Markets of Routine Exceptionalism: Peace Parks in southern Africa

Georgina Barrett, doctoral candidate and lecturer in the Department for Political and International Studies, Rhodes University, South Africa.

Contact: g.barrett@ru.ac.za

Abstract:

Advocates of southern African peace parks- transfrontier conservation areas- present a vision of a 'boundless' natural landscape transcendent of the violent cartography of sovereign statism in the region. Moreover, peace parks are constructed as vast biodiversity rich wildernesses inhabited by rare and precious fauna and flora and harmonious albeit scattered communities of 'traditional' African peoples. As such, the region's frontiers symbolise exceptional spaces of opportunity; for ecosystem scale conservation, and emancipation through peace, community, and wealth for the region's states and people. However, the economic imperative underpinning this exceptionalism- that of attracting large numbers of primarily foreign but also local wealthy tourists, cultural voyeurs and game hunters- means that peace parks are sites of continued reinvention, exploration, and adventure to meet the transient desires of the market. When viewed through the optic offered by international political sociology, the distinction between the peace parks 'vision' and the tangible realty is blurred. The former has become a powerful- albeit illusionary- space of exception where a select group of elite actors are able to dictate the means required to maintain the market imperative of the parks in the name of conservation and development. The maintenance of the vision however, necessitates increased control and management of the lived life of the place, which itself gives life to the vision. The exception is thus sustained through the routinisation of illiberal practices of inclusion and exclusion, control and surveillance in the management of the parks. Legitimated by global concerns about the security of the world's ecological integrity and the survival of the neoliberal economic order, these practices are uncritically accepted as both necessary and desirable to sustain peace parks as an environmental and cultural commodity.

Introduction

Advocates of southern African peace parks- transfrontier conservation areas- market a vision of a 'boundless' natural landscape transcendent of the violent cartography of sovereign statism in the region. Moreover, they construct the parks as vast biodiversity rich wildernesses inhabited by rare and precious fauna and flora and harmonious albeit scattered communities of 'traditional' African peoples. As such, the region's frontiers symbolise exceptional spaces of opportunity: for ecosystem scale conservation, and emancipation through peace, community, and wealth for the region's states and people. International political sociology provides a useful lens through which to understand how the commodification of people and nature in the peace parks has resulted in, and is subsequently underpinned by, Weberian routines of bureaucratic and technological control and management embedded in global neoliberal governance structures. Furthermore, it is useful for reflecting critically on how 'securing' the vision necessary for the successful commodification of the parks is also dependent upon these routines and itself gives rise to patterns of security and insecurity, inclusion and exclusion reminiscent of colonial and apartheid eras.

This paper argues that the frontier spaces designated as peace parks are constructed as an exceptional response to a convergence of regional and global environmental, economic, and political agendas, each of which bring a sense of urgency and necessity to their creation. Leading advocates of the parks, including the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF), International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the region's states and government departments- particularly those pertaining to the economy, the environment, and tourism- have thus constructed a vision of the parks with which to lure (international) investors and tourists. Of particular interest here is the Boundless Southern Africa (herein referred to as Boundless) collaborative marketing strategy adopted by the region's states to 'sell' peace parks, and that of the primary facilitating agency, the PPF. Both construct an idealised 'vision' of peace parks aligned to prevailing international environmental governance 'best practice' of ecosystem-scale biodiversity conservation.[1] In southern Africa and elsewhere, this has resulted in the adoption of market-based solutions that prescribe the monetary valuation and commodification of nature and culture as the desirable and logical path to its preservation.[2]

It is unsurprising that the vision presented is a selective interpretation of the lived life of the parks; one which obscures the complex and highly contested nature of their creation and development and which, in the pursuit of environmental (and economic) security, has given rise to patterns of insecurity too. However, the success of the 'vision' relies on its performativity[3] in order to sustain its consumer appeal. Consequently, the distinction between the vision and the complex reality 'on the ground' is increasingly blurred and as a result, it is the vision, rather than the lived life of the parks, that has become the 'exception', albeit it an illusionary one. Moreover, it is this 'vision as exception' that underpins the authority and legitimacy of elite actors to dictate the means necessary for maintaining the parks' viability as environmental and cultural commodities. In short, the 'vision' must become 'reality' for the investors and tourists visiting the parks. Thus, to sustain the vision requires continual re-articulation, re-invention, exploration, and adventure, as captured in the promotional materials of the PPF and Boundless. However, it also necessitates the effective 'control' and 'management' of the lived life of the parks in order for the vision to be secured. This entails the suppression of 'elements'- people and activities- perceived as threatening to the vision,

---

[1] On the shift from community-based conservation to transfrontier and ecosystem scale conservation over the last ten years see, for example: Brosius and Russell (2003), Büscher (2010), Schwartz (1999). On the influence of neoliberalism in environmental governance see: Duffy (2007, 60), and the 2007 Special Issue of Conservation and Society, in particular Igoe and Brockington (2007), Büscher and Dressler (2007), and Büscher (2010).

[2] The commodification of nature is receiving increasing attention. See for example: King and Stewart (1996) West, Igoe and Brockington (2006), Büscher and Dressler (*Forthcoming*).

[3] Kevin Dunn's (2009) work is particularly insightful. He illustrates how state structuring/ structural effects are discursively produced through continual acts of performativity. His article not only interrogates these processes of performativity in the context of African national parks but argues that the continual need for performativity creates opportunities for resistence and contestation of state power and authority..

or the prevailing conservation wisdom and economic imperatives sustaining it. As a result, securing the vision also creates patterns of insecurity. The routinisation of illiberal practices of inclusion and exclusion, control and surveillance are justified by a combination of high-level global concerns regarding the preservation of the world's ecological integrity, the sustainability of the neoliberal economic order, and regional aspirations for a more secure and prosperous future.[4]

This paper is set out in five parts beginning with an overview of the theoretical framework- international political sociology- informing the discussion. This is followed by a summary of the way in which environmental security narratives have constructed the 'existential threat' and how, coupled with regional fears and aspirations this has given support to the development of an effective solution in the form of peace parks. The third section provides a more detailed discussion of the construction of the marketable vision, primarily drawing on the narratives of the PPF and Boundless. Reflecting on these narratives, the subsequent section argues that the vision is made 'real' through its perfomativity by powerful actors through a series of discursive practices including narrative, visualisation, and practical experience. The final section argues that this 'positive' performativity is not sufficient to sustain the vision. Rather, routinised bureaucratic and technological efforts to discipline the landscape and the region's people in line with the vision accompany overt coercive processes of control. As a result, the lived life of the parks and the vision become mutually constitutive and particular lifestyles and 'traditional' practices are identified either as part of the 'threat' to, or as a valuable commodity within, the parks. The paper concludes by suggesting that to understand the way in which these routinised practices give rise to patterns of inclusion and exclusion and how these reflect continuity with the region's colonial and apartheid history is deserving and requisite of further analysis.

Securitization and Routines of (In)security[5]

In an introductory book chapter on an international political sociology of security, Didier Bigo argues that two questions are of primary importance, "what security *means* and what security *does*".[6] Such an approach is interested in "discourses of security and constructions of danger" which have enabled apparently liberal regimes to "create an atmosphere that both justifies and necessitates...*illiberal* practices".[7] Traditionally,-in IR and political science at least- professionals of

---

[4] In a paper presented at the Association of American Geographers Annual Conference in Seattle, 2011 the author argued that it is the economic imperative that is ultimately privileged over the conservation agenda precisely because of the powerful framing narrative of the market in the development of southern African peace parks. See Barrett (2011).
[5] (In)security is used to indicate the dialogical relationship between security and insecurity. See Bigo (2008).
[6] Bigo (2008, 116). Emphasis added.
[7] Ibid.

politics including policymakers, government and state leaders, claim the authority to 'speak' security and thus invoke a 'politics of exception'[8] in which extraordinary measures are legitimated in response to a perceived existential threat to (state) security. However, in the contemporary era, the state is only one of a plethora of actors able to declare and frame the 'exception' in response to a variety of threats to a range of referents. Consequently, what has emerged is a "field of security relations, between security professionals, governmental and non-governmental institutions, the police, military, and private enterprise, across an increasingly *globalised* terrain".[9] Attention must therefore be given to the host of "transnational networks of bureaucracies and private agents who 'manage' the (in)security underpinning the exception"[10] in relation to a specific referent in a given context and, given the primary forces driving modernity, to the consumerist society whose routines frame "the condition of possibilities of these claims and their acceptance".[11]

In southern Africa, states have rarely had the exclusive authority to 'securitize' and yet the "secondary sites of securitization" represented by various interest groups- including, for example, neoliberal conservationists - have provided an "analytical frame that views the progress promised by the state as the best form of protection" and thus "inculcate(s) the region's life with the values of modernity".[12] Thus, although elements of neoliberalism may appear to undermine state authority, the state continues to be a major vehicle through which other actors can pursue their own objectives and in doing so, bolster the state in the process. Put differently, transnational networks compete to frame and prioritise the perceived threat agenda, the course of action required to address it and the mechanisms necessary to maintain the security of the referent and to defeat or contain the elements causing the threat.[13] However, they may do so independently of or in collaboration with the state. Information generated through increasingly sophisticated non-human technologies of communication and surveillance, for example, and in relation to conservation, global positioning systems (GPS) and geographic information systems (GIS), validates their claims and actions. Furthermore, these 'managers' of insecurity share a complimentary amalgam of bureaucratic, technocratic, and quasi-scientific language in the creation of 'knowledge truths' about the particular issue, event, or actor(s) posing a threat- in this case, to the region's biodiversity. This

---

[8] Gorgio Agamben's (1998) writing on the 'state of exception' has been particularly influential in poststructuralist security studies and analysis of the War on Terror, see for example Aradau (2004), the issue of immigration, see for example Huysmans and Buonfino (2008), and the role of borders and spaces of exclusion, see for example, Basaran (2008), Vaughan-Williams (2008), and Vaughan-Williams (2009). The 'politics of exception' refers to discourses of insecurity and exceptional political measures adopted or curtailed because of the invocation of the 'emergency'.

[9] Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (2010, 69). Emphasis in the original.

[10] Bigo (2008, 116).

[11] Ibid, p128.

[12] Vale (2003, 165)

[13] Bigo (2008, 128).

often results in general categorisations and numerical abstractions about people and place void of context and the complicated nuances of human relations. It can also give rise to the routinised 'management' and 'control' of them, a process that invariably excludes those lacking the capacity or grammar to engage. Thus, the enunciation of 'security', the network of actors involved in framing it and the illiberal practices legitimated in its name are all vital elements of the 'process of securitization'.[14] However, the process also requires the successful convincing of a target audience-often, but not always the public or sections thereof- that the threat is 'real', pressing and therefore requisite of an extraordinary response. The security enunciator's success in part relies on their "social and symbolic capital",[15] and ability to create effectively a sense of urgency by evoking a range of emotions including, for example, feelings of danger, fear, risk, or worry. Arguably, however, an array of other emotions including, for example, hope and optimism about the success of the measures employed to realise the desired (security) objectives, can also be prevalent. This is arguably the case with the convergence of fears and aspirations at the global, regional, and local levels concerning biodiversity conservation and socio-economic development, convergent in the establishment of peace parks in southern Africa.

The pursuit of 'security' by an actor(s) in relation to a specific issue invariably invokes a response from and consequences for others – some of whom may be constructed as part of the perceived threat agenda. Rather than security being either positive or negative, it is considered as dialogical and is, for Bigo at least, about 'sacrifice'. This 'sacrifice' however, does not guarantee that the pursuit of security will be 'successful' or that it will elucidate prior knowledge about what the consequences of securitization may ultimately be. This is because of not only the contextual specificities of each securitization process, but also the different implications these processes have for various actors. Actors including the enunciator(s), audience and third parties, the latter of whom often become 'victims' of the securitization process, particularly when it directly contributes to their insecurity.[16] Therefore, when discourses of environmental security/conservation invoke fears of global ecological collapse, its enunciation- supported by scientific 'facts'- may result in the public sanctioning of illiberal practices of control and management which also cause insecurity, at least for some. Overshadowed by the fixation on the 'exception', these processes are embedded in the daily routines of governance, appearing both 'natural' and 'logical' and thus tacitly accepted, even demanded. Consequently, this can reinforce the power and authority of the actors who seek to

---

[14] Securitization theory is primarily associated with the 'Copenhagen School' and in particular the work of Ole Wæver (1995). For Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde (1998), securitization is the process by which a given economic, environmental, military or societal issue is declared an existential threat to state security and thus promoted to the realm of emergency politics.

[15] Bigo (2008, 125).

[16] Bigo (2008, 125-126). For a fuller discussion of the dialogical nature of security see Bigo (2001) and (Bigo and Tsoukala 2008).

benefit from their use, whilst shielding them from rigorous critique. It is therefore necessary to uncover and understand the management routines of (in)security and the implications thereof in order to appreciate fully what security *does* for the actors who enunciate it and for the audiences they seek to convince. Moreover, what it *does* for "the victims of the practices of violence, surveillance, and punishment taken in the name of protection and security".[17] With regard to peace parks in southern Africa, this requires an understanding of the perceived threat and the context in which the parks emerged and it is to this that the paper now briefly turns.

Securitizing the Environment

   The global environmental lobby has proven adept at sustaining issues of environmental 'security' on the international political agenda since the late 1980s. A process facilitated by the proliferation of environmental governance networks, advancements in scientific and communication technologies and the prevalence of 'Western' political and economic institutions. The momentary crisis in orthodox security thinking which led to a 'broadening' of the traditional remit of security studies and practice to include threats posed *b*y and *to* the environment in the immediate post-Cold War period could also be referenced.[18] Subsequently, a wide range of state and non-state actors have framed environmental degradation- including deforestation, desertification, and biodiversity loss- as an existential threat to global ecological integrity, the welfare of humanity and the prevailing economic order.   Combined, these fears have helped to generate an unprecedented sense of permanence to the need for environmental protection and conservation.   This is significant if compared, for example, to previous efforts to bring global political and public focus to specific environmental issues such as 'global warming', 'acid rain', and 'ozone-depletion'. These issues did not sustain political and public attention in the same way that 'climate change' and its associated challenges have in the contemporary era. The Copenhagen and Cancun Summits of 2010 and the publication of the 'Stern for Nature'[19] in the same year, highlighting the challenges posed by continued and increasing biodiversity loss, are indicative of this continuity.[20] However, the apparent permanence of large-scale environmental protection and conservation initiatives such as peace parks may not endure given that they are framed by and reliant on an inherently volatile economic

---

[17] Bigo (2008, 118).

[18] Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde (1998, particularly Chapter Four). Although rarely was the environment the only or primary referent in such cases. Rather, the environment was perceived as posing a threat to the state- because of natural disasters earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, tsunamis, and so forth- or because its degradation or abundance could undermine economic and political stability by triggering and sustaining conflict.

[19] Jowit (2010).

[20] Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2010).

system. At present however, widespread uncertainty about the temporal (and spatial) distribution of the perceived 'crisis' and its implications helps to sustain global attention to a host of inter-connected environmental issues, including biodiversity loss.

Increasingly, a growing number and range of environmental governance networks are seeking to influence and direct political and policy priorities for effective environmental protection and conservation at the regional and global level. The PPF, World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), IUCN, and WWF (SA) are some of the primary actors involved in framing the environmental challenges facing southern Africa and the prescribed solutions for its rescue.[21] Each relies on advancements in communication and surveillance technology to collect, produce and record dataset 'evidence' to inform knowledge about the state of the region's biodiversity. The authority afforded to this 'evidence' legitimates policy prescriptions, particularly by regional actors such as the PPF, who have gained respect as 'leaders' in biodiversity conservation in global governance networks.[22] In addition, sustained fears about the 'future' have legitimated the search for and implementation of tangible and effective localised 'solutions' to global biodiversity loss. Thus, developing countries are under pressure to pursue 'sustainable' economic development where more developed states historically have not.[23] Consequently, peace parks have been mooted as "one of the key solutions to challenge the sustainable management of transfrontier eco-systems and natural resources" in southern Africa,[24] and they now incorporate an estimated fifty percent of the region's formally protected areas.[25] Thus, through the development of conservation land-use options and regional scale eco-tourism, peace parks are an exceptional measure to "arrest the poverty/environment cycle"[26] in southern Africa.

---

[21] Spierenburg and Wels (2010).

[22] The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) awarded former President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki and the people of South Africa with a with the Africa award for the country's "commitment to cultural and environmental diversity", United National Environment Programme (2005). A year earlier, Dr Anton Rupert received the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute's Freedom from Want Medal. In a letter to Rupert from the Foundation it said, "[y]our extraordinary leadership in protecting the magnificent beauty and wildlife resources of Africa has led to achievements for which your countrymen and people everywhere will be eternally grateful. Your vision transcended frontiers. Out of your efforts, the Peace Parks Foundation emerged which has combined economic opportunity for Africans while preserving the natural heritage of the continent. The partnership you established with the legendary Mandela to accomplish this purpose has been an inspiration to the world, giving hope for peace", Peace Parks Foundation (2006, 4).

[23] This has both fuelled and given legitimacy to the search for 'African solutions to African problems'- an ethos prevalent in the PPF narratives. See for example, Peace Parks Foundation (2009, 1).

[24] Rabson Dhlodhlo, Project Manager of the Maloti-Drakensberg Transfrontier Project cited in Blandy (2006).

[25] Myburgh (n.d.).

[26] Blandy (2006).

Southern African Peace Parks

The development of peace parks and southern African peace parks in particular is well documented.[27] In brief, peace parks are not unique to southern Africa and when first tabled by the South African Afrikaner business tycoon and conservationist, Anton Rupert, to the then President of Mozambique- Joaquim Chissano- in May 1990, they were already established as an appropriate biodiversity conservation option in international environmental governance circles.[28] Rupert, then President of the Southern African Nature Foundation (now WWF South Africa), sought to 'recreate' the historic migration routes for the region's wildlife disrupted by political state boundaries by linking 'islands' of biodiversity through a series of vast transfrontier parks and corridors across southern Africa. Amended in the early 1990s by the World Bank's Global Environmental Fund (GEF) to include socio-economic development objectives, Rupert's dream was first realised with the official opening of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (TFP) between South Africa and Botswana in 2000.[29] The PPF website now lists ten southern African peace parks, with twenty-two potential sites identified across the region.[30] The largest, the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park, covers 35,000 km², and is part of the much larger Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area covering a staggering 100,000 km². This is however, set to be succeeded by the Kavango-Zambezi (Kaza) Transfrontier Park following the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed in 2006 between Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe, and which will potentially cover an estimated 287 132 km².[31] Each park offers a unique biodiversity experience as well as a range of 'adventure' and 'cultural' experiences for tourists visiting the region.

Southern Africa's rich and varied biodiversity has undoubtedly made peace parks an appealing option through which to contribute toward (global) environmental rescue and regional economic prosperity with the development of large-scale (eco)tourism ventures. Moreover, and at the local and regional level, they could help to address the legacy of under-development and structural poverty created through colonial- and in the case of South Africa, apartheid- rule and to overcome historically rooted regressive constructions of Africa and Africans.[32] The creation of the parks therefore promises to deliver a host of benefits. For example, an increase in state revenue and economic returns, the expansion of private entrepreneurialism; the promotion of inter-state peace

---

[27] See, for example, Ali (2007), Hanks (2003), Peace Parks Foundation, *Origins* (n.d.), Sandwith, et al.(2001), Thorsell (1991), Westling (1993) and Wolmer (2003).
[28] Peace Parks Foundation,*Origins* (n.d.).
[29] Southern African Development Community (n.d.).
[30]Myburgh (n.d.).
[31]Fox (2009). The KAZA TFCA is still 'in development'.
[32]A critical discussion of the capacity of peace parks to deliver the 'African Renaissance' can be found in van Amerom and Büscher (2005).

and cooperation; international recognition and legitimacy, a role in international environmental governance decision-making, socio-economic development and employment opportunities for local communities; and the long term preservation of rich and potentially rare biodiversity as a global 'public good'.[33]

Whilst the parks may be spatially located outside of the 'West' they are however informed by the 'Weberian routines of rationality' and consumerism prevalent in 'Western' modernity which have dominated global relations since the decline of international bipolarity at the end of the 1980s. This has found expression through a quasi-scientific economic discourse that has proffered the 'defence' and 'security' of the environment and elements thereof through its commodification. The growing trend toward 'eco-friendly', 'green consumerism', 'corporate social responsibility', and 'natural capital investment' opportunities has increasingly framed the search for 'effective' solutions to environmental degradation.[34] Put differently, there has been a 'neoliberalising' of the environment and in southern Africa (and elsewhere) of nature too.[35] The potential materialization of the aforementioned aspirations has therefore led to the adoption of market-based solutions for biodiversity preservation and conservation.[36] Consequently, there has been a degree of synergy among the region's states, the southern African Development Community (SADC), and key conservation actors, including the PPF, WWF (South Africa), and the IUCN, in the construction of a 'marketable' vision of the parks. However, this vision must be continually re-articulated and 'made real' in the experiences of those visiting the parks in order to secure their long-term viability in a world of fickle consumerism.

The Construction of a Vision

The 'vision' of southern African peace parks constructed by its advocates, particularly in the narratives of the PPF and Boundless, has several key elements. In one respect, it showcases the aesthetic natural beauty and exceptionalism of the wildlife and landscape of the region and highlights the wealth and variety of biodiversity. The aesthetic appeal is accompanied by a sense of mythical and historic splendour both in terms of the 'timeless' presence of nature and the cultural significance of the areas for 'traditional' indigenous communities. In another, it involves the

---

[33] Sandwith, et al. (2001) discuss the potential advantages of transboundary conservation initatives in greater detail.

[34] Sandilands (1993) highlights the use of 'green' labelling to sell capitalist growth to consumers. See also Carrier (2010). In relation to protected areas see Igoe, Neves and Brockington (2010) and conservation more broadly, MacDonald (2010).

[35] Igoe and Brockington (2007).

[36] See Dressler and Büscher (2008).

constant articulation and performativity of the vision and its 'successes' in meeting their collaborative conservation and socio-economic development objectives as discussed in the section to follow. It gains life through a combination of narratives: a constant articulation of the goals, the visual and descriptive invocation of the landscape, wildlife, and peoples, and the tangible realisation of the vision 'on the ground'. This section of the paper looks specifically at the creation of this 'vision'.

Founded by Anton Rupert, the PPF has since its inception positioned itself as *the* coordinating body in the establishment and construction of southern African peace parks. Benefitting from the profile of its visionary- Rupert- the PPF has proven adept at drawing in huge amounts of donor funding, the support of high profile political figures, including Nelson Mandela and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. [37] It has also been pivotal in securing the continued support of southern African states- although sometimes more rhetorical than practical-, and international 'approval' for the development of the parks. Working with regional states, the PPF appear to have the 'social and symbolic capital' required to convince its external and state level audiences of the viability and necessity of the parks.[38] This is evidenced not only be the number of parks in various stages of development but also by the PPF's authority as part of a wider network of conservation actors in influencing government policy on key areas of concern. For example, it has recently led the campaign to prevent coal-mining operations near to the Mapungubwe National Park in South Africa. It also gained 'NGO Observer Status' at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Cancun in December 2010.[39]

Through their website, campaign videos and annual reports, the PPF construct a vision of the parks that, as already indicated, draws on the aesthetic beauty and richness of the 'timeless' natural scenery, wildlife and cultural diversity of the southern African landscape. It is in the descriptions of each park that these aesthetic elements of the vision are explicit. The Greater Limpopo TFCA is, for example, described as the "world's greatest animal kingdom" – a phrase that has since been repeated in the Boundless campaign and in media coverage of the park.[40] Globally, the Lumbobo

---

[37] Peace Parks Foundation, *Origins* (n.d.)

[38] Spierenburg and Wels (2010) explore the 'social capital' of the late Anton Rupert and the late Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands in attracting funding and support for transfrontier conservation in southern Africa and how influential they have been in framing conservation strategies. The PPF has continued to attract substantial funding from European state bodies and from the South African government. See Peace Parks Foundation, *Donors of Peace Parks Foundation* (n.d.) for more information as well as the organisation's annual reports and financial statements.

[39] Peace Parks Foundation, *Climate Change Programme in Southern African TFCAs* (n.d.)

[40] Peace Parks Foundation, *Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park*(n.d.), Ministry of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (2001), and African Wildlife Foundation, (2002).

TFCA and Resource Area between Mozambique, South Africa and Swaziland, is "one of the most striking areas of biodiversity".[41]   It is however, the narratives of the Kgalagadi and the Ai/Ais Richtersveld which speak to the idea of a 'boundless wilderness' most directly. Of the Kgalagadi, the PPF describes a landscape relatively freed from "human interference", which they claim is a rarity on the continent.[42] The Boundless website presents an even more idyllic vision of the Kgalagadi, as "the largest expanse of continuous sand mass in the world... [A] remarkable place of shimmering heat and sand that seemingly stretches beyond the horizon, a great and humbling space whose vastness makes us realise that we are all but grains of sand in the grand scheme of things." [43]   The /Ai/Ais Richtersveld is described as "spanning some of the most spectacular arid and desert mountain scenery in Southern Africa", featuring the world's second largest Canyon, that of the Fish River.[44]

More explicitly a 'marketing' campaign, Boundless speaks directly to its audience, inviting them to "be mesmerised" by the Kgalagadi's scenery and "[s]tare down at ancient history weathered by an eternity of sun, wind and strong river currents".[45] Boundless also emphasises the exceptionalism of the wildlife and landscape of the parks, and their human inhabitants with reference given to the "world's fastest animal on land", "the world's heaviest flying bird", the "unique Kalahari Lion",[46] and in the Maloti-Drakensburg TFCA, "the highest falls in southern Africa, home of the *critically endangered* bearded vulture".[47] The potential jewel of the peace parks, the Kavango Zambezi, embraces the "largest inland delta in the world, the biggest transfrontier conservation area in the world, breathtaking falls, and the largest contiguous population of African elephant and the highest concentrations of wildlife on the African continent".[48] The punctuation of the narrative with high quality images profiling the stunning cultural and natural beauty of the parks turns the vision into something more visually captivating, also echoed in the performance of the 'Boundless Song'. The song depicts the region's wonders, the freedom with which animals roam and people collaborate, and invites tourists to visit a 'boundless' southern Africa.[49]

It is not only the articulation and visual representation of 'wilderness' that informs the vision. Much of the PPF narrative centres on giving life to a former epoch. For the more "intrepid

---

[41] Peace Parks Foundation, *Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation and Resource Area* (n.d.)
[42] A comment which appears to contradict the fact that San communities have lived in the Kalahari for centuries.
[43] Boundless Southern Africa, *Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park* (n.d.)
[44] Peace Parks Foundation, */Ai/Ais/ Richtersveld Transfrontier Park* (n.d.)
[45] Boundless Southern Africa, *Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park* (n.d.)
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid. Emphasis added.
[48] Boundless Southern Africa, *Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area* (n.d.)
[49] Boundless Southern Africa, *Boundless Song* (2009)

adventurer", they suggest climbing down the "350 million year old and erosion-rich Orange River gorge" abundant with "history, folklore and grandeur" to "touch the passage of time".[50]   The invocation of pre-colonial times, to ancient African civilizations in the spirit of Thabo Mbeki's African Renaissance[51] is also a central 'attraction' of the parks. For those seeking to "experience a kinship with past generations", the Greater Mapungubwe TFCA is constructed as the "cultural TFCA", and an ideal destination in which to explore Iron Age sites on all sides of the Botswana-South Africa-Zimbabwe borders.[52]   These sites represent "a highly sophisticated civilization which traded with Arabia, Egypt, India, and China".[53]   This representation challenges regressive colonial constructions of indigenous Africans as 'backward' and 'uncivilised'. The Maloti-Drakensberg TFCA too has cultural significance, with the "world's greatest outdoor gallery" and the "largest and most concentrated group of rock paintings in Africa south of the Sahara".[54]   Implicitly, the bonds between these historic communities are invoked as transcendent of the "modern international borders" which have hindered the unity of their decedents in recent centuries, particularly during and since colonialism. Yet, the narrative gives an impression that this history is still alive, in the San of the Kalahari, and the in the Ai/Ais Richtersveld – one of the last regions where the "traditional lifestyle" of the Nama communities is being "*preserved".*[55]

There is a dualism in the construction of African identities playing out in the creation of the peace parks vision. On the one hand, external scientific narratives have been used to legitimate ecosystem scale conservation initiatives, exemplifying a move away from community based natural resource management (CBNRM) and a return to 'fortress conservation' reminiscent of colonial practices, albeit more recently with a pro-community veneer.[56]   On the other hand, and in an era where human and minority rights have gained substantial international attention, states are arguably more sensitive to demonstrating recognition of and support for these communities. This is made more appealing when indigenous communities and their cultural 'traditions' can become a revenue earner. An entry from the Boundless Expedition diary illustrates how, in this particular case, the San's way of life is romanticised:

> *At sunset we walk across the pan to meet these delightful San people, like early hunter*
> *gatherers we squat around the coals of a small fire on the Kalahari sand where amongst*

---

[50] Boundless Southern Africa, */Ai/Ais/ Richtersveld Transfrontier Park* (n.d.)
[51] Thabo Mbeki (2004)first presented his idea of an African Renaissance in his now infamous "I am an African" speech in which he sought to challenge regressive constructions of Africa and Africans by invoking visions of a culturally and intellectually rich pre-colonial continent and the potential within Africa to deliver its own development.
[52] Peace Parks Foundation, *Greater Mapungubwe* (n.d.)
[53] Ibid.
[54] Peace Parks Foundation, *Maloti-Drakensberg Conservation and Development Area* (n.d.)
[55] Peace Parks Foundation, */Ai/Ais/ Richtersveld Transfrontier Park* (n.d.)
[56] Dressler and Büscher (2008).

rudimentary grass and stick shelters, we watch the light golden brown complexioned women with smiling wrinkles and twinkling laughing eyes, using their tiny hands to fashion ostrich shell necklaces and bangles. Mashozi, who's been sitting with an old man, hands me a necklace made from a piece of gemsbok bone decorated with a burnt etching of a naked hunter with a bow.[57]

The descriptions of local communities and their 'traditions' in the diary entries are part of the Boundless central commitment to promoting "Nature, Community and Culture";[58] a marketing strategy that speaks to both conservation and development objectives. In a promotional video images of the landscape and wildlife are set to a soundtrack of spirited music and interspersed with title pages, one of which reads, "[where communities and cultures are supported and celebrated".[59] The PPF argues that the "[n]ational boundaries proclaimed at the Treaty of Berlin in 1884....cut across tribal and clan groupings as well wildlife migration routes, fragmenting ecosystems and *threatening* biodiversity" while the establishment of peace parks "strives to correct these past injustices".[60] The 'opening' of migratory routes to enable the region's wildlife, particularly elephants, to roam freely, as they have "since the dawn of time"[61] is thus a symbolic transcendence of this violent socio-economic and political history, and one which is again commonly referenced in the media 'progress' reports of the parks' developments. However, only wildlife and the region's tourists are able to move freely within the parks- local communities are restricted to peripheral conservancies or land outside the parks altogether.

Making the Vision Reality

The sensory construction of the peace parks vision is not however necessarily sufficient either to sustain consumer and investor attention nor the parks' legitimacy as an extraordinary but crucial response to the conservation and development challenges for which they were designed. The aesthetic natural and cultural allure of the parks may create an idealised vision but it requires constant articulation and performativity for it to become a marketable and tangible 'reality'. This performativity is achieved through a series of discursive practices at a range of levels – from the state down to the daily functioning of the park which are then promoted as 'milestones', 'progress' or 'success' stories. So for example, at the inter-state level the publicised celebrations surrounding the signing of Memorandums of Understanding (MoU) or treaties between collaborating states gives tangible expression to the parks. They help to validate the PPF claims that the parks are an "an

---

[57] Gertruida (2009).
[58] This is the Boundless tagline.
[59] Boundless Southern Africa, *Boundless 2008* (2008).
[60] Peace Parks Foundation, *Why Peace Parks?* (n.d.). Emphasis added.
[61] Peace Parks Foundation, *Lower Zambezi- Mana Pools TFCA* (n.d.).

African success story", representing an "exemplary process of partnership between governments and the private sector" and where "peace reigns between the relevant countries" as evidenced by the "free movement of tourists and wildlife across international borders".[62] Thus, the creation of the parks, albeit on paper, helps to underpin the vision and itself represents a remarkable achievement for a region with such a turbulent and violent inter-state history.

Of course, when the bureaucratic and legal processes have begun this permits action on the ground to bring the parks into existence. Once created, tourists can experience the 'wildernesses' and rich biodiversity of the region first hand. The possibilities are already hinted at in the construction of the vision, as the desire to attract tourists is an explicit objective. To entice them, a range of activities are promoted including, for example, the possibility for those "enjoying 4x4 trails" to "flock" to the Kgalagadi to "experience the Kalahari's tranquillity".[63] When this becomes a genuine possibility, a lived experience for those visiting the parks, it helps to solidify the vision by making it 'real'. The performativity of the vision has however been given most vivid expression and tangible realisation through the Boundless 2009 Expedition led by one of "Africa's most colourful modern day explorers",[64] Kinglsey Holgate. The Expedition traversed the continent from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic linking "9 southern African Countries, 7 Transfrontier Conservation Areas, more than 30 Game and Nature Reserves and the Communities living in and adjacent to these areas"[65] and has been documented on the Boundless website. The aim was to "boost Southern Africa's magnificent parks...removing the barriers that have not only prevented communities from benefiting from resources in the area, but also blocked the natural migration routes of wildlife.[66] 'Mad Mike', one of the Expedition team-members, said that it had "helped keep the Peace Parks Foundation's vision of Transfrontier Conservation alive, mapped, photographed, filmed, documented, raised awareness for and opened up what we are confident has the potential to become accepted internationally as one of the greatest coast-to-coast 4x4 adventure routes in the world".[67]

The tag line of Boundless- "open spaces, unlimited beauty, [and] infinite possibilities" – finds practical validation in the expedition and the reporting thereof and offers an insight into the 'reality' of the region that visitors may enjoy. The diary entries gives 'life' to the sense of adventure and the unity of 'nature, community, and culture' in action as this abstract illustrates:

---

[62] Peace Parks Foundation, *What Are Peace Parks Programmes? The TFCAs* (n.d.).
[63] Peace Parks Foundation, *Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park* (n.d.).
[64] Holgate (2011).
[65] Boundless Southern Africa, *The Boundless Expedition*, (n.d.)
[66] Media Club South Africa (2009)
[67] Rumble (n.d.)

>   *We're still zigzagging across Mama Africa, and she's beautiful as ever, as now out of Caprivi and back into beautiful Botswana, wild dogs at Savuti, we head for the River Khwai. The road is flooded, difficult going, abnormally high water, deep river crossings – we camp on the riverbank.... Next day .... – another great community day to link nature, culture and community. Speeches in the 'Kgotla', the chief's meeting place, the gathering of Khwai River water to be added to the symbolic expedition calabash, this time by two lovely traditional Basarwa San ladies. There's singing, dancing, feasting......Onto Xakanaxa in Moremi Game Reserve – more flooded river crossings, elephants galore, a great leopard sighting – no. 6 on this journey – the area is always a paradise for wildlife. Ross' voice over the radio: "Another leopard across the mopani pole bridge under the sausage tree." That's no. 7 – let's face it, the freedom of a 4x4 wildlife journey across Botswana is a must for every adventurer – a hardwood fire at night, the unfenced sounds of the wild, the roar of a lion, red-billed francolins heralding the dawn, the cackle of a hyena, the cry of a jackal, and the true Transfrontier travellers, the ever present elephant who need no boundaries – some 250,000 of these silent giants that wander across the Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Park, shared by Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.*[68]

The extract is one of many reinforcing the idea of a 'boundless' southern Africa being actually experienced not only by the free roaming animals but also by actual people, actual adventurers of 'wild' Africa. The Boundless Expedition thus transforms the 'vision' into a lived reality for the expeditionists and for those it targets with its promotional material. Supporting such ventures, better still, actively participating in such ventures, celebrates the apparent role (eco)tourism can play in helping local communities and people be 'uplifted' out of poverty which otherwise causes them to "exhaust" the resources upon which "their and *our* survival depends".[69] As the PPF's former Chief Executive, Prof Willem van Riet, stated, "[w]ith the worldwide growth in the eco-tourism industry, peace parks offer an opportunity to optimise the abundance of fauna and flora that Africa has to offer - to the benefit of local communities".[70] Peace parks therefore offer investors and tourists an insight into what, to employ a contemporary cliché, might be referred to as the 'feel-good-factor' of their investment. As a result, it further reinforces the validity of market-based conservation solutions, making critique of the neoliberal order underpinning it- and the cause of so much environmental degradation and poverty- difficult.

There is another element to the performativity of the vision, which not only underscores the physical manifestation of the parks but their potential. The PPF's 'success' stories highlight the progress being made in the development of the parks, and thus the realisation of the vision and the importance for continued 'investment' in order to 'secure' the region's biodiversity and cultural heritage for future generations. Thus, the opening of community owned or managed eco-tourism

---

[68] Gertruida (2009).
[69] Rabson Dhlodhlo cited in Blandy (2006). Emphasis added.
[70] Cited in Blandy (2006).

ventures, the spread of innovative and sustainable conservation land-use options are celebrated as milestones in the realisation of the vision and balancing of conservation and development needs.[71] As such, the PPF highlights examples of community enthusiasm to "join the wildlife business",[72] and of "integrated development plans (IDPs) whereby "all affected communities as stakeholders identified their needs and priorities for development".[73] It speaks of efforts to 'manage' human-nature conflict by, for example, providing communities with electric fences to protect their crops from marauding elephants.[74] In addition, they have 'invested' in education and training initiatives relevant to the management of the 'wildlife' and the development of the region's hospitality services.

These achievements are reinforced by statistical 'evidence' about the size of the parks, the most desirable land-use options, and the amount of fencing erected or dismantled, animal populations and migration patterns, and so forth. Increasingly sophisticated scientific and technological date gathering and visual representation techniques track, monitor, and record this information. For example, the PPF has embraced GIS technologies to 'map' the landscape. It argues that "without the use of this technology" the demarcation of land use zones and park boundaries would be "extremely difficult if not impossible".[75] Craig Beech, GIS Manager at the PPF, argues that GIS provide the "language" through which cross data-set analysis can create "visual-spatial benchmarks" with which to measure progress and "illustrate the significant role Peace Parks can play in lessening the impact man has had on the environment".[76] Furthermore, that they help to create "visual material that would illustrate and allow [them] to sell this concept of regional collaboration through transfrontier conservation".[77] The intention is to provide a "monitoring and evaluation system which is being offered to ascertain the condition of the environment" and run "predictive models offering pertinent information and scenarios to decision makers".[78] He goes on:

> *[b]y producing and refining geographical information from spatial models, an adaptive management practice can be supported for the land-management authorities. This will help to facilitate the Peace Parks concept, and to ensure that it is accepted as a life-changing, sustainable land-use option for local communities. In this monitoring and evaluation process*

---

[71] Poverty has been widely accepted as a major threat to environmental integrity. See a review of the debate in Duraiappah (1996).
[72] Peace Parks Foundation, *Lubombo Transfrontier Conservation and Resource Area* (n.d.).
[73] Peace Parks Foundation, *Kavango-Zambezi* (n.d.). IDPs seems an unfortunate acronym given that communities have been 'relocated' because of the parks.
[74] Peace Parks Foundation, *Greater Mapungubwe* (n.d.).
[75] Beech (n.d.).
[76] Beech (2006).
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid.

these data and information offer donors and funders current, scientifically accurate visual information of that which their resources contribute toward.[79]

However, as discussed in the next section, these processes can also play a role in legitimating exclusionary practices.

The continual re-articulation and tangible expression of the peace parks vision is one that seeks to draw legitimacy from a play on fear about environmental degradation and specifically biodiversity loss, and hopes about the future security and prosperity of the region's people and states. All of which is framed by the discourse of neoliberalism and dependent upon the successful commodification of nature and culture in the region. It becomes *the* version of 'reality' when it is believed or uncritically accepted by the 'market', and especially in this case, (eco)tourists and capital investors. It is, however, only a partial reality, one specifically designed to match the ever-volatile trends in consumer markets by at once invoking familiar constructions of Africa which are the same time different and 'other' to their own daily lives. It is a dream-like illusion in that it seeks to construct a 'reality' that consumers and investors are willing to 'buy' but which obscures from view the highly subjective and complex realities of their existence. However, when market-based solutions are presented- and globally they increasingly are- as the most logical and effective means through which to achieve a host of environmental conservation and development needs, the actual 'reality' of the lived life of the parks can be easily obscured. [80]

Policing the Vision, Creating the Reality

The sustainability and security of the 'vision' and its realisation in the performativity of the parks requires constant control and management of the actual and total 'reality' or 'lived experience' of the parks. To reiterate the insight offered by Bigo above, this reading of the parks' 'reality' suggests that the structures of neoliberalism and consumerist society are framing the "the condition of possibilities" [81] of the vision and its acceptance. Put differently, the logic of consumerism and market-based solutions has given rise to new processes of 'control' and 'management' in the creation and maintenance of the region's frontiers. The elements of this 'reality' often obscured by the vision are those which discipline the landscape and its people to conform to the vision and which extract or suppress the activities of those perceived to threaten it. From this perspective, the lived

---

[79] Ibid.

[80] McAfee (1999)discussed this trend in the World Bank and the development of the Convention on Biodiversity Conservation and the way in which such processes obscure the spatial and social contexts because they locate conservation 'best- practice' within international (consumer) markets.

[81] Bigo (2008, 128)

life of the parks are not 'unbounded wildernesses' epitomising "harmony between humans and nature"[82] as constructed in the vision, but actually highly controlled, managed, and contentious spaces of inclusion and exclusion. Security and insecurity, inclusion and exclusion, although not binary, are underpinned by routine bureaucratic, scientific, technological practices. In the context of peace parks, these Weberian routines of rationalisation find expression in the mapping, monitoring, and surveillance practices designed to make the management of the parks more predictable, efficient, and controllable and embedded in a 'global governmentality' which itself promotes the "politics of inclusion and exclusion".[83]

Brosius and Russell argue, such processes may make peace parks more 'legible' but they also "distance 'bioplanners' from the effects of their interventions" whilst constructing the 'threat' to biodiversity and those posing it in a particular way.[84] They argue that the "relationship between the technical and the political" is essential to understanding patterns of inclusion and exclusion, particularly as the 'evidence' produced helps to ascribe roles to actors and 'victims' of the conservation agendas.[85] So, for example, the cartographic legacy in the region is replicated through transfrontier parks- albeit through physical rather than political representations- as it was in the colonial construction of national parks. A legacy that historically, and in the present, works in the interests of the state and elite actor interests. The launch of the PPF Climate Change Programme has further enhanced the justification – based on 'risk assessments' and 'mitigation feasibility studies'- to reduce agricultural land-use options in favour of "conservation agriculture initiatives" with the aim of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.[86]

Furthermore, if one accepts Beech's argument that GIS provides a common language for the network of environmental governance actors, it is complimented by a range of catch-phrases infused with neoliberal ideology such as 'eco-tourism', 'community-empowerment', 'upliftment' and "stakeholder participation". These words are as exclusionary as they sound inclusionary and ones that have huge market appeal but often lack substance precisely because the 'evidence' underpinning the chosen conservation strategies is framed by a highly prescriptive scientific discourse and technical process that is itself exclusionary. Yet such consequences can appear logical and necessary, even desirable, and thus tacitly accepted as requisite for the vision's success. For without effective 'management' of the lived life of the parks, the vision and all that it promises is continually threatened. Thus, to borrow from the words of Tosa, "neoliberal governmentality

---

[82] Peace Parks Foundation, *Why Peace Parks?* (n.d.)
[83] Tosa (2009, 414)
[84] Brosius and Russell (2003, 48-49)
[85] Ibid, p.49
[86] Peace Parks Foundation, *Climate Change Programme* (n.d.)

promotes securitization of supposedly risky groups on the periphery" [87] and the adoption of illiberal practices in the pursuit of security of the referent- in this case, the vision of the peace parks.

The establishment of the parks has arguably increased the monitoring and control of human transience in the border-zones of the region. Whilst these spaces represent the boundary lines of political authority and power of the respective states, historically, for the people who occupied them, they were also sites of continual crossing, trade, and exchange. As such, the political and identity markers ascribed by sovereignty were relatively insignificant on a day-to-day basis. Furthermore, the borderzones, even those previously designated as national parks, were also smuggler and migration routes for people seeking employment (or sanctuary) in the various economic hubs across the region, particularly in South Africa. Moving- rather than removing- the fences into neighbouring countries and sometimes by substantial distances is not only inhibitive but legitimates the need for greater 'policing' against would-be- poachers and smugglers which in turn increases the states' physical and symbolic power in the region's borderzones. This may be exacerbated if, as Peluso argues, states hijack the "ideology, legitimacy and technology" of conservation to increase or appropriate "their control over valuable resources and recalcitrant populations".[88] Arguably, the establishment of peace parks in the region has facilitated such a process, whether evidenced by the rituals of law-enforcement or the apparently non-violent but equally disciplining routines of the conservation lobby in the region, including the PPF, African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) and WWF (SA).

Each of the parks is accessible to visitors through park gates and, between countries, through checkpoints. These gates and checkpoints are not only symbolic but also practical manifestations of the need to create a space- the parks- where only animals and tourists roam freely. Thus, the practice of identity checks, recording of identification numbers, copying of passports, tracking of vehicle registrations, are all designed to exclude and monitor unwanted 'elements' as much as they are to include visitors. In the Ai/ Ais Richtersveld TFCA, the PPF has sought to "better control access from the south to the Namibian section of the Transfrontier Park" by constructing an "access control facility" at Gamkop.[89] In other words, such facilities allow the PPF and its workers to control entry in and out of the park- giving them the power to define who constitutes a 'legitimate' visitor, invariably determined by the requisition of payment for entry, which is affordable only by a select group of people. Another mechanism for inhibiting cross border transience has been the stipulation, in the Kgalagadi for example, that in order to 'cross' the border requires the booking of one night's

---

[87] Ibid.
[88] Peluso (1993, 199).
[89] Peace Parks Foundation, */Ai/Ais RichtersveldTransfrontier Park* (n.d.)

accommodation in the park to reduce commercial traffic along the new road linking the park sections.[90]

The construction of fencing to 'protect' tourists and animals and entry gates through which park visitors and workers pass do not therefore only symbolise access and the 'openness' of the spaces beyond, they are also clear makers of state and, it could be argued, PPF authority. One of the PPF 'progress' reports on Mapungubwe highlights the handing over of an "electric fence worth R250 000 to the Maramani community of Zimbabwe to help deter stray elephants from destroying crops in the Shashe irrigation scheme".[91] But it also goes on to implicitly demonstrate how such efforts are used to discipline the space and people; it is "the first step in the *proper* zoning and planning of the area that will encourage the reduction of dryland cropping in sensitive wildlife dispersal areas".[92] In other words, the electric fence 'protects' the Maramani's crops but also facilitates their continued adherence to particular farming and land-use options and to ensure they do not exploit the resources where the wildlife is being 'dispersed'. The 'boundless vision' is only realisable within the parks when fences create these highly managed and gated wildernesses. Furthermore, framed by the logic of the market, selective access is desirable because exclusivity adds a premium to commodities, particularly it could be argued, for eco-tourism 'experiences'. After all, the region's *exceptional* biodiversity is central to the development of the vision.

Ellis argues that an "element of coercion" is necessary in the construction of national- and therefore by extension, international parks.[93] A process, he argues which has continued in the post-apartheid era with South African Defence Forces (SADF) training of game wardens in the region and the *keovoet* counter-insurgency troops deployed for conservation purposes in Namibia in the 1990s.[94] Furthermore, the creation of the parks and the 'security' of both visitors and animals-particularly endangered animals- have increased border patrols and the establishment of anti-poaching units.[95] Historically too, conservation initiatives in the region have involved, rather controversially, the use of military and or police personnel. It is therefore unsurprising that some local communities continue to associate these parks with the violent history of police and military brutality and restricted access. The presence of armed and uniformed game wardens and rangers can exacerbate such perceptions and perpetuate distrust and unwillingness on the part of local

---

[90] Peace Parks Foundation, *Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park* (n.d.)
[91] Peace Parks Foundation, *Greater Mapungubwe* (n.d.)
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ellis (1994).
[94] Ibid, p67. Keovoet was a group of primarily Zulu personal set up by the apartheid security police as the main counter-insurgency unit in Namibia prior to its independence.
[95] Spenceley and Schoon (2007)

communities to engage with the vision in the prescribed manner and thus exposes them to greater disciplining in order to garner their conformity. As such, local communities are constructed as either "conservation heroes" or "environmental villains".[96] This is primarily because of policy decisions, underpinned by scientific 'evidence' about conservation 'best-practice', that have sought to exclude or inhibit local community access to the parks' resources and discredit indigenous knowledge about natural resource management – except, that is, unless it can be incorporated into tourism activities. This reinforces exclusionary practices that are based on racialised categorisations of people, which, it could be argued remain prominent in access and utilisation of land, particularly spaces designated for 'conservation'.[97] Moreover, it compounds historically rooted regressive constructions of indigenous Africans that locate them within and not as 'masters' of the land.[98]

    The production of abstract data says little about the complex nexus in human-wildlife relations or associations to landscape and culture. The pursuit of non-conservation land-use options is considered and framed as 'illegitimate' by the PPF and other ecosystem scale advocates and thus reinforces the colonial logic of the illegitimacy and undesirability of indigenous livelihood practices. Justified by the urgent need to preserve the region's biodiversity and find dispersal spaces for the Kruger's over-grown elephant population this can, and has, also led to the exclusion from the parks through 'relocation' – not all of which has been amicable.[99] The 'evidence' however is combined with and supports 'rational' arguments about human and animal security, further legitimating the process of relocation and removal. Even the restriction of access to resources is arguably a form of displacement[100] and echoes the historical exclusion of indigenous communities from their lands in pursuit of a more 'profitable' form of land-use. When communities have won land claim rights their "willingness to join the wildlife business"[101] – to reiterate the PPF comment- can be interpreted as a processes whereby the 'governed' engage in self-improvement as defined by prevailing

---

[96] Moore (2010, 19).

[97] McDermott Hughes (2002, 2) suggests "travel in Southern Africa is unavoidably coded by race".

[98] See, for example, Patrick Harries (2007) excellent analysis of the Swiss Missionary construction of the 'African' and 'Africa' and the relationship between European and African knowledge systems.

[99] In a critical analysis of the 'relocation' of 26,000 Mozambican from the land designated for the Limpopo National Park, later incorporated into the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area, Milgroom and Spierenburg (2008) argue that the restrictions on livelihood strategies resulted in an induced acceptance of relocation. Thus, the expansion of wildlife dispersal areas, park regulations and management procedures proved effective at excluding local communities from these spaces. Moore (2010, 19) also argues that environmental narratives are being used as "tools of persuasion" to garner African peoples compliance with international environmental agendas.

[100] Cernea (2006, 9). Curran, et al. (2009) have contended that in the last decade there has been no 'forced' relocation of peoples in the creation of national parks in Africa but the issue remains contenscious and as Cernea hihglights, displacement may not mean the physical exclusion from the land but denial of access to resources or imposed regulations about land-use options which inhibit 'tradiitional' livelihoods and result in 'relocation'.

[101] Peace Parks Foundation, *Lumbobo Transfrontier Conservation and Resource Area* (n.d.)

understandings of modernity. In doing so, they "voluntarily pursue the goals outlined by the hegemony by fabricating the desires and preferences of 'the governed', and even constructnig their own subjectivity".[102] In some respects, communities such as the Nama in the Ai/Ais Richtersveld, permitted to stay because they seek to maintain their 'traditional' lifestyle, have conformed to the whims of the market by complimenting the vision as a means of retaining their identity.

Yet, hunters who 'pay' the bounty to track and kill game, including large and rare mammals including elephant and lion are not considered illegitimate precisely because they operate within, and not against, the prevailing market logic.[103] Ironically, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands- close friend of Anton Rupert and co-founder of the PPF- was a keen hunter despite his high profile role in the WWF; the two were not, it seems, incompatible.[104] Although hunting is not given particular attention by the PPF or the Boundless campaign, it is arguably historically associated with the notion of 'explorers' and 'adventurers'. This is explicit in extracts from the Boundless Expedition blog and diaries employing the dominant narrative of adventure, exploration, and discovery of Africa by Europeans. Such invocations reinforce colonial narratives of European encounters with Africa and their categorisation and organisation of space and place. Furthermore, they continue to be the narratives most associated with 'wild', unexplored Africa, which holds appeal in cotemporary consumer markets. An extract from the Boundless Expedition blog is illustrative of the point:

> "[t]alking stick gets passed around the fire" and "stories of Livingstone and his Makololo porters who paddled down this river in 1855 to discover Mosi-oa-Tunya, the Smoke That Thunders, which he named after Queen Victoria, the legend of Nyaminyami, the Zambezi River God".[105]

And yet the PPF, and others , claiming to overcome the historical injustices of colonial and apartheid rule, do so through dependency on a volatile and unpredictable commodity driven economy that exposes both the region's people and the long term 'investment' in conservation susceptible to (Western) market ficklty.

Conclusion

Outside of critical academia, the 'neoliberalisation of nature' that has led to the marketing of a specific vision of southern African peace parks and the parks themselves as an extraordinary achievement for the region, are celebrated, particularly given the region's difficult and violent past. However, the successful commodification of the parks has not and cannot rely alone on the

---

[102] Tosa (2009, 427) discusses this idea of 'voluntary' subjugation in his analysis of the 'global slum'.

[103] Ironically, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands- close friend of Anton Rupert and co-founder of the PPF- was a keen hunter despite his high profile role in the WWF; the two were not, it seems, incompatible.

[104]Ellis (1994, 59)

[105] Holgate (2009).

construction of a marketable vision and its tangible expression in the activities of tourists, investors, and advocates such as the PPF and Boundless. To secure the vision, and thus the successful commodification requires the effective 'control' and 'management' of the parks physicality and the people who may threaten the realisation of the vision and its practical manifestation. Celebrated- regionally and internationally- the vision is the exception legitimating illiberal acts defined and justified by a network of elite and influential actors pre-occupied with the over-arching environmental and economic imperatives underpinning it. In order to make the vision 'real' therefore, not only requires the likes of Kingsley Holgate and the successful branding and marketing of the parks, it also requires the careful management of people, place and activities to ensure that they do not jeopardise the vision being sold.

As such, the commodification of nature and culture in pace parks in southern Africa create patterns of inclusion and exclusion, security and insecurity, which reinforce rather that break with historical processes of alienation, not only physically, but economically, politically and psychologically too. Moreover, while there appears to be a move towards 'engaging' local communities in the development and management of southern African peace parks- as evidenced by the PPF and Boundless materials- it is difficult not to see how these claims of inclusivity are actually also disciplining the people and landscape in line with the market. They are only inclusive if people conform to the 'vision' for which their participation is desired. As a result, the process of 'preserving' aspects of the region's cultural and natural history and lived life in line with the vision results in the 'sacrifice' of other elements. This 'sacrifice' is not only realised through explicitly coercive practices but also by the routinisation of bureaucratic and scientific techniques of management and control which are constructed as both necessary and desirable in the pursuit of conservation and, it is argued, socio-economic development. Thus, process of inclusion and exclusion have become naturalised in the daily management of the parks and legitimated by the overarching international and regional objectives for which the vision was constructed. Furthermore, it could be argued that the power of the state is reinforced through the creation of the exception in the marketing strategies. By blurring the lines of state control in the 'vision', the boundaries in reality become securitized in new ways. As such, the territorialisation of state power is in a sense not retreating but, aided by a network of conservation and economic actors, able to assert itself under the guise of economic and environmental security.

Bibliography

African Wildlife Foundation,. "Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park will Double Land for Wildlife-Including Kruger's 10,000 Elephants." *African Wildlife Foundation.* 12 August 2002. http://www.awf.org/content/headline/detail/1163 (accessed April 29, 2011).

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Ali, Saleem H., ed. *Peace Parks: Conservation and Conflict Resolution.* London, 2007.

Aradau, Claudia. "Security and the Democratic Scene: Desecuritization and Emancipation." *Journal of International Relations and Development* 7 (2004): 388-413.

Barrett, Georgina. "Utopian Dreams,Apocalyptic Nightmares and Market Panaceas." *Association of American Geographers Annual Conference.* Seattle, 12 April 2011.

Basaran, Tugba. "Security, Law, Borders: Spaces of Exclusion." *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (December 2008): 339-354.

Beech, Craig. "ESRI- ArcNews." *The Peace Parks Foundation Aided by GIS.* http://www.esri.com/news/arcnews/summer01articles/thepeaceparks.html (accessed May 7, 2011).

—. "Peace Parks Foundation GIS Lecture, Oxford University." *African Environments Programme, University of Oxford.* 19 September 2006. african-environments.ouce.ox.ac.uk/events/2006/190906.doc (accessed May 1, 2011).

Bigo, Didier. "International Political Sociology." Chap. 9 in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, edited by Paul D Williams, 116-129. London: Routledge, 2008.

—. "The Möbius Ribbon of Internal and External Security(ies)." In *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations*, edited by Mathias Albert, David Jacobson and Lapid Yosef, 91-116. Minneapolis: University of Minnisota Press, 2001.

Bigo, Didier, and Anastassia Tsoukala, . *Terror, Insecurity and Liberty: Illiberal Practices of Liberal Regimes after 9/11.* London: Routledge, 2008.

Blandy, Fran. "Transfrontier parks a boost to conservation." *IOL SciTech.* 22 June 2006. http://www.iol.co.za/scitech/technology/transfrontier-parks-a-boost-to-conservation-1.282687 (accessed February 21, 2011).

Boundless Southern Africa. "/Ai/Ais- Richtersveld Transfrontier Conservation Area." *Boundless Southern Africa.* http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=141&Itemid=257 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. "Boundless 2008." *Boundless Southern Africa.* 2008.
http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=172&Itemid=308
(accessed April 27, 2011).

—. "Boundless Song." *Boundless Southern Africa.* 2009.
http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=172&Itemid=308
(accessed April 29, 2011).

—. "Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park." *Boundless Southern Africa.*
http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=138&Itemid=250
(accessed April 29, 2011).

—. *Boundless Southern Africa Expedition 2009.*
http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=17&Itemi
d=306 (accessed May 13, 2011).

—. "Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area." *Boundless Southern Africa.*
http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=139&Itemid=253
(accessed April 29, 2011).

Brosius, J.Peter, and Diane Russell. "Conservation from Above: An Anthropological Perspective on
Transboundary Protected Areas and Ecoregional Planning." *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 17, no.
1/2 (2003): 39-65.

Büscher, Bram. "Seeking 'telos' in the 'transfrontier'? Neoliberalism and the transcending of
community conservation in Southern Africa." *Environment and Planning A* 42, no. 3 (2010): 644 –
660.

Büscher, Bram, and Wolfram Dressler. "Commodity conservation. The restructuring of community
conservation in South Africa and the Phillippines." *Geoforum*, Forthcoming.

—. "Linking Neoprotectionism and Environmental Governance: On the Rapidly Increasing Tensions
between Actors in the Environment-Development Nexus." *Conservation and Society* 5, no. 4 (2007):
586-611.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis.* 1998.

Carrier, James G. "Protecting the Environment the Natural Way: Ethical Consumption and
Commodity Fetishism." *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (June 2010): 672-689.

Cernea, Michael M. "Population displacement inside protected areas: a redefinition of concepts in
conservation policies." *Policy Matters* 14 (March 2006): 8-26.

Curran, B, et al. "Are Central Africa's Protected Areas Displacing Hundreds of Thousands of Rural
Poor?" *Conservation and Society* 7 (2009): 30-45.

Dalby, Simon. *Environmental Security.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

—. *Security and Environmental Change.* Cambridge: Polity, 2009.

—. "Security, Modernity, Ecology: The Dilemmas of Post-Cold War Security Discourses." *Alternatives* 17 (1992): 95-134.

Dressler, Wolfram, and Bram Büscher. "Market triumphalism and the CBNRM 'crises' at the South African section of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park." *Geoforum* 39, no. 1 (January 2008): 452-465.

Duffy, Rosaleen. "Peace Parks and Global Politics: The Paradoxes and Challenges of Global Governance." In *Peace Parks: Conservation and Conflict Resolution*, edited by Saleem H Ali, 55-68. London: MIT Press, 2007.

—. "The Potential and Pitfalls of Global Environmental Governance: The Politics of Transfrontier Conservation Areas in Southern Africa." *Political Geography* 25, no. 1 (2006): 89-112.

Dunn, Kevin. "Contested State Spaces: African National Parks and the State." *European Journal of International Relations* 15, no. 3 (September 2009): 423-446.

Duraiappah, Anantha. *CREED Working Paper Series No 8: Poverty and Environmental Degradation: A Literature Review and Analysis.* London: International Institute for Environment and Development, 1996.

Ellis, Stephen. "Of Elephants and Men: Politics and Nature Conservation in South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 20, no. 1 (March 1994): 53-69.

Fox, Justin. "The Birth of Africa's Greatest Game Park." *Getaway*, October 2009: 34-43.

Gertruida, Tannie. "#19- Tannie Gertruida and the Nama Stap." *Boundless Southern Africa, Expedition News.* 2009. http://www.boundlessa.com/en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=195&Itemid=306 (accessed April 29, 2011).

Hanks, John. "Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) in Southern Africa: Their Role in Conserving Biodiversity, Socioeconomic Development and Promoting a Culture of Peace." *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 17, no. 1/2 (2003): 127-148.

Harries, Patrick. *Butterflies and Barbarians: Swiss Missionaries and Systems of Knowledge in South-East Africa.* Oxford: James Curry Publishers, 2007.

Holgate, Kingsley. "Dispatch 37- Livingstone's Victoria Falls." *Boundless Southern Africa Expedition.* 2009. http://www.imagineering.co.za/boundlesssa/dispatch37.html (accessed May 2, 2011).

—. "The Grey Beard of Africa." *Kingsley Holgate.* 2011. http://www.kingsleyholgate.net/about-kingsley-holgate.html (accessed April 27, 2011).

Hughes, David McDermott. "Going Transboundary: Scale-Making and Exclusion in Southern-African Conservation." *Paper Presented at the Environment and Development Advanced research Circle, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA.* 19 April 2002. http://hdgc.epp.cmu.edu/misc/Going%20Transboundary%20-%20Hughes%5B1%5D.pdf (accessed May 2, 2011).

Huysmans, Jef, and Alessandra Buonfino. "Politics of exceptioin and unease: Immigration, asylum and terrorism in parliamentary debates in the UK." *Political Studies* 54, no. 4 (2008): 766-788.

Igoe, Jim, and Dan Brockington. "Neoliberal Conservation: An Introduction." *Conservation and Society* 5, no. 4 (2007): 432-449.

Igoe, Jim, Katja Neves, and Dan Brockington. "A Spectacular Eco-Tour around the Historic Bloc: Theorising the Convergence of Biodiversity Conservation and Capitalist Expansion." *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (June 2010): 486–512.

Jowit, Juliette. "UN says case for saving species 'more powerful than climate change'." *The Guardian.* 21 May 2010. http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/may/21/un-biodiversity-economic-report (accessed November 28, 2010).

King, D A, and W P Stewart. "Ecotourism and commodification: protecting people and places." *Biodiversity Conservation* 5, no. 3 (1996): 293-305.

MacDonald, Kenneth Iain. "The Devil is in the (Bio)diversity: Private Sector "Engagement" and the Restructuring of Biodiversity Conservation." *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (June 2010): 513–550.

Mbeki, Thabo. "I am an African." *African Renaissance* 1, no. 2 (2004): 9-13.

McAfee, Kathleen. "Selling nature to save it? Biodiversity and green developmentalism." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17, no. 2 (1999): 133 – 154.

Media Club South Africa. "Famous adventurer promotes transfrontier conservation." *Africa Good News.* 18 June 2009. http://www.africagoodnews.com/development/education/615-famous-adventurer-to-promote-transfrontier-conservation.html (accessed February 17, 2011).

Millgroom, Jessica, and Marja Spierenburg. "Induced volition: Resettlement from the Limpopo National Park, Mozambique." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 26, no. 4 (2008): 435 - 448.

Ministry of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. "MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS AND TOURISM, VALLI MOOSA, INTRODUCES THE GREAT LIMPOPO TRANSFRONTIER PARK." *South African Government Information.* 4 October 2001. http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/2001/0110081046a1002.htm (accessed April 29, 2011).

Moore, Lorraine Elizabeth. "Conservation Heroes Versus Environmental Villains: Perceiving Elephants in the Caprivi Strip." *Human Ecology* 38, no. 1 (2010): 19-29.

Myburgh, Werner. "Message from the CEO of the Peace Parks Foundation." *Peace Parks Foundation.* http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=1&mid=3 (accessed February 21, 2011).

Peace Parks Foundation. "Lower Zambezi-Mana Pools TFCA." *Peace Parks Foundation.* http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1019 (accessed April 27, 2011).

—. "Malot-Drakensberg Transfrontier Conservation and Development Area." *Peace Parks Foundation.* http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1004 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. "Why Peace Parks?" *Peace Parks Foundation.* http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=19&mid=20 (accessed April 27, 2011).

—. "/Ai/Ais Richtersveld Transfrontier Park." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1001 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. *Annual Review and Financial Statement.* Stellenbosch: Peace Parks Foundation, 2009.

—. *Annual Reviews and Financial Statements.* http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=1&mid=17
(accessed January 23, 2011).

—. "Climate Change Programme in Southern African TFCAs." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/programme.php?pid=24&mid=1021 (accessed February 12, 2011).

—. *Donors of Peace Parks Foundation.* http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=42&mid=50
(accessed January 23, 2011).

—. "Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1005 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. "Greater Mapungubwe." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1003 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. "Kavango-Zambezi." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1008 (accessed April 27, 2011).

—. "Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1002 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. "Lumombo Transfrontier Conservation and Resource Area." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/tfca.php?pid=27&mid=1006 (accessed April 29, 2011).

—. *Origins.* http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=1&mid=2 (accessed February 21, 2011).

Peace Parks Foundation,. *Ten Years Review, 1997-2006.* Stellenbosch, South Africa: Peace Parks
Foundation, 2006.

—. "What Are Peace Parks Programmes? The TFCAs." *Peace Parks Foundation.*
http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=100&mid=19 (accessed April 29, 2011).

Peluso, Nancy Lee. "Coercing conservation?. The politics of state resource control." *Global
Environmental Change* 3, no. 2 (1993): 199-217.

Peoples, Columbus, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. "Poststructuralism and International Political
Sociology." In *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*, by Columbus Peoples and Nick Vaughan-
Williams, 62-74. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010.

Rogers, Heather. "The greening of capitalism?" *International Socialist Review, Online Edition.* March-
April 2010. http://www.isreview.org/issues/70/feat-greencapitalism.shtml (accessed May 10, 2011).

Rumble, Mike. "Message from Mike Rumble." *Boundless Southern Africa Expedition .*
http://www.imagineering.co.za/boundlesssa/mike.html (accessed May 11, 2011).

Sandilands, Catriona. "On "Green" Consumerism: Environmental Privitization and "Family Values"." *Canadian Women's Studies/ les cahiers de la femmes* 13, no. 3 (Spring 1993): 45-47.

Sandwith, Trevor, Clare Shine, Lawrence Hamilton, and David Sheppard. *Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Co-operation.* No.7, IUCN- World Conservation Union, 2001.

Schwartz, Mark W. "Choosing the Appropriate Scale of Reserves for Conservation." *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 30 (1999): 83-108.

Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity. "Global Biodiversity Outlook 3." Montreal, 2010, 94.

Southern African Development Community (SADC),. *SADC Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs).* http://www.sadc.int/fanr/naturalresources/transfrontier/index.php?media=print&media=print (accessed May 12, 2011).

Spenceley, Anna, and Michael Schoon. "Peace Parks as Social Ecological Systems: Testing Environmental Resiliance in Southern Africa." In *Peace Parks: Conservation and Conflict Resolution*, edited by Saleem H Ali, 83-104. Cambridge,, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2007.

Spierenburg, Marja, and Harry Wels. "Conservative Philanthropists, Royalty and Business Elites in Nature Conservation in Southern Africa." *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (June 2010): 647-670.

Spierenburg, Marja, and Harry Wels. "Conservative Philanthropists, Royalty and Business Elites in Nature Conservation in Southern Africa." *Antipode* 42, no. 3 (2010): 647–670.

Thorsell, J W, ed. *Parks on the Borderline: Experiences in Transfrontier Conservation.* Gland, Switzerland: International Union for the Conservation of Nature, 1991.

Tosa, Hiroyuki. "Anarchical Governance: Neoliberal Governmentality in Resonance with the State of Exception." *International Political Sociology* 3 (2009): 414-430.

United National Environment Programme. *First-Ever UNEP 'Champions of the Earth' Presented to Seven Environmental Leaders.* 19 April 2005. http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?DocumentID=430&ArticleID=4775&l=en (accessed February 22, 2011).

Vale, Peter. *Security and Politics in Southern Africa: The Regional Dimension.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2003.

van Amerom, Marloes, and Bram Büscher. "Peace parks in Southern Africa: bringers of an African Renaissance?" *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 43, no. 2 (2005): 159-182.

Vaughan-Williams, Nick. *Border Politics: The Limits of Sovereign Power.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Vaughan-Williams, Nick. "Borders, Territory, Law†." *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (December 2008): 322-338.

Wæver, Ole. "Securitization and desecuritization." In *On Security*, edited by Ronnie D. Lipschutz, 46-86. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

West, Paige, James Igoe, and Dan Brockington. "Parks and Peoples: The Social Impact of Protected Areas." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35 (2006): 251-77.

Westling, A H, ed. *Transfrontier reserves for peace and nature: a contribution to human security.* Nairobi: United Nations Environment Programme, 1993.

Wolmer, William. "Transboundary Conservation: The Politics of Ecological Integrity in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29, no. 1 (March 2003): 261-278.