Conclusion
Understanding Protected Areas in Globalisation

Hervé Rakoto Ramiarantsoa and Estienne Rodary

This publication reveals a great variety of situations resulting from the experimentation of sustainable development approaches. As such, the sustainable development approach to natural resource management is a reflection of the trend towards the ecologisation of development policies (Rodary and Milian). This raises questions regarding the various influences spatial, temporal and actors' scales have on the dynamics of protected areas (Carrière et al., Méral et al.).

Naturally, the case studies report some situations that are already known. This is the case for the tensions still affecting the relationships between the administrations that manage the resources and the populations residing next to these very resources. This is also the case for specific situations: of scale interactions, as in the Amazon (Aubertin and Filoche, Albert et al.); of agents as in Africa between wildlife and cattle (Boutrais); or of specific areas such as coastal areas (Chaboud et al.). But the cases presented here also report more original findings, such as the role of community-based management in protected areas worldwide (Rodary and Milian). These studies are in line with both the general context of sustainable development, and the specific context of the history of protected areas. They question the extent to which the environment either emerged as the main issue of land policies, or remained marginal in development policies. In this context, this conclusion will develop two central points mentioned in the introduction. First, the coherence between the definitions guiding the objectives of protected areas governance and the tools that are used; second, the perspectives of radical transformation in conservation policies with regard to the politics of participation of different stakeholders.

Contextualising Protected Areas

On reading the various texts of this publication, the first conclusion is the importance of the dynamics of globalisation in biodiversity conservation. For several decades, although with a notable reinforcement after the Summit of Rio in 1992, globalisation has been both structuring and determining discourses. It has highlighted the necessity to combine "the needs of the indigenous people with those of healthy ecosystems" (Worldwatch Institute 2005). Globalisation

connects the natural sites of the planet through ecological networks. Bonnin speaks of the "supranational value" granted to natural landscapes. In line with the logic of capital, the acquisition of development rights over land reinforces the contractual exclusion of different social groups. However, the studies highlight the unequal appropriation by societies of the opportunities created by globalisation[1]. The analyses also focus on some ambiguities in conservation practices: the blurry dimension of the participation, the interference between the community-based and the 'back to the barriers' movements, and the discrepancies between definitions and tools in conservation. These are but a few examples that show the need to contextualise protected areas.

Therefore, whereas the main trends of protected area management policies are driven on a global scale, specific studies actually show that their trajectories are not linear. The case studies reveal several types of interweaving: of rights (Aubertin and Filoche), powers (Chaboud et al.) and management (Albert et al.). Moreover, while goals can be clearly stated, divergences appear during their implementation that are linked to different geographic contexts. The first element relates to the heritage bequeathed to the protected areas, which differentiates them from one another in their appropriation, their constraints and their dynamics. Boutrais recalls a fundamental difference between West and East African pastoralism and park management. West Africa is imbued with a nature conservation policy of French origin that divides and excludes, whereas the Anglo-Saxon policy has already several decades of experiences in associating local communities with conservation. A similar heritage issue is to be found in the management of the 'mega-biodiversity' in Madagascar. The challenge of conservation requires a "major evolution of the mode of governance", combining the management practices inherited from the colonial administration, the more recent French co-operation, with Anglo-Saxon financing through international conservation NGOs. Another element that ought to be mentioned is when protected area management overlaps with other administrative structures of a territory. Depending on the responsibilities and involvement of the latter, we observe 'local' initiatives that bring a special touch to governance of protected areas; the analysis of the Guyana Amazonian Park (Aubertin and Filoche) illustrates this point.

However, we need to point out that, irrespective of the context, protected areas concern local as well as global realities, and their roles in conservation need to be considered at every level. First, on the spatial scale, not only because the coexistence of species (e.g. wildlife and cattle) on a large scale brings separate trajectories at the local scale (Boutrais), but also because from now on one must understand how protected areas fit into inclusive systems, such as the ecological networks (Bonnin). Second, the temporal scale, whether it concerns the funding of these areas (Méral et al. in this regard note the inadequacy between the temporalities of aid linked to the typical five-year international programmes, and

1 On that subject, see the special issue on capitalism and conservation in Brockington and Duffy (2010).

the longer time required for the sustainability of biodiversity conservation), the sequential utilisation of the same resources (e.g. the herds belonging to the Maasai in East African parks), or still the unequal temporalities that characterise corridors and the distinction between a conduit and a habitat (Carrière et al.). Third, and finally, is the scale of actors intervening in the field of protected areas, including the dominant status of the supranational, and the heightened importance of conservation NGOs that end up as financial intermediaries in the new structure of payments for ecosystem services (Méral et al.). The significance of the interference of these scales leads to consider at the same time the various levels operating in the delimited field of conservation policies, and what, outside that field, influences conservation institutions and governance. Bonnin helpfully reminds us that the capacity of the Natura 2000 network to realise its objectives "depends particularly on the maintenance or restoration of an appropriate matrix of territory, both in and between the sites".

Coherence Between Definitions and Tools

All studies show that sustainable development is both strong in discourses and still is rarely reflected in the governance of protected areas. When it comes to the categories of protection, the decision-making and the tools implemented, sustainable development is generally very marginal; the prioritisation of local demands is a reality only in specific contexts; the consultation process with the different stakeholders is barely balanced; and the link between information and action in regard to sustainability is far from evident.

A first point concerns the definition of what needs to be conserved. On what information is this choice based? It appears that local knowledge is given little consideration, despite the fact that it often reveals practices that enrich biodiversity. Recognising local knowledge, or even re-qualifying it as 'traditional' knowledge, poses the problem of the valorisation of the local scale by public policies. Boutrais examines this in the light of pastoralism in Africa. For the shepherds who are stakeholders in the management of the environment (e.g. fire management, now recognised by biological science as a useful disturbance for, in its absence, environments close up and loose their pyrophyte species), protected areas are resources of food and security for their animals. Moreover, the shepherds' livestock typically includes pastoral breeds that have become rare, and cannot tolerate a sedentary lifestyle. But neither the shepherds' perception of the land nor the fact that they own endangered bovine breeds, is taken into account by the protected area administrations. Reconciling nature conservation with pastoralism remains inconceivable. Whereas both domains would benefit by complementing each other, particularly when confronted with agriculture, the real threat to both. Generally, what constitutes a major local constraint is downgraded by managerial criteria decided at higher levels.

This directly concerns the second point, on the role attributed to scientific knowledge. Chaboud et al. insist there is an indispensable requirement for

adequate scientific expertise in order to specify the objectives and the methods of any sustainable policy. Although such a requirement appears obvious, too often only 'standardised' academic science is employed when defining projects. The fact that local knowledge is not called upon, generates problems concerning their social acceptability. Moreover, unreliable data, and unverified results, constitute the foundations of certain practices. The text of Carrière et al. sheds light on the confusing contradictions between the credit given to the concept of corridor, now an essential part of conservation policy, and the many criticisms concerning this concept, making it "barely workable". The eviction of pastoralism from protected areas in Africa on the grounds of competition between wildlife and cattle is just as problematic; whereas a contrary perception acknowledges that wildlife plays a role in the protection of pastoral areas against the expansion of agricultural land. Some are even surprised to find, in Guyana, parks with fragmented cores, breaking the ecological rule according to which there is an exponential link between the number of species and the surface area. Many cases illustrate the misalignment of political decisions and scientific expertise, power and knowledge (see notably Fairhead and Leach 1996). In this sense, political choices in recent conservation policies (participation, ecological networks, etc.) seem to perpetuate previous use of the scientific expertise.

This raises a third point, which has to do with the relationship between global and local scale, i.e. how decisions made on a global scale impact the communities residing next to the resources affected by these decisions. The polarity is rarely reversed, and occurs only in exceptional cases (such as the international networks instituted by the Amerindian communities). Yet, the constantly evolving importance of actors at the international level is an intrinsic cause of disconnection with the local level. The dimension taken by the international scale appears across several issues. It accompanies the increasing leverage of global NGOs, in tune with the latest development towards 'large scale' approaches in conservation (Wolmer 2003; Hughes 2005; Büscher 2009). Chapin (2004) points out that although recently (1950–2000) the funds available for conservation have decreased by 50%, those allocated to Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy and the World Wide Fund for Nature have experienced a relative, as well as an absolute, increase in value. The relationships between these three organisations and private firms and bilateral/multilateral undertakings and financing, enables them to control the redistribution of resources allocated for conservation carried out by local organisations: which *de facto*, have their initiatives limited. Furthermore, these large NGOs create partnerships with international institutions outside the conservation field (e.g. USAID and the World Bank). Because the environment is a conditionality of aid, one can understand why the state is so reluctant to look for the interests of local populations. Yet, the example of the Brazilian Indigenous Lands (Albert et al.) illustrates that when dealing with an issue as delicate as that of the legitimacy of access to resources, modern national law can both recognise, and integrate, indigenous rights (Chaboud et al.). Another domain where we find a dichotomy between a global dominant position and a local marginalisation,

concerns the payments for ecosystem services, a perspective which is yet set to become a reference point for conservation (Armsworth et al. 2007; Redford and Adams 2009). Méral et al. reveal how the economic logic of 'carbon projects' could result in programmes on large surface areas in which the indigenous populations have absolutely no control. Ought we to anticipate a similar initiative in the ecological networks that "compete" (Bonnin) with protected areas? This recent trend conceives sustainable development through territorial zoning (core zones, buffer zones and biological corridors) and through the fitting of these different levels. Naturalist scientific knowledge, when focused on spatial delimitations, elevates biophysical units of a certain size to the rank of a land use planning tool, by introducing the notion of 'ecological infrastructure'. The natural resource is no longer given consideration at the local level. Irrespective of its scientific validity, this vision alters the level of understanding of the resource, therefore changing its status by removing it from the sphere of activity of the communities. Such a detachment of initiatives from local realities reflects a much more general attitude concerning sustainable development carried out within protected areas: an approach which serves politics exclusively.

Does this signify an improvement in the way conservation policies face ecological challenges? It is difficult to offer a clear answer to this question, all the more since it raises the problem of separation of knowledge and action. The texts in this publication touch on three points. The first concerns the lack of clarity of the concepts used to define conservation tools. The most striking example is that of the controversy surrounding corridors, yet they "have been given a role to play in the conservation of forest ecosystems, particularly by overcoming the potential effects of their fragmentation, the resulting isolation of their animal and plant populations, and even their extinction". While highlighting the absence of a clear scientific assertion that corridors maintain functional connectivity, the contribution of Carrière et al. sheds light on the exploitation of the concept to obtain finance for the protection of the Malagasy forests. The second point tackles the issue of the contradictory results that science can supply, which calls for a refinement of these studies in order to identify adequate forms of management. The fragmentation of the ecological systems in Sudanese Africa is a case in point. The contact between protected areas and the open spaces that border them, allows the population of herbaceous species to be maintained on the outskirts, protected areas therefore taking on the role of vegetation reservoir. At the same time, these bordering open spaces are ecologically dangerous, with their high concentration of glossinas in a fragmented landscape with a high natural gradient. This contact area is attractive due to its wealth of available pastures, but is also dangerous because of the presence of tsetse flies. How then should it be managed according to its ecological functionality? It appears in any case that the problem is causing the argument between conservation and pastoralism to shift from the protected areas to their outskirts. Finally, the third point notes the perception, by indigenous people, of the ecological issues associated with conservation. Whereas trees and wildlife are at the centre of the foresters' interventions in protected areas, for the

cattle farmer there is no incompatibility between grazing the herbaceous cover, and protecting ligneous species, because grazing leads to a reduction in bush fires. Yet the relevance of this logic goes unrecognised. These three points also highlight the difficulty in distinguishing the ecological dynamics of conservation, so as to properly appreciate them, since the intervention of man is so pervasive. In his comparison between West and East Africa, Boutrais reports how technology and social dynamics have enabled cattle farming to develop in savannah areas that were not previously frequented because of the presence of the tsetse fly. But he also reports how the fallow of farmland generates scrub spreading, which is the cause of the dramatic return of the fly and therefore bovine trypanosomosis. A few years ago, on the theme of the ecological challenges of conservation, Jacques Weber (2000) was already asking an important question relating to the balance between objective and method: "Can the social be managed biologically?" These complex combinations probably explain why, more generally as far as protected areas are concerned, "an evaluation process [...] is yet to be defined" (Bonnin).

Finally, the lack of coherence between tools is also obvious in the domain of protected area financing. The recent expansion of protected areas makes the creation of new forms of sustainable financing indispensable; the traditional resources being inadequate, particularly in the context of privatisation of the state. The future evolution of spatial governance, although not yet clearly defined, will depend on these new forms of sustainable financing. An analysis of this issue shows that the multiplication of the protected areas is a headlong rush that constitutes an incentive to search for alternative financial mechanisms. And even if the mechanism can be reversed, with the finance bringing more protected areas, in either case the tool mobilised is not finalised and is refined while used. With the Malagasy example, Méral et al. highlight the effect of incoherence between definitions and tools in relation to sustainable development: the policies and management of protected areas are decided outside the country. Looking at the autonomy of national actors, did the innovation that sustainable development policies were supposed to bring go from bad to worse?

Participation is Dead, Long Live Participation!

From the point of view of sustainable development, participation brings a social dimension to the economic objectives, and to the conservation of natural resources. Participation is thus a requirement for sustainability. Integrating it into the management of protected areas constitutes a test for sustainable development, particularly through programmes based on devolution of natural resources management. Can the participation principle change the administration of protected areas, by bringing real innovation? The answers, never straightforward, can be found at the limits of the participative approach.

The analysis of Rodary and Milian sheds light on the status attributed to community-based management, when considered over the long term. The evolution of protected areas highlights that community-based areas have experienced their

highest rates of expansion when the increase of all kind of protected areas was slowing down in the 1990s. This finding could mean a rupture in the historical importance of the preservationist and fortress approaches. Even then, we would need to know whether the practices mobilised in the areas thus classified actually meet sustainable development criteria. The analysis draws up two other findings that do not follow the direction of this change. The first one concerns the number of sites. For over 40 years, with the exception of Category IV (Habitat and Species Management Area), all the forms historically registered by the IUCN experience comparable rates of expansion. The authors highlight that this even applies to Category Ia (Strict Nature Reserve), the most preservationist of all the categories. Does that mean that community-based policies have been hampered by the legacy of protected areas? The second finding recognises the limited role of Category VI (Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources), yet it was intended to promote an integrative approach between conservation and development. Can we speak of protected areas as a means of sustainable development as long as this category remains marginal?

It is in this context of a dominant participation discourse that comes along with the perpetuation of more protectionist protected areas that practices integrating the co-management of local communities with the management of resources are actually carried out. This process represents an opportunity for governments to find, on site, 'responsible' stakeholders able to deal with commitment to the institutionalised conservation of natural resources (Blanc-Pamard and Boutrais 2002). In addition to this, the political and economic benefits linked to the establishment of protected areas (Chaboud et al.), are increased by community participation, as a new norm in international policies. Thus, in various forms, the participation policies become a means to reassert the role of the state that was previously weakened from its traditional functions, just as the participation movement was explicitly aimed at avoiding the state. Therefore, participation has, paradoxically, enabled a return of the state, i.e. a concerted public policy in decentralised areas.

Moreover, involvement in participation institutions can reflect the initiatives taken by a local community to reinforce their territorial base. This is particularly evident in the Brazilian Amazon. The new image of indigenous people campaigning at the local level for an environmental cause has been used, by national and international levels in order to claim legitimacy over nature protection. Yet Albert et al. also shed light on the logics to the Amerindian groups within the framework of the peculiar protected areas that are the Indigenous Lands. While maintaining a structure responsible for the sustainable exploitation in these spaces, the local populations will use participation to become involved in institutions outside of their usual sphere, hence widening and strengthen their autonomy. These processes of re-appropriation are evident elsewhere in the world, particularly in Australia and Southern Africa, where land claims enable formerly marginalised communities to become involved in conservation as partners, and no longer as mere participants within structures that are developed and managed elsewhere (Reid et al. 2004).

As such, participation opens – albeit partially – a space for negotiation on the local scale that did not automatically exist before, and that actors knew how to appropriate, even if it presupposed the assimilation and translation of external norms and practices (Rodary 2009). Thus a second result of participation is indeed found in local political re-appropriation, offering a glimpse of the transformation of current conservation governance.

Participation does not always bring about local capacity building. When it is part of a protection programme that excludes communities in the decision process and includes them in the management, participation contributes to inequalities between stakeholders. Such standardisation pays little heed to the priorities at local level, despite the fact that participation is actually supposed to prioritise the capacities of local communities. This form of participation is ineffective considering that "the needs of the indigenous people [...] must be more efficiently integrated into the conservation programmes" (Collective 2005). This is illustrated by several aspects of the analysis of the Guyana Amazonian Park, even though they are actually presented as 'participative democracy' (Aubertin and Filoche). The fact that the Wayana's goal to see their villages included within the core area of the park was refused is an example of this.

Even though the concept of participation is portrayed as an innovation in sustainable management of protected areas, it remains a truly ambiguous notion. Instead of significant progress towards the empowerment of local communities, the concept has been generating situations where participation is one of many tools in the service of policies that undoubtedly aim at conserving natural resources, but which are conceived without giving priority to local needs (see Shackleton et al. 2010a; 2010b). The result is that, among the different groups that are using these resources, the most vulnerable individuals and communities do not benefit, which goes against "poverty reduction and best distribution of wealth", which are yet at the core of sustainable development theory (Chaboud 2007). At the same time, as previously noted, participation has reintroduced political issues to the local management of natural resources, both through the state and through the empowerment of local populations. Admittedly, these populations are not homogeneous: the idea of a political process enabling the equal participation of all stakeholder, is a utopian illusion capable of mobilising people into action, but obviously impractical. Nonetheless, the fact remains that the re-appropriation of the issue of nature management by certain local actors is a notable change compared to former, often authoritarian, centralised, state policies.

The result is a dual conclusion: on the one hand, participation has revealed its limitations in meeting the expectations brought with its introduction to conservation; on the other hand, the fact that these limitations are understood and taken into account, gives participation the status of a tool amongst other tools. And if explicitly intertwined with international networks, participation can indeed make it possible to reconfigure the balance of power in favour of historically marginalised actors. It brings new institutional spaces and innovative practices valorising local actors. In this sense, the post-participations period the world of

conservation is currently experiencing, might indicate the beginning of a real rupture with previous policies.

References

Armsworth P.R. et al., 2007 – Ecosystem-service science and the way forward for conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 21 (6): 1383–1384.

Blanc-Pamard C., Boutrais J., 2002 – Les temps de l'environnement. D'un sauvetage technique à une gestion locale en Afrique et à Madagascar. *Historiens et Géographes*, 381: 389–401.

Brockington D., Duffy R. (eds.), 2010 – Capitalism and Conservation. Antipode, Special issue, 42 (3): 469–799.

Büscher B.E., 2010 – Seeking 'telos' in the 'transfrontier'? Neoliberalism and the transcending of community conservation in Southern Africa. *Environment and Planning A*, 42 (3): 644–660.

Chaboud C., 2007 – Gérer et valoriser les ressources marines pour lutter contre la pauvreté. *Études Rurales*, 178: 197–212.

Chapin M., 2004 – A Challenge to conservationists. *WorldWatch Magazine*, November–December: 17–31.

Collective, 2005 – A challenge to conservationists: Phase II. From reader. *Worldwatch Magazine*, January–February: 5–20.

Fairhead J., Leach M., 1996 – *Misreading the African landscape. Society and ecology in a forest-savanna mosaic*. Cambridge/New York, Cambridge Univ. Press, p. 354.

Hughes D.M., 2005 – Third nature: making space and time in the Great Limpopo Conservation Area. *Cultural Anthropology*, 20 (2): 157–184.

Marty P., Vivien F.-D., Lepart J., Larrère R. (eds.), 2005 – *Les biodiversités. Objets, théories, pratiques*. Paris, CNRS Éditions, p. 261.

Redford K.H., Adams W.M., 2009 – Payment for ecosystem services and the challenge of saving nature. *Conservation Biology*, 23 (4): 785–787.

Reid H., Fig D., Magome H., et Leader-Williams N., 2004 – Co-management of contractual national parks in South Africa: lessons from Australia. *Conservation & Society*, 2 (2): 377–409.

Rodary E., 2009 – Mobilizing for nature in southern African community-based conservation policies, or the death of the local. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 18 (10): 2585–2600.

Shackleton C. M. Willis T. J., Brown K., Polunin N. V. C. (eds.), 2010a – Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM): designing the next generation (Part 1). *Environmental Conservation, Special issue*, 37 (1): 1–106.

Shackleton C. M. Willis T. J., Brown K., Polunin N. V. C. (eds.), 2010b – Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM): designing the

next generation (Part 2). *Environmental Conservation, Special issue*, 37 (3): 22 –372.

Weber J., 2000 – "Pour une gestion sociale des ressources naturelles". *In* Compagnon D., Constantin F. (eds.), *Administrer l'environnement en Afrique. Gestion communautaire, conservation et développement durable*. Paris/ Nairobi, Karthala/IFRA: 79–105.

Wolmer W., 2006 – "Big conservation: the politics of ecoregional science in southern Africa, Culture, Nature, Future?" Perspectives on Science and Development *In* Africa. *University of Edinburgh, April 12–13 2006*, p. 14.

Rakoto Ramiarantsoa Hervé, Rodary Estienne.

Conlusion : understanding protected areas in globalisation.

In : Aubertin Catherine (ed.), Rodary Estienne (ed.). Protected areas, sustainable land ?

Farnham (GBR), Marseille : Ashgate, IRD, 2011, p. 167-176.

ISBN 978-1-4094-1235-9, 978-1-4094-1236-6