



Investigating the tourism potential of Gafat industrial village: South Gondar Administrative Zone, North Western Ethiopia

*Ertiban Demewoz¹

Lecturer of Tourism and Heritage management
Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia
Email: ear29demewoz@gmail.com
P.O. Box: 272, Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia

and

Fridiywok Abebe²

Lecturer of Tourism and Heritage management
Department of Tourism Management, University of Gondar, Ethiopia
Email: abebefridiywok@yahoo.com
P.O. Box: 196, University of Gondar, Ethiopia

Corresponding author*

Abstract

The objective of the research was to assess the tourism potential of Gafat Industrial Village for tourism development in the South Gondar Administrative Zone. To achieve this objective, a purely qualitative research design was used. It included document analysis, direct observation, interviews, photographs and video data. The investigators used purposive and snowball sampling techniques for 20 informants. The collected data were analyzed using description and interpretation. Based on the result of the research, Gafat Industrial Village has enormous tourism potential for tourism development. Gafat is said to be the first industrial village in Africa, and it was the boarding school of technology for Europeans and Ethiopians and it was the cannon factory of Emperor Tewodros II (the first large cannon, named Sevastopol was produced on this site). The site needs tourism product development with the involvement of all stakeholders, and it requires promotion for users and it also necessitates management with the supervision of concerned professionals for tourism development.

Keywords: Gafat industrial village, tourism potentials, Tewodros II, Artists, tourism development

Introduction

Tourism is often associated with fun, pleasure, and leisure. However, many of the studies are focused on a historical or anthropological context (Hara, 2008). On the other hand, all destinations require adequate attractions, amenities, and accessibility to appeal to large numbers of tourists. The more attractions a destination can offer, the easier it becomes to market that destination to the tourist. Listing and analyzing attractions to satisfy every individual is not an easy matter, but increasing the number of attractions is expected from concerned bodies (Holloway et al, 2009). Therefore, to secure tourism development in Ethiopia, there should be the fulfillment of such elements, by conducting intense research to guide it.

It is undoubtedly the fact that Ethiopia has many tourism resources. However, most of them are not well studied, promoted, and used. Additionally, accommodation, amenities, accessibility and other infrastructure are not stretched and developed, like that of Gafat industrial village. The village is a part and parcel of these issues since it is among the Ethiopian tourism resources that have great potential for tourism development. At this site, an industrial school was established where Ethiopian youths

¹ Principal investigator

² co – investigator



acquired literacy and some technical skills (Bahru, 2002). Moreover, it is believed that this site is the first industrial village in Africa, and it is the resource place for the firm struggle of Ethiopians against the British between 1855 -1868) (Tekeletsadik, 1981).

The investigators do not believe that this research is the first to be conducted on Gafat industrial village. Researchers, such as Solomon (2011) and Yirdaw (2012), have done research on related issues in and around Debre Tabor town. Solomon has conducted a research study entitled “A history of Farta wereda 1935 - 1991”. His research is mainly focused on the recent history (1935 – 1991). Hence, the research lacked due attention to the industrial village of Gafat (19th century) because his study did not investigate the industrial village deeply. On the other hand, Yirdaw conducted his research entitled “Heritage potentials, management challenges, and prospects: the case of Debre Tabor town and its surroundings”. Like Solomon, his research gave little attention for the industrial village of Gafat since it was concerned on the many heritage aspects (churches, sacred vestments, traditional church students, mosque, leather works, festivals, farming activity etc.) of the town and its vicinity.

As a result, this research filled the gaps of the above researchers (Solomon and Yirdaw) by assessing the detailed potential of especially the great imprints of Emperor Tewodros II in Gafat industrial village, the artists and artisans, the associated histories, and comings and goings of the people. It also gave due attention to the stakeholders since the site is neither promoted for tourists nor incorporated in the historic route of Ethiopia. Thus, conducting a research in Gafat Industrial Village is mandatory for the development of tourism in South Gondar Administrative Zone (SGAZ).

Review of related literature

Since the research is mainly focused on the tourism potentials of Gafat industrial village, the researchers would like to carry out related literature reviews regarding the notions of tourism and the industrial heritage. Conducting such reviews provides hints for the village in showing the relationships, as the village is one part of tourism development. Likewise, the industrial heritage section took its role in sharing experiences.

Notion of Tourism

Several attempts were made to define tourism since it is a highly complicated amalgam of various parts. These parts are human feelings, emotions, and desires. It also includes natural and cultural attractions, suppliers of transport, accommodation and other services, and government policy and regulatory frameworks (Holden, 2008). In incorporating such issues, there are many attempts for defining the term tourism. The attempts are explained in the following ways. The first attempt to define tourism was that of Hunziker and Krapf in 1942. Based on these two scholars, tourism is defined as ‘the sum of the phenomena and relationships arising from the travel and stay of non-residents’. On the bases of the scholars, non-residents do not lead to permanent residence. Likewise, the non-residents are also not connected to any earning activity. This definition helps us to distinguish tourism from migration. However, it makes the assumption that both travel and stay are necessary for tourism. Tourism would also appear to exclude business travel, which is connected with earnings, even if that income is not earned in the destination country. In many cases, the difference between business and leisure tourism is extremely difficult since most business trips will combine elements of leisure activity (Holloway et al, 2009).

The above expressions have a similarity with the idea proposed by Jafari (1977). Jafari defined tourism as the study of a man away from his usual habitat. In line with this scholarly expression, tourism should respond to the needs of tourists and it is accompanied by impacts on the tourists and the industry. These are the impacts on the socio-cultural, economic, and physical environments. Likewise, according to Mathieson and Wall (1982), as cited in Theobald (2005), “Tourism is the temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence”. Additionally, it includes “the activities



which were undertaken during their stay in those destinations, and the facilities created to cater to their needs". Support such thoughts, other definitions of tourism have also broadened the issue. For example, the World Tourism Organization (WTO) definition published in 1994 saw tourism as comprising various elements. These are the activities of persons traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year. The activities might be for leisure, business or other purposes (WTO, 1994). Hence, based on the above notions of tourism, Gafat industrial village is among the vital elements of Ethiopian tourism development.

Industrial Heritage

Various countries are the owners of industrial heritage in different seasons. For instance, Britain became the seat of the Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century, and over the past half-century. The interest has been awakened in the many redundant buildings and obsolete machinery dating back to this period. The fact that so many of the early factories and warehouses were also architectural gems in their own way gave impetus to preserve these building and restore them for tourism. Other European countries, USA and Australia have also recognized the potential of such buildings (Holloway & Taylor, 2006).

The variety of such industrial buildings and sites is astonishing for tourists. For example, early mining sites such as the coal and slate mines of South Wales or the copper mines of Cornwall were converted into tourist attractions though they were docks and manufacturing sites. Moreover, derelict textile mills of the north of England were driven out of existence by the importation of cheap textiles from developing countries following World War II. These have either taken on new life as museums or in some cases have been converted to attractive new homes. Some changed into open-air museums. The open-air museums which are based on a combination of industrial archaeology and industrial heritage, provide settings to be properly appreciated. It will require many hours, if not days, of viewing, and much help to turn former areas of urban decay into major tourist attractions (Holloway & Taylor, 2006). Likewise, Gafat industrial village has the chance to be an open-air museum if supporting actions are undertaken.

Methodology

Description of the Study area

This study was conducted in SGAZ, Amhara national regional state of northern Ethiopia. The zone is geographically bounded by East Gojjam on the south, North Gondar on the north, Waghimra on the northeast, North Wollo on the east and west Gojjam on the west. Astronomically, it is located between 11° 02' - 12° 33'N and 37° 25' - 38° 41' E with an altitude range of 1500-4231 m (Alemayehu, 2002). Researchers have selected Gafat industrial village, in Farta district of SGAZ. It is specially located in Hiruy – Aregay kebele in the northeast of Debre Tabor town which is 6km away.

The Study Design

In the study, the researchers followed a cross-sectional research perspective. This design is the best to find the prevalence of a phenomenon, situation, problem and attitude of the selected sites' heads, experts and the local communities. Since the research is focused on the assessment of tourism potentials in Gafat industrial village, the issue was approached by using a qualitative research method. The main reason for using this method was that qualitative research studies are designed to discover what can be learned about some phenomenon of interest, particularly social phenomena where people are the participants (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).



Data Gathering Tools

According to Maykut and Morehouse (1994), (referring to Erickson and Wilson, 1982; Wagner, 1979), the data of qualitative inquiry is most often people's words and actions. Accordingly, it requires methods that allow the researcher to capture language and behavior. In line with this, the most useful ways of gathering these forms of data are participant observation, in-depth interviews, and the collection of relevant documents (Berg, 2001). Thus, the researchers have gathered information from participant observation, in-depth interviews, document and textual analysis, and photographic data.

Sampling

The researchers have used purposive sampling since such participants are thought to be more appropriate (knowledgeable, experienced, etc.) for the study than the others. This was accompanied by snowball (chain referral) sampling, a technique used to identify potential participants (Altinay & Paraskevas, 2008). On the base of such cases, participants were selected from various categories. These were: ten local persons of Hiruy – Abaregay district, one head and two experts of Farta district culture and tourism office, six scholars who have credible knowledge on the issues, and an expert of SGAZ culture tourism department. The participants were thus twenty in number (n=20).

Sources of Data

The researchers were used primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected from participant observations, photographic data, and in-depth interviews. Moreover, data from secondary information sources (documents and texts) were used for the research works.

Analysis of Data

The data Analysis of this research was conducted by categorizing, describing and interpreting the data collected from participant observation, in-depth interviews, document and textual analysis, and photographic data.

Data Analysis, Description and Interpretation

This part shows the findings on the tourism potentials of Gafat industrial village. It mainly focuses on the area description of the village, the name of the village, the preconditions for Emperor Tewodros II to build the village, the name Kasa of Emperor Tewodros and its relationship with the village, and the reasons for Gafat to be an industrial village. Likewise, it also includes the results related to the artists of the village, the cannon works, and the attention of the Emperor to the artists. Finally, it describes the closing stages of art in the industrial village. All of these are described below.

Area Description of Gafat Industrial Village

Gafat industrial village was the cannon factory (foundry) of Emperor Tewodros II (Crummey, 1998: 80; Rubenson, 1991: 179). It is located in Farata wereda of Hiruy and Abaregay kebele around six kilometers distance from Debre Tabor town. The village is among the sites which has an immense amount of tourism potential. It is a very accessible site for tourism development since the major tourist routes of Bahir Dar Lalibela pass through Debre Tabor town.

Debra Tabor was a really pleasing place for Tewodros II owing to some reasons. These are his acceptance by the people of Debre Tabor and the events occurred during his presence in the town. His coming to Debre Tabor was due to conflict with the people of Gondar. Consequently, he burnt some treasures of Gondar and he looted the rest, after which he came to Debre Tabor where his beloved son Alemayehu was born on April 05/ 1853 E.C. His mission of producing a cannon was realized at Gafat.

Again, when his son Alemayehu was born, Tewodros II had a cannon and guns and released 500 prisoners. Thus, great happiness filled the town. Emperor Tewodros said Debre Tabor was a “New Gondar” (Tekletsadik, 1981: 363; Tekle’eyesus, 2002: 117 and 128; Paulos, 1985: 319; Weldemaryam, 1897, 24 and 39, Rita, 1973: 16).

Gafat is said to be the first industrial village in the land of Africa. It is the place where the light of industrial civilization was ‘thrown the beam of light’. Additionally, the site is among the three most important places (Qwara and Maqdela) in the life of Emperor Tewodros II (Amare, 2003: 172; Bahru, 2002: 40). It has three important sites. These are the cannon foundry, the home enclosure of Artists, and the house of horses. The first served as the plant site in which the metals and other minerals were melted to prepare the cannon, the second was the house of the Artists who were involved in the work of the cannon’s manufacture and their families, and the third, used as the house of the horses which served the transporting of minerals (Rubenson, 1991: 179; Dessalegn, Beza, and Werku, interviewed on 26/10/2016; Asmamaw and Adane, interviewed on 12/01/2017).

Owing to the existence of a number of healthy conditions, Gafat was termed the town of ‘gratification’. The home enclosure of the Artists had twelve small storied houses (lodges and huts). Each of the small houses took five days to be erected (Paulos, 1985: 159; Marsden, 2007: 64). The enclosure also had a strong fence. In the fence, there were four cannons in each of the four windows. The four windows thus served as fortifications. Likewise, the village had various fruits since water irrigation was available to each house of the artists (Blanc, 1868: 84, Fasila, 1959: 36; Gerima, 1961: 196; Asmamaw and Adane, interviewed on 12/01/2017).

There was also a water-wheel which moved around in various directions. On its one side, it split wood with its saw, with another side it grinded gunpowder, on another side it organized gunpowder and on yet another side, it blew with bellows. Additionally, it spouted water. There were also two fire blusters used for preparing the cannon. Generally, during this period, Gafat became a great center of technical skills (Blanc, 1868: 84, Fasila, 1959: 37; Gerima, 1961: 197; Paulos, 1985: 170; Marsden, 2007: 64 - 65).



Figure. 1.1. The ruined home of the European Artist, at Gafat Industrial Village (Source: Authors own)



Figure 1.2. the cannon foundry of Gafat industrial village (Source: Authors own)



Figure 1.3. the house of horses (Source: Authors own)

The name Gafat and its provision for the Industrial Village

On the bases of historical pieces of evidence, the name Gafat was coined from the tribe who was known as Gafat. The tribe had two categories. These were the relatives of kusa and the relative of Israel. The first to enter Ethiopia were the relatives of kusa. The second group of relatives came during the reign of king Rehoboam (r. 931 – 913 BC), the king of Israel. These two groups settled in separate areas. After a period of time, they lived together. Based on their father's name of kusa, they named themselves Gafat (Taye, 1914: 31).

Gafat begot ten sons. These were Abdray, Gembo, Birebabo, Yezembel, Yesubli, Ashmen, Harbesh, Harb akel, Wengie, and Din. The children of each son of Gafat was this a name of a tribe. Thus, the tribe of Abdray, tribe of Gembo, tribe of Birebabo, tribe of Yezembel, tribe of Yesubli, tribe of Ashmen, tribe of Harbesh, tribe of Harb akel, tribe of Wengie, and the tribe of Din. These were all collectively called the

tribe of Gafat (Taye, 1914: 32; Alemu, 2005: 23). The tribes first settled in Shewa as there is a place called by that name, between debre libanos and bejer, bel Gafat. Then, they moved to Gojjam and lived around the Abay area. After a time, they were again moved, this time to Gondar (Selamko and Estie mekane eyesus). Up to today, the two of the places are called Gafat (Taye, 1914: 32). When they moved and lived in different parts of the country, they were made strong fighting with the kings of Ethiopia. For instance, during king Susenyos reign, they were very numerous and fought many times with him against invaders (Taye, 1914: 32; Alemu, 2005: 23).

Finally, all the natives of Ethiopia and Europeans were better known under the collective name of the “Gafat people”, on account of the name of the village they usually resided in (Blanc, 1868: 22). In other words, the place served as the permanent residence of a little colony of European gunsmiths and other workmen in the pay of the Emperor. Consequently, the village was a sort of Abyssinian Woolwich Arsenal (Charles, 1867: 181).

Preconditions: Motivating circumstances and experiences for Emperor Tewodros to build Gafat Industrial village

Emperor Tewodros II had trustworthy preconditions, motivations, and experiences to build Gafat industrial village. Among these, his mother - in – law Menen, the coming of Muslims in North Western Ethiopia, and his vision for modern Ethiopia all played a huge part. While he was at Quara, he heard of the coming of Turkish and Egyptian forces in North Western Ethiopia. He fought the Turkish and Egyptian armies at the palace of Debarki since he was interested in the campaign conducted in the west aimed at handing back Ethiopian territories which were taken by Egypt and the Turkish government. The Turks and the Egyptians came with modern military equipment and manpower and they won. Even though Tewodros was not successful, he learned a great lesson from the campaign. His ambition was then to develop Ethiopianism by more willingly Ethiopian people rather than by focusing on Quara and its vicinity. Generally, he came back with a new state of mind (Gerima, 1961: 41 and 137; Littmann, 1902: 13; Tekletsadiq, 1936: 1; Paulos, 1985: 173; Tadesse et al, 1990: 89; Bahru, 2002: 28 and 35 – 36; Marsden, 2007: 35).

After the battle of Dabarki, Emperor Tewodros overcame the regional lords or princes in order to form one and united Ethiopia. He overthrew Ras Ali, the governor of Begemidir and went to Yeju (Tadesse et al, 1990: 90; Gerima, 1961: 142; Rubenson, 1991: 208). Emperor Tewodros wanted to stop the anarchy of the princes and the bloodshed that had befallen his people (Tadesse et al, 1990: 103 - 104; Bahru, 2002: 33).

The third important circumstance was to build an industrial village at Gafat for Emperor Tewodros as part of his vision for modern Ethiopia and its national unity, and this was to be through tackling the problem of regional powers (Marsden, 2007: 34). Moreover, he has been described as Ethiopia’s first Emperor with a concept of modernization (Bahru, 2002: 32). To strengthen his philosophy, he took noteworthy actions such as changing his name, creating military reformation, and increasing territorial expansion. Thus, all of the above things obliged Emperor Tewodros to build Gafat industrial village.

The Name Tewodros for Kasa

Some researchers explain the name Kassa, used to describe Tewodros, as “the fire of Qwara” (Crummey, 1971: 108 as cited in Sir, 2015: 26) and others refer to him as “Abba Moged (Lord of the storm)” (Gelaye, 2009: 1357 as cited in Sir, 2015: 39). He was anointed and crowned at deresgie Maryam church as he was the Emperor (king of kings) of Ethiopia in February 1855. In the name of Tewodros II, encapsulates his emperorship which was conferred by the hand of Bishop Selama. He thus adopted the regal name of “Tewodros” (Marcus, 1994: 64; Sir, 2015: 22; Rubenson, 1991: 173).



There were principal reasons to apply the name Tewodros to Kasa. These were the name by itself and a prophecy. He believed he was destined to be a monarch and was capable of great things, whether good or evil. The name Tewodros also means 'strong'. This was the name of the eagerly awaited Ethiopian prince who was to put an end to the trials and tribulations of his people. He was also expected to rule the world in righteousness, peace and prosperity (Hall, 2003: 53; Sir, 2015: 24; Ajayi, 1989: 391; Rubenson, 1991: 173). Hence, he has required to be stronger than all his enemies, both local princes and foreigners (Charles, 1867: 39; Paulos, 1985: 78). In other words, the name Tewodros was largely endowed with his impression of his personal qualities including his sense of mission, his military skill and valour, and especially his extraordinary intelligence (Bahru, 2002: 27).

Why Gafat was selected as an Industrial Village

The main reason for selecting Gafat as an industrial village was its association with tribe of Gafat in the area. The inhabitants were well known for their various handicrafts such as blacksmithing, jewelry, weaving, tannery, and the art of traditional music and the use of musical instruments. Secondly, to create handicrafts, Gafat was ideal as there were there were minerals or materials (iron, brick etc...) in and around the village (Semerneh, Derehina Eyesus, Aferwanat, Qoley Maryam). (Taye, 1914: 33; Gerima, 1961: 164; Amare, 2003: 181; Dessalegn, Beza, and Werku, interviewed on 26/10/2016; Asmamaw and Adane, interviewed on 12/01/2017).

The third important reason was due to a connection with Debre Tabor. It was a congenial place for the Emperor Tewodros due to its many comforts when he fought against the the people of Gondar. He named Debre Tabor the "New Gondar". In addition, Gafat is very near site, (about 5 kilometers), to Debre Tabor Town. In addition, it was strategically sited. After the defeat of Ras Ali of Begemidir, except for Debre Tabor, all of the Princes (Tedila Guwalu in Gojjam, Amedie Beshir in Wollo, and Wube of Semen...) became challengers of Emperor Tewodros power. When he was on the other side, the plateau of Mekidela, Tewodros was not comfortable due to the weather conditions, the landscape, and the other related conditions for living. Hence, in 1852 E.C. Emperor Tewodros mobilized the Europeans (Filad with his wife, Waldmeier with his wife, Bender, Salmuler, Konzlan), who were seated at Mekidela plateau, to attack Gafat. The most reasonably safe and sound place for him to operate in was Debre Tabor (Marsden, 2007: 35, Paulos, 1985: 159). Gafat was the place where the handicraftsmen (employees), formed a confederation and It was the ideal place to assure the dream of the Emperor. In line with Bahiru (2003: 33) the site, Gafat more than any other place, symbolized Tewodros's modernizing drive.

The Workers (Artists) of (at) Gafat Industrial Village

The Battle of Dabarqi bestowed Emperor Tewodros grand know-how and it enabled him to set his sights countrywide. He observed that if Ethiopia had not produced military equipment, it would not be a sovereign country. Europeans were paying much attention to Africa in the name of preaching the gospel and needed to be curtailed. Tewodros also wanted to enrich Ethiopia and raise it to higher levels and thus equal in the level of civilization with supposedly civilized nations. Accordingly, the Emperor planned to obtain foreign assistance to manufacture military types of equipment (Bahru, 2002: 33 and 37; Amare, 2003: 179; Gerima, 1961: 162, 163 and 170).

During the production processes, both Ethiopians and foreigners participated. The Ethiopians had knowledge of blacksmithing, and various other skills and gifts and were thus selected from various parts of Ethiopia. This was in addition to the local people who lived at Gafat, and who conducted training with the missionaries. On this basis, they obtained a chance to gain experience on manufacturing cannons and other armaments. war pieces of equipment. The foreigners who participated in the cannon making were citizens of Germany, England, France, Poland, Austria, Scotland, and Felasha missionaries who also partook (Tekletsadiq, 1981: 364 - 365; Gerima, 1961: 133 and 163- 164; Ajayi, 1989: 394). Among



them, was a certain Theophilus Waldmeier, a Protestant missionary who had vast handicraft knowledge and offered training to the people of Gafat and Felashas, opening a boarding school.

Moreover, in 1856. some missionaries from Scotland, England, and Felasha, who were twenty-five in number, entered into Ethiopia. Their interest was to preach the gospel through opening schools (Gerima, 1961: 163 – 164) and earned money via handicraft production. A French gunsmith and a Polish deserter from the Russian army also joined with the artists in Gafatr (Ajayi, 1989: 394). Gafat thus became a village of Europeans (Paulos, 1985: 159). Moreover, from 1856 the people of Gafat tried to fulfill the orders of Emperor Tewodros (Gerima, 1961: 164).

S.n.	Name of the Artist	Occupation
1	Waldmeier	Woodworker and road engineer
2	Salmuller	Blacksmith
3	John Mayor	Cart driver
4	Lendor	Woodworker and blacksmith
5	Bendor	Smith for saddle nose
6	Moritz Hall	Smith for sculpture
7	Bergo	Wood maker for the gun and blacksmith
8	Shemper	Limestone maker
9	Sandel	Highway engineer
10	Kinder	Chief surveyor

Table 1. 1 the chief foreign artists of Gafat industrial village (Gerima, 1961: 227; Fasila, 1959: 39 and 47; Tekletsadiq, 1981: 365; Rubenson, 1991: 179)

The cannon making at Gafat Industrial Village: the raw materials, the processes, and the Canon(s)

To show how the potential of the village, the available raw materials and processes are described that were used for cannon manufacture. On the bases of shreds of evidence, the raw materials were the minerals found in and around Gafat, and treasures which came from Gondar town and the hill of Mekidela. The minerals of Gafat and the surrounding area included iron, silver, and gold (Gerima, 1961: 164; Amare, 2003: 181; Dessalegn, Beza, and Werku, interviewed on 26/10/2016; Asmamaw and Adane, interviewed on 12/01/2017). Furthermore, the main reason for treasure coming from Gondar was that Emperor Tewodros had faced strong challenges from the people of Gondar. He thus burnt Gondar town and the churches, and looted the treasuries of the churches which included crosses, sistrums, *sens* or jars of holy water, brasses, bells, golden and silver drums, golden and silver bowls, and pieces of jewelry of prior kings who gave wealthy objects to the churches. All these were used for making the cannon. The large cups of brass, which numbered fifty, were also added for the production. These came from Mekidela (Tekletsadiq, 1981: 363 – 365; Paulos, 1985: 160; Tekle'eyesus, 2002: 123 and 129). Ajayi (1989: 396) also asserts that many brass and silver objects were melted down to make the cannon.

In 1861, Emperor Tewodros II asked the people of Gafat to make handicrafts rather than simply preach the gospel. In a question to Waldmeier, Tewodros stated “you Europeans are wise, but you are hiding your skill, I need to make me a large cannon, mortars, and bomb-shells”. The Europeans however initially raised objections. They gave false information as to their abilities, but the Emperor forced them to try their best (Gerima, 1961: 164 -165; Ajayi, 1989: 394; Paulos, 1985: 159). Accordingly, even though the issue was very hard for the Europeans, they found a solution to escape from the likely forthcoming hardship meted out to them by Emperor Tewodros II. They decided to co-operate as they possessed technical skill and stated that they were ready to help with anything required. Based on their decision, Waldmier made the model of the cannon on paper and he gave it to the Emperor who agreed with their decision and he assigned to them laborers who were counted in the thousands for the work to be completed. From the missionaries side, Mortiz, a former soldier of Russia and Poland, was the man with

the best knowledge (Gerima, 1961: 165 -166; Ajayi, 1989: 394; Paulos, 1985: 159 - 160; Tadesse et al, 1990: 127; Tadesse and Girma, N D: 122). The Europeans prepared a blast furnace which was made of clay, a mixture of sand and soil. After several failed attempts the eventually made the blast furnace (Gerima, 1961: 164 -165; Paulos, 1985: 160; Tadesse et al, 1990: 127).

All of the artisans were very interested in the event (Gerima, 1961: 164 -165; Paulos, 1985: 160 – 161; Dessalegn, Beza, and Werku, interviewed on 26/10/2016; Asmamaw and Adane, interviewed on 12/01/2017). In line with the successful accomplishment of the blast furnace and the melting down of the iron, the work on the body of the cannon was begun. After some other parts were made the expectations of Emperor Tewodros II rose (Gerima, 1961: 164 -165). In his eagerness, Emperor Tewodros II visited Gafat twice a day (Blanc, 1868: 85). However, according to Rassam (1869: 148), the Emperor went down to the foundry almost every day to see his artisans at work.

The Canon(s): the large and the smalls

Investing in the production of military equipment (cannon, cart etc...) was very important to Tewodros II. Firstly, he prepared a wooden cannon, which was covered with iron, at Chewdiba or Sawdiba, to fight against Ras Ali (Gerima, 1961: 51; Littman, 1902: 14). Besides this, at the appropriate time, while he was in Gafat, Emperor Tewodros produced one large cannon and fifteen small cannons, through managing various technicalities (Tekle'eyesus, 2003: 123; Gerima 1961: 166 – 168). The name of the large cannon was Sevastopol and it was very large in size and there was no cannon in Ethiopia comparable to it. It weighed 8 tons while the weight of the shells for the cannon was 17 kilograms per shell. The cannon was finally rifled at maqdela (Tekle'eyesus, 2003: 123; Tekletsadiq, 1936: 37; Gerima 1961: 167 - 168; Tekletsadiq, 1981: 365; Ajayi, 1989: 394; Paulos, 1985:166 and 287). Emperor Tewodros had a total of about 35 cannons (Tekletsadiq, 1981: 366). The chief reason for Emperor Tewodros naming the cannon stating Sevastopol, was based on the place in the Crimean war of 1853 – 1856, which was Russia's heavily fortified chief naval base in the Black Sea. The site is located on the Crimean peninsula. In this place, the Christian Orthodox Russians defeated Muslim Turkey (Tadesse et al, 1990: 109; Bahru, 2002: 36; Tadesse and Girma, N.D.:126; Rubenson, 1991: 183, Marsden, 2007: 35). The name Sevastopolis has come from the Greek words. These are σεβαστό sevastos (venerable) and the noun πόλις pólis (city). Hence, Emperor Tewodros gave the name Sevastopol for the cannon willing to repeat the victory over Turkish and also the Egyptians. This was to say 'venerable' (great and respectful) cannon 'get victory over all the enemies' (Bahru, 2002: 36; Rubenson, 1991: 183).

In addition to the cannons, Emperor Tewodros II had also directed his European artisans at Gafat to build him some wooden boats to ply on the Lake, instead of the ordinary native canoes made of bulrushes. Through this mobilization, the first boat in Ethiopia that could be moved with its engine was made in April 1858. It was 60 foot in length and 20 foot in width and it could carry 100 persons. The Emperor was one of the apprentices (Rassam, 1869: 5; Paulos, 1985: 171). At the end of the work of the cannon construction, Emperor Tewodros gave prizes for the artists and he ordered them to make carts that could be used to move the cannons, Sevastopol or other materials. On that context, the artists made fourteen carts at Gafat (Paulos, 1985: 161).

The Attentions of Emperor Tewodros II to Artists and Advisors

Emperor Tewodros had given several special treatments to the artists and advisors for the sake of prolonging their existence here in Gafat Industrial village. Building family linkages and forwarding prizes or gifts were among the special treatments. Likewise, he gave high positions to the employees. Appreciation and respect were also afforded to them. On the concern of building family linkage, and choosing 'smart' girls among the Ethiopians for weddings, the Emperor allowed marriages for Europeans. This was done to keep the Europeans in Ethiopia. There was even a beauty contest at atse seqela, in Gondar. In this contest, Tsehaytu Yilma (the daughter of dejjazmach Yilma Asfaw from Seqelt)



and Tewabech (the daughter of Sheh Mohamed Geta, from Addis Alem) won first and second places respectively. Tsehaytu and Tewabech were given to Orma'el, chief of the artists, and Moritz, the vice of Orma'el to be their wives. Both of them bore children. Additionally, Emperor Tewodros II provided money, honey, and butter for them. This action of the Emperor made these Europeans live in Gafat (Gerima, 1961: 165 and 187 -188).

In line with the other issue, Emperor Tewodros II has provided venerable prizes or gifts for the artists and their families. To the craftsmen, he gave the prizes of shields, spears, weapons, horses, and mules which were fully jewelry-furnished in gold and silver trappings, and clothes (kemis and drib). He also added several gifts (embroidered kemis, barnous, jewelry made of gold and silver) for their wives. For instance, to Orma'el, he gave the land of inheritance on the side of his wife Taytu Yilma, and for Mr. Sendal (a surveyor) he provided a fully equipped (saddled and decorated) mule, his Kemis, trouser, and one thousand birr. Likewise, for Mr. Iender, Mr. Kindlen and Mayor, each received 600 birr, kemis and drib for each of them (Ajayi, 19889: 394; Gerima, 1961: 131- 132, 161 and 187 – 188; Paulos, 1985: 161; Blanc, 1868: 22).

Moreover, Emperor Tewodros II was eager to recognize the persons (both Ethiopians and foreigners) who shared the same ideas on the prospects on Gafat industrial village. For example, Fitawirari Gebrye (Ethiopian) and John Bell (England) were very important persons in the life of the Emperor. Each of them was highly honored and were his military generals and advisors. Fitawirari Gebrye was from the 'side of the Emperor', (from Quara till Meqdela), and John Bell was also a close friend and advisor of Tewodros (Gerima, 1961: 141- 142).

Giving appreciation and respect were also among the good works of Emperor Tewodros II for the employees. For instance, when new technology was used in Gafat industrial village, he kissed the hands of Waldmeier and stated that, the 'soil will eat these astonishing hands' (Paulos, 1985: 170). The Emperor referred to numerous artists as his children (Blanc, 1868: 23, Marsden, 2007: 42 and 191). Additionally, Tewodros allowed artists (missionaries) to perform their daily prayers (Paulos, 1985: 161) and he gave them land for tombs (Gerima, 1961: 88).

The closing stages of Art at Gafat Industrial Village

Gafat was also a symbol of the uneasy relationship between Tewodros and the European missionaries (Bahiru, 2003: 33). In the closing stages of Gafat industrial village, four major events took place. These were miscommunication between Emperor Tewodros II and the people of Gafat (Europeans), the Europeans leaving the village, the devastation of establishments at the village, and the shift from Gafat to Meqdela. Emperor Tewodros II was very disappointed since the government of England was not permitting professional craftsmen to go to Ethiopia (Gafat) (Fasila, 1959: 36; Gerima, 1961: 196). Without the knowledge of the emperor, the craftsmen who settled at Gafat Industrial village built a fortification at the fence which had four windows. The emperor did not supported this work and it has created hesitation on him. Hence, he has forced the people of Europe to be exiled from the village. Moreover, they were surrounded by foreign soldiers and driven out being tethered by their hands. During this period time, the happiness of the people of Gafat was changed into sorrow (Fasila, 1959: 36 – 37; Gerima, 1961: 197). The Europeans, forty in number, were imprisoned at Meqdela and Gafat, by Tewodros II. Among them, were prisoners who were in chains at Magdala including four from England (one of them the wife of Mr. Rosenthal, Consul Cameron, Kerans, McKelvery, Rosenthal), two Germans (Rosenthal (missionary), and Stern (missionary), two Frenchmen (makerer and Bardel), and one Italian (Pietro). The persons who were detained at Gafat, near Debre Tabor, were six Germans (one of them the wife of Mr. Flad, Steiger (missionary), Brandeis missionary), (Schiller and Essler natural history collectors), M. Flad (missionary) and Mrs. P. Flad), and three children of the latter (A. Flad, Fr. Flad, P. Flad) (Tekletsadik, 1936: 29; Rassam, 1869: 204).

Thirdly, all the establishments (the water - wheel and the blast furnace) were demolished. Finally, the journey of the cannon from Gafat industrial village to Meqdela was started on October 1, 1868. The distance from the village to Meqdela covered a distance of 320 kilometers. The principal reason for the journey (selecting Meqdela) was that In the opinion of Tewodros, Meqdela was strategic, since the plateau was hilly and faced all directions while only having one gate. This was to win over the power of England in an intelligent manner. The people who participated in the trip numbered 500. The journey took six and a half months. During the journey Tewodros was accompanied by 4, 000 soldiers and 30,000 trekkers (Gerima, 1985, 197; Paulos, 1985: 164 - 166; Fasila, 1959: 38; Tekletsadik, 1936: 34). After the closing stages of the Gafat industrial village, the local communities (seven households) live in their self-constructed homes. However, after getting compensation from Debre Tabor University, they left. The houses were left on the site as witnesses to their prior habitation (fig 1.4) (Meseret and Adane interviewed on 12/01/2017).



Figure 1.4 the former houses of the local households

The Sustainable Tourism Master Plan 2015-2025

It is globally accepted that any tourism development should be sustainable providing fairness for the current exploitation of tourism resources while not compromising the ability of future generations to enjoy fascinating places, and considering social justice and poverty alleviation.

“As a result of sweeping economic reforms, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) has been enjoying unprecedented tourism growth in the recent years. International tourist arrivals have been on a growth trajectory since the 90s rising from 64,000 in 1990 to 681,249 in 2013. This has been matched by growth in the contribution of the travel and tourism sector’s direct contribution to the country’s GDP which in 2013 was 4.2%, translating to ETB 35,766.6m and is expected to grow by 4.8% p.a. reaching ETB 59, 495.2m (3.6% of GDP) by 2024.” (Tralac, 2016)

Tourism is an important source of employment accounting for 3.8% of total employment in 2013 in Ethiopia, representing some 985,500 jobs. It is thus an avenue to arrive at accelerated and sustainable development in efforts to end poverty as articulated in the country’s Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP), 2010-2015 (Tralac, 2016). Gafat industrial village in the South Gondar Administrative Zone, North Western Ethiopia, is a prime example of an opportunity waiting to be grabbed.



Conclusion

It is unfortunate that Gafat is not internationally known and there is thus a huge lack of awareness about this special place in Ethiopian and African history. The Gafat Industrial village has many tourism resources. It has a rich history, amazing people, historical monuments, heritage, arts and handicrafts. It was the first industrial village on the soil of Africa. This was a vital place for Ethiopia's civilization to sprout. Hence, Emperor Tewodros II paid a great attention to the village. He had an ambition of ruling Ethiopia in a modern way, including territorial expansion up to Jerusalem. Due to this, he changed his name from Kasa to Tewodros. The village has three important sites. These are the enclosure of artists, the foundry and the house of horses. In this village, the 'sun' of technology was raised. This is because the boarding school of technology for the Europeans and Ethiopians was situated there, and the great cannon of Sevastopol was manufactured in it using local materials. Finally, the industrial village was eroded due to European interventions and some internal rivalries towards the illustrious Emperor Tewodros.

While Gafat has some unhospitable aspects for tourists nowadays, it has some good services, accessibility, and offers prospects for relaxation. For a start, in order to capitalize on the very rich history described in this article, the support of all stakeholders, including the locals and the private sector involvement in heritage management is crucial (Richards, 1996). Secondly, the Office of Culture and Tourism of South Gondar should prioritize raising greater awareness about the town and essentially take ownership of proceedings relating to tourism enhancement. For sustainable tourism development to materialise, it will be necessary to create an advisory board comprising experts in various fields such as heritage studies and tourism marketing. Support should be given to the local community by the state to create micro enterprises that would also serve the purpose of reducing unemployment and provide needed jobs. The lack of competent manpower in the needed heritage management and tourism initiatives will be a perpetual challenge to the rich cultural heritage management of Gafat and its sustainable development for tourism. The anthropogenic agents of destruction require consideration (Mekonnen, 2016) and there is a dire need to improve the current infrastructure and attitudes of inhabitants if foreign tourists are to be attracted to Gafat.

References

- Ajayi, A. (Ed.). (1989). *Africa in the Nineteenth Century until the 1880s*, University of California Press, United States of America.
- Alemayehu, W. (2002). *Opportunities, Constraints, and Prospects of the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahido Churches in Conserving Forest Resources: The Case of Churches in South Gonder, Northern Ethiopia*, Master's Thesis
- Alemu, H. (translator). (2005 E.C.). *The history of Ethiopia (1597 – 1625): The chronicle of king Susenyos* (in Amharic), Addis Ababa, Sirak Printing Enterprise.
- Altinay, L. & Paraskevas, A. (2008). *Planning research in hospitality and tourism*, USA.
- Amare, A. (2003 E.C). *Emperor Tewodros yesterday, today and tomorrow* (in Amharic), USA
- Bahru, Z. (2002). *A history of modern Ethiopia: 1855 -1991: (2nd edition)*, Addis Ababa
- Bairu, T. (editor). (1977). *A chronicle of Emperor Yohannes IV (1872 - 89)*, Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, Wiesbaden.
- Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Allyn & Bacon,



- Blanc, H. (1868). The story of the captives: A narrative of the events of Mr. Rassam's mission to Abyssinia, London.
- Charles, B. (1867). The British Captives in Abyssinia (2nd edi.), London
- Clay, C. (No Date). The royal chronicles of Abyssinia (1769 – 1840), Cambridge university press, London
- Crummey, D. (1998). Personality and political culture in Ethiopian history: the case of Emperor Tewodros, Boston University, African Studies Center.
- Fasila, L. (publisher). (1959). The History of Ethiopia (in Amharic), Senat Printing press, Rome
- Gerima, T. (1961). Aba Tatek Kasa Yequaraw Anbesa (in Amharic), Addis Ababa, Birhan and Selam printing press
- Hall, J. (2003). Ethiopia in the Modern world, Chelsea House Publishers, United States of America
- Hara, T. (2008). Quantitative Tourism Industry Analysis, USA.
- Holden, A. (2008). Environment and Tourism, Second Edition.
- Holloway, C. & Taylor, N. (2006). The business of tourism (7th edition), Pearson Education Limited.
- Holloway, C., Humphreys, C. & Davidson, R. (2009). The business of Tourism (Eighth edi), Pearson Education Limited.
- Jafari, J (Editor). (1977). Annals of Tourism Research (Special Number October/December).
- Littmann, E. (publisher). (1902). The History of Tewodros (Amharic), New York.
- Marcus, H. (1994). A History of Ethiopia, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Marsden, P. (2007). The bare foot Emperor: an Ethiopian Tragedy, New York, Harper Press
- Maykut, P. & Morehouse, R. (1994). Beginning Qualitative Research: a Philosophic and Practical Guide.
- Mekonnen, H. (2016). Cultural Heritage Management in the Town of Debre Tabor and its Surroundings, European Academic Research, IV (6), September 2016.
- Morin, D. (2009). Orality in the Chronicle of King Tewodros II.
- Paulos, G. (1985). Emperor Tewodros (in Amharic) (1st edi.), Addis Ababa
- Rassam, H. (1869). Narrative of the British Mission to Theodore, King of Abyssinia, (volume – II), London
- Richards, G (1996). Production and Consumption of European Cultural Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23: 261-283.
- Rita, P. (1973). The Library of Emperor Tewodros II at Mäqdäla (Magdala), Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 36(1), 15-42.
- Rubenson, S. (1991). The survival of Ethiopian independence. Addis Ababa, Kuraz Publishing Agency.
- Sir, N. (2015). Tewodros and Tipu as Warrior against Imperialist Britain: A comparative study, *Asian and African Studies*, 24(1), 2015.



- Solomon, A. (2011). A History of Farta wereda (1935 – 1991), MA thesis, Addis Ababa.
- Taddesse, B., Richard, P. & Shiferaw, B. (editors). (1990). Kasa and casa: papers on lives, times and Images of Tewodros II and Yohannes IV (1855 – 1889), AAU, Institute of Ethiopian Studies.
- Tadesse, D. & Girma, A. (N.D.). A short History of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- Taye, G.M. (aleqa). (1914). The History of Ethiopian People in short word (in Amharic), Asmera.
- Tekle'eyesus, W. (aleqa) (commentary by Sirgew Gelaw (Doctor). (2002 E.C.). The History of Ethiopia (Amharic), Addis Ababa.
- Tekletsadiq, M. (1936). The History of Ethiopia (from emperor Tewodros to Haile Selassie) (Amharic), Addis Ababa
- Tekletsadiq, M. (1981). Emperor Tewodros and Unity of Ethiopia (Amharic), Kuraz publishing Agency
- Theobald, W. (Editor). (2005). Global Tourism, Third Edition, Elsevier Inc.
- Tralac (2016). Ethiopia's Sustainable Tourism Master Plan 2015-2025, UNECA Available online at <https://www.tralac.org/news/article/10510-ethiopia-s-sustainable-tourism-master-plan-2015-2025.html>[Accessed on 19 August 2018]
- Weldemariam (Aleqa). (1897). Chronique de Theodoros II (1853 -1868) (Published by Mondon Widale), Paris
- WTO, 1994, National and regional tourism planning, Madrid, Spain.
- Yirdaw, A. (2015). Heritage Potentials, Management Challenges, and Prospects: The Case of Debre Tabor Town and Its Surroundings, Ethiopia, MA thesis (unpublished)