

WILDLANDS¹ FOR A LIVING - LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND PROTECTED AREAS IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION²

By Stig Jensen³,

Very preliminary draft, please do not cite without permission

Abstract

The international interest for nature in the South is increasing. The dominating form of regulation for safeguarding the wildlands is the creation of protected areas. Establishing protected areas on land that people have traditionally inhabited or utilized has had and can have extensive consequences for them. The debate about protected areas has been characterized by conflicting viewpoints. One is that protected areas are necessary to ensure unique wildlands. The other position is that creation of protected areas inhibits development, especially for people in and around the protected areas. The central question in this article is how a bridge can be built between the wish to secure the wildlands without having an inhibiting effect on development. The primary focus is on local communities, although I will also include national and international aspects because external initiatives have had extensive consequences locally. I have organized the article in four sections. In the first, general considerations about the interaction between nature and society under the different conditions existing in North and South present the context for some of the basic interests that are significant in the present debate about protected areas and local communities. The second section focuses on the development of protected areas over time. Here, I present an argument for different generations in the practical management of the wildlands. The third section aims to present both the debate and some of the experiences that have been collected in connection with the different generations of protected areas. Finally, I discuss and draw conclusions about some of the central aspects of protected areas and local communities in relation to globalization.

Introduction

Africa's environmental resources cannot continue to be exploited in a manner that does not benefit Africa and her people. This is a paradox of a people dying from hunger, starvation and poverty when they are potentially so rich and well endowed.

Nelson Mandela

Inspiration for this article comes from Southern Africa. This region is in focus, because in many ways Southern Africa is in the forefront in connection with natural resource management in developing

¹ I use the term wildlands for natural areas that have not been significantly modified by human activities. For more on wildlands issues, see Ledec and Goodland (1988).

² Paper for presentation at the IASCP 2002 Conference in Zimbabwe for the sub-theme on Protected Areas in Constituting the Commons within the proposed panel, Local people's strategic support for protected areas: Compromising conservation?

³ Ph.D.-candidate at Centre for Development Research, Denmark.

countries and especially in Africa. Africa's first public protected area was established as far back as 1884 in South Africa (for further details, see Robinson 1998). Also, according to Beinart (2000), Zimbabwe's Campfire programme is the continent's flagship within natural resource management. Several other countries in the region, especially Zambia and Namibia, have also launched exciting initiatives in connection with local communities and wildlands management. In recent years, South Africa has taken the lead with several initiatives that place local communities in the central role and thus create the basis for a new generation within natural resource management.

Another reason for focusing on Southern Africa is my fieldwork experience in most of the countries in the region, where I have closely followed the debate about local communities and natural resource management. I will primarily focus on Zimbabwe, because in addition to Campfire much interesting experience with natural resource management can be found here. I am aware, however, that the choice of Zimbabwe involves problems. Certain specific social and natural conditions in Zimbabwe make it difficult to generalize the country's experiences, first, because of the extremely unequal land distribution. Second, the natural environment with dry area conditions is largely unsuitable for traditional agriculture but favourable for wild animals, including large numbers of large game. Few countries in the world have comparable conditions. Third, the timing of Zimbabwe's decentralization efforts, such as Campfire, was extremely good, because during the same period, international tourism grew explosively. Even though these conditions make Zimbabwe a unique case, experiences from Zimbabwe can be useful in other contexts.

Zimbabwe's current political situation also needs to be taken into consideration. Until recently, Zimbabwe was considered one of Africa's most stable countries. The year 2000, however, has been a turning point for both development and natural resource management in Zimbabwe due to internal conflicts that have brought Zimbabwe to the brink of political, social, and economic collapse.⁴

Although the article discusses natural resource management and protected areas, its scope does not allow considerations of central aspects concerning to what extent protected areas are effective in ensuring natural values, nor do I discuss the question of whether protected areas are correctly positioned in accordance with the goals of safeguarding the most important nature areas. In addition, I only discuss protected areas in connection with the most important natural resources, based on a modern natural scientific approach. There are other approaches that are used by local societies in connection with protected areas - for example, cultural or spiritual aspects - but these are not included here.

Nature for consumption and pleasure

Human existence is and has always been dependent on natural resources. During recent decades, both the conditions for and our perceptions about the relationship between society and nature have been undergoing major changes. A striking feature of recent developments in the North is the concept of local environment's independence as a basis for survival coupled with a growing appreciation for nature. Most people in the so-called developed part of the world are no longer dependent on local natural resources. Daily consumption is based on access to a global market with a huge diversity of products. They buy kiwi fruit from New Zealand, cheese from Italy, rice from

⁴ For a brief introduction to the Zimbabwe crisis, see Hammar and Jensen (2002).

India, soybeans from USA, and coffee from Africa. For many people, recreational activities play an increasingly larger role in their perception of a good life. Protected areas⁵ are important destinations for such activities, which are not restricted to local areas but are enjoyed further away. The enormous growth in North-South tourism in recent decades is an indication of this pattern⁶. Appreciation of outdoor activities is probably a factor in the growth of environmental NGOs since the 1970s (Caldwell 1990b). Another factor is the new phenomenon called lifepolitics,⁷ where individuals support the struggle to protect the environment by supporting the work of environmental NGOs through their membership or other economic support. This struggle has become increasingly internationalized. The international impact of the environmental NGOs in the North is reflected through the growth in international environmental agreements since 1970 (UNEP 1989).⁸

Living in poverty with valuable nature

Conditions for people in many developing countries are quite different from those in the developed world, especially in rural areas where local natural resources are the basis of sustenance. The struggle for control of natural resources for people in many developing countries is therefore often a question of survival. Access to wildlands and survival are closely related because the poorest and most disadvantaged people on earth are the ones most directly dependent on natural eco-systems and resources (Wood 1997). Since exploitation of wildlands is still the traditional way to increase production in many African countries, scarcity of available wildlands is a growing development problem in many countries. The lack of possibilities to expand agricultural production has prompted Agarwal and Narain (1989) to emphasize the need for an expanded poverty concept that also includes the lack of access to biomass. The inclusion and transformation of wildlands through different forms of human manipulation is not only of local interest, because the significance of wildlands in developing countries is enormous. They are home for a very diverse and unique nature⁹ that comprises about 80 percent of the world's biodiversity (Raven 1994). There is growing international interest for biodiversity, exemplified by the fact that 150 heads of state and government leaders signed an international convention on biodiversity at the UN Conference on Environment and Development in 1992.¹⁰

⁵ For more on classification of protected areas, see the paper by Victoria M. Edwards.

⁶ For further on development in international tourism see Sindinga (1999)

⁷ According to Anthony Giddens, lifepolitics can be explained as follows (1981:181): "... lifepolitics concerns political issues which flow from processes of self-actualisation in post-traditional contexts, where globalising influences intrude deeply into the reflexive project of the self, and conversely where processes of self-realisation influence global strategies".

⁸ The growing number of international environmental agreements indicates that the interest in nature is no longer limited to 'nature freaks' or local and national interests but has entered international politics.

⁹ It is important to remember that biodiversity is not equally distributed, either in relation to quality or quantity. For information on so-called hot spots of biodiversity which are very important in setting priorities for wildlands management with protected areas, see Bird Life (1998), ICDP (1992), Myers (1990) etc.

¹⁰ The convention for biodiversity has now been signed by most countries. The prominent exception is USA (UNDP 2001: 200-203).

Part 2 Generations of protection

This section presents different forms of regulation with focus on protected areas and local societies. In connection with wildlands management, it is possible to identify different periods, which I call generations. The concept of generations is perhaps not the most obvious to use, since here they are not the usual 30 years but of varying length. When I use this term anyway, it is because it symbolizes a process of change over time. The concept of generations is also used by others without adhering to the 30-year time span (see Rønnfeldt 1997).

This generation approach does not imply that I maintain that a form of management is tied to a specific period or that during a period there is only one type of regulation. On the contrary, it is an attempt to emphasize some of the shifts that have taken place within and between generations. A shift cannot always be assigned a precise date; thus, the periodization should be understood as having a certain degree of flexibility. I work with five generations and some of them are closely connected with the dominating form of government. The first relates to pre-colonial administrative practices. The second generation relates to external colonialization. The third generation is the colonial state's management form. The fourth generation relates to the decentralizing initiatives within natural resource management. The fifth generation comprises the newest initiatives for people-centred natural resource management. The discussion focuses especially on attempts at decentralization, because these have some interesting perspectives, and some experiences with them have already been acquired. The fifth generation, on the other hand, is more a presentation of some new initiatives.

Since this paper cannot include all the initiatives taken in Southern Africa, I use Zimbabwe to exemplify the first four generations. This makes it possible to describe the country's decentralization initiatives, which are undoubtedly the most comprehensive in an African context and perhaps in relation to developing countries as a whole, both in relation to time period and geographic area.

In relation to the fifth generation, I include some recent initiatives in connection with protected areas, which place people in the central role. The examples come from South Africa, which to a certain extent has taken over the leadership from Zimbabwe with respect to exciting initiatives within wildlands management. The South African initiatives create the basis for presenting a new generation.

First generation - Traditional protection of species and areas

The first generation covers Zimbabwe's early history. I will not go into detail about pre-colonial Zimbabwe, because Beach (1980) has already written a brilliant book that covers different localities, actors, interactions between groups etc. Although it is difficult to generalize about pre-colonial Zimbabwe, it seems that the basic management principle during this period was so-called joint local management by indigenous institutions with the chiefs as the highest authority. The exploitation pattern also seems to have varied in relation to the natural setting (see Beach 1980) with extensive use of slash and burn and cattle farming as the most widespread practices. Selected areas, animals, and plants were protected according to local traditions. According to Child (1995), the Ndebele people had established protected areas where hunting was reserved for the ruling class. A widely used approach was a so-called taboo against people killing selected species, the so-called

totem species, or hunting of some animals may have been restricted to chiefs.¹¹ There seem to have been major fluctuations in the population due to migrations caused by factors such as disease and availability of natural resources.¹² This generation ends with the external colonization of Zimbabwe around 1890.

Second generation - Open access for the colonizers

The second generation covers roughly from 1890 to around 1920's, the period when white settlers' private enterprises governed the country. This period was characterized by a total revolution of intra- society relations, with the breakdown of traditional institutions, as well as the relationship between society and nature, with unregulated exploitation of nature. The invasion of the private enterprise, British South Africa Company (BSAC), resulted in an intensive hunt for the country's natural resources. BSAC's objective was to mine minerals, particularly gold, but they quickly discovered that the underground was no gold mine. Therefore, agriculture became the colonists' alternative, and BSAC allotted land to its staff without consideration for indigenous peoples and their entitlement and management traditions. Some of the traditional inhabitants of the areas were moved out and placed on reserves. These were located on the poorest land and comprised less than 25 percent of Zimbabwe's total area (Rukuni 1994).

Third generation - King's Nature' - a preservationist approach

The third generation (starting around 1924) was from the establishment of the colony of Rhodesia until its first initiatives with decentralization shortly before its demise. A dominating pattern in natural resource management during this generation was a preservationist, centralized management approach, where indigenous nature was internationalized and designated as 'The King's Nature'. Thus, the indigenous natural values belonged to the British throne and were therefore protected. Part of the protectionist environmental legislation was the state's creation of natural reserves (protected areas) covering up to 20 percent of the country (see Rukuni 1994).

The basis for this strict regulation was both the strong reductions in wild life and the trend in the British colonies to consider natural resources as the property of the British throne. Another proof of the colonial state's commitment to international regulation for nature preservation can be seen by the fact that Rhodesia signed the International Convention for preservation of African Fauna and Flora in 1933.¹³

For the indigenous African population, developments following colonization meant triple expropriation. First, the best agricultural lands, between 40-50 percent, were taken over by the colonists (Rukuni 1994). Second, other areas were expropriated as wild animal reserves. Third, the African inhabitants were excluded by law from utilizing the original natural resources. 'The King's

¹¹ For more about protection and use of wild animals in pre-colonial Zimbabwe, see Child (1995).

¹² For more about these issues, see Beach (1980, 1984), and Kjerkhus (1996)

¹³ Also called the London Convention.

Nature' also meant limitations on the property rights of white colonists, because they were also restricted from using indigenous resources.

Fourth generation - Decentralization under different conditions

The fourth generation started with Rhodesia's (after 1980, Zimbabwe's) first initiatives with decentralization in the mid 1970's. Before presenting the decentralization initiatives, some insights into the theoretical debate on decentralization should be mentioned. The literature presents different approaches to decentralization. Some authors, such as Carney (1995), only analyse decentralization within the public sector, in cases where the central authorities delegate autonomy to local authorities. This article is concerned with a broader definition of decentralization that includes powers moved from the central authorities to the periphery and also includes privatization, based on Rondanelli (1989).

Zimbabwe experimented for a long time with several different forms of decentralization of natural resource management. In the following, the two currently most widespread forms of decentralization are presented separately, since they are very different. The basis for starting both initiatives was the approach, 'use it or lose it': Nature must serve a purpose – nature seen primarily as user value. The idea behind both initiatives is also that decentralization of natural resource management should lead to both improved protection of nature and local economic benefits.

The first decentralization of natural resource management came with the revision of the Wildlife Act in 1975. This revision led to decentralized management of the privately owned areas, the areas mainly owned by white colonists.¹⁴ The legislation consisted in deregulation of earlier imposed restrictions on property rights established by the law on 'The King's Nature'. However, rare flora and fauna were still protected. The revised law meant self-administration by the private landowners, who comprised the wealthy and white segment of the population. The philosophy behind the law – according to the brain behind it, Graham Child (director for many years of Rhodesia's national park authority), was the notion that the most optimal exploitation in 80 percent of Zimbabwe is the exploitation of wildlife (Child 1995).¹⁵

The other type of decentralization was carried out by the new independent Zimbabwean administration at the end of the 1980s under the name Campfire, an abbreviation of Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources. The law was designed for the local communities in the communal areas so that they could manage their natural resources. The goal of Campfire was double: to increase income opportunities in the poorest land areas, and to maintain nature that was considered too poor for agriculture but good for wild animals (Campfire 1996). The economic basis was to be accumulated through various forms of natural resource exploitation, such as income from tourism and the sale of wild animals or animal products such as hides, ivory etc. (Jensen 1999).

¹⁴ The white commercial farmers occupied at this time 43% of the land (Child 1994). For more on land distribution in a historical perspective, see Rukuni (1994).

¹⁵ This seems to be in accordance with agricultural experts such as Cousins and Robbins (1994), who assert that only 17 percent of the land can be used for intensive cultivation, and in 50 percent of the country, cultivation of the land is very risky as it is only suited for domestic animals.

The perception behind Campfire was that if “local communities receive control over their resources, it will mean that the local communities will exploit nature in ways that are both economically and ecologically sound” (Campfire 1996). Campfire did not mean self-administration for the local community by transferring property rights. The land still belonged to the state, but Campfire gave greater use rights, and exploitation of indigenous nature was no longer illegal. To participate in Campfire, the local community had to request authority from the government. The administration of Campfire was placed in the district. One of the district’s tasks was to rent the right to exploit the wildlife in Campfire areas.¹⁶ Rentals were aimed at companies with interests in tourism. In connection with Campfire incomes, the national park administration worked out a division of 80 percent to the local community and 20 percent to the district (Jensen 1999).

Parks for the people

My fifth generation is inspired by the new wildlands management initiatives in the New South Africa.¹⁷ The new South African government has committed itself to a fundamentally different way of governing the country with a more participatory approach (Lawrence 2000). The dominant conservation ideology during the period of apartheid can be characterized as a combination of several of the above-mentioned generations, although the third generation preservationist approach of excluding local communities’ utilization seems to have been the most dominating.¹⁸ The new South African approach has not yet materialized into large-scale wildlands management plans. However, among some really interesting cases of people-centred wildlands initiatives, three will be briefly described here.

The first initiative is the so-called contractual national parks, which is a new concept for wildlands management.¹⁹ According to Robinson (1998), an amendment to the National Park Act makes provision for areas in private, communal, or government possession to be managed by the South African National Parks (SANP) authorities in accordance with a contractual agreement between the proprietor and the SANP. The Richtersveld National Park in the dry northwestern Cape is an example of a protected area jointly managed by the SANP and the communities in the Richtersveld area. After years of negotiation between representatives for the indigenous pastoral Nama people and the South African government, an agreement was reached. The SANP and the Richtersveld communities agree to establish joint management, where SANP still plays a role in park management and the different community pastoralists continue their traditional utilization. The agreement also provides options for voluntary reductions, e.g. in the number of stock grazing in the area, where the government makes compensatory land available to the local communities for grazing an equivalent amount of stock units (Robinson 1998).

Another initiative is the Garden Route Campaign in the eastern part of Western Cape Province. The Garden Route Campaign is a local citizen’s initiative, or as Jenny Lawrence (2000) calls it: an

¹⁶ For more on the institutional set-up for Campfire, see Jensen (1999).

¹⁷ New South Africa is a commonly used phrase for the transition of government from apartheid South Africa to the new democratic South Africa established after the general election in April 1994.

¹⁸ According to Robinson (1998), this approach mainly appealed to the affluent, mainly white segment in South Africa.

¹⁹ The first initiatives were initiated during apartheid.

initiative "...by a small group of dedicated individuals. Their commitment is based on the fundamental principle...to create a link between the socio-economic development of our underprivileged communities and the need for environmental protection". The Garden Route initiative wants to initiate a dialogue with the central government about changing the current development pattern in the Garden Route area, which has gradually deteriorated the landscape due to different development initiatives such as the building of holiday homes, monoculture farming, exotic forest plantations etc. The Garden Route Campaign fights for access to the decision making process for their local area, and for the declaration of a National Heritage Area for the whole region. In this way, the future will be based on sensitive development, which will minimize any negative impact on the environment and maximize sustainable development of the local community (Lawrence 2000).

The third initiative is in the twin forest protected areas, Dwesa-Cwebe nature reserves, on the so-called Wild Coast in Eastern Cape Province. Dwesa-Cwebe is one of the few forest areas on the Wild Coast and has been a forest reserve for more than 100 years. There have been plenty of conflicts over the years between the nature reserve authorities and the surrounding local communities over the access and utilization of resources in Dwesa-Cwebe. The local communities are living on communal land, and the dominant land-use is subsistence agriculture in one of South Africa's poorest regions. The South African government has instigated such new people-oriented initiatives as the Restitution of Land Rights Act of 1994, which identified land alienated on racial grounds and provided the mechanism for a new approach. Another important initiative was the new National Forest Act, which allows the state to enter into joint management arrangements for the management of state forests.²⁰ A visit by Derek Hanekom, Minister of Land Affairs, helped the local communities to organize themselves into new Communal Property Associations (CPAs). At the same time, the Dwesa-Cwebe reserves were transferred into a land holding trust in which each of the CPAs are represented. This means that the neighbouring communities are managers of the Dwesa-Cwebe reserves. At same time, the South African government launched a new development initiative called The Wild Coast spatial development initiative with the ambition of attracting investments in tourism and farming to create jobs in one of South Africa's least developed areas.

Part 3 Debate about protected areas under different generations

This section discusses both the debate and the experience gained during the five generations. Emphasis is on the fourth generation's decentralization initiatives, because some interesting experiences have been acquired in this connection that are extremely central in the debate about local communities and protected areas. In relation to the fifth generation, I briefly discuss information gathered during fieldwork in Dwesa-Cwebe. Problems exist with regard to the earlier generations because very little has been written down and another possible source of information, oral history, must be used with care, because statements about the past are coloured by the present situation. Finally, some of the earlier written material comes from those who were then in power and is based on their viewpoint, which is not necessarily considered to be the objective truth by others. In order to place the situation during generations three to five in a global context, I choose to point out certain 'events' relevant to the relationship between protected areas and local communities in Southern Africa.

²⁰ For more on this issue, see Timmermanns (1999).

First generation - sustainable exploitation or massive destruction

Very little has been written about protected areas and local people in the first generation. However, some disagreement exists in the literature regarding pre-colonial society's effect on nature in Zimbabwe. For example, Sam Moyo (1991) claims that pre-colonial practices can be regarded as sustainable exploitation, whereas Graham Child (1995) believes that the period was characterized by widespread destruction of natural vegetation. According to studies by Roger Summers,²¹ slash and burn farming and traditional pastoralism and the systematic burning associated with it had a measurable impact on habitats. Child (1995) also states that the impact might have been greater if not for the primitive weapons used and the sparse population at that time. Therefore, wildlife and other renewable resources were still relatively plentiful prior to white colonization (Child 1995).

Second generation - destruction

Regarding the second generation, there seems to be little disagreement that it was characterized by massive destruction of indigenous vegetation and wild animals. The white settlers are blamed for most of the destruction of the environment with massive deforestation, erosion, soil depletion, and extensive hunting (McGregor 1995). The settlers argued, however, that the native Africans caused more damage to the environment, because the native method of cultivation with clearing and burning without control was very destructive (MacGregor 1995).

Another important factor was the tsetse control programme, which had a major impact on game, because large numbers of game were killed to eliminate the food source for tsetse flies (Child 1995). Problems in connection with this generation's natural resource management were not only hunting of resources by white colonizers but also the fact that, through their expansive confiscation of land areas, they influenced the traditional forms of management practised in the first generation.

Third generation - centralization, exclusion, and destruction

The natural resource management of the third generation, which Graham Child (1995: 49) called conventional Western style, centrally directed protectionism, seems to have resulted in large increases in the stock of game and other wildlife, particularly in the protected areas (Child 1995). The situation in the rest of the country was very different. On the 'native land' of the indigenous inhabitants, the areas that later became the communal lands, the poorest people were living on the poorest land. Sam Moyo (1991) describes the situation in the communal lands as over-populated areas with over-exploited natural resources and increasing poaching of wild animals. The dominating explanation for poaching was that people earned money, especially through the ivory trade. Timberlake (1985) rejects this, because his studies show that most poaching was a political protest.

²¹ The study by Roger Summers was published in 1966 and referred to by Child (1995).

In contrast to the situation in the communal areas, Moyo (1991) describes the privately owned areas as sparsely populated and with under-exploitation of natural resources.²² Although the privately owned land might have been under-utilized as described by Sam Moyo, this is not necessarily the case with regard to wildlife. A dominant notion among farmers was that wildlife should be eliminated outside protected areas due to its negative impact on agricultural production (Child 1995). The farmers did not have much respect for 'the King's Nature'. As a result, there was illegal shooting and poisoning of so-called problem animals such as elephants and systematic destruction of indigenous vegetation, thus degrading the living conditions for undesirable wild animals (Olthof 1995). The government also undermined its own strict law through limited enforcement and by killing thousands of head of game in continuation of the tsetse control programme (Child 1995). The general picture during this generation as presented by Child (1995: 49) was that wildlife was in serious decline.

New actors on the international scene

Towards the end of this generation, a new actor, international nature conservation organizations (INCOs),²³ entered the debate on wildlands management in Africa. INCOs' great popular breakthrough in Western Europe and North America occurred in connection with Africa's decolonization and the consequences this had for nature. INCOs (mainly WWF) promoted the idea that independence would result in decreasing numbers of animals, because Africans were not considered to feel any love of animals; they only thought of wild animals in terms of meat for consumption. As Bernhard and Michael Grimek (1960:130) stated: "Today most Africans regards wild animals merely as so much meat, hides and grazing. We Europeans must teach our black brothers to value their own possessions..."

The northern-based nature conservation organizations were originally spokesmen for a pessimistic view of the situation in developing countries that is reminiscent of Malthusian horror scenarios – a death spiral with growing population, poverty, and deterioration of nature (see e.g. Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1981). The main enemy in the fight for conservation of the world's natural resources was local communities, because they were seen as the cause of nature's deterioration. Therefore, a central element in the INCOs' strategy for safeguarding wildlands was to establish protected areas in order to exclude local people's utilization.²⁴

²² Sam Moyo's description gives a general picture of the country that is in accordance with UNDP's study showing that Zimbabwe is among the countries in the world with the greatest degree of economic inequality (UNDP 1998).

²³ Such as the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN). The reason for not using the term NGO in connection with these organizations is the fact that IUCN also has states as members. I therefore regard it as a quasi NGO.

²⁴ Important partners of the INCOs in the fight for nature were research communities within the natural sciences. Many campaigns carried out by the INCOs have been based on natural scientific research. In addition, nature organizations have contributed financially to research activities.

New independent states

The many new independent African states that emerged in the 1960s and thereafter also became new actors in wildlands management. The INCOs' expectations regarding these new states were as already mentioned not very high. The changes in wildlands management within the new independent states varied. The most profound changes occurred in connection with the administrative staff responsible for natural resource management. Some independent countries indigenized the staff, which meant a total renewal within the state administration.

Some of the new independent states entered a dialogue with the INCOs on wildlands management. This meant new opportunities for the INCOs, since their activities until then had been focused on advocacy for collecting money for natural scientific documentation on the state of nature. With decolonization, the nature organizations received a central role as advisors in practical natural resource management in a number of African states.

The new alliances between the INCOs and the new state administrations were based on a division of labour. The INCO was responsible for selecting areas and making plans for wildland management, while the state was responsible for practical implementation and financing.²⁵ Wildlands management was initially based on state intervention with centralized and nature-centred 'fence and fines' regulation.²⁶ In the alliance between INCOs and the new independent states, there seemed to be agreement that local communities were a threat to nature, and that protected areas were needed to secure wildlands. The impact of protected areas has been huge in some countries: e.g. in Tanzania, 25 percent of the country is protected area (Jensen 1999b), and in Zimbabwe, 13.8 percent (Chenje 1998). As a consequence of this development pattern, many initiatives for protection of nature resulted in local conflicts of varying magnitude (see Kothari et al. 1995, Princen 1995).

Fourth generation - Zimbabwe

Since the debate and experience from both private natural resource management and management in communal lands differ greatly, I discuss them separately. Actually, the only common characteristic is that international tourism must be considered the economic foundation for them both.

Decentralization benefits the rich

The private landowners, mostly whites, with their approximately 4500 farms, owns about 40 percent of the land, including the major portion of good land (see Rukuni 1994, Muir 1994). For them, decentralization of natural resource management according to the revised law of 1975 provided new opportunities for exploitation. In many private areas, the good land was cultivated intensively, while the poor agricultural land, comprising 66 percent of privately owned land, was

²⁵ This is not necessarily the case for all African countries, but it does apply to some countries in eastern and southern Africa.

²⁶ For more on the 'old style' nature preservation strategy, see Adams and Hulme (2001).

unexploited (Katerere 1991). The revised law of 1975 provided the opportunity for more diverse area use so that the earlier 'surplus areas' could become productive. A study has shown that more than 75 percent of landowners in the dry areas shifted to some form of production based on wildlife (Child 1996). Opportunities for diverse use of natural resources vary greatly in Zimbabwe. Especially the dry savannah areas, with many wild animals from antelope to elephants, have provided new opportunities for exploitation and income. Expanded and differentiated production has meant increased need for labour, especially in service functions for tourists, hunting, and hotel management. These are jobs that are mainly filled by people from nearby local areas, many of which have suffered from extreme unemployment and poverty.

Nature-based production, especially hunting wild animals, is not only a way for private owners to supplement and differentiate production. For some, it has become an alternative to farming in the traditional sense. Several studies in Zimbabwe have documented that utilization of wild animals can be more profitable than traditional farming (see Muir et al. 2000, Du Toit 2000). This has meant that more landowners have shifted their production from cattle to wildlife. In southeastern Zimbabwe, for example, some private landowners have joined together to establish the world's largest private nature reserve, Savé Valley Conservancy (Du Toit 2000).

Decentralization has not only been an economic success for the landowners and their employees but also for nature. Many private landowners have not only been interested in exploiting nature; they have also invested in improvements of nature, for example, in purchasing and re-releasing various species of animals. As a result, the private areas have become the most important in Zimbabwe for several rare species. The share of animals living in the private areas is, for example, 66 percent of the black rhinoceroses, 56 percent of the cheetahs, and 94 percent of the eland antelopes (Muir et al. 2000). Private landholders do not always invest in nature, for example, by improving biodiversity, and there are examples from Southern Africa of environmental degradation on private land (Beinart 2000).

The shift by the private landowners to reliance on wild natural resources has also had some side effects, especially when the animals have gone outside the private areas and into communal land. The private landowners' success in attracting tourists has had negative consequences for incomes of the state-owned protected areas, because the state has not invested to the same extent in improvements and marketing. Therefore, domestic and international tourists tend to prefer private reserves to national parks.

Actually, decentralization has meant that private protected areas have been established in addition to those that are state-owned. Thus, the total area of protected land has increased greatly²⁷.

Decentralizing for the poor

Decentralization of wildlands management with Campfire has also provided new opportunities for people in the communal areas. Much experience has been collected from different Campfire activities, but it does not give the same clear picture as for the privately owned land, primarily because Campfire is still very young. The oldest projects have operated for about 10 years.

²⁷ Although I do not have the exact figures.

Secondly, the group participating in Campfire is more heterogeneous. Thirdly, the institutional set-up is much different, both from the earlier management of the communal areas and for the private areas. In spite of these conditions, it is valuable to examine Campfire's most important experiences.

This presentation is structured around some of the important issues concerning internal factors:

Economic conditions

The first years with Campfire were characterized by massive support for the programme, but that seems no longer to be the case. There has been an enormous increase in incomes from 743,699 Zimbabwe \$ in 1989 to 34 million in 1998, and they are expected to reach 60 million Zimbabwe \$ in 1999 (The Herald 1999a).²⁸ Tourism is the most important source of income, with hunting alone contributing more than 90 percent of Campfire's income (Child et al. 1997). Even though the growth of income seems enormous, more than half of all income stems from only three areas (Maveneke et al. 2000). In fact, Campfire outside these areas has relatively little money. A study supports the fact that incomes from most Campfire projects are limited. The figures show a yearly income of 11 US\$ or less in 75 percent of the Campfire projects (see Maveneke et al. 2000).

Conflicts over resources

Another important issue is the distribution of money, which causes the greatest conflict in Campfire. The heart of the conflict is the relationship between the districts and the local communities. The districts are the highest authority and therefore receive all incomes from, for example, tourist operators connected with Campfire. The districts are supposed to then channel the money back to the villages in accordance with the percentages mentioned earlier. Most villages claim that either they do not receive the money or that it is only a fraction of the amount to which they are entitled, because the district authorities keep the money.

Local communities' distribution of Campfire income

On the village level, there are also conflicts about the use of Campfire income. The fewest conflicts arise in the most homogeneous areas where people live concentrated within a limited area (Makeneke et al. 2000). Most characteristic of local communities in Campfire, however, is that they are very heterogeneous and spread out over a wide area.

In some cases, Campfire income is used for the common benefit in the form of investments in water pumps, health clinics etc. Examples also exist of income being divided among the village's inhabitants. Finally, there are also examples of the money being used to invest in infrastructure, especially roads, so that tourists can reach the wildland areas more easily (The Herald 1999b).

A growing problem in several Campfire projects concerns newcomers, because the new inhabitants also wish to share in Campfire income (see Dzingirai 1999). It is not only people's mobility that causes local conflicts. Animal migrations also create problems, because most of Zimbabwe's larger animals migrate across great distances, especially in connection with the dry and wet seasons. Many Campfire projects are in areas where wild animals are accessible, often in connection with the dry

²⁸ A contributing cause of the sharp increase in 1999 is the anticipation of ivory sales from the large stores that have accumulated as a result of the prohibition of international trade in ivory. This trade is regulated by CITES (International Convention for Trade with Threatened Species). In 1997, CITES gave Zimbabwe, Botswana, and Namibia dispensation for controlled sale, and some of the income from ivory sales is expected to go to Campfire.

season. This has created conflicts, because the areas with animals outside the 'hunting season' do not receive a share of the income from tourism (Child 1995).

Sustainable exploitation of nature

Another important factor in connection with decentralization of natural resource management is the expectation of better protection of nature. Much evidence indicates that the wild animals in Campfire areas are under-exploited, because only a limited share of the valuable animal species is actually exploited. This is, in any case, the conclusion of a comprehensive study (Child et al. 1997). The results of studies carried out by the international nature organization, IUCN, indicate growing herds of key species such as elephants, lions, and leopards, even though they are hunted. On the basis of this information, it is clear that Campfire areas are a new form of protected areas where there is limited and sustainable utilization.

Local communities' views of the Campfire concept

Locally, villages have very different attitudes toward Campfire and the idea of sustainable use of the wildlands. A critical attitude seems to dominate, as is substantiated by a study carried out in one Campfire area showing that 85 percent of those asked saw no perspectives in the use of wild animals (Hill 1996). To what extent the study applies for all Campfire projects is difficult to determine, but my interviews with people in the communal areas outside Campfire indicate that they are very critical, and the majority do not wish to participate in Campfire. This attitude can be due to some of the problems discussed above. It can also be due to the fact that natural resource management and especially the protection of nature are identified with the regulation carried out in colonial times, when many Africans felt themselves marginalized and deemed to be of less value than nature.

Decision-making processes in Campfire

Some of the dissatisfaction in the villages was related to Campfire's goals and decision-making processes. Some examples indicate that people felt themselves induced to participate in Campfire projects because they believed the main aim to be to eliminate 'problem' animals such as elephants, which cause great damage many places. Another criticism of Campfire is that the concept itself promotes a step backwards for development in that people give up farming for a life with wild animals, something they consider to be a return to the 'bad old days' (Alexander and MacGregor 2000). Dissatisfaction with Campfire has in some cases led to demonstrations with slogans like "Campfire destroys our opportunities for development" and "We want our Campfire, not the district's Campfire" (Alexander and MacGregor 2000). Its very negative reputation has caused a growing number of villages to refuse to seek authorization to participate in Campfire (Chenga 1998). There are also examples of district councils starting Campfire projects without consulting the local communities (Alexander and MacGregor 2000).

Relations between the local communities and the authorities

In many localities, the district authorities are regarded as enemies. This is not only because of the economic reasons already mentioned, but also because of dissatisfaction with the institution itself, with the district. There are many reasons for this dissatisfaction: The district can be considered to be the tool of the governing party, ZANU PF. The district is often seen as a modern institution, a product of a centrally designated local reform that had no local roots. There is also dissatisfaction

with the fact that districts have taken over some functions that had previously been the domain of traditional institutions. In addition, it is a problem that the district councils can be very far away. The people do not feel themselves represented in and by the districts and therefore do not participate in decision-making processes.

The state wants money

Another important aspect of decentralization is the external factors, because decentralization does not take place in a local vacuum but is influenced from outside. This outside influence can be extremely important for success and has in some cases been overlooked. In the following, national and international initiatives are discussed, as well as the latest developments that have or are expected to have significance for decentralization of natural resource management in Zimbabwe. Some of the problems with the districts in connection with Campfire are due to state interventions, primarily because, since the 1990s, the state has cut its economic grants to the districts in compliance with Zimbabwe's agreement with the Bretton Woods institutions in connection with structural adjustment programmes. As a consequence, the districts have very limited funds and some districts have recently begun to stop their activities. Therefore, there is no doubt that the districts that administrate Campfire money have an opportunity for an economic boost that will certainly be exploited.

Another important factor is that Zimbabwe's local reforms have shifted the decision-making competence from the traditional local institutions to the new districts. Also, the state has strengthened centralization, because the number of districts has been reduced from over 200 during colonial times to around 55 at present (Mandondo 2000). The question is why does the state implement decentralization initiatives while undermining them with other laws. The answer is, according to Professor John Makumbe from University of Zimbabwe: "... decentralization in post-colonial Zimbabwe has been instrumental in the mobilization of the local masses for participation in central government initiated and funded programmes with little regard for the development priorities of the local people themselves" (Makumbe 1998). This political inconsistency, and especially the state's lack of any will to surrender autonomy, is the Achilles heel in connection with decentralization initiatives in many developing countries (Carney 1995, Eriksen 1999).

International interest in Zimbabwe's management

Another important external factor, also mentioned earlier, is the fact that international actors and international conditions have great impact on decentralization of natural resource management in Zimbabwe. As already mentioned, tourism is the life nerve for both private landowners and Campfire. In addition, the international aid organizations finance many local development initiatives within Campfire. The American USAID is the largest contributor, but only a very limited amount of the aid granted is used. Because of the poor quality of the local applications, 90 percent of them have been rejected (Herald 1999c).

International interest has also contributed in a directly negative way to decentralization of natural resource management. This applies especially to the decision made by CITES (International Convention for Trade with Threatened Species) in 1989 to internationally prohibit trade with ivory. It is precisely the lack of this trade that has caused great losses, especially for Campfire, since hunting elephants comprises almost 95 percent of the income from hunting tourism (Child et al. 1997). An important part of the income from elephant hunting is the sale of ivory. Now, there seem to be new opportunities since CITES, at the end of the 1990s, gave dispensation to Zimbabwe, Namibia, and Botswana.

In the international, post-Brundtland debate, Zimbabwe harvested much recognition for decentralization of natural resource management and represented a model for other developing countries. However, especially American animal protection organizations criticized the hunting of wild animals (see Campfire 1996). Also among social science researchers, criticism of Campfire has increased. It has been called a new form of nature protection in which local communities are held hostage by the authorities in order to accommodate international interests in conservation (Tsiko 1999). Both researchers and local people in Zimbabwe have expressed this view.

International debate on environment and development

The fourth generation's international political debate on regulations between society and nature has been characterized as a paradigmatic shift from pessimistic descriptions to a perspective of positive interaction. The great breakthrough came with the UN's World Commission for Environment and Development and its report (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987).²⁹ The Brundtland report set a new agenda for the debate and promoted the new concept of sustainable development, where people and nature are supposed to be in positive interaction. This was a break with the anti-human attitude that had dominated the debate until then. An avalanche of publications on integration of environmental and development questions followed in the wake of the Brundtland report. The concept's impact could be measured by the fact that the 1992 version of World Development Report (World Bank 1992) had environment and development as its theme. The World Bank came to the same conclusion as the Brundtland report, even though its term was "win-win" for situations with a positive interaction between environment and development.

An important international event that followed in the wake of the Brundtland report was the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio in 1992. At that time, this was the world's largest international conference with participation of heads of state and government leaders from more than 150 countries. Several international agreements regarding environment and development were ratified at the conference. Although they were still between states, the Brundtland way of thinking permeated the agreements. For example, in connection with the Biodiversity Convention, the utilization aspect was also taken into consideration. In addition, recognition of local and national interests in connection with biodiversity was also a breakthrough.

In the post-Brundtland natural resource management debate, devolution or decentralization has been an 'open sesame' word. Local communities and their traditional management systems were seen as the key to wildlands management. This led to the appearance of new terms, such as ICDP (Integrated Conservation and Development Projects) and CBNRM (Community Based Natural Resource Management). The change can be characterized as a paradigm shift due to the fact that WWF, one of the central actors within the INCOs, now claimed that the focus of natural resource management should shift from nature to people (Andersen 1996).

The period also represents a breakthrough in the relationship between North and South, especially in the wake of the debt crises in the 1970s. The international bilateral and multilateral institutions cooperated in connection with development aid. The type of aid also changed from aid to the state in the form of resources for capacity building through, for example, infrastructure projects to greater emphasis on so-called policy-based loans through structural adjustment programmes. The Bretton

²⁹ The World Commission on Environment's report is often called the Brundtland report, named after the commission's chairman, Gro Harlem Brundtland.

Wood institutions were especially in the forefront with regard to this development. The dominating idea was that there was need for political changes in developing countries if they were to be able to develop in a positive way. Central to this approach was the claim that the state hindered development in most developing countries. Therefore, it was necessary to reduce the state through decentralization and privatization. This would allow market forces to play a greater role, which would create development also in these countries.

Fifth generation - people in conflict over nature

Many of the initiatives within the fifth generation are so new that very little has been published on experiences with these activities. However, on the background of my participation in a research workshop³⁰ in the Dwesa-Cwebe area, I can present some preliminary considerations about the fifth generation of natural resource management based on my knowledge of this case.

There can be no doubt that the changed management practices in connection with Dwesa-Cwebe forest reserves have created new opportunities for the local communities in the neighbouring areas, because, in contrast with earlier, they are allowed to and also do utilize the reserves' natural resources. Although there are many different forms of utilization in the two reserves, I limit the presentation here to the terrestrial³¹ resources. Access to the reserves has been enthusiastically utilized. Important uses have been collection of various forest products such as wood for building houses, fences, fuel etc., grass for thatching, and also various medicinal plants. Dwesa-Cwebe was also used for grazing for domestic animals from the neighbouring area. Most local inhabitants we were in contact with agreed that the newest development, which gave local communities the mandate to manage Dwesa-Cwebe had a positive influence on their access to resources.

However, there was disagreement about whether the local utilization of Dwesa-Cwebe's nature values could be considered sustainable. Most of the local people we spoke with in the surrounding villages seemed to agree that their utilization was sustainable. For example, it was said that local communities had voluntarily agreed not to exploit the forest reserves at certain times of the year.

This attitude toward sustainable utilization of the forest reserves was not shared, however, by the reserve authorities and the tourist industry in the area. They agreed that the reserves were over-utilized, and that, in practice, there was open access to the reserves' resources. In this connection, it should be noted that according to the new agreement reserve authorities no longer have any regulating authority. Their job is to collect fees in connection with utilization of the reserves' resources and to conduct surveillance of the situation in the area. Both the local reserve authorities and the tourist industry informed us that exploitation of the reserves was not only for local use.

³⁰ The research workshop took place in September 2000 with its base at the Haven Hotel. It was arranged by Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Zimbabwe in co-operation with Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), University of Stellenbosch and University of Transkei. The workshop was funded by CIDA, University of Alberta, Institute of Environmental Studies at Univ. of Zimbabwe and CIFOR. In connection with the workshop, we collected data on forest management in Dwesa-Cwebe Nature Reserve. The team participating in the activity comprised primarily academicians from both South Africa and the rest of the world. Various state authorities with responsibility for natural resource management in the area were also represented.

³¹ The new management practice has also meant that local communities have gained access to coastal areas and marine resources outside Dwesa-Cwebe.

Forest products were sold at markets outside local communities, and there was evidence that forest products were also removed illegally, as fences around the reserves were down in several places. They gave no clear indication of the amount of illegal felling.

Our experience in Dwesa-Cwebe told us that forest resources were being utilized, but it is very difficult, in the course of a brief visit, to evaluate the extent of utilization and to judge whether it is sustainable.³² It was clear, however, that there were some difficulties involved in initiating the new agreement with regard to the structures for managing Dwesa-Cwebe. It was decided that institutions should be established to ensure sustainable use, but they did not function in accordance with intentions. In fact, some people said that they did not function at all. One explanation is that the new institutions were not harmonized with the existing local institutions with regard to the local division of authority. South Africa's local reforms, which established modern democratic institutions locally at the same time that the traditional institutions were still functioning, resulted in power struggles between traditional and modern institutions. These power struggles led to institutional paralysis in relation to the management of Dwesa-Cwebe. The practical consequence was that no form of effective regulation of use existed in the reserves.

A very important component in connection with local development in Dwesa-Cwebe was the so-called Wild Coast spatial development initiative that was supposed to bring large investments to the area. The most important of these was the establishment of a huge luxury hotel complex that was supposed to attract wealthy international tourists and at the same time create many local jobs. It was to be the economic locomotive for development in the area. When we were in the area, nothing of the kind had happened thus far, and in fact, the existing hotel, the Haven, was supposed to close the day we were to depart. This was a big problem, because the hotel and the nature reserve were the only workplaces in the area. The plan for a luxury hotel in Dwesa-Cwebe seemed most unrealistic, first because it would demand large investments that had not been forthcoming as yet. Secondly, the infrastructure, especially the road system, was not up to South African standard. A vehicle with four wheel drive was necessary to come to Dwesa-Cwebe, which is not very attractive to most luxury tourists. Third, it is doubtful that tourists would come to Dwesa-Cwebe since it does not exactly lie on the 'tourist route', and we learned that other luxury hotels along the Wild Coast had a very low number of visitors.

The lacking national development initiatives created some frustration for people in the area, and the expectation that the Haven would close did not improve matters. It was hoped that international organizations could co-operate with local institutions to ensure future sustainable development in the area.

International conflicts

On the international political scene, agreement still seems to exist about sustainable development as the future development strategy. This is reflected by the fact that the UN is arranging a 10-year follow-up of the UNCED conference called The World Summit for Sustainable Development. WSSD is to be held in Johannesburg in September 2002. The debate preceding the conference has

³² This was the case even though we were actually a multidisciplinary group with many different areas of expertise, but sustainable utilization is not easy to evaluate even with a longer time perspective.

revealed great conflicts, primarily between North and South. The South wants investments in development, whereas the North wants effective environmental regulation in the South. At the same time, the South feels that countries in the North have not lived up to the promises made at UNCED regarding increased aid to developing countries. In contrast to UNCED, where many proposals were made for conventions and other agreements, no such concrete proposals have emerged as yet for discussion at WSSD except for one from South Africa based to a great extent on NEPAD³³ - an African initiative to increase investments in the South. EU is at present working on something called the Global Deal, which is a non-binding agreement stipulating that EU will increase its efforts in the South, but at the same time, the South must initiate improved environmental management.

Another theme that characterizes the international debate is that free trade is the mechanism that will create development in both North and South. If all countries remove custom barriers and subsidies, this would promote (sustainable) development. This viewpoint has won great political support but also some criticism (Boesen and Jensen 2002).

Part 4 Discussion and conclusion

Debate on local communities and wildlands management

There is consensus in the current post-Brundtland's international debate that local communities should play a larger role in natural resource management. This was not the case when Rhodesia began decentralization of natural resource management. At that time, in 1975, more than ten years before the Brundtland report, the dominating idea was preservationist management of natural resources without people and based on centralized regulation. Since Zimbabwe began early and has broad practical experience with decentralization of natural resource management, it provides a good case for judging local communities in wildlands management. That is why I found it useful to outline some of the Zimbabwean initiatives and present some general lessons that might be of relevance in other African or developing countries.

The preceding section has presented several questions that could be discussed, but I will concentrate on local communities and their surroundings in connection with wildlands management. By surroundings I do not only refer to the natural surroundings but also other external factors such as state and international decisions that will have significant consequences for local communities. The discussion primarily refers to initiatives and experiences within the fourth and fifth generations. I feel that these initiatives have exciting perspectives, since I expect that the struggle concerning the wildlands will come to a head in the years to come, and there will hardly be room for more protected areas without people.

- *Can local communities play a positive role in wild land management?*

Yes! Even though experience with fourth generation decentralization in Zimbabwe has not only been positive, the answer is yes for two reasons. First, there are no better alternatives. Earlier experience with open access and central administration has not been good either for securing the wildlands or local development. Secondly, there are opportunities and need for improvement,

³³ NEPAD is The New Partnership for Africa's Development.

especially in relation to Campfire. Without some changes, initiatives like the Campfire programme will have problems. The most obvious solution could be a complete institutional revolution so that Campfire projects are on an equal footing with those of the private landowners, and even more important, so that governmental institutions such as the districts are no longer involved or at least limited. The prerequisite for such a solution would be that the state carry out the necessary changes in legislation. Such changes will also mean moving from the fourth generation into the fifth. As we have seen with the Dwesa-Cwebe case, there are also problems with fifth generation initiatives, although some of the problems mentioned could be temporary initial difficulties. On the other hand, it is also important not to treat local communities as homogenous units with a common agenda. This is seldom the case as is also the perception that local communities always have lived in a sustainable way and will continue to do so if they gain control over resources.

Whether the situation in Dwesa-Cwebe can be described as fifth generation development can also be discussed, especially since there are some aspects that indicate that both first and second generation problems are implicit in the situation. In relation to Richersveld, it would be interesting in future to see how the contractual relations between local communities and the state develop and also whether the area will become a magnet for people from outside and how such a development will be managed. This opens for an important aspect in relation to local communities in wildlands management, the need for dialogue between local people and external actors. The dominant approach to wildlands management is still to focus on natural resources and then involve the people living in the area. True fifth generation initiatives should be locally driven activities, a bit like the Garden Route Campaign, even though The Garden Route Campaign is an example of how individuals and groups with strong resources are able to market their viewpoints successfully.

- *Can local economic benefit from managing wildlands?*

Yes, but not unequivocally for two reasons, one of these applies specifically to Campfire, whereas the other applies to both forms of decentralization. Both the private landowners and Campfire have had large and increasing incomes as a result of decentralization. In Campfire, the trickling down to the participating villages has been limited because the districts may have kept most of the money. This is completely against the Campfire agreement but an example of how external factors play a very important role in the local context. The districts keep the money, because they have severe economic problems due to cutbacks in central government funding, and these are a result of Zimbabwe's involvement in structural adjustment programmes in the mid-1990s. So it is not only a local-national conflict over resources but is linked to international relations. The districts use Campfire money in very different ways, which could be the subject of an independent study, but the consequences have been that, except for a couple of successful projects, the local communities receive only small amounts from Campfire, and this helps to undermine local interest for participation.

Zimbabwe's decentralization seems to have been most successful in the privately owned areas. This is due to many different factors, the most important undoubtedly being the enormous land areas that are owned by some few thousand well-situated whites. In relation to the private landowners, it is also important to remember that they have had both resources to invest and control over their own areas. The most recent developments show that this situation may soon be history, because of the post-2000 Zimbabwe's extensive fast track land reforms and land invasions. Land reform is obviously necessary in order to equalize the injustices created by colonization that still exist. Land reform will undoubtedly influence future management of natural resources, but the consequences will depend on how the reform is carried out.

Some of the private landowners have received large profits from wildlands management as a result of Zimbabwe's decentralization, and in these cases, the local communities in adjoining areas have often received economic benefits in the form of jobs that have been created, a benefit that is often overlooked.

Incomes for both private landowners and Campfire could have been even larger, if CITES had not maintained the international ban against selling ivory for ten years. Hunting elephants is the most important source of income for both Campfire and the private landowners.³⁴ This obstacle has reduced incomes, but the recent dispensation allowing controlled trade will increase income opportunities. The question is whether benefits from selling ivory will be shared with the local people.

- *Can local management contribute to better wildlands protection?*

Clearly, yes. Especially experiences from fourth generation initiatives with the privately owned areas in Zimbabwe show that developments have been noteworthy. Decentralization has not only led to spreading the risks and to new economic opportunities for exploitation of unused land. Private landowners have invested in wildlands many places by shifting land use from agriculture to production based on wildlife, because it is economically profitable. This has meant that privately owned areas in Zimbabwe have become home for considerable herds of nationally and globally threatened biodiversity, such as the black rhinoceros. Wildlands are also thriving within Campfire. There are no examples of over-exploitation, and studies show that Campfire projects under-exploit valuable species such as elephants.

The situation in Dwesa-Cwebe is less positive and the question is whether this is just a transition phenomenon.

- *Can the state play a positive role?*

During the last couple of decades, debates on wildlands management has focused on global priorities for protected areas and the local capacity to function as wildlands managers. The state and governmental institutions have been seen as obstacles to efficient wildlands management. This is a problem, because states are important institutions for sustainable utilization and management of protected areas. The precondition for effective wildlands management is stable political, economic, and natural resource conditions. The current situation in Zimbabwe underlines this argument. Therefore, a true partnership between international, national, and local actors is necessary. The state will often be an important actor as mediator, facilitator etc.

Is it correct that states and governmental institutions have created many problems for local people and for efficient wildlands management? In Campfire, many of the problems were caused by the lack of local control of the exploitation of nature, decision-making processes, power relations, and many other factors. Many of these problems could have been solved through state willingness toward local self-management. Such a transition to complete local control would demand local capacity to solve all the inherent conflicts. As shown in the case of Dwesa-Cwebe, local capability is crucial in fifth generation wildlands management. This requires governmental support with both financial and institutional arrangements.

³⁴ Around 90 percent of the income in Campfire projects comes from elephant hunting.

- *Can globalization play a positive role in local wildlands management?*

The international community and globalization have a huge impact on all the generations of wildlands management, except maybe the first. Therefore, it is impossible to include all aspects of international relations relevant for local wildlands management.

One of the really important factors is international tourism. It seems that fourth and fifth generation initiatives are based on international tourism. Tourist incomes are the economic foundation for both local development and wildlands management. The latest developments in both Zimbabwe and Dwesa-Cwebe show that this foundation is vulnerable and can crumble. Therefore, it is obvious that if local management is to be economically sustainable, the product needs to be differentiated to a greater extent. This applies for all the mentioned initiatives, so that they do not only rely on international tourists but also other types of economic input. I see a number of problems with large-scale tourism as the foundation for combined local development and wildlands management, primarily because many of these initiatives are based on the perception of local benefits from tourism. My experience with tourism in developing countries is that only a very small proportion of the economic flow from tourism benefits the country and the local areas visited. Most of the money stays in developed countries because the tour operators, hotels, airline companies etc. are owned by international companies. Secondly, tourism is very sensitive to political instability or such international events as that of 11 September 2001. As a consequence, tourists can be scared away for a while or forever. For Zimbabwe's decentralization initiatives, the current situation can be fatal, also in a longer time perspective. It takes time to re-establish a destination, and by that time other destinations may have been able to take over the former market segment. Tourists can buy similar products in neighbouring countries like South Africa, Zambia, Botswana, and Namibia. Third, and extremely important, the cost of establishing a tourist destination is often overlooked or at least underestimated. It is economically, socially, environmentally, culturally very expensive to establish a tourist destination.

Financing environmental protection

The international community has been supportive in establishing protected areas, both with money and know-how. If the international community would live up to the fifth generation approach, it could consider redirecting resources toward payments for environmental goods in developing countries. This could be in the form of economic compensation schemes for the rural poor for either environmentally sound (e.g. organic) farming or for not utilizing specific environmentally valuable wildlands. The reasoning behind this idea is that the environment in developing countries provides important services, not only of interest to the local people but also of regional, national, and even global interest (off-sites). A way to avoid an over-exploitation of the environment that adversely affects off-site benefits would be to make some kind of compensation to the rural people. This could entail paying individuals and communities directly for environmentally sound practices and would be justified by the fact that, as a rule, the environmental services provided by the rural people in or around wildlands are currently uncompensated by the off-site beneficiaries. Such compensation could increase the rural people's incentive to take these interests into account in their land-use decisions, potentially saving them from eventual loss. It would also provide an important recognition of local people's legitimate rights to their resources.

Such compensation schemes are designed to bridge the interests of economically poor service

providers and the rich and to benefit both parties. The vision is that the greater the willingness to pay on the side of the external service recipients, the more likely are the chances that these transfers will eventually improve conditions for the environmental service providers. Simultaneously, these economic compensation schemes could be a new way to secure wildlands of global importance.

The current practice of establishing so-called protected areas has often been challenged in the South. This pressure comes not only from the poor local residents that are affected by use restrictions, but also national governments that experience limitations on agricultural expansion and other land uses. Compensation schemes could be much more direct and focused on integrated conservation and development programmes. They could compensate people directly for environmentally sound performance and make such compensation directly contingent on monitored quality.

The question is also whether the international community should reconsider the benefits of covering so many developing countries in Africa and elsewhere with protected areas without human activities. Experience in recent years seems to provide a basis for revising practices regarding protected areas and their management by local communities. Several of the fourth generation initiatives can be seen as extra protected areas that are managed by private landowners or local communities.

Conclusion

International interest in ensuring the unique nature values in the South is increasing. The task of protecting nature values in developing countries is largely carried out by poor communities in some of the world's poorest countries, because most nature values worth protecting are found in these countries. A central element in protecting nature values is establishment of protected areas. Such areas are often kept free of all forms of utilization, often due to external interests in protecting a locality's nature values. In practice, ideas behind the management strategies connected with protected areas have changed over time, as the discussion of the five generations has shown. The costs of establishing and maintaining nature reserves are mostly borne by the local communities living in or around the protected areas. In most generations, the management initiatives are launched on the basis of an excluding, nature-oriented management strategy. Although earlier generations were based on a nature-oriented approach, this did not necessarily guarantee that nature values were protected.

In recent years, more focus has been on local community needs in connection with natural resource management. However, even the newest generations of management strategies seem to provide relatively limited direct benefits for local communities involved in managing protected areas and other wildlands. An important input in most fourth and fifth generation initiatives actually derives from tourism, for example, in the form of wage labour. There also seems to be a danger in exclusively counting on economic benefits for local communities. Several other aspects, such as cultural and social factors can also be significant for success, as well as the aspect of participation in connection with the whole process of management of a specific locality. In this context it is also important not to focus too much on local conditions, because as documented, external conditions such as economic and structural changes can be of great importance. It has also been demonstrated that environmental policy regulation alone cannot ensure local communities and protected areas, because other societal processes can influence development.

Since the benefits from protecting the environment are global goods, there is clearly a need for revising the distribution of the burden between the international community, the state, and local communities in developing countries in connection with protection of unique wildlands. Clearly, the international community must contribute to a greater extent to carrying the costs of protecting internationally important nature areas if the concept of protected areas will have any meaning in the future.

References:

- Adams, W. H. and D. Hulme 2001: "If communities conservation is the answer in Africa, what is the question", *Oryx* 35: 193-200.
- Agarwal, Anil and Sunita Narain. 1989: *Towards Green Villages - A strategy for environmentally sound and participatory rural development*, Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi.
- Alexander, Jocelyn and JoAnn McGregor. 2000: "Wildlife and Politics: CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe", *Development and Change* vol. 31, no. 3, The Hague, The Netherlands.
- Andersen, Morten. 1996: "Roret lagt om", *Udvikling* no. 3-4, Foreign Ministry, Copenhagen.
- Beach, D. N. 1984: *Zimbabwe before 1900*, Mambo Press, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Beach, D. N. 1980: *The Shona and Zimbabwe 900-1850*, Heinemann, London, UK.
- Beinart, William 2000: "African history and environmental history", in *African Affairs*, vol. 99, number 395, April 2000.
- BirdLife 1998: *Endemic Bird Areas of the World – Priorities for Biodiversity Conservation*, BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK.
- Boesen, Jannik and Stig Jensen 2002: "A Global Deal on Agriculture benefiting the poor farmers in The Third World" in Holst, J.L (Ed.): *Closing the Gap*, Danmarks Naturfredningsforening / Danish Society for the Conservation of Nature (DN), Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Caldwell, Lynton K. 1990a: *International Environmental Policy*, Second Edition, Duke University Press.
- Caldwell, Lynton K. 1988: "Beyond Environmental Diplomacy: The Changing Institutional Structures of International Cooperation" in John E. Carroll (Ed.): *International Diplomacy*, Cambridge University Press.
- CAMPFIRE homepage 1996: http://campfire_zimbabwe.org/
- Carney, Diana. 1995: *Management and supply in agriculture and natural resources: Is decentralisation the answer?* ODI - Natural Resource Perspectives, no. 4, UK.
- Chenga, Nelson 1998: "Villagers who say no to Campfire", *The Herald*, 24 November 1998, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Chenje, M. (ed.) 1998: *The State of Zimbabwe's Environment 1 998*, Ministry of Mines, Environment and Tourism, Zimbabwe.
- Child, B. 1996: "Zimbabwe", in *Decentralization and Biodiversity Conservation*, Ernest Lutz and J. Caldecott (eds.), World Bank.
- Child, Brian et al. 1997: *Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Programme: Natural Resource Management by the People*, IUCN-ROSA, Environmental Issues Series no. 2, IUCN-ROSA, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Child, G. 1995: "Managing wildlife successfully in Zimbabwe", *Oryx* vol. 29, no. 3.
- Cousins, Ben and Steven Robins 1994: "Institutions for Land Redistribution and Management: The Zimbabwean Experience", *SA Sociological Review*, vol. 6, no. 2.
- Du Toit, Raoul. 2000: "Case study of policies that support sustainable development in Africa: The Savé Valley Conservancy, Zimbabwe", in David Turnham (ed.): *African Perspectives - Practices and Policies Supporting Sustainable Development*, Scandinavian Seminar College, Copenhagen, Denmark. <http://www.cdr.dk/sscafrica>

Dzingirai, V. 1999: "Immigrants regard Campfire as useless. Migration and struggle for land in the Zambezi Valley", *The Herald*, 17 March 1999, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Ehrlich, Paul and A. Ehrlich. 1981: *Extinction*, Random House, New York, USA.

Eriksen, Stein Sundstøl. 1999: "The Limits of Local Democracy: Decision-Making and Popular Influence in a Tanzanian and Zimbabwean Council", *Forum for Development Studies*, no. 2, Oslo, Norway.

Giddens, Anthony 1981: *Modernity and self-identity. Self and society in the modern age*. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Grzimek, Bernhard and Michael Grzimek 1960: *Serengeti Shall Not Die*, Collins Fontana Books, London, Great Britain.

Hammar, Amanda & Stig Jensen 2002: *The Zimbabwe in Crisis*, - An issue paper from the Centre for Development Research, Copenhagen, Denmark.

The Herald 1999a: "Environment – Campfire", *The Herald*, 29 October 1999, Harare, Zimbabwe.

The Herald 1999b: "Villagers set aside \$1 mio for construction of road", *The Herald*, 12 April 1999, Harare, Zimbabwe.

The Herald 1999c: "Fund rejects 300 project proposals", *The Herald*, 12 February 1999, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Hill, Kevin A. 1996: "Zimbabwe's Wildlife Utilization Programs: Grassroots Democracy or an Extension of State Power?" *African Studies Review*, vol. 39, no. 1.

ICDP 1992: *Putting biodiversity on the Map: Priority Areas for Global Conservation*, International Council for Bird Preservation, Cambridge, UK.

Jensen, Stig. 1999: "Management of biodiversity locally - a view from Zimbabwe", in *Proceedings of the Conference on Biodiversity and Development*, October 1998, RUF and Centre for Tropical Ecosystem Research, Århus University, Denmark.

Katerere, Yemi. 1991: *Issues in Household Energy Strategy Formulation: The Zimbabwe Experience*, Working Paper no. 2, Zimbabwe Environmental Research Organisation (ZERO), Harare, Zimbabwe.

Kjerkhus, H. 1977/1996: *Ecology Control and Economic Development in East African History: Case of Tanganyika, 1850-1950*, James Currey, London, UK.

Kothari, A. et al. 1995: "People and Protected Areas - rethinking conservation in India", *The Ecologist* vol. 25, no. 5.

Lawrence, Jenny 2000: "The Garden Route Campaign for sustainable development: a retrospective analyse" unpublished paper at the Scandinavian Seminar College, Copenhagen, Denmark. <http://www.cdr.dk/sscafrica>

Ledec, George and Robert Goodland. 1988: *Wildlands – Their Protection and Management in Economic Development*, The World Bank, Washington D. C., USA.

Makumbe, John. 1998: *Democracy and Development in Zimbabwe: Constraints of Decentralisation*, SAPES Books, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Mandondo, Alois 2000: *Forging (un)democratic resource governance systems from relics of Zimbabwe's colonial past*, unpublished paper, Institute of Environmental Studies, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Maveneke et al. 2000: "Local participation as an instrument of conservation and development: The case of Campfire in Zimbabwe", in David Turnham (ed.): *African Perspectives - Practices and Policies Supporting Sustainable Development*, Scandinavian Seminar College, Copenhagen, Denmark. <http://www.cdr.dk/sscafrica>

McGregor, J. 1995: "Conservation, Control and Ecological Change: The Politics and Ecology of Colonial Conservation in Shurugwi, Zimbabwe", *Environment and History*, special issue: Zimbabwe, vol. 1, no. 3.

Moyo, Sam (ed.) 1991: *Zimbabwe's Environmental Dilemma - Balancing Resource Inequities*, ZERO, Harare, Zimbabwe.

- Muir, Kay et al. 2000: "Zimbabwe's experience in allocating wild resource use-rights to farmers: the importance of policies which provide secure tenure to growth, equity and the environment", in David Turnham (ed.): *African Perspectives - Practices and Policies Supporting Sustainable Development*, Scandinavian Seminar College, Copenhagen, Denmark. <http://www.cdr.dk/sscafrica>
- Muir, Kay. 1994: "Agriculture in Zimbabwe", in M. Rukuni. and C. K. Eicher (eds.): *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Revolution*, University of Zimbabwe Publications, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Myers, N. 1990: "The Biodiversity Challenge: Expanding Hot-Spots Analysis" in *The Environmentalist*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 243-256.
- Olthof, Wim. 1995: "Wildlife Resources and Local Development: Experiences from Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE Programme", in J.P.M. van den Breemer et al (eds.): *Local Resource Management in Africa*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Princen, T. 1995: Ivory, conservation, and environmental transnational coalitions, in Thomas Risse-Kappen (ed.): *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In*, Cambridge Studies in International Relations: 42, Cambridge University Press.
- Raven, Peter 1994: "Why it matters", *Our Planet*, vol. 6. no. 4.
- Robinson, Robbie 1998: *Community Partnership in Richtersveld National Park*, unpublished paper at the Scandinavian Seminar College Workshop in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, November 1998. <http://www.cdr.dk/sscafrica>
- Rukuni, Mandivamba 1994: "The Evolution of Agricultural Policy: 1890-1990", in M. Rukuni. and Carl K. Eicher (ed.): *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Revolution*, University of Zimbabwe Publications, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. et al. 1989. "Analysing decentralization policies in developing countries: A political-economy framework", *Development and change* vol. 20, no. 1: 57-87.
- Rønnfeldt, Carsten 1997: "Three Generations of Environment and Security Research", in *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 34 No. 4, November 1997.
- Sindinga, Issac 1999: *Tourism and African development – change and challenge of tourism in Kenya*, African Studie Centre Research Series 14/1999., Leiden, Holland.
- Timberlake, Lloyd. 1985: *Africa in Crisis: The Causes, The Cures of Environmental Bankruptcy*, International Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK.
- Timmermanns, Herman 1999: *Reconciling Conservation and Rural Development – social and ecological dynamics of forest resource harvesting in the Cwebe Nature Reserve*, unpublished paper at the South African National Forestry Symposium in September 1999.
- Tsiko, Sifelani 1999: "Campfire faces tough battle to clear its image abroad", *Sunday Mail*, 11 April, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- UNDP 2001: *Human Development Report 2001*, UNDP, Oxford University Press, New York, USA.
- UNDP 1998: *Zimbabwe Human Development Report 1998*. Harare: UNDP, Poverty Reduction Forum & Institute of Development Studies.
- World Bank 1992: *World Development Report 1992 - Development and the Environment*, World Bank, Oxford University Press.
- World Commission on Environment and Development 1987: *Our Common Future*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wood, A. 1997: *Strategies for Sustainability in Africa*, London: IUCN/Earthscan.