthermore, it was often argued that the Women’s Group was dominated by women from a particular ward, even a particular family. There were long-standing rivalries between the three wards in the village and these were reflected in degrees of involvement in the women’s organisation, with women in the most remote part of the village claiming that they were not informed about its activities, thereby effectively excluding them. For example, the Scandinavian NGO supported projects in other parts of Africa, and links had been established which had enabled some of the members of the Women’s Group to travel out of Tanzania. This was a benefit which caused much jealousy and accusations of nepotism even though we were informed that the village as a whole had tested all possible candidates for this trip and rejected those who were not articulate enough to act as representatives; as it happened, all of the rejected candidates came from the most remote ward.

The District Administration

Towards the end of our stay, matters came to a head and rumours started flying which reached the ears of the district authorities. It was clear that, while all the correct procedures had been followed by both the Scandinavian organisation and the local Women’s Group, and all the necessary papers and permits had been deposited with the relevant government departments, local civil servants based in the district capital which was far from the village had little idea about what was happening there. They started making investigations and were astounded to discover the extent of funding received by the Women’s Group, subsequently arguing that this must be ‘supervised’ by both the Village Council and the District officials. This of course ran directly counter to the aims of the funders and the women’s group, namely to ‘empower’ women and build their ‘capacity’.

Preliminary Report and Recommendations

Just before the end of our fieldwork, we left the village for a few days to write a Preliminary Report in Swahili, which was sent back to key people in the village. We thought that the most important contribution we could make was to bring the problems about which we had heard, whether perceived or real, into the open and suggest ways of reconciling some of the differences between categories of people. Then we returned for a blockbuster meeting of the entire village to discuss our findings and our recommendations, before departing.

We explained in our report that we saw many positive developments for all villagers, such as more children at primary school and some at secondary, or even studying further, that the Kindergarten was helping many children, and that the Learning Centre was finished and many young people were learning English, Arabic and computing. For women, we highlighted the many projects which had been started, such as the market and the fact that women had
learned skills such as batik, computing, English, how to run a business, how to set up and run savings and loans schemes, and how to manage the construction of a big building.

However, we also listed the many problems and grievances we had heard about, stating that ‘Although these issues are outside of the work we were given, we have listened to what people have said, and we understand the seriousness of these problems.’ We then went on to give some recommendations. We wrote as follows to the funders, with whom we had kept in touch by email during our fieldwork:

Just in terms of a general overview, there are many wonderful things that have been happening with the Women’s Group ... There is much that is really quite brilliant and we don’t want to downplay this ... Nevertheless, the tensions that erupted recently ... are quite extreme.

There is a huge amount of jealousy that the women have received so much and the other societies in the village so little. It is also hard to explain why the women can have things like a Learning Centre, seen as a luxury, when the hospital is about to close down because of lack of funds and when the primary school is in such a dire state. (Letter to funders)

We therefore asked the funders whether any of the funds could be used for projects which could be clearly seen to benefit men as well as women, and particularly the secondary school scholarships. The reply was clear:

Men benefit [from existing projects] in a different and indirect way [for example] all the children in the nursery get a good start. ... we know that more young boys attend secondary school than girls, therefore a special effort is needed to make it possible for girls to attend. (Letter from funders)

The funders also pointed out that much of the money supporting the women’s projects came from an appeal aimed specifically at women in the donor country and had been given in the name of women’s solidarity, so it could not be diverted away from women’s projects. Furthermore, as we well knew, the donor organisation also received funding from an umbrella organisation of national women’s organisations in their country, who in turn were funded by the country’s international development agency. The funding organisation with which we were dealing was therefore accountable to its own funders and had to approve projects which fitted in with agreed parameters: in short the ‘outcomes’ had to tally with the original ‘aims and objectives’, thus clear constraints existed. We tried on numerous occasions to explain this to local people when they protested that Women’s Group funding should go to the clinic or the school, which they saw as priorities.

One of our recommendations had been to appoint a community development officer from outside so as to untangle one strand of the complex relations between the hotel and the women’s group. This was agreed to by the funder and so we found ourselves writing job descriptions and person specifications, as well as finding an appointment panel, before finally leaving the country to begin writing our report proper.

Writing the Report

On our return home, we started writing our report. It went through several iterations, with the first versions coming in for major criticism from the Scandinavian funders. Their spokesperson wrote:

My feeling is that due to the sudden difficult situation with lots of tension, the focus was shifted from the women’s group to the community ... [so it] does not concentrate so much on women’s personal experiences and women’s collective experience, as stated in the TOR.

To this we replied as follows:

The TOR form an annexe to the report, so it should be quite clear what they are. We also state clearly why we felt that we had to broaden our reach. Perhaps we should in any case have said that it is only good practice (and good anthropology) to consider any institution in its social context – the women’s group does not exist in a vacuum.

The second matter with which the donors took issue was relative lack of information about their own organisation:

The donor organisation is first and foremost a women’s organisation with a strong belief in international solidarity and it is from this position that it is also the organiser of the funding for the women’s group [in Tanzania].

This was important to the donors not only in terms of their own rationale for the work they were doing, but also in terms of their relationship with the national development agency to which they were accountable for the funds they received. A third point raised by the donor about our report concerned our discussion about the clinic, which had been based on many comments from villagers:

If I should make any comment on international funding, there has been a shift in [government] policy from
funding many private Tanzanian NGOs, such as local health centres, to giving the money for funding health directly to the Ministry [of Health in Tanzania]. The national development agency [Scandinavian] now only funds primary health services directly via the [Tanzanian] Ministry of Health, and in the Tanzanian Ministry [it is known that] this area is the very last [to get funding]. [Furthermore] to further fund the Health Centre is not according to the project strategy of our women’s organisation here [since we fund activities run and administered by women and no women have held [administrative] posts there …[Finally] the funding the women’s group gets is regarded [by others] as easy money but it is not, the members have worked for it.

While my colleague and I understood fully the fact that international development agencies often changed their priorities, often for good reasons, from the local point of view, this appeared perverse. Why build and fund a health centre if there was no money to keep it going for a long period of time? We wrote back:

We spent so much time on the Health Centre and have devoted the amount of space in the report that we did for several reasons:

- It was the topic uppermost in people’s minds and frequently used as an example of a) unsustainability and b) the irrationality (to them) of funding new projects when a valued earlier one was failing

- Many of the women do feel that they, as women, ‘own’ the clinic. This is because they were the ones who pushed for it at the beginning, they are the ones who give birth and who take sick children there. It may not formally be a Women’s Society project now, but it is part of their history and consciousness and they are very concerned about it and its future

Finally, the donor was categorical in the organisation’s refusal to countenance secondary school scholarships for boys:

The reason the women’s group started with the scholarships [for girls] was because boys were sent but fewer girls, if any girls at all.

Since I knew from my own research that this was perfectly true it was difficult to contest such a view, although my colleague and I felt that it was important to shift the widespread perception in the village that boys were being discriminated against, in order for the Women’s Group to be able to continue in a climate which was less hostile to its existence.

The donor made her final point:

The women’s organisation project in the village was not a project for saving the whole society. The aim was to help the women to organise themselves further and empower them further. Nowhere would such a project escape animosity or conflict from the surrounding society – the question is whether the women in this village are ready to take on this conflict or not.

Clearly they were not, because around this time, the very able Chair of the Women’s Group resigned, saying she had had enough, just as the Project Manager had done earlier. In our final set of comments to the donor regarding the Report, we wrote as follows:

We are both feminists as well as anthropologists … We are both proud to call ourselves feminists even though it is no longer fashionable to do so. Much of our professional activity centres around gender issues. But we both believe that politics is the art of the possible, and that in order to change the world, you first have to understand it. What we understand the Women’s Society to be about is to enable women to get together and do things together, and in the process learn new things as well as improve their economic position.

It’s also about changing not only themselves but others, including males with whom they have relationships. We don’t think that’s very different from your standpoint. But where perhaps we differ from you is in maintaining that they have to do so in a way that accords with realities in the village. Women cannot operate in a perpetually confrontational situation. In order to further their own aims, they have to take account of the views of others and the situation in which they operate. Finally, the conflict is not simply about gender. It is also an ugly struggle over resources in a context of poverty which has pitted men against women, women against women, and family members against each other.

We worked extremely hard in the village (subsequently) in an extraordinarily daunting situation in our attempt to mediate this conflict, not least in the interests of the continuance of the Women’s Group. While at times we thought the task was hopeless, we believe we have succeeded somewhat in defusing some of the tensions (no small feat!). This slight relief in tensions is obviously precarious (as the emails [to you and us] from the former Project Manager make clear). All sides including the donors will have to compromise if the Women’s Group is to continue at all.

Post-evaluation

It took several months to achieve a report which my colleague and I felt still made the points we wanted to make and which the donor organisation could live
with. It also took several months to get an outside Project Manager appointed and in post, since not everyone with the requisite qualifications wanted to go and live in such a remote area.

In the year after our evaluation, the Scandinavian donor organisation sent two people to the village to see matters for themselves. They produced a short and very positive report on the Women’s Group, although it made only a very brief mention of our own evaluation, so it was difficult to see to what extent our recommendations had borne fruit.

I returned briefly to the village in 2010 to find that things had changed. The clinic had finally been handed over completely to the government, which was covering its costs, now reduced from their previous levels because of fewer staff, so the hotel levy was going entirely to support the primary school. The Scandinavian donors had pulled out because, according to the hotelier who had once been a Project Manager for the Women’s Group, ‘Men came in as officeholders and on the last visit by the donor organisation the main office holders were all men so they were not very pleased’. Even so, the donor organisation had funded the building of a guest-house as a project for the Women’s Group before it withdrew support. On its website, the donor stated:

> Over the last few years, we have reduced the number of countries we work in to improve our expertise in particular regions, and to follow their development. We also hope that tighter concentration on selected geographic areas will help strengthen collaboration and coordination amongst our [own] organisations.

This was bad news but more encouraging was the fact that the former Chair of the Women’s Group was standing for election as the local councillor (Diwan), which was a major talking point not only in the village but more widely in the area. She told me that the District Commissioner was very supportive of her candidacy. I asked her how the Women’s Group was doing and she said that since she left office it had fared badly and she had been asked to go back but she wanted to focus on winning the diwanship and getting her children educated.

**Conclusion**

There were a number of important players in this saga and they had very different perceptions and standpoints, informed in part by the social positions in which they found themselves.

The members of the donor organisation wanted above all to support poor women, and also to demonstrate that funding could empower such women and enable them to organise a variety of projects. For this reason, they were less concerned with other aspects of village life, asserting that they had not entered this arena to save the whole of the society. It was argued that conflict was an inevitable part of the social change they were trying to bring about. They did make efforts to try and understand the whole situation, particularly in terms of visiting the projects themselves on a regular basis, but their priorities to work for women sometimes obscured the realities of the situation on the ground. In hiring anthropologists to carry out this consultancy they found themselves hearing things which made them uncomfortable and with which they disagreed.

The hoteliers came from a standpoint of running an ethical business which, while making profits, also benefitted the community in which it was placed. However, ‘the community’ members did not all have the same views about the hotel: some saw it as having brought jobs and training (‘but at low wages’ a few remarked), others resented the loss of land and commented on the disparity between the standard of living of the hoteliers and their guests, and their own as villagers. Basically some felt that their control over their own village had been lessened with the coming of the hotel.

Some of the men in the village were concerned about the degree of autonomy which the Women’s Group gave to their wives, but many men supported it, not least because households had become increasingly dependent on the women bringing in some income. The main complaints mostly voiced by some men were about the fact that it was so well resourced, while their own economic activities had become so unprofitable and the two other village societies (often referred to as ‘men’s societies’) had so little funding. Younger and better educated men also raised questions about the women’s competence to handle such large amounts of money, and about the Women’s Group priorities. Many of these misgivings were voiced in meetings of the other two societies, the Village Council or the village as a whole. In short then, male responses to the existence of the Women’s Group were not simply in terms of gender but also in terms of economic concerns.

The women themselves were far from united. While in theory all women in the village were members of the Women’s Group in fact only about half of the adult women participated to any meaningful degree, and most of these resided in only two of the three wards of the village. Furthermore, most of the project buildings were located in a single ward and it was also in this location that many of the committee...
members lived. Scarcely surprising then that the comment ‘some get, others don’t’ was frequently heard from some of the women, as well as from men.

The anthropologists wanted to try and disentangle the conflicts and suggest some acceptable ways in which they might be resolved. But in order to do this, we needed to understand what was going on, who said and thought what, and why. We wanted above all to enable the Women’s Group not only to continue but to flourish. Given the complex and difficult set of circumstances, it is perhaps not surprising that we did not succeed in our efforts.

So where does this cautionary tale leave anthropologists considering accepting a consultation, or getting involved in a development project? Perhaps the only advice can be to try and think through some of the pitfalls in advance, to negotiate with the funders both professional autonomy (including intellectual property rights encompassing the right to publish from the work) and also sufficient time to do the job properly (including time for unforeseen circumstances). This will of course vary depending on whether or not the anthropologist has prior knowledge and experience of the area or whether they need to more or less start from scratch. The amount of time we had at our disposal, even though generous by consultancy standards and even given that we worked very hard, would not really have been enough if one of us had not already had research experience in the area. Doing a consultancy also means being prepared in advance to be considered as part of the ‘awkward squad’, including by the commissioning agency. Being an engaged anthropologist is a risky business before, during and after such projects. This does not mean that engagement should be avoided and indeed, such a stance often provides exceptional insights which a more detached stance might miss.
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Notes

1. Because some of the issues raised in this article remain ongoing and sensitive, I have, with the agreement of the colleague with whom I carried out this work, anonymised both the location and people concerned.
2. Secondary education is not free in Tanzania and in addition to fees, families have to pay for the costs of uniform, transport, books and other items.
3. The nearby National Park also gave some scholarships for secondary schooling, again only for girls, and for the same reason: that they were under-represented at secondary school because parents preferred to invest in boys. I had found this to be the case in my own fieldwork in the area.
4. It was to be another three years of negotiations before a long-term agreement was signed between the village and the hotel.
5. One ward was near to the harbour, while the third was furthest away and was also the most recently settled by migrants from outside.
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