

2018

National Parks and Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: and Examination of Social and Economic Program Effectiveness in the Development Paradigm

Jackson R. Barratt Heitmann
Bard College

Recommended Citation

Barratt Heitmann, Jackson R., "National Parks and Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: and Examination of Social and Economic Program Effectiveness in the Development Paradigm" (2018). *Senior Projects Spring 2018*. 216.
https://digitalcommons.bard.edu/senproj_s2018/216

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Bard Undergraduate Senior Projects at Bard Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Senior Projects Spring 2018 by an authorized administrator of Bard Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@bard.edu.

National Parks and Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: and Examination of Social and Economic Program Effectiveness in the Development Paradigm

Senior Project Submitted to:

The Division of Social Studies

of Bard College

by

Jackson Barratt Heitmann

Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

May 2018

Acknowledgements

To Professor James Ketterer, thank you so much for your wonderful guidance and direction throughout this year.

To all my professors, you have changed the way I think over the course of my time here, and I cannot express the gratitude I feel for the education you have given me.

To my mother, thank you for raising me, and cherishing me for these past 22 years, your love for me is immense as mine is for you.

To my siblings, you have helped ground me throughout my life and I would be nothing without you.

To my family, thank you for helping me throughout the last 4 years especially navigating the ins and outs of life stateside.

To my friends, the laughs have been great, and I have enjoyed every minute of it.

Finally, to my partner, you have seen me at my best and worst, and I am extremely grateful for your compassion throughout this process.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADC	Area Development Communities (Zambia)
CBNRM	Community-Based Natural Resource Management
CRB	Community Resource Board (Zambia)
CSL	Conservation South Luangwa
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs (South Africa)
EM	Environmental Monitoring
EPWP	Expanded Public Works Programs (South Africa)
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent Jobs
GMA	Game Management Area
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
KNP	Kruger National Park
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Service
LIRDP	Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Program
MMNR	Masai Mara National Reserve
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NPWS	National Parks and Wildlife Service (Zambia)
SANParks	South African National Parks
SLAMU	South Luangwa Management Unit
SLNP	South Luangwa National Park
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNESCO	UN Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
VAG	Village Action Group (Zambia)
ZAWA	Zambian Wildlife Authority

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Kruger National Park (South Africa)	27
Chapter 2: South Luangwa National Park (Zambia)	37
Chapter 3: Masai Mara National Reserve (Kenya)	47
Conclusion	56
Bibliography	59

Introduction

What is the relationship between national parks and development? This research question at large is an attempt to analyze the effects that national parks have on development. This topic spans all national parks from all around the world that currently deal with development initiatives.

Whether this is improving camp sites in Yellowstone to increase visitors, or creating health clinics in Kruger National Park for local employees, or creating tour guide jobs in Peru by expanding into day and night tours. This question of whether the decisions that parks make are effective in helping people in the local communities that surround national parks is critical to understanding the effectiveness of parks as not only conservation areas, but as development institutions. The application of this question can be applied to any national park facing international, governmental, local, or internal pressure to aide the communities immediately surrounding the park, or those who are employed by the park. This question is intentionally broad in an attempt to better understand all of the intricacies and complexities engaged simply by the relationship.

Hypothesis

National Parks are currently created to conserve ecosystems, and the flora and fauna contained within their borders, for the benefit and use by the people of that nation. Although National Parks were originally set up to preserve wildlife, now they are viewed more broadly, as a way of preserving and enhancing the life of peoples in the entire nation. This recent shift from strictly ecosystem preservation to benefiting the people of the nation that the park is contained within, is

a marked shift in national park imaginations and discourse. When parks were originally conceived of in Africa, adventurers, wildlife enthusiasts, and colonialists were concerned with preserving a wild landscape, or “wild Eden”.¹ Parks were meant to enclose the conceived space in which the natural world was pristine and devoid of any human activity. As colonial rule modernized national parks were created, and they still existed for the sole use of white residents and tourists to engage with nature. Slowly, this began to change as conservation practice began to realize people lived within these perceived spaces, and had for millennia. Empire and colonialism collapsed, and with it came a new paradigm, development.

Since independence across many African nations, conservation has become extremely contentious. It represents not only areas for conservation of natural processes and species, but also for development. Both conservation and development were imposed on people of African nations, and they continue to impose the will of western imagination. But, the most recent shift from “development” to “sustainable development”, has particularly changed national parks as political, social, economic, and cultural spaces. They are now intersectional areas for preserving nature, but also for the sustainable development of rural populations.

The research question of this paper is concerned with whether or not this shift that has brought development and conservation so close, is a feasible and effective option for national parks. What is the relationship between national parks and development? This question deals with anthropological discussions of conceived space, of political development discourse, and also with conservation practices. All of these have slightly different conceptions of national parks, and they all offer different critiques and framing to engage with national parks.

¹Adams, Jonathan S., and Thomas O. McShane. *The Myth of Wild Africa: Conservation without Illusion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

The embedded history of national parks will make it difficult to actually change the lives of rural inhabitants because they are so heavily western oriented. Funding for conservation comes mostly from western conservation organizations like the IUCN, the WWF, or the World Bank and IMF. For example Kruger National Park in South Africa only received 15% of its total funding from the government, the remaining 85% came from tourism and self funding through grants.² Western imposition on national parks undermines the ‘national’ part of the park, the legitimacy of it as a national park, and eats away at the sovereignty of the nation. Sovereignty in this case meaning that the state is not the sole input of funding and expectations, but that other national entities can deem what is important for the park to accomplish. Parks are currently run nationally, and so there are jobs being created, as well as schools and health clinics. This being said wildlife management generates huge sums of money, evident in the ecotourism numbers published by each national government, but how much of the money they generate is being put back into those same local economies? Property rights and land claims further complicate the issue, as how can development occur if people aren’t allowed access to land they were previously.

All of these stipulations are meant to illuminate the complex network of ideas, and practices set in motion that blur the answer of this question. The relationship is not black or white. It is not stagnant, but rather fluid. My hypothesis is that parks are institutions with their own interests. The interests of citizens, the centralized government, and the international community are prioritized in that order by park management. The interactions that national parks have with de-

² South African National Parks on Tourism Development, Growth, Transformation, Tariff Increases. August 20, 2012. Accessed October 24, 2017. <https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/14711/>.

velopment have varying impacts on each of these actors, and the way development affects individuals is different in each individual case. The relationship illuminates a greater issue of socio-environmental systems that must effectively and equally weigh each parks respective actions to be successful in integrating the disregarded citizenry into future conservation and development efforts.

Cases

- a. Masai Mara National Reserve (Kenya)
- b. South Luangwa National Park (Zambia)
- c. Kruger National Park (South Africa)

The reason I have chosen to utilize African case studies for this project, and not national parks from other areas of the world, is to examine the experiences that each individual nation has undergone. Although all national parks undergo similar thematic battles of land eviction and employment, these cases represent specific experiences that illustrate the greater shared thematic issues globally. I chose these three firstly because it helps to dispel the generalizations about Africa as a single entity. It is comprised of many nations with very different histories of conservation and development practice. I also chose these cases because national parks in South and Eastern Africa inhabit a very different space than the rest of the world. The huge megafauna that exist are at the pinnacle of conservation practice, and are not seen in such abundance and size anywhere else in the world. Lastly, parks in Africa are subjected to a greater conservation imper-

atives than parks in the United States, for example, due to the biological diversity. This brings me to why I chose these cases in specific from all of the possibilities across the continent.

The first shared similarity between these parks is their Anglophone colonial history, and the development of British rule. Kenya, South Africa, and Zambia were all colonized by the British, meaning that an overall normative prerogative by the British Empire was imposed on each of these nations making it different from much of the rule of the French and German empires elsewhere in Africa and other colonized nations. Furthermore, each of these nations were settler colonies, meaning that white Europeans moved to these countries to establish British control. But even before they became settler colonies under direct rule of the British government, they were privately run by British trading companies from 1888-1923. This differed greatly from other nations where indirect rule was adopted by the colonial government, such as in Nigeria. This key similarity of being settler colonies, and trading companies prior to that, makes them extremely similar and different from all other colonies of the British who adopted indirect rule at some point in Namibia, Nigeria, and others.

A second key similarity that each of these nations share is that when colonial governments arrived in each of these nations, land was allocated for wildlife preservation earlier than any other colonies in Africa. In 1896 the British colonial administration allocated land for game reserves to help preserve elephants from going extinct in Zambia.³ Similarly, in 1896 the formation of the British East African Protectorate, led to the creation of giant game reserves to protect

³ Manning, Ian Patrick Alexander. *Volume I: Wildlife Conservation in Zambia*. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria Press, 1993: 45. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/25570/01volumeI.pdf?sequence=2>.

the depleted wildlife populations in Kenya.⁴ Lastly, South Africa's conservation movement began in 1886 with the creation of two forest reserves. These were some of the first formal creations of conservation areas under colonial jurisdiction.

This being said, National Parks were being created officially all over the planet at this time, by President Grant in the US in 1876, and in Australia in 1879. These parks are all important in illustrating the marked shift in human history. People for the first time believed in conserving land, and every national park shares some history constructed by this period. What these three cases do in particular is hone in on the experiences of Africa which underwent colonial rule very differently than Australia, New Zealand, or the United States.

Another similarity that lead to this case selection is each of these nations' history of land reclamation post independence in National Parks. In South Africa, Kruger National Park has been subject to land claims, one of which was won in 1998⁵, similarly Masai Mara National Reserve has been subject to many land disputes from local inhabitants because of their inability to reach watering holes located within the park.⁶ Their colonial histories also mean that they entered similar changes to the bureaucratic structure of national parks and government entities from colonial rule, to independence. This being said these parks exist within greater conservation areas, and different institutions.

⁴ Chongwa, Mungumi Bakari. "The History and Evolution of National Parks in Kenya." *The George Wright Forum* 29, no. 1 (2012): 39-42.

⁵ Melissa Wray and Lynette Strauss, "Land Claims in Kruger," news release, 2017, accessed November 30, 2017, <http://www.krugerpark.co.za/krugerpark-times-2-4-land-claims-in-kruger-19187.html>.

⁶ Roderick P. Neumann, *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 57.

Although these three areas have similar origin stories in terms of conservation policy, each park became nationalized during different time periods. Kruger National park was created as a national entity in 1926, in between the first and second world wars. Masai Mara National Reserve was created in 1961, and South Luangwa in 1976. Kruger's nationalization was very early for the African continent, and also became a national institution before South Africa gained independence. Kenya created the Masai Mara National Reserve prior to independence in 1961, and Zambia although a colony like South Africa and Kenya, did not establish national parks until they achieved independence in the post-war period. Zambia was slower to adopt conservation policy taking 10 years following their independence to create South Luangwa. These cases all exist in historical paradigms, and the nationalization of these parks all occurred at different point in each of there histories which creates a pointed analysis of three places with similar origins, but very different conservation implementation.

A key difference is their respective histories once they achieve independence, is that economic resources were allocated differently to community-based resource groups in different countries--this depended on nationalization of property, or commercialization privately. Their histories of conservation success have also varied up to the present, and it is only over the past 20 or 30 years that national parks in Zambia for example are now hot tourist destinations. It is also over the past 20 years that development has undergone a shift which has been imposed on national parks. Furthermore, development in each of these nations has had different outcomes. I will further explore these outcomes and their "effectiveness" in the definitions portion of this chapter, but the categorizations of development fall under economic, social, political, and envi-

ronmental. South Africa, Kenya, and Zambia have all been effective and ineffective in different categories, which makes for a compelling case analysis.

A case study could be developed to investigate the differences that occur in Indonesia, Brazil, Europe, and other African cases, and it would be extremely valuable as conservation practices have undergone different transformations in different places. This case selection, however, is meant to best understand what has happened in South and Eastern African nations which are now hubs for wildlife tourism and iconic megafauna. Comparisons between parks on different continents is useful, but Kenya, Zambia, and South Africa all contain the same species that make them so distinct, the lion, elephant, leopard, and others that have shaped their ability to create national parks. The ecosystems of Brazil, the United States, and Indonesia are completely different, and their relationship with colonialism is different, as well as imaginings of “wildness” that are central to the conception of Africa.

I will evaluate these cases from 1960-2016. Although emphasis will be made on the most recent data available for each case. The respective development programs in each of these nations has undergone drastic shifts from consumptive tourism, to non-consumptive, to community based, and each park achieved relative consistency in approach at some point in each parks history. Therefore, analysis of the most recent development program statistics will provide the best insight into the current effectiveness. However, the 50-year time period is extremely important, because it represents the independence movement across the continent, and the inception of “development”. The transition that each nation underwent was unprecedented in world history as every nation had its own borders, constitutions, and policies. National Parks represent this key intersection of gained independence, international pressure, and ecological integrity.

This being said, this research *can* be applicable to future studies of national parks around the world. Further in this chapter I will outline the key components to this analysis—social and economic factors. Parks around the world have all been created to preserve nature, but they have come to represent something new over the past 50 years. They represent areas of development and nationalization. This is a similarity globally. Parks in the United States now have explicit missions to preserve wild areas for American use. Similarly in Peru, Yaguas National Park was just formally created to preserve biodiversity, and the lives of indigenous populations.⁷ A park system encompassing an area four times the size of Yellowstone and Yosemite National park was created in Patagonia to preserve wild land in Chile.⁸ Although the park was explicitly created to preserve indigenous animal species, the park now boasts many high-end lodges and hiking trails for outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy.⁹ National Parks are changing around the globe to preserve nature *and* serve the nations they lie within. Whether this is through tourism, preservation for indigenous populations, or for development initiatives, this paper is an important addition to the conversation surrounding national parks worldwide and what they mean as social and economic development prerogatives.

National parks are not stagnant, they are constantly evolving in practice and effectiveness. The lessons of development impacts on national park institutions is far-reaching, and not

⁷ Funes, Yessenia. "Peru's New National Park Protects the Amazon and the People Who Call It Home." Earther.com. Last modified January 16, 2018. Accessed March 7, 2018. <https://earther.com/perus-new-national-park-protects-the-amazon-and-the-peo-1822120613>.

⁸ Bonnefoy, Pascale. "With 10 Million Acres in Patagonia, a National Park System Is Born." New York Times, February 19, 2018. Accessed March 8, 2018. <https://mobile.nytimes.com/2018/02/19/world/americas/patagonia-national-park-chile.html?referer=https://t.co/Bq0xRmo06a?amp=1#click=https://t.co/Bq0xRmo06a>.

⁹ Bonnefoy, "With 10 Million".

confined to the case selection in this paper. It is rather a deep investigation of a particular geographical region, with broad reaching analysis for the phenomena globally.

Methodology

I will be utilizing comparative case study analysis for this research paper. I will utilize the three cases listed above, to discuss and analyze how national parks are embedded in individual histories, then move on to discuss the historical developments of each park, and how that has coincided with national sentiments of development practice in national parks and their surrounding areas.

Examining each case historically, then analyzing shifts in management structure, economic resources, and community-based development efforts will be successful in finding how national parks have fared in trying to converge original ideas of ecological conservation and complex rural development policy into constructed institutions.

Through these examinations it will become integral to discuss how the creation of national parks, conservation, and development all exist in a political space. With each case will come a slightly different conclusion about how national parks can and have been utilized as development vehicles, whether that is through ecotourism and game management, or through employment, education, and health care for local populations. The comparison of cases will allow for a better understanding of *how* things have changed in three different places.

Furthermore, it is important to discuss how my research question and methodology will avoid endogeneity. In my hypothesis it may seem that the question could have no independent or

dependent variable. The independent variable in this paper is the national park, and the dependent variable is the success of rural development practices in these parks. It could be mistaken that development discourse has changed national parks, but I will address this issue by examining the historical conceptions of parks, and how they have changed since development has been imposed. In other words, development in this paper occurs historically before, during, or after parks were created, and therefore they are just another factor or dependent input into the equation.

Definitions

When discussing national parks it becomes important to define and illustrate the intricacies and nuances of the term. In this case the word ‘national’ becomes very important in constructing the idea of a national park. The word national is utilized when creating parks to effectively express a national sentiment.¹⁰ Meaning the park is to be utilized and funded by the entire country because of socio-cultural importance to the inhabitants of that nation. It is possible that the national sentiment may be representing the particular interests of one subset of the population. For example in South Africa this may be an expression of white national sentiment, in an attempt to further extend property rights across the nation, inherently taking land away from black South Africans.

“National” also alludes to economic accountability. By creating a national park, you are inherently making the funding for that park funnel through some national government institution.

¹⁰ Carruthers, Jane. "Creating a National Park, 1910 to 1926." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 15, no. 2 (1989): 188-216. 188

Whether that be the Department of Forestry, or Department of Fisheries and Wildlife becomes more specific depending on the nation. This differs from a regional park, or a municipal park, because funding for the park begins at the federal level. The economics of a national park then inherently become very political as well. To secure funding as a national park it then becomes important to prove success in some way. Success can become quite subjective, meaning the park can choose to submit revenue earnings from tourism, or population stability of lions, or better yet increased literacy rates amongst children in primary education surrounding the park. Measures and proxies for success are submitted to federal agencies for approval for funding, which is different from that of a regional or municipal park that is working on a smaller scale.

This brings me to the categorical nature of the national parks I will be discussing. In order to create normative distinctions in the national park discourse, I will be utilizing the International Union for Conservation and Nature (IUCN) to define national parks. Their definition of national parks are “protected areas [in] large natural or near natural areas set aside to protect large-scale ecological processes, along with the complement of species and ecosystems characteristic of the area, which also provide a foundation for environmentally and culturally compatible spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and visitor opportunities.”¹¹ Along with this definition comes a categorical designation, Category II for national parks. South Luangwa and Masai Mara are currently category II defined national parks by the IUCN, while Kruger is designated as a national park but currently has no designation from the IUCN. The IUCN cannot specifically designate Kruger due to the complex nature of private land ownership and different trans-boundary site crossover. More importantly this definition will help guide the designation of areas

¹¹ IUCN, "Category II: National Park," IUCN.org, accessed April 14, 2018, <https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about/protected-areas-categories/category-ii-national-park>.

as national parks, so that we can assume a few similarities, and distinctions from other areas.

These similarities are that they receive funding and recognition from the national government as a space conserving biodiversity and whole ecosystems, while also serving recreational purposes for economic benefit.

It is now also important to define development as it is the dependent variable I will be examining. Development as a discourse has evolved since its inception after WWII—I will discuss this in the literature review—and it has been largely criticized. This paper is concerned with these conceptions of “development”, but in terms of rural development I will utilize the World Bank definition to create a baseline, which I can critique in each subsequent chapter. The world Bank defines rural development as “is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people - the rural poor. It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural areas”.¹² This definition differs from my own conceptions of development, that I will discuss further in my literature review section. But, generally this definition doesn’t include cultural standards of people, or recognize that development is imposed and assigned, and not conceived off in the same light by those who are being developed. Furthermore, rural development encapsulates a range of goals outside those listed just in the definition, and in a broad range of areas that are all uniquely different. These rural areas include those that have been resistant to change and to development regimes over time, and who continue to struggle with development as a paradigm. This being said, the World Bank definition will suffice because no definition is ever going to capture every aspect of such a

¹² World Bank. *Rural Development*. Policy Paper no. 10272. Washington D.C., DC: The World Bank, 1975. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/522641468766236215/Rural-development>.

complex idea. In fact, a definition like the World Bank acutely presents an opportunity to critique and reconstruct the definition in the latter chapters.

Finally, it is important to define what constitutes effectiveness. This definition is central to my research questions which raises the question of what constitutes effective development practice or effective park management? For this project it is important to recognize different categories of rural development that can be measured through proxies, or other more specific metrics. The categorizations I will utilize to evaluate effectiveness in each of my national park cases are: 1) social and 2) economic.

Social effectiveness can be measured at a park based on whether health clinics, education services, literacy rates, or infant mortality have been affected by national park rural development policies and efforts. Economic effectiveness can be measured through the more traditional economic metrics of GDP at the national level, but employment opportunities at the local level, are also measures of economic effectiveness brought about by national parks. These two factors are more pointed in analysis of the development impacts that national parks have. Environmental and ecological effectiveness of these parks is no doubt an important factor, but it is not entirely applicable to this paper. The sustainability of certain social programs, or of certain economic measures will be included as it is pertinent to the continuation of those programs in conjunction with each national parks respective philosophy. But, environmental and ecological effectiveness have been covered extensively in Southern Africa as it pertains to habitat restoration, ecological integrity of parks, and ecosystem stress from human use. These have been studied in their own contexts, but little has been done to look at the issue from a social and economic development perspective that is highly intersectional in scope. The social and economic development in each

of the cases will intersect with other components, environmental, political, anthropological, as well as others because that is the nature of national parks. However, I will point my analysis more directly towards social and economic factors such as the well being of removed indigenous populations, the respective work programs within parks, and the accountability of decentralized government structures in distributing tourist revenue. These issues are what are central to “development”, and less so with the environmental components of the parks because they represent a different area of study.

Each of these categories are meant to encapsulate a broad array of metrics that can be used to measure effectiveness, to analyze what parks do differently, what works, and what does not. It is meant to also shift areas of analysis from strictly economic terms, to those more difficult to measure and less indicative of ‘development’ by international standards. Parks are different and so are the categories for measuring effectiveness of rural development initiatives in this paper, to capture more broadly the effects national parks have had on rural communities.

South Luangwa National Park - IUCN Category II - National Park.¹³

Kruger National Park - IUCN Undefined Category.¹⁴

Masai Mara National Reserve - IUCN Category II - National Park.¹⁵

Relevant Literature

¹³ Protected Planet, Map of Protected Areas Worldwide, map, ProtectedPlanet.net, accessed April 14, 2018, <https://www.protectedplanet.net>.

¹⁴ Protected Planet, Map of Protected Areas Worldwide, map.

¹⁵ Protected Planet, Map of Protected Areas Worldwide, map.

National park discourse in Africa, particularly anglophone nations, has undergone paradigm shifts throughout the evolution of national parks historically that are also embedded in discussions of development. The trajectory of national park thought has grown with development as countries moved from colonial to post-colonial independence. It becomes important then to track the development of national parks. There are a few spheres of discourse involved in the review of literature on this topic, they include: 1) discourse on the creation of national parks generally as a global phenomena, 2) the notion of development and rural development also as a global phenomena following the collapse of empire after WWII, 3) national parks as they have been conceived of in Africa, 4) development projects and discourse in Africa, and 5) the interdisciplinary literature on national parks as areas engaging in development practice.

To begin, it is important to review some of the influential literature on national parks more generally, and outside of the African-centric literature. Parks and preservation areas throughout premodern history were originally created to keep the poor off of untouched land.¹⁶ Following industrialization and the exploitation that accompanied it, the United States became the first country to create a “National” park, in the form of Yellowstone and Yosemite.¹⁷ They were created to preserve the natural beauty of the land¹⁸, and so miners, timber extractors, and

¹⁶ O'Neill, Karen M. "The International Politics of National Parks." *Human Ecology* 24, no. 4. 1996, 522.

¹⁷ O'Neill, "The International," 523.

¹⁸ Zaslowky, Dyan. "These American Lands: Parks, Wilderness, and the Public Lands." In *These American Lands: Parks, Wilderness, and the Public Lands*, by Dyan Zaslowky and T. H. Watkins. Rev. and expanded ed. Washington, DC: Island Press, 1994.

indigenous peoples were evicted from the land at the advisement of naturalists.¹⁹ These same sentiments were also expressed in other European nations, as well as in Australia. National Parks were created in colonies of Africa as game reserves to protect the dichotomy of race and class, and expel people from their land, and preserve the megafauna they desired to hunt. National Parks were largely government sponsored once interests groups like concerned citizens, non-governmental organizations, and scientists lobbied for policy and park creation to preserve the natural world from human destruction.²⁰

When the United States designated Yellowstone and Yosemite national parks, there were a few inherent built in conditions, that have set the foundation for national park discourse overall. One is that preservation of natural space is beneficial to the nation.²¹ Parks are therefore socio-culturally important. Yet, in 1872, transportation, infrastructure, and a lack of leisure time led to few visitors. Also inherent to the public benefit was economic gain.²² In Canada, the Prime Minister made Banff a National Park because the natural scenery would attract wealthy visitors to the area. ²³ Following the proliferation of parks, the United States also started the standard of land eviction. The United States government began relocating native Americans on land reserves to create the Grand Canyon Park in 1882. The beginning of nationalized park systems set the

¹⁹ Haines, Aubrey L. *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*. Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: Yellowstone Library and Museum Association, 1977.

²⁰ O'Neill, *The International Politics of National Parks*, 524.

²¹ Kafarowski, Joanna. "How Attitudes and Values Shape Access to National Parks." *The George Wright Forum* 20, no. 4 (2003): 53-63

²² Kafarowski, "How Attitudes," 56.

²³ Kafarowski, "How Attitudes," 57.

stage for the movement worldwide, and was characterized by explicit national benefit through leisure activities, economic benefit, and land eviction.

Following the end of World War II, environmental politics, and therefore conservation and national parks, became an international issue. The United Nations (UN) created the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), and the UN Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) created the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) which included the input of states and nongovernmental organizations in establishing treaties for national park funding and creation.²⁴ The globalization of conservation and nature preservation pushed undeveloped nations to create national parks as they would receive funding from industrialized nations to do so. Seeing as most of these nations already had game reserves the incentive to create national parks was easily met. National Parks became an extension of the first world's ability to establish international agendas, and provide funding for less-developed nations to follow this agenda, with very little input or mobilization at times from the states themselves, according to O'Neill.

The designation of parks as national spaces is new. It was only conceived of formally following the end of World War II. I firmly believe that parks themselves are imagined spaces of wildness, but national parks are inherently more manipulative. They evoke national sentiment which is a point of pride. US National Parks exist on land that belongs to Native Americans, yet it is claimed as American, and inundated with statues and monuments of "American Identity". National Parks are also supposed to serve people, yet they exist to preserve that which we have so desired to conquer since our species' inception, nature. Parks are a remnant of the previous

²⁴O'Neil, "The International," 525.

place before man, that *did* exist for millions of years. It is indicative of the human condition, one of delineation, oversight, and history. That is why they are such a unique intersectional space, it brings together competing disciplines to decide who should have access, and who shouldn't. This politicization of the space, as "belonging", in the form of national identity in the US, or nationalization of space in Zambia, where most visitors are not Zambian, speaks to their economic desires and political association. My view is that parks generally deal with race, class, and later international politics, but at the heart of these discussions are pieces that help us to understand the human condition. This in turn allows for a more holistic approach, and a deeper examination of the parks as human developments in space.

Development as we understand it was born after the end of World War II, and has since undergone academic scrutiny in the evolution and creation of what is known as development discourse. It began with Modernization Theory, which argued that development into an industrialized nation was linear, and inevitable even for undeveloped nations.²⁵ Andre Gunder Frank's theory of underdevelopment disregarded a linear even playing field for all states, because he saw Latin American nations as having been "underdeveloped".²⁶ Meaning that these nations were intentionally exploited by colonial powers, and therefore did not become an equal state with the US after each of these nations achieved independence. In fact, he says that they were internally underdeveloped by these colonial powers because their exploitation undermined their ability to industrialize and become democracies. Finally, another school of development thought is known

²⁵ Rostow, W. W. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-communist Manifesto*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.

²⁶ Andre Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," *Monthly Review* 18, 4. 1966.

as dependency theory. Which stipulates that world trade exists on a platform of core states, semi-periphery states, and periphery states. The periphery states exist only to be exploited and provide resources for core states who are already industrialized. It perpetuates a system in which periphery states become poorer at the expense of enriching already wealthy states. This theory is based on an assumption that this is also the normative way that states enter the world system. These broad schools of thought created what we know as development, and each of them challenges the notion of a state's ability to develop.

My definition of development differs slightly from the literature listed above. Each of the academics above was more concerned with defining the process at hand, development, as it became a discourse in those 20-30 years following its inception. Since then Franz Fanon's prophetic *The Wretched of the Earth*, outlined the neocolonial forces that would follow colonialism, and bare a new system that would further exploit African nations under the guise of "independence".²⁷ I believe that development regimes today still exploit much of Africa, and to a large degree serve the consumption and political needs of Europe and the United States. But, I believe development still has meaning for those people who are subjects of development. Development is not *just* for the West, but also for people in areas that are subjects of development projects by USAID, the World Bank, and the IMF.

The conceptions of the subjects of development need inclusion in the discourse. Curating a development discourse centered around those who are being developed is integral to detangling the terribly corrupt and political process of development. Cultural, social, and economic benefits that subjects of development see are just as important as artificial quantitative measure of GDP,

²⁷ Fanon, Franz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press, 1963.

GNP, or employment rate. How individuals see their own development is largely ignored, and is integral to the discourse. Therefore, development is the imposition of western standards and legacies, and these subjects of development have feelings about how their culture, society, and economic status are affected by these decisions, be them positive or negative.

The national park cases that I am examining for this paper are all on the African continent. After reviewing the general literature on parks and development, it is necessary to magnify the review down to the continental level for African parks, park management, and rural development initiatives intersecting with parks. This breadth of literature will help set the stage for analysis of the three cases more specifically and succinctly.

One of the leading academics on African national parks is environmental historian Jane Carruthers, whose work focused on South Africa. In her famous piece entitled *Creating a National Park*, she discusses the historical underpinnings of the creating of national parks. Space in South Africa was highly racialized—like much of Africa—and Kruger National Park was of particular interest in South Africa. With the onset of colonialism, fertile soils were exploited for agricultural purposes, and much of the wildlife across the country was depleted.²⁸ Kruger National Park became one of the few game reserve management areas, that was created to protect game, and replenish populations. However, Carruthers writes that this was in effect an attempt by the colonial South African government to protect game for white hunters, and forcibly remove indigenous populations from their land to do so.²⁹ Carruthers roots her argument about the cre-

²⁸ Terborgh, John, Carel van Schaik, Lisa Davenport, and Madhu Rao, eds. *Making Parks Work: Strategies for Preserving Tropical Nature*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2002. 41

²⁹ Carruthers, “Creating a,” 189.

ation of the Park in one that cites native populations as the culprits for the decline of wildlife populations, as an inherently political process.³⁰

It is pertinent to discuss the colonial domination of much of Africa, and the ensuing visions of nature that national parks are embedded in. Colonial regimes were interested in resource extortion and free labor. While many of the desired resources were minerals, timber, salt, ivory, spices, and others, wildlife and nature became ‘imagined’ spaces, through which national parks were eventually constructed. Nature was envisioned by colonial administrators as a ‘wild’ place. Adams and McShane argue in their book , *The Myth of Wild Africa*, that nature became part of an imagined untamed space.³¹ This imagined dark space as it came to be seen in the nineteenth century was rife with stereotypes that are still embedded in each respective nations history. The very categorization of space by explorers and eventually colonial administrators as a place still untouched by man, and devoid of the industrial infrastructure of Europe, created a myth and misunderstanding.⁶ This myth imagined a place devoid of people, and full of the romanticized beasts of the Serengeti. According to Adams and McShane, National Parks came to be envisioned as spaces that still captured the wild untamed splendor of Africa before modernization, and meaning that all native or indigenous populations had to be removed to make way for man’s quintessential and utopian vision of that space.⁶

Adams, McShane, and Caruthers make up the literature on African National Parks, and their conceptions, but it is important to dive deeper into each nation’s literature and their more specific relationships with these concepts.

³⁰ Carruthers, Jane. *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 1995. 17

³¹ Adams, “The Myth,” 68.

Brian Child's book *Parks in Transition* makes a compelling case for park management structures in southern Africa. His formulation is generally useful in outlining how parks were developed in Zambia, South Africa, and Kenya. Parks originally went through a militarization phase.³² Their concern was to secure large amounts of land as quickly as possible. Park management then adopted a stock mentality, where they were concerned with essentially building up the population numbers of species. They inherently ignored basic ecology about the prey-predator relationship, and culled thousands of animals. South Africa particularly adopted this practice at Kruger where 18,440 individual animals were killed between 1904-1927.³³ Zambia also adopted this practice, but not in the South Luangwa Valley, where South Luangwa National Park is located. Kenya on the other hand deviated from the intentional culling practice that occurred in Kruger. Hunting was sport across Kenya, and the parks were simply for hunting purposes, but this practice led to huge population decreases because of the infamous 'Big Hunt', in which Winston Churchill and Theodore Roosevelt partook in huge animal hunts.³⁴ This period of park management and conservation was slightly different in each area, but it resulted in extreme population reduction of many species in all three areas. It also led to ecological issues in changed environments. Clearing of brush and trees to make viewing the animals easier for visiting tourists was normal practice during this period. This was largely unnecessary in Kenya due to the ecosystem being true savannah with little flora in the way of brush and trees.

³² Child, B. *Parks in Transition: Biodiversity, Rural Development, and the Bottom Line*. London: Earthscan Publications, 2004.

³³ Child, "Parks in," 16.

³⁴ Mwaura, Francis. "Wildlife Heritage Ownership and Utilization in Kenya – the Past, Present and Future." In *Conservation of Natural and Cultural Heritage in Kenya: A Cross-Disciplinary Approach*, edited by Deisser Anne-Marie and Njuguna Mugwima, 125-42. London: UCL Press, 2016.

In all three of these national parks, there was great animosity and hostility towards the colonial wardens evicting indigenous people from their land. This characterized much of the same period as above in terms of the social-economic structure.

The conservation prescriptions, and management techniques in each of these nations began to change in the 1950s with the introduction of ecologists as a central research pillar for parks.³⁵ This shift marked an increase in research by true ecologists on the relationships that soil, flora, and fauna have.³⁶ This was pronounced in Kruger National Park as their primary initiative following the state establishment of parks.³⁷ In Kenya, following independence, wildlife conservation was pursued as a means of taking back their cultural heritage, while in Zambia President Kenneth Kaunda continued to implement colonialist conservation policy. He forcibly removed people to create South Luangwa National Park in 1963, and allowed for greater scientific monitoring to save animals and the ecosystem.³⁸ Ecologists flocked to Africa in this time period to study these areas generally, but each of these nations had slightly different histories coinciding with the macro-movement.³⁹ What coincided with this ecology movement was the introduction of private company tourism. Private ownership of hotels and safaris began to operate inside na-

³⁵ Child, "Parks in," 17.

³⁶ Child, "Parks in," 17.

³⁷ Venter, Freek J., Robert J. Naiman, Harry C. Biggs, and Danie J. Pienaar. "The Evolution of Conservation Management Philosophy: Science, Environmental Change and Social Adjustments in Kruger National Park." *Ecosystems* 11, no. 2 (2008): 173-92.

³⁸ Manning, Ian Patrick Alexander. *Volume I: Wildlife Conservation in Zambia*. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria Press, 1993. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/25570/01volumeI.pdf?sequence=2>. 56.

³⁹ Child, "Parks in," 18.

tional parks. These tourism companies began to accrue huge profit margins in all three nations, but especially in South Africa and Zambia with the Sun Hotels Group.⁴⁰

Finally, following the ecologist era of national parks, comes the present era of community conservation and adaptive wildlife management. This approach was radical in that many governments realized that independent national parks could not single handedly conserve species, but in fact community participation and development was integral to saving species that existed outside the parks. In Zambia's South Luangwa Valley, the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development project was initiated in 1983.⁴¹ These project mimicked the CAMPFIRE program initiated in Zimbabwe, that aimed to integrate communities into wildlife management practice. Kruger National Park has not created such a program, but has created local employment opportunities that have created more disposable income for local individuals, compared to those not employed by the park.⁴² Masai Mara National Reserve to date has no such program, but has voiced concerns about adaptive management structures, as the economic burden of national parks has complicated their livelihoods.⁴³ This final period of park management has marked the beginning of interactions with development, and other disciplines. National parks will not be successful if lions can eat, but people cannot.

⁴⁰ Child, "Parks in," 19.

⁴¹ Adams, "The Myth," 105.

⁴² SANParks, *SANParks Annual Report 2015/2016*, 2016, accessed October 13, 2017, <https://www.sanparks.org/assets/docs/general/annual-report-2016.pdf>.

⁴³ Kabiri, Ngeta. "The Political Economy of Wildlife Conservation and Decline in Kenya." *The Journal of Environment & Development* 19, no. 4 (2010): 424-45.

This brief history organizes the trajectory of parks into a linear progression, although each of these countries has adhered and strayed from it at different points. This entire literature review is aimed at understanding the macro and micro histories and trajectories of national parks and development, so that we can begin to map out the relationship that exists in each of the case studies. In the following chapters, I will begin to argue about how this relationship between national park, and development initiative is cross-sectional in scope, from ecology, to the social sciences. It will also analyze the tensions that occur between park management and local individuals. At the macro level, I will argue that national parks exist as an institution that is itself part of an enduring political process.

Chapter 1: Kruger National Park - South Africa

The Kruger National Park is the first case study examining whether parks implement effective development initiatives. Kruger is the earliest case for this comparative study because it was founded in 1926 whilst still under direct colonial rule. It is necessary to examine the early history of Kruger, because the racial, social, and economic development initiatives that have been instituted today attempt to undo the legal restraints and wrongdoings initiated under the parks original creation. Kruger boasts one of the largest tourism economies and visitor rates of all national parks on the continent.⁴⁴ The different social and economic programs, most notably the land claim and environmental monitoring programs, illustrate the different success and failures the park has had in procuring socio-economic development for local residents. The land claim program currently has 40 claims pending, and they have been pending for almost 25 years since the end of Apartheid.⁴⁵ Meanwhile, the environmental monitoring program (EM) has had considerable affect on the livelihood of new employees, including disposable incomes, savings accounts, and civic engagement within their communities. However, the program was created by the Ministry of the Interior's Public Works Program, a policy that aims only to provide temporary jobs—lasting only 1 year. It is impossible to say whether these programs have failed or succeed as a whole, but the different social and economic affects can be evaluated on such a basis. Development programs need improvement in Kruger National Park, but they are on a path to-

⁴⁴ SANParks, *SANParks Annual*, 88.

⁴⁵ Melissa Wray and Lynette Strauss, "Land Claims in Kruger," news release, 2017, accessed November 30, 2017, <http://www.krugerpark.co.za/krugerpark-times-2-4-land-claims-in-kruger-19187.html>.

wards successful and sustainable development evident in the tourism economy, and the land claim and environmental monitoring programs.

a. Social Development

To begin to understand land claims as a social program, we first have to investigate the racial and legal history of the park that has led to the program. One of the most striking issues in Kruger National Park revolves around it as a racially motivated property regime. With the onset of colonialism came white nationalism. This white nationalism gave way to land evictions in the early 1900s with the creation of two game parks, which became Kruger National Park officially in 1926.⁴⁶ The National Parks Act formally created property in South Africa that was to be used by white men for hunting game, and preserving other flora and fauna, whilst also removing many local inhabitants from their land.⁴⁷ In efforts to remove inhabitants off desirable land--i.e fertile soil for agriculture, and natural ecosystems with megafauna--the colonial government chose to systematically strip rural inhabitants of *their* land. This land was used for agricultural purposes, and for grazing by cattle prior to colonialism, creating terrible circumstances for individuals taken off of their land. The racial motivation in this case is to undermine the economic, political, and social well-being of black individuals by white colonial administrators. Through this racialization process, race became endemic legislatively in South Africa. The historical nature of this action taken by colonial whites creates a discourse of race not present before foreign invasion of

⁴⁶ Carruthers, Jane. "Creating a National Park, 1910 to 1926." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 15, no. 2 (1989): 188-216. 188.

⁴⁷ Carruthers, "Creating a," 189.

this land, and a legacy of racially motivated legislation and political upheaval, that is unresolved to this day. By creating government property for white individuals, black individuals are inherently marginalized socially, and economically, but also legally.

This brings us to one of the first aspects of measuring the effectiveness of the relationship between Parks and development. A central component to this idea of effective development measures has to address the historical narrative, and the ongoing proceedings to resurrect these past injustices. Land claims were first decreed as a legal process to reclaim land after the end of Apartheid in 1994,⁴⁸ and were meant to give land back to the rightful owners. Land claims therefore exist as a form of social and economic development because it attempts to resurrect past injustices, and provide a source of income for those individuals who lost their land. Currently there are around 40 land claims in Kruger National Park that have been filed to SANParks (South African National Parks system).⁴⁹ Of these 40 claims that have been filed since 1998, only two have been settled, the Makuleke and Mdluli, and both resulted in land being given back with formal recognition that the land would be used for conservation purposes.⁵⁰ This source comes from the South African government, and the site has been edited in 2017, which means over the course of almost 20 years, only 2 cases have been settled, and in both cases the government required these families to use the land for conservation. Land reclamation is certainly development practice because it is an attempt to give families back land that was taken, increasing employment, and land value for impoverished South Africans.

⁴⁸ Wray and Strauss, "Land Claims."

⁴⁹ Wray and Strauss, "Land Claims."

⁵⁰ Wray and Strauss, "Land Claims."

Since only 2 out of 40 cases have been settled, land claims are largely an ineffective tool to dismantle the deeply historical Kruger property regime. This is due to the fact that many evicted individuals do not have access to information or formal documentation that ties them to land that was taken from them up to 100 years ago. The legality of property contains the injustices of history that are well documented, yet the legal system still expects individuals to produce written documents citing their land eviction. White settlers were for the most part not producing documentation for land eviction, they were simply removing individuals from their land and producing documentation that they now owned it.⁵¹ Development largely ignores that these individuals were taken away from land that now generates economic growth, and land claims are taken for granted as legal processes in place to correct these wrong doings. Development needs to stress that these property regimes are embedded, and unequal. Apartheid did not end until 1994, and only then did the legal process of detangling these land claims begin after almost 100 years of inequality and prejudice.⁵² The property regime that exists in this form in Kruger National Park makes development practice associated with property and land, largely ineffective. The history of race and nationalist sentiments becoming binding legal mandate have caused serious injustices in the form of national park property, and land reclamation is a form of development that completely ignores this important history.

b. Economic Development

⁵¹ Carruthers, "Creating a," 192.

⁵² Visser, Gustav, and Christian M. Rogerson. "Researching the South African Tourism and Development Nexus." *GeoJournal* 60, no. 3 (2004): 201-15. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41147884>.

Another integral tool to understanding the effectiveness of development programs in National Parks is economic development. Tourism represents a major source of economic development in South Africa. In SANParks Economic Assessment from 2008, they reported that their capital expenditure on national parks was R230,0 million.⁵³ They stipulated that this capital investment would create new business sales of R637,4 million.⁵⁴ In terms of employment across all national parks, the capital expenditure of the entire SANParks system would create approximately 2,664 permanent and temporary jobs, directly, and indirectly. The operational expenditure for SANParks in this assessment was R1,068.8 million, and was expected to generate a gross output in the economy of R2, 375.1 million.⁵⁵ It was also estimated that for each R1 million of operational expenditure budget spent, that 6.32 permanent jobs would be created.⁵⁶ On this macro scale, in 2008, it is evident that all of these numbers are positive in terms of economic development for national parks. A total of over 2,000 jobs created, and a total contribution of 220,5 million rand to GDP, is extremely positive for a growing economy. This is obviously macro-scale, and does not investigate Kruger specifically, but does show positive signs of development in terms of employment and GDP cumulatively for national parks. GDP has often been criticized by economists as an arbitrary number, with little significance when evaluating sustainable development, but nonetheless it is still valuable to see that national parks *are* contributing to economic growth and employment. At the broadest scale in terms of all national parks current reports, eco-

⁵³ SANParks, *SANParks: Economic Impact Assessment*, iv, March 2008, accessed November 30, 2017, https://www.sanparks.org/about/economic_impact_study_sept08.pdf.

⁵⁴ SANParks, *SANParks: Economic*, iv.

⁵⁵ SANParks, *SANParks: Economic*, iv.

⁵⁶ SANParks, *SANParks: Economic*, vii.

conomic development is high and effective. The question we beg is then who is being employed, and is Kruger National Park specifically implementing successful economic development initiatives?

In in annual report done by SANParks for 2015-2016, they measured a total of 6,334 full time equivalent (FTE) jobs created by their Expanded Public Works Programs (EPWP) across all National Parks.⁵⁷ These programs include the Environmental Monitoring Program, Working for Water, Working for Wetlands, and many more.⁵⁸ The environmental monitoring (EM) program hired approximately 1441 individuals across all parks in 2015, with 20% of these being employed in the Kruger to Canyons Reserve.⁵⁹ The program was designed to give local inhabitants biodiversity monitoring privileges to both create employment, give people a sense of ownership of their ecosystem, and decrease poaching activities in Kruger National Park. A study was done to analyze the effects that employment from this program had on individuals income, and their respective cost of living expenses. Of the approximately 288 environmental monitors (EMs), a total of 108 EMs participated in the study. On average the total income earned in EM households was R6306 per month, and R2844 came from EM monitoring.⁶⁰ Only 18% of EM monitors had all of their income coming from EM monitoring. Their mean monthly expenditures for utilities, groceries, and transport was R2558, leaving on average R286 for savings--about 79% of individ-

⁵⁷ SANParks, *SANParks Annual*, 88.

⁵⁸ SANParks, *SANParks Annual*, 88.

⁵⁹ Louise Swemmer, *The Social and Economic Impact of the Kruger to Canyon Biosphere Environmental Monitor Programme – Impact on the Environmental Monitors*, 13, December 2015, accessed December 6, 2017.

⁶⁰ Swemmer, *The Social*, 24.

uals responded saying prior to working as an EM they were unable to save money.⁶¹ Working as an EM monitor for most of these individuals was also qualitatively extremely important, as many individuals responded saying that they felt empowered in their village and community to make recommendations on building projects, felt proud for being self-sufficient, and generally happy because they were employed.⁶² This illuminates positive outcomes from the EM program in Kruger National Park.

Most of these individuals had not been employed prior to the program, and that direct employment opportunity provided disposable income, savings, and enough money to pay for their children's school clothes. By employing one EM monitor, there is a cascading effect on their family having another source of income to pay rent and utility bills, while also making their children able to attend school. Furthermore, less explicitly this paper also includes vital information that is useful for thinking about development in Africa. Most families are not relying on a single individual's household income, but rather, a culmination of agriculture,⁶³ formal employment, and parenthood. This paper is useful because the EM monitors discuss the fact that employment is extremely important and valuable to them, and brought about by the existence of Kruger National Park. But, being a parent, cleaning the home, and attending to crops are all non-monetary forms of employment, and in this survey, respondents mentioned they were no longer able to do these things when they became employed as an EM. This offers a unique economic perspective on development in this particular work program. It is more qualitative but perhaps

⁶¹ Swemmer, *The Social*, 26.

⁶² Swemmer, *The Social*, 33.

⁶³ Swemmer, *The Social*, 30.

equally as valuable. The cost-benefit analysis of formal EM employment, versus informal employment at home is necessary for development agencies to undertake, and understand in order to offer valuable policy recommendations for development in the future. All in all, this critical scientific paper is vital in understanding that our western vision of employment, cannot be transplanted in different cultural contexts.

The effectiveness of the EM program does illustrate efficiency and usefulness, but it is necessary to look at the scope of these operations in terms of policy at the park management level. Kruger National Park is operated and run by SANParks, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA).⁶⁴ The DEA is the governing body that created the Expanded Public Works Program (EPWP)--the program that created the environmental monitoring program that I cited above--that was used across all the South African National Parks. This program has shown a steady increase since its inception in the late 1990s.⁶⁵ In 2007/2008, only 2,059 people were employed through the EPWP,⁶⁶ while 6,334 were created in 2015/2016. Although this increase is significant, the EPWP is not holistically viable as the sole government sponsored program for all national parks. The first issue is that all of these programs are explicitly temporary work programs for the unemployed. The individuals working as environmental monitors, or other conservation professions do gain professional skills that could be helpful for securing employment in the future, but temporary work programs do not provide steady income

⁶⁴ Department of Environmental Affairs, "South African National Parks (SANParks)," Environmental Affairs, accessed December 6, 2017, <https://www.environment.gov.za/statutorybodies/sanparks>.

⁶⁵ SANParks, "Expanded Public Works Programmes (EPWP)," SANParks.org, accessed December 12, 2017, https://www.sanparks.org/about/connecting_to_society/epwp.php.

⁶⁶ Department of Environmental Affairs, "South African," Environmental Affairs.

or employment to marginalized communities over time. The positive feedback from the EM program shows that individuals are more than happy to be employed, and the government department has a duty to provide full time work, that lasts over 1 year. If an individual works for only one year, then all the bills they were able to pay prior, is no longer available. The money saved from that year of employment becomes negligible for the future, because saving R286 a month--\$22 equivalent--is \$264 dollars after a year of employment. \$264 dollars in a nation where the average monthly expenditure is R2558, \$200. There are no studies done to provide insight into the employment opportunities for individuals once they have worked for 1 year in the program, but I cannot imagine that other forms of formal employment are readily available inside the park post-EPWP employment. This policy does do what it says it is going to do, but the DEA needs to complete further research and technical reports to find out what happens to these individuals post-employment. The only numbers they publish are number of persons employed, and the number of total days worked.⁶⁷ The EPWP is significant, but alarmingly shallow in scope.

To conclude, these specific social and economic programs in Kruger illustrate general themes that exist in all national parks. Racial tensions and land eviction are serious issues around the world, and the Kruger National Park case makes it apparent that creating a legal system to file land claims is ineffective and unjust. In developing countries where many national parks are, land eviction took place without documentation or legal warning. To be effective, parks must find a way to give individuals back their land. Whether it is through employment on the land, or partial ownership of the park, giving people a stake in *their* park is important, as evidenced by

⁶⁷ Republic of South Africa Department of Environmental Affairs, Department of Environmental Affairs Annual Report 2015/16, by Department of Environmental Affairs, 2013, accessed November 23, 2017, https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/reports/2015_16annual_report_environmentalaffairs.pdf.

the EM program. Lastly, western economic measures of success are not enough. Savings are terrific for impoverished families, but to change their lives to be dependent on the western tourist economy is volatile. Around the planet western tourists visit national parks, but without those visitors the parks become empty, ineffective economic sinkholes for local residents. Tying together the global market and rural pastoralist societies is a recipe for disaster when western economies are in decline, and less people travel. The issues of land eviction, race, and employment have been largely ineffective, but the positive influences can be celebrated and expanded to change the discourse on national parks as development vehicles.

Chapter 2: South Luangwa National Park - Zambia

South Luangwa National Park is located in the Eastern province of Zambia, and is intersected by the Zambezi River. South Luangwa was formally created as a national park in 1971, when the National Parks and Wildlife Act was implemented after passing in 1968.⁶⁸ Zambia only gained independence in 1964.⁶⁹ Before becoming a national park, South Luangwa was comprised of several different game management areas and controlled hunting areas set up under indirect rule by the British colonial administration.⁷⁰ It is important to note that South Luangwa National Park contains both the national park and game management areas that exist as buffers between the park and open access land. This history is integral to some of the development initiatives that the state has sponsored with the help of different NGOs. It also represents a similarity to Kruger National Park that has been tackled differently in South Luangwa with the creation of Community Resource Boards (CRBs) and specifically the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project (LIRD) which later became the South Luangwa Management Unit (SLAMU).⁷¹ The technical details and history are relevant to this paper, but the choice of the Zambian government to adopt a community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) system in South Luangwa is the central pillar to understanding the success and effectiveness of the development initiatives taken by or in conjunction with South Luangwa National Park. The adoption of such a develop-

⁶⁸ Ian Patrick Alexander Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife Conservation in Zambia* (Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria Press, 1993), 48, <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/25570/01volumeI.pdf?sequence=2>.

⁶⁹ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 56.

⁷⁰ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 48.

⁷¹ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 62.

ment method points us towards it's analysis. Analysis of this development scheme will involve analysis of social and economic development programs.

a. Social Development

In order to analyze the current CBNRM system—SLAMU—we first have to understand the trajectory of the National Park briefly. Prior to establishment as a National Park, South Luangwa was a game management area that implemented a cropping scheme to provide funds for the local residents of the South Luangwa river valley.⁷² This cropping scheme meant killing elephants and other animals, to generate income from ivory and tusks—although very little money was actually funneled to local communities as much of it was lost in various corrupt bureaucratic departments.⁷³ Once Zambia gained independence, the pro-conservation President, Kenneth Kaunda, had power vested in his office to control game management and national parks.⁷⁴ He decided to create the Zambian National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS).⁷⁵ This highly centralized government office had positions filled personally by Kaunda, and received very little funding to implement strong programs to both curb poaching and assist with rural development programs in areas surrounding parks.⁷⁶ His highly centralized view of conservation led to huge declines in animal populations, most notably the black rhino and elephant in South Luangwa Na-

⁷² Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 58.

⁷³ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 59.

⁷⁴ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 57.

⁷⁵ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 60.

⁷⁶ Manning, *Volume I: Wildlife*, 60.

tional Park. Poaching activities escalated because revenue from safaris was not going to communities, it was all staying in the central government being paid to officials, businessmen and other upper class individuals. Furthermore, Kaunda did little to curb these poaching activities with legislation and policy, choosing to send military into the parks to preserve the borders. This led to a pivotal turning point in Zambian history with the creation of the LIRD, the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project. The LIRD was a CBNRM program, that was essentially funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), as a pilot program to be co-managed by the NPWS. They believed that heavy poaching in the South Luangwa National Park could only be dealt with by improving the livelihoods of surrounding communities living on the borders of the park.⁷⁷

Zambia has since created Community Resource Boards (CRBs) across much of the country, but in South Luangwa village action groups (VAG) were created instead.⁷⁸ This is particularly important because across many of the nations in Southern and Eastern Africa that have implemented CBNRM systems, South Luangwa implemented an even more decentralized plan, VAGs.⁷⁹ The difference between CRBs and VAGs, is that a VAG represents a single village with 10 elected officials—usually a chief, and nine others—who lobby on behalf of constituents to the

⁷⁷ Godfrey Joe Zimba, "The Management of South Luangwa National Park towards Sustainable Tourism Development" (master's thesis, The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 2006), accessed February 14, 2018, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.456.6197&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

⁷⁸ Child, B. *Parks in Transition: Biodiversity, Rural Development, and the Bottom Line*. London: Earthscan Publications, 2004. 78

⁷⁹ Child, *Parks in Transition*, 78.

central government, and other intermediary institutions.⁸⁰ In turn, the social development in the areas surrounding South Luangwa National Park are stronger because of a more decentralized devolution of power to influence both policy and practice that affects people living around South Luangwa National Park. In a study done by Brian Child and Barry Dalal-Clayton, they found that this devolution of authority resulted in better benefits for the inhabitants of villages, when compared to regional level CRB programs that contained many different municipalities and villages.⁸¹ VAGs manage their respective game areas, which have boundaries that push right up to South Luangwa National Park. Specifically, they found that a mere 0.8% of distributed wildlife revenue from hunting and sustainable tourism was unaccounted for in VAG economic reports surrounding South Luangwa National Park, while 40% was unaccounted for in Area Development Committees (ADCs)—regional boards with less decentralized power to elected officials in each village.⁸² Furthermore, attitudes in villages changed dramatically from 1996-1998 in the villages with elected VAGs, mainly the Lupande Game Management area adjacent to South Luangwa National Park. They felt that the wildlife was no longer completely state owned, nor for the benefit solely of the central government, but rather that maintaining healthy wildlife populations was in their control, and for their benefit.⁸³ In fact, in 1996 only 12% of individuals living in the LIRD area thought that the program was benefiting them “very much”, and in 1998 that

⁸⁰ Brian Child and Barry Dalal-Clayton, "Transforming Approaches to CBNRM: Learning from the Luangwa Experience in Zambia," chapter 12 to *Getting Biodiversity Projects to Work: Towards More Effective Conservation and Development*, by Thomas O. McShane and Michael P. Wells (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), digital file.

⁸¹ Child and Dalal-Clayton, "Transforming Approaches," chapter 12, 264.

⁸² Child and Dalal-Clayton, "Transforming Approaches," chapter 12, 264.

⁸³ Child and Dalal-Clayton, "Transforming Approaches," chapter 12, 265.

number was 25%.⁸⁴ This huge increase was due to a single policy decision, The Zambian Wildlife Act of 1998, that created the revenue redistribution to VAGs, and ADCs located within the LIRD. ⁸⁵

This social prerogative created by national government, but devolved into the LIRD village action groups (VAGs) represents a successful social development program following many years of little success. By devolving authority from the central government that is still incapable of allocating funds sufficiently to ADCs, social programs were able to help individuals feel ownership for park land, after being evicted during the parks creation. However, ZAWA is an underfunded government body that relies on NGO efforts and international aid to employ and devolve authority to local inhabitants in the surrounding GMAs. The ability for social change to continue in the SLNP and within SLAMU (formerly known as LIRD), will require greater transition away from international aid initiatives, and more robust government involvement in allocating funds properly, and providing systematic devolution of authority to the SLNP because it is technically under government oversight. There is only so far that international aid and NGO efforts can play in a government program. In order to be successful, the SLNP and SLAMU must take regulatory action to both symbolically and politically devolve authority—because it has proven successful—to achieve greater social change in extremely low income areas that can receive greater benefit from their surrounding National Park through government action.

⁸⁴ Child and Dalal-Clayton, "Transforming Approaches," chapter 12, 266.

⁸⁵ Child and Dalal-Clayton, "Transforming Approaches," chapter 12, 266.

b. Economic Development

Similar to Kruger National Park in South Africa, South Luangwa National Park represents a huge piece of Zambia's tourism industry. Hailed as one of the most beautiful, and bountiful parks on the continent, visitor rates have gradually risen since the parks inception in 1971, especially over the last 25 years.⁸⁶ In 1994 there were 12, 699⁸⁷ visitors to South Luangwa National Park, and in 2014 there were 41, 970⁸⁸, a 331% increase. Compared to Kruger National Park in South Africa this is extremely small, but South Luangwa National represents the most visited national park in Zambia, and second largest tourist destination to Victoria Falls in Livingston. The question becomes whether the initiated programs within the SLAMU area and the SNLP are effective economically for both the national and local economies, and whether local employment and disposable income have risen in the area since the inception of community development initiatives within SLAMU and the SLNP.

Firstly, like in the Kruger case, it is evident the South Luangwa National Park (SLNP) has created huge revenue from park visitation for the Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA). Between 1998 and 2003—when much of the research was done on the LIRD/SLAMU—tourist

⁸⁶ Adam Pope, *Luangwa Safari Association Tourism Report*, April 2005, accessed March 22, 2018, <http://fsg.afre.msu.edu/zambia/resources/Luangwa%20Safari%20Association%20Tourism%20Study%20-%20Final%20Report%20-%20rev%202.pdf>.

⁸⁷ Pope, *Luangwa Safari*, 24.

⁸⁸ Zambian National Government Ministry of Tourism and Arts. *Tourism Statistical Digest*. July 2014. Accessed March 22, 2018. <http://www.mota.gov.zm/index.php/downloads/data-and-statistics/27-2014-tourism-statistical-digest-draft/file>.

revenue in the SLNP rose from \$494,414 to \$830,640, almost doubling.⁸⁹ Over the course of this time period, the LIRDP was renamed SLAMU with a central vision of connecting local communities to the national park, as well as fostering wildlife management as an effective development tool within the surrounding Game management areas that were now part of South Luangwa Area Management Unit (SLAMU).⁹⁰ The central issue with the huge increase in wildlife tourism, was that the national park still had a negative net gain, meaning that the park's expenditure for building infrastructure and employment, was more than the park revenue from tourism and hunting in the surrounding GMAs, meaning it was essentially an ineffective economic development case, because it was relying too heavily on NORAD funding and not capitalizing on potential for wildlife profits.⁹¹

In another study done by Brian Child and Barry Dalal-Clayton, they found that a central legislation change in 1996 led to increased funding return to local communities surrounding South Luangwa National Park.⁹² In 1996, the government program SLAMU, decided to take all revenues from park visitation, lodging, and other fees and invest in the park management appara-

⁸⁹ Pope, *Luangwa Safari*, 26.

⁹⁰ Barry Dalal-Clayton and Brian Child, *Lessons from Luangwa: The Story of the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project*, Zambia, Wildlife and Development Series 13 (London, England: International Institute for Environment and Development, 2003), accessed March 22, 2018, <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9079IIED.pdf>.

⁹¹ United National Environmental Program (UNEP) for the Zambian National Government
Zambian Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources. *A Financial and Economic Analysis of the Costs and Benefits of Managing the Protected Area Estate*. April 2004. Accessed March 22, 2018. <http://fsg.afre.msu.edu/zambia/resources/Economic%20Analysis%20of%20Protected%20Areas1%20%20zambia%20report.pdf>.

⁹² Dalal-Clayton and Child, *Lessons from*, 200.

tus, and then local communities would receive 100% of all hunting, lodging, and safari fees.⁹³ Prior to this arrangement, local communities received 40% of total revenue from the SLNP and GMA, while now they receive nothing directly from the SLNP, but keep 100% from the GMA.⁹⁴ By doing so, local VAGs were able to form within the SLAMU government enforced area, and decide what infrastructure and social programs they wanted to undertake from their *own* hunting concessions, lodging, and safari fees. In 1996, total income for all the VAGs located within SLAMU jurisdiction was \$28,122,883, of which 48% was kept in cash and allocated proportionately to community members, and 47% was allocated for community funded projects. Figures for such revenue and community projects is nonexistent prior to this turning point in history, but it points towards a highly effective government solution to the political process of distributing revenue from national parks efficiently and effectively to community members. Anecdotal evidence proves that Chiefs in different VAGs felt greater ownership for their own wildlife practice. Park revenue was used largely to build new lodging over this period to catch up to more developed tourism industries in South Africa and Botswana. Although revenue from the National Park is retained within the government to build its own infrastructure, by separating that revenue stream from that of local communities outside the park, wildlife that is state-owned within the Park is sectioned off and wildlife located within the GMA becomes property of local communities. This dichotomy is extremely important in fostering community activism and ownership of wildlife that yields huge economic rewards for previously exploited low-income communities.

⁹³ Dalal-Clayton and Child, *Lessons from*, 200.

⁹⁴ Dalal-Clayton and Child, *Lessons from*, 200.

Lastly, employment has risen gradually within South Luangwa National Park, and outside of the park with different NGOs and other community funded projects. An NGO named Conservation South Luangwa (CSL), published a report in 2015 citing their own training programs for Village Scouts.⁹⁵ In 2015, they trained a total of 63 scouts in wildlife protection, including veterinary care, canine unit use, aerial patrolling, and foot patrolling. Of these 63 scouts, 15 were absorbed by the NGO, while the remaining 48 were employed by their respective Community Resource Boards (CRBs). This program was actually completed in conjunction with the Department of National Parks and Wildlife in Zambia. This is a huge step forward because the organizational and economic capacity of such an institution is minimal, but with the help of a local NGO in South Luangwa 63 individuals became employed full time.

Economic and social development programs inside and just outside of the SNLP are largely still developing into more concrete systems. The issue with social programs in the SLNP is that they still largely rely heavily on international funding, which will gradually decrease with time. The economic effectiveness of programs in the SLNP is a lack of government oversight, and research to determine the effects on local populations beyond employment, revenue, and expenditure. Although, the essential conclusions that can be made about social and economic effectiveness in Zambia are that decentralized institutions that give ownership back to local populations for their benefit, encourages growth and spending within local communities according to a few academic and non-governmental studies. VAGs have been instrumental in establishing game management areas outside of the SLNP that harness natural ecosystems for their own economic

⁹⁵ Conservation South Luangwa, Conservation South Luangwa (CSL) Annual Report 2015, 10, 2015, accessed April 19, 2018, <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/56ec3b690442625503c916f7/t/577bed6e-be6594a326d4f964/1467739506385/SLCS-Annual-Report-2015.pdf>.

and social success, be it through infrastructure projects or employment as a scout with a local NGO. The decision to stop allocating funds from the SLNP to VAGs was instrumental in creating ownership of land outside the park *fully*, instead of a quasi-government system that allocated funds from the SLNP partially to areas outside the park. The development paradigm in Zambia has undergone a huge shift over the past 35 years, and economic and social effectiveness is beginning to reap rewards, but government institutions need to decentralize further and allow local populations to make their own decisions about wildlife and conservation, because it is empowering for local populations to change their social and economic status through *their* prerogative.

Chapter 3: Maasai Marra National Reserve - Kenya

The Maasai Marra National Reserve (MMNR) is located within the Serengeti ecosystem that stretches nearly 10,000 square miles from Tanzania into northern Kenya.⁹⁶ The portion of this ecosystem that lies within the Kenyan national border is known as the Masai Mara, and a large portion of it was created into a national reserve—synonymous with a national park⁹⁷—in 1974.⁹⁸ This area known as Maasailand was a continuous ecosystem prior to the establishment of an international border between Kenya and Tanzania in 1920, when German East Africa transferred the territory to British East Africa.⁹⁹ Following the disintegration of the British and German Empires, the border between Kenya and Tanzania became formalized internationally, and the Masai Mara National Reserve was created in 1974 by the Kenyan government to preserve wildlife populations, with explicit non-consumptive tourism measures, i.e only tourism viewing and safari tours.¹⁰⁰ The complicated history of the Masai Mara is what distinguishes it as a especially intersectional case study for this paper. Similar to both Zambia and South Africa, the park evicted a collective group of rural pastoralist inhabitants, known as the Masai, from this entire national reserve to serve as a stepping stone towards a tourism economy. But, with changes in the

⁹⁶ Jonathan S. Adams and Thomas O. McShane, *The Myth of Wild Africa: Conservation without Illusion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 38.

⁹⁷ International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), "Masai Mara in Kenya," [protectedplanet.net](https://www.protectedplanet.net), last modified 2014, accessed April 7, 2018, <https://www.protectedplanet.net/1297>.

⁹⁸ International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), "Masai Mara," [protectedplanet.net](https://www.protectedplanet.net).

⁹⁹ Katherine Homewood, "Development, Demarcation and Ecological Outcomes in Maasailand," *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 65, no. 3 (1995): 335, doi:10.2307/1161050.

¹⁰⁰ Homewood, "Development, Demarcation," 335.

development paradigm in the 1980-90s towards integration of rural communities into national parks social and economic development projects have been undertaken inside the park and surrounding it to “better” the lives of the Masai people. Through community resource boards, employment, and tourism the Masai Mara National Reserve has been caught in institutional stagnation, complicated land use rights, and a booming tourism economy. The focus for this chapter will once again assess the effectiveness of the respective economic and social programs created by or in conjunction with the Masai Mara National Reserve.

a. Social Development

The Masai people have been subjugated to hardship and marginalization since the colonial era, and it has continued into the present. One of the first ways to analyze social development in the Masai Mara National Reserve (MMNR), is to look at how the national government and city councils in charge of the park are addressing issues of livelihood, land eviction, and wildlife conflict with Masai populations that inhabit areas surrounding the park. Beginning with the parks inception in 1974, the Kenyan government promptly evicted almost all Masai populations from the national park, that was previously entirely used by the Masai.¹⁰¹ The baseline for understanding social effectiveness therefore must deal with reconciling land eviction through other means, or returning land to rightful owners. The latter obviously has not happened although, around 100 square kilometers was returned to the Masai out of the 1600 square miles the

¹⁰¹ Homewood, "Development, Demarcation," 335.

park encompasses in the 1980s.¹⁰² Part of this area is still within the MMNR, it is known as the Mara Triangle, and represents a huge portion of wildlife tourism in the park.¹⁰³ The central government has been extremely naive in their vision of social development for the evicted Masai. They were given ranch land outside of the MMNR to be used as pastoral land for cattle grazing. The issue is that much of the land outside of MMNR is not arable, and provides no basis for sustainable agriculture or pastoral production.¹⁰⁴ Some of the land has been used for tourism, almost an extension of the MMNR, where wildlife roams freely, and camps are set up for tourist accommodation.¹⁰⁵ The issue with policies set up by the Kenyan government that led to the Mara Triangle creations, and other privately owned land ranch just outside the park is that assistance is not provided, and fencing has created enormous pressures on grazing efficiency, and tourism.¹⁰⁶

The social implications for development therefore are pertinent in this discussion of privatizing land, and creating competitive capitalist models for development. Firstly, without access to the MMNR due to fencing, ranches located outside the park are forced to fence in their respective land to keep out wildlife and other ranches, because the dry season creates extremely arid conditions with little vegetation for feeding.¹⁰⁷ This privatized model for land redistribution by

¹⁰² Homewood, "Development, Demarcation," 335.

¹⁰³ Nigel Leader-Williams et al., *Wildlife and People: Conflict and Conservation in Masai Mara, Kenya*, publication no. 13618628, 27, March 2003, accessed April 13, 2018, <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/92251-IED.pdf>.

¹⁰⁴ Homewood, "Development, Demarcation," 335.

¹⁰⁵ Leader-Williams et al., *Wildlife and People*, 28.

¹⁰⁶ Leader-Williams et al., *Wildlife and People*, 32.

¹⁰⁷ Teklehaymanot Weldemichel, "Fencing-in Oneself: Understanding the Fencing Crisis in Maasai Mara, Kenya," AfricanBioServices (blog), entry posted March 17, 2017, accessed April 13, 2018, <http://african-bioservices.eu/fencing-in-oneself-understanding-the-fencing-crisis-in-masai-mara-kenya/>.

the Kenyan government as implemented in the late 1970s, was completely random.¹⁰⁸ This is a completely artificial policy decision, that also allowed other tribes to migrate and claim ranch lands just outside of the MMNR, further increasing competition for arable land.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, ranch land distributions were made in the late 1970s, but Masai populations have erupted since this policy decision, increasing from 10 people/km² to 60 people/km².¹¹⁰ This single policy decision has forever changed land redistribution inside the MMNR, and in ranches outside of the park. Although studies suggest that nutritional levels have not changed dramatically, the social dynamics of this area have taken a toll on the Masai. Infighting between tribes who have immigrated has led to violence,¹¹¹ school going children have been impacted by elephant stampedes in their ranch areas,¹¹² and history has not been upended to change the lives of the Masai by the Kenyan government. It is for these reasons, that the Kenyan government has largely been ineffective in crafting policy that is effective in promoting equal opportunity for Masai farmers, in returning land to rightful owners, and changing the development paradigm to support the Masai.

However, it is important to note that some positive social impacts have been documented from the establishment of the MMNR. Private park companies within the MMNR park—although largely white owned—have been instrumental in creating primary schools, health facilities, and employment opportunities for local populations who were unfairly taken off *their land*.

¹⁰⁸ Mitchell Harwitz, "On Improving the Lot of the Poorest: Economic Plans in Kenya," *African Studies Review* 21, no. 3 (December 1978): 71, doi:10.2307/523886.

¹⁰⁹ Harwitz, "On Improving," 72.

¹¹⁰ Leader-Williams et al., *Wildlife and People*, 28.

¹¹¹ Homewood, "Development, Demarcation," 345.

¹¹² Leader-Williams et al., *Wildlife and People*, 32.

One camp company named *Governor Camp*, has initiated multiple programs that include assisting in the creation of two primary schools, two biogas plants, and tree planting.¹¹³ Although the Masai had already begun the creation of the primary schools, the Governors camp helped fund the projects by creating 7 additional classrooms, paying 4 teachers, and creating a library.¹¹⁴ School projects such as these would not have been possible without the tourism profits from the MMNR. Furthermore, Governors Camp helped create 2 biogas plants that reduce the need for firewood that has destroyed habitat for wildlife, and occupied a lot of time for Masai women especially in finding, and consequently cutting down trees.¹¹⁵ These programs are incredibly effective socially proven through educational opportunities that did not exist prior to the creation of the park. Reconciling the positive impacts made by one company outside the reserve however overlooks the breadth of research done on land redistribution due to the parks creation.

Evidently, the Masai Mara National Reserve dealt with the end of colonialism by randomly relocating the Masai to create tourism opportunities. The economic output of these efforts will be analyzed later in this chapter, but it is plain to see that ideologically shifting towards privatized capitalist land redistribution has become a burden for the Masai. This polarizing government policy has forever changed the social circumstances of the Masai, and although positive social programs have taken shape voluntarily by private lodging companies, the central injustices have not been resurrected through unfair land redistribution, wildlife prioritization, and privatization of land.

¹¹³ Governors Camp, "Masai Mara Projects," news release, 2018, <https://www.governorscamp.com/masai-mara-projects>.

¹¹⁴ Governors Camp, "Masai Mara."

¹¹⁵ Governors Camp, "Masai Mara."

b. Economic Development

As with the previous two cases examined in this paper, the MMNR represents one of the most iconic, and most visited parks on the African continent.¹¹⁶ It was estimated that visitor rates to the MMNR were around 200,000 visitors in the early 1990s¹¹⁷, but have since decreased to 147,000 in 2015.¹¹⁸ Still, the MMNR represents the most visited park in Kenya according to the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, and tourism represents one of the most important contributors to the national economy. Economic effectiveness in this chapter will focus on the positive national economic effectiveness of the MMNR, and an analytic framework that assesses the negative impacts of tourism on local inhabitants. The MMNR like South Luangwa and Kruger, is a tourist cash-cow, but to what degree is money changing the lives of the Masai who were taken off this land to conserve wildlife?

The first indicator of economic effectiveness in a national park occurs at the macro-level.

Tourism is a huge industry in Kenya occupying a greater contribution to GDP than South Lu-

¹¹⁶ Medani Bhandari, "Is Tourism Always Beneficial? A Case Study from Masai Mara National Reserve, Narok, Kenya.," *The Pacific Journal of Science and Technology* 15, no. 1 (May 2014): 468, accessed April 14, 2018, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270570658_Is_Tourism_Always_Beneficial_A_Case_Study_from_Masai_Mara_National_Reserve_Narok_Kenya?enrichId=rgreq-3bc7a88b7b2981b5714f555496fabf5f-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzI3M-DU3MDY1ODtBUzoxODMwNzk0NDQ0MjY3NTNAMTQyMDY2MDk0OTMyNQ%3D%3D&el=1_x_3&_esc=publicationCoverPdf.

¹¹⁷ Bhandari, "Is Tourism," 468.

¹¹⁸ Institute of Economic Affairs, "Number of Visitors to National Parks and Game Reserves, 2011-2015," news release, May 18, 2016, accessed April 14, 2018, http://www.ieakenya.or.ke/number_of_the_week/number-of-visitors-to-national-parks-and-game-reserves-2011-2015.

angwa in Zambia or Kruger in South Africa at 15%, or \$73 million (US dollars).¹¹⁹ From the tourism revenue in Kenya, national parks and reserves are the greatest contributor, and park fees collected in Kenya totaled \$26,872,827 (US Dollars) and 25% was supposedly allocated to local populations, although many Masai have cited that this rarely occurs, if ever. Most money that should be allocated to communities like in Zambia, gets lost in the bureaucratic structure, with the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) allocating funds to regional, and council boards that never makes its way to local populations directly.¹²⁰ Furthermore, studies also suggest that that although employment is high at around 400,000 jobs in national parks and reserves, 90% of these are informal positions that are usually not long-term.¹²¹ Monetary and employment effectiveness in this case are subject to scrutiny analytically. There is no doubt that the opportunity cost of pastoral land and agriculture in the MMNR would produce far less monetarily than tourism¹²², but the benefit of tourism has not positively affected the Masai living outside the park. It is similar in scope to issues faced in Zambia and South Africa. Firstly, regional ranches, and community boards—like the CBNRM network named the LIRDP in Zambia—are not decentralized enough, and do not empower the Masai.¹²³ Secondly, they offer employment opportunities like the EM monitoring program in Kruger, short-term monetary driven positions. This ties the Masai to a

¹¹⁹ Hubert Chueng, "Tourism in Kenya's National Parks: A Cost-Benefit Analysis," *SURG Journal* 6, no. 1 (2012): 31, accessed April 14, 2018, doi:2291-1367.

¹²⁰ Isaac Sindiga, "Wildlife Based Tourism in Kenya: Land Use Conflicts and Government Compensation Policies over Protected Areas," *Journal of Tourism Studies* 6, no. 2 (December 1995): accessed April 13, 2018, <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=961010438;res=IELAPA>.

¹²¹ Chueng, "Tourism in Kenya's," 34.

¹²² Chueng, "Tourism in Kenya's," 34.

¹²³ Tom Gesora Ondicho, "Tourism, Power and Politics: The Challenges of Maasai Involvement in Tourism Development" (PhD diss., Massey University, 2010), i, accessed April 14, 2018, https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1964/02_whole.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.

capitalist world system that does not seek to empower the impoverished and disenfranchised, but rather to create profit generating schemes for rich—often white—investors and the central government.

Lastly, the visitation rates to the MMNR have decreased dramatically—about 25%—since the early 1990s due to inundated parks that were destroying viable habitat, and not benefiting local populations collectively.¹²⁴ A government policy to reduce visitation and preserve wild land was instituted in the 2000s, due to hectic visitor numbers.¹²⁵ But, the unforeseen consequences of terrorist attacks by al-Shabab in 2013 have lowered tourist visitation more than expected over the course of 2 years from 2013-2015. The issue is that these unforeseen events can change the course of an entire year for individuals like the Masai who rely on employment in the park, or what little money they receive from visitation, to survive economically because they are now tied to the global market economy. Tourism has definitely brought health care, education, and infrastructure to rural areas of Kenya, especially around the MMNR. But, studies even show that students are dropping out of school to gain employment in the park,¹²⁶ and choose to participate in a market economy that exploits them. Fair wages are still not available, and the huge sums of money generated by the park have seemingly not changed the lives of local residents.¹²⁷

The unfortunate truth about the MMNR is that social and economic programs are still generally poor. There are bright spots, the ability for a minority of the Masai to actually partici-

¹²⁴ Bhandari, "Is Tourism," 468.

¹²⁵ Bhandari, "Is Tourism," 468.

¹²⁶ Chueng, "Tourism in Kenya's," 34.

¹²⁷ Homewood, "Development, Demarcation," 344.

pate in ecotourism through privately owned ranches benefits both the natural ecosystem and the people. New educational facilities and biogas plants have been created on some Masai land. But unfortunately, overall it seems these programs are few and far between, and the literature substantiates this point. Neo-colonial tendencies of the central government to exploit its own citizens through eco-tourism is evident in the MMNR with the bureaucratic structure usurping funds that are legally supposed to go to the local Masai populations. The market economy further exploits these individuals by changing their mode of production—agriculture and pastoral—to accommodate the global tourist economy. With democratization amongst the local Masai government, and greater ownership of public conservation lands, successful and effective social and economic programs can be achieved, but until neo-colonial laws and policies are lifted marginalization will continue.

Conclusion

This relationship between national parks and development is layered, complex, uncomfortable, and unresolved. Effectiveness is not black or white, it exists on a spectrum between the two. These three cases have provided a baseline for understanding the issues that national parks will continue to face throughout history. Land eviction, gainful employment, wildlife prioritization, healthcare, poor institutions, corrupt bureaucracy, and education are an intricate interwoven web of themes and ideas that shape the relationship between people and parks. If we honestly reorient our perspective, we can begin to tackle these issues that have no simple answer. Decentralized institutions have changed the way rural inhabitants in Zambia feel about themselves and their land. Environmental Monitors in Kruger have decreased poaching and become involved in their local governments. Collaboration between the Masai and local safari companies have created primary schools, and renewable energy plants. Effective development exists in these three cases, and they can work for parks globally. Collaboration, decentralization of institutions, and long term employment makes individuals feel invested in their nation, their community, and their land.

There are lessons to be learned from the cases contained within this study that are also negative. Whiteness has permeated national parks, and injustices continue to play out in national parks due to racism. Our western measures of GDP, disposable income, and disposable income coupled with cost-benefit analysis do not paint the full picture of the Masai experience. Western academia is focused on numeric measure, but students dropping out of school to work in national

parks and participate in the market economy cannot be assigned a value. It represents an ideological struggle between capitalism, socialism, and the other -isms. How we frame development changes how we value its effectiveness. Lastly, bureaucratic systems undermine rural populations, especially in underdeveloped nations. The Zambian government neglects its citizens by keeping entry funds from ever reaching the individuals who lost their lives and land for the parks creation. The political process must shift in Kenya, Zambia, and South Africa, but also globally to accommodate the needs of people in the middle and lower classes. These very issues exist in a microcosm at the national park level, and it is necessary to expand this analysis to our conceptions of national identity, political process, and representation. People globally are faced with these harsh realities everyday and our academic conclusions in specific subjects have to permeate our societies to achieve effectiveness, or progress in all walks of life.

Future studies can examine a broader range of cases. I have chosen to stick to one geographic region with similar attributes, but worthwhile analysis could be undertaken to evaluate the similar and different issues that parks have in initiating development programs. It could also be helpful to examine how parks interact with development in Europe and the United States compared to other areas of the world. However, there is a reason behind the case selection and why this study because the shared histories and thematic issues make them easily comparable. The policy process is different in other nations, language is different, as are the political systems. It would require document translation, and a uniform analysis method that accounts for political system variation, theoretical ideology, economic prosperity, and other confounding factors that could affect conclusions.

Addressing the differences that western nations face in creating successful development programs outside national parks would certainly be valuable in conversation with other parks globally. The time gap between park creation is fairly little historically, with the first park being created in 1879, and therefore there is a lot of work that can be done comparatively since it is such a young subject. Comparing how national parks interact with state parks, or municipal parks would also shed light on the effectiveness development programs might have at smaller levels. State parks and municipal parks might have a smaller footprint, but one that is exponentially more valuable in terms of employment, leisure activities, general happiness, and other nonparametric measures. The additional work that could be undertaken is wide, and would provide necessary insight on the relationships parks have with people generally.

Bibliography

- Adams, Jonathan S., and Thomas O. McShane. *The Myth of Wild Africa: Conservation without Illusion*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Andre Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," *Monthly Review* 18, 4. 1966. 17-31.
- Bhandari, Medani. "Is Tourism Always Beneficial? A Case Study from Masai Mara National Reserve, Narok, Kenya." *The Pacific Journal of Science and Technology* 15, no. 1 (May 2014): 458-83. Accessed April 14, 2018. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270570658_Is_Tourism_Always_Beneficial_A_Case_Study_from_Masai_Mara_National_Reserve_Narok_Kenya?enrichId=rgreq-3bc7a88b7b2981b5714f555496fabf5f-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzI3MDU3MDY1ODtBUzoxODMw-Nzk0NDQ0MjY3NTNAMTQyMDY2MDk0OTMyNQ%3D%3D&el=1_x_3&_esc=publicationCoverPdf.
- Bonnefoy, Pascale. "With 10 Million Acres in Patagonia, a National Park System Is Born." *New York Times*, February 19, 2018. Accessed March 8, 2018. <https://mobile.nytimes.com/2018/02/19/world/americas/patagonia-national-park-chile.html?referer=https://t.co/Bq0xRmo06a?amp=1#click=https://t.co/Bq0xRmo06a>.
- Bradford Strickland. "'My Grandfather's Gun Was Called Field of Children': Ecological History as Indictment of State Development Policy." *Africa Today* 48, no. 1 (2001): 111-19. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4187392>.
- Carruthers, Jane. "Creating a National Park, 1910 to 1926." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 15, no. 2 (1989): 188-216. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2636800>.
- Carruthers, Jane. *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 1995.
- Child, B. *Parks in Transition: Biodiversity, Rural Development, and the Bottom Line*. London: Earthscan Publications, 2004.
- Child, Brian, and Barry Dalal-Clayton. "Transforming Approaches to CBNRM: Learning from the Luangwa Experience in Zambia." Chapter 12 to *Getting Biodiversity Projects to Work: Towards More Effective Conservation and Development*, by Thomas O. McShane and Michael P. Wells, 257-87. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004. Digital file.
- Chongwa, Mungumi Bakari. "The History and Evolution of National Parks in Kenya." *The George Wright Forum* 29, no. 1 (2012): 39-42.

- Chuang, Hubert. "Tourism in Kenya's National Parks: A Cost-Benefit Analysis." *SURG Journal* 6, no. 1 (2012): 31-40. Accessed April 14, 2018. doi:2291-1367.
- Conservation South Luangwa. *Conservation South Luangwa (CSL) Annual Report 2015*. 2015. Accessed April 19, 2018. <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/56ec3b690442625503c916f7/t/577bed6ebe6594a326d4f964/1467739506385/SLCS-Annual-Report-2015.pdf>.
- Dalal-Clayton, Barry. WILDLIFE WORKING FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT – LESSONS FROM ZAMBIA'S LUANGWA VALLEY. Report. International Institute for Environment and Development, 1991. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep01653>.
- Dalal-Clayton, Barry, and Brian Child. *Lessons from Luangwa: The Story of the Luangwa Integrated Resource Development Project, Zambia*. Wildlife and Development Series 13. London, England: International Institute for Environment and Development, 2003. Accessed March 22, 2018. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9079IIED.pdf>.
- Department of Environmental Affairs. "South African National Parks (SANParks)." Environmental Affairs. Accessed December 6, 2017. <https://www.environment.gov.za/statutorybodies/sanparks>.
- Fuller, D. O. "The Fallacy of Popular Wisdom in African Wildlife Management." *Conservation Biology* 14, no. 2 (2000): 586-87. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2641630>.
- Funes, Yessenia. "Peru's New National Park Protects the Amazon and the People Who Call It Home." *Earther.com*. Last modified January 16, 2018. Accessed March 7, 2018. <https://earther.com/perus-new-national-park-protects-the-amazon-and-the-peo-1822120613>.
- Governors Camp. "Masai Mara Projects." News release. 2018. <https://www.governorscamp.com/masai-mara-projects>.
- Haines, Aubrey L. *The Yellowstone Story: A History of Our First National Park*. Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.: Yellowstone Library and Museum Association, 1977.
- Harwitz, Mitchell. "On Improving the Lot of the Poorest: Economic Plans in Kenya." *African Studies Review* 21, no. 3 (December 1978): 65-73. doi:10.2307/523886.
- Homewood, Katherine. "Development, Demarcation and Ecological Outcomes in Maasailand." *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 65, no. 3 (1995): 331-50. doi:10.2307/1161050.
- Institute of Economic Affairs. "Number of Visitors to National Parks and Game Reserves, 2011-2015." News release. May 18, 2016. Accessed April 14, 2018. <http://www.ieak->

enya.or.ke/number_of_the_week/number-of-visitors-to-national-parks-and-game-reserves-2011-2015.

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). "Masai Mara in Kenya." *protectedplanet.net*. Last modified 2014. Accessed April 7, 2018. <https://www.protectedplanet.net/1297>.

IUCN. "Category II: National Park." IUCN.org. Accessed April 14, 2018. <https://www.iucn.org/theme/protected-areas/about/protected-areas-categories/category-ii-national-park>.

Joshua Kurlantzick. "Free-Range Markets." *Foreign Policy*, no. 142 (2004): 68-69. doi: 10.2307/4147580.

Kabiri, Ngeta. "The Political Economy of Wildlife Conservation and Decline in Kenya." *The Journal of Environment & Development* 19, no. 4 (2010): 424-45.

Kafarowski, Joanna. "How Attitudes and Values Shape Access to National Parks." *The George Wright Forum* 20, no. 4 (2003): 53-63

Leader-Williams, Nigel, Noah Sitati, Geoffrey Karanja, and Matt Walpole. *Wildlife and People: Conflict and Conservation in Masai Mara, Kenya*. Publication no. 13618628. March 2003. Accessed April 13, 2018. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/9225IIED.pdf>.

Licht, Daniel S., Rob Slotow, and Joshua Millspaugh. "Out of Africa: Lessons from Park Management in South Africa." *The George Wright Forum* 25, no. 1 (2008): 20-29.

Manning, Ian Patrick Alexander. *Volume I: Wildlife Conservation in Zambia*. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria Press, 1993. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/25570/01volumeI.pdf?sequence=2>.

Mwaura, Francis. "Wildlife Heritage Ownership and Utilization in Kenya – the Past, Present and Future." In *Conservation of Natural and Cultural Heritage in Kenya: A Cross-Disciplinary Approach*, edited by Deisser Anne-Marie and Njuguna Mugwima, 125-42. London: UCL Press, 2016.

Net Industries. "Types of British Colonial Rule in Africa." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Accessed November 10, 2017. <http://encyclopedia.jrank.org/articles/pages/5921/TYPES-OF-BRITISH-COLONIAL-RULE-IN-AFRICA.html>.

Neumann, Roderick P. *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

- Ondicho, Tom Gesora. "Tourism, Power and Politics: The Challenges of Maasai Involvement in Tourism Development." PhD diss., Massey University, 2010. Accessed April 14, 2018. https://mro.massey.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10179/1964/02_whole.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- O'Neill, Karen M. "The International Politics of National Parks." *Human Ecology* 24, no. 4 (1996): 521-39.
- Pope, Adam. *Luangwa Safari Association Tourism Report*. April 2005. Accessed March 22, 2018. <http://fsg.afre.msu.edu/zambia/resources/Luangwa%20Safari%20Association%20Tourism%20Study%20-%20Final%20Report%20-%20rev%202.pdf>.
- Protected Planet. Map of Protected Areas Worldwide. Map. ProtectedPlanet.net. Accessed April 14, 2018. <https://www.protectedplanet.net>.
- Republic of South Africa Department of Environmental Affairs. *Department of Environmental Affairs Annual Report 2015/16*. By Department of Environmental Affairs. 2013. Accessed November 23, 2017. https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/reports/2015_16annual_report_environmentalaffairs.pdf.
- Rostow, W. W. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-communist Manifesto*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1971.
- Sachs, Jeffrey. *The Age of Sustainable Development*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.
- SANParks. "Expanded Public Works Programmes (EPWP)." SANParks.org. Accessed December 12, 2017. https://www.sanparks.org/about/connecting_to_society/epwp.php.
- . *SANParks Annual Report 2015/2016*. 2016. Accessed October 13, 2017. <https://www.sanparks.org/assets/docs/general/annual-report-2016.pdf>.
- . *SANParks: Economic Impact Assessment*. March 2008. Accessed November 30, 2017. https://www.sanparks.org/about/economic_impact_study_sept08.pdf.
- Sindiga, Isaac. "Wildlife Based Tourism in Kenya: Land Use Conflicts and Government Compensation Policies over Protected Areas." *Journal of Tourism Studies* 6, no. 2 (December 1995): 45-55. Accessed April 13, 2018. <https://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=961010438;res=IELAPA>.
- South African National Parks on Tourism Development, Growth, Transformation, Tariff Increases*. August 20, 2012. Accessed October 24, 2017. <https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/14711/>.

- Stockbridge, Mike, and Andrew Dorward. "Defining Rural Development." Rural Development. Last modified 2014. Accessed October 24, 2017. https://www.soas.ac.uk/cedep-demos/000_P530_RD_K3736-Demo/unit1/page_09.htm.
- Swemmer, Louise. *The Social and Economic Impact of the Kruger to Canyon Biosphere Environmental Monitor Programme – Impact on the Environmental Monitors*. December 2015. Accessed December 6, 2017.
- Terborgh, John, Carel van Schaik, Lisa Davenport, and Madhu Rao, eds. *Making Parks Work: Strategies for Preserving Tropical Nature*. Washington, DC: Island Press, 2002.
- United National Environmental Program (UNEP) for the Zambian National Government Zambian Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources. *A Financial and Economic Analysis of the Costs and Benefits of Managing the Protected Area Estate*. April 2004. Accessed March 22, 2018. <http://fsg.afre.msu.edu/zambia/resources/Economic%20Analysis%20of%20Protected%20Areas1%20%20zambia%20report.pdf>.
- Venter, Freek J., Robert J. Naiman, Harry C. Biggs, and Danie J. Pienaar. "The Evolution of Conservation Management Philosophy: Science, Environmental Change and Social Adjustments in Kruger National Park." *Ecosystems* 11, no. 2 (2008): 173-92.
- Visser, Gustav, and Christian M. Rogerson. "Researching the South African Tourism and Development Nexus." *GeoJournal* 60, no. 3 (2004): 201-15. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41147884>.
- Weldemichel, Teklehaymanot. "Fencing-in Oneself: Understanding the Fencing Crisis in Maasai Mara, Kenya." *AfricanBioServices* (blog). Entry posted March 17, 2017. Accessed April 13, 2018. <http://africanbioservices.eu/fencing-in-oneself-understanding-the-fencing-crisis-in-maasai-mara-kenya/>.
- World Bank. *Rural Development*. Policy Paper no. 10272. Washington D.C., DC: The World Bank, 1975. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/522641468766236215/Rural-development>.
- Wray, Melissa, and Lynette Strauss. "Land Claims in Kruger." News release. 2017. Accessed November 30, 2017. <http://www.krugerpark.co.za/krugerpark-times-2-4-land-claims-in-kruger-19187.html>.
- Zambian National Government Ministry of Tourism and Arts. *Tourism Statistical Digest*. July 2014. Accessed March 22, 2018. <http://www.mota.gov.zm/index.php/downloads/data-and-statistics/27-2014-tourism-statistical-digest-draft/file>.

Zaslowsky, Dyan. "These American Lands: Parks, Wilderness, and the Public Lands." In *These American Lands: Parks, Wilderness, and the Public Lands*, by Dyan Zaslowsky and T. H. Watkins. Rev. and expanded ed. Washington, DC: Island Press, 1994.

Zimba, Godfrey Joe. "The Management of South Lunagwa National Park towards Sustainable Tourism Development." Master's thesis, The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, 2006. Accessed February 14, 2018. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.456.6197&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

