Background

My research explores...

- If local communities, wildlife, and foreign tourists don't benefit from the subtly ethnicized, heavily inequitable, and environmentally damaging status quo of Yala National Park, who is?
- Despite the substantial evidence for successful community-centered national park management as well as regional examples in Nepal and India, why is Sri Lanka anomalous?
- The central government has been obviously implicated but I am interested in exploring the role of domestic tourists and the corporate tourism industry who:
    - (1) I assume to be predominantly soft-core ecotourists belonging to the educated, Sinhala-Buddhist, upper-middle-class of Sri Lanka;
    - (2) enable, by political vote, mainstream cultural narrative and lobbying power, the central government's ineffective park management
        - because of their internalized colonialism with respect to their relationship with nature.

Hypothesis: Why is this happening?

- Weak governance (*Interview)*
    - Corruption
    - Appeasement to secure political patronages

AND/OR

- Flawed + colonial relationship with nature
    - The perspective of *terra nullius* (land without people) is similar to colonial scientists and 'explorers' such as HM Stanley (Nelson, 2011).
        - Influenced by: Yellowstone ideal of conservation (Kopke, 2021), perpetuated by the covers of National Geographic → pristine land without people (Peace et al, 2012).
        - Manifested in areas other than national parks in SL and formerly colonized countries:

- Neo-liberal environmentalism benefits the urban middle-class instead of supporting local communities (e.g. luxury eco-houses, tea exports, land rights, and the refusal to preserve native land under the guise of sustainability but offers the same land to foreign developers) (Camisami, 2018; Gomez-Barris, 2019).
- A mismatch between local sustainability priorities and eurocentric sustainability goals (e.g. priorities should be mangrove protection, coral reef regeneration, clean air, etc. but tourism operators focus exclusively on energy and plastic reduction which are sufficient for Western accreditors and certificates to label them as 'sustainable') (Kottage et al, 2020).

My research is unique because...

- a stakeholder analysis on YNP even though it is the most visited park in the country and generates the most money.
- the implications of rural community exclusion and resource mismanagement in national parks on conservation in Sri Lanka.
- the connection between rural community exclusion in environmental policy and management as a form of internalized colonialism.

WHY

1. **justice: exploiting and depleting local resources worsens poverty, (~~compromises the support for national parks and stewardship)~~**

In 2020, albeit a year rife with curfews and travel restrictions, YNP reaped 3 billion LKR in revenue, almost three times as much as 2018 *(Interview)*. Yet, counterintuitively, living in proximity to one of the island's biggest cash cows means barely surviving – villagers live on one meal a day, without electricity three days a week, and many have turned to illegal mining out of desperation *(Interview)*.

Even prior to the pandemic, the costs of living in proximity to a national park were abundant (Kariyawasam et al, 2020; Givá & Raitio, 2017). Conservation obstructed land use for agriculture, housing, irrigation, and other development activities of rural residents. For example, shifting cultivation near Udawalawe National Park (Sri Lanka) and gathering fruits, hunting, and charcoal production in Limpopo National Park (Mozambique) is no longer possible. Costs also include inflation from tourism, crop and livestock depredation by wild animals, and competition for water with both wildlife and tourism accommodations.

Additionally, land grabs inside the park also contribute to costs encountered by rural communities. For example, large corporations such as the Hilton and politicized religious leaders such as the Sithulpawwa Chief Monk are currently developing vast areas of land inside the park *(Interview)*.

Developments like these shrink the available landmass for wildlife and force them out of their habitat into populous areas in search of food and water; they subsequently destroy crops, houses, and attack anyone that gets in their way. In fact, the human-elephant conflict is devastating and results in hundreds of fatalities, both human and elephant, every year *(Interview)*.

Concurrently, local communities are excluded from park supply chains and therefore revenues. Based on a case study of Udawalawe National Park, the largest and oldest park on the island, 66% of economic benefits are earned by external stakeholders such as the central government and hotel chains (Kariyawasam et al, 2020). The remaining benefits are skewed towards safari jeep drivers who themselves have limited access to human capital development. I argue that the distribution of benefits at YNP is likely to be even more disproportionate.

Further, the failure to meaningfully include local communities in national park development presents three main implications: loss of indigenous means of conservation, forced local stewardship, and the neglect of the development needs of rural communities.

Kariyawasam and colleagues (2020) argue that the exclusion of local communities in the benefits of national parks and increased incompatibility between their livelihoods and tourism can alter local attitudes towards conservation and actions concerning the environment. Particularly, if conservation projects do not provide economic justification for locals, they will tend to accelerate the depletion of natural capital stock (Kariawasam et al, 2020). Similarly, Senanayake (2006) supports this claim by arguing that “modern” forms of

conservation adds pressure on natural resources and divert people from complex indigenous mechanisms to simple and easy techniques such as chemical agriculture.

In addition to **exposing policy failures and resource mismanagement,** this paper seeks to reveal the lived realities of communities around national parks. Some researchers argue that the relationship between local populations and the environment is often romanticized and their stewardship is forced. Literature in this area is predominantly associated with indigenous communities on the American continent. It is widely recognized that through the romanticized depiction of native populations in media and literature, ordinary people are transformed into environmental activists, sometimes reluctantly (Peace et al 2012; Hames, 2007). Likewise, Gomez-Barris (2019) demonstrates that in the Chilean national visual order, the Mapuche are viewed as either invisible racially inferior peoples or as hypervisible in the realm of folklore and environmental stewardship. This presents the dual-threat where local people and their knowledge are either wholly ignored and endangered or entirely depended on without the financial and capital support, both likely in the Sri Lankan context.

In fact, a visionary exercise conducted by Givá and Raitio (2017) at the Limpopo National Park in Mozambique conveys that local populations living in the park visualize their long-term future beyond their urgent need to survive and beyond the conservation needs of their environment. They have aspirations to live in a house with access to electricity and water, separated from wildlife by an electrical fence; they would like improved access to services such as schools, hospitals, roads, improved agricultural and market opportunities, as well as capacity-building and training to enable tourism business opportunities. These ambitions are versatile and beyond the imagination of the local forest, dwellers craving to live in proximity to wild leopards and elephants due to a perceived immunity from the dangers of predation. This image of the “modern” native is one that Nelson (2011) argues, disrupts the political message of the environmentalists, and more notably, confuses and annoys them. My thesis aims to debunk this myth by revealing the complex and diverse needs of rural communities.

2. **Limited reinvestment into park management and minimal support for park staff heightens rural poverty, disincentivizes careers in conservation, —> exposes (un)sustainability of wildlife tourism**

It is not only ordinary villagers who experience this inequity but Department of Wildlife Conservation officers too. The 3bn LKR is lauded but no one seems to know where it goes, thus exposing an additional issue of governmental communication, transparency, and potentially, corruption. The Nimalawa Rangers' Office receives a meager $30/month in petty cash and only has five employees to monitor 10.66 km²; officers sleep on broken beds, beg for uniforms, and rangers spend out of pocket for the office's needs (*Interview)*. Many have commented that drivers, trackers, and DWC officials don't receive the training they need (such as nature interpretation and language skills) and are expected to learn on the job (*Interview;* Prakash, et al, 2019). Therefore, there appears to be minimal reinvestment into YNP despite the large revenue it generates. I argue that this is likely to disincentivize civilians from pursuing a career in conservation, especially in the public sector, thus endangering the national conservation agenda.

Another critique of management at YNP is the overcrowding inside the park which has resulted in wildlife acclimatization and disappointing tourist experiences. According to a study by Prakash and colleagues (2019), heavy visitor traffic was the leading complaint by foreign tourists at five of the most popular Sri Lankan parks. This overcrowding was speculated to be due to a lack of minimum and maximum travelers in safari jeeps, an absence of limitations on the number of cars, and the amount of time a car can spend inside the park. The absence of these regulations allows the government to achieve two primary goals: reap higher revenues through entrance tickets and secure the political patronage of jeep drivers. The latter is because jeep drivers have protested restricting the number of jeeps inside the park as that would limit the number of rides per driver and even put many drivers out of a job in an area where no other jobs are available.

However, the overcrowding is also likely to be related to the second leading complaint of limited wildlife viewing opportunities (*Interview*; Prakash et al, 2019). Trackers assume visitors only want to see charismatic species such as leopards and elephants so all jeeps ultimately crowd around one viewing site, resulting in a subpar viewing experience for the majority of travelers. The drivers have also been accused of getting too close to the

animals and calling their colleagues to inform them of a sighting which further overcrowds viewing opportunities (*Interview*; Prakash et al, 2019).

From protesting regulation to 'misbehavior' inside the park, their actions stem from the need to survive *(Interview)*. Out of the 5000 LKR cost of a game ride, a driver only gets to keep 700 LKR ($3.50), (the remaining is returned to the owner of the jeep and spent on fuel); this 14% is barely sufficient for daily meals let alone utility bills and other costs of living *(Interview)*. Many drivers commented that this is the reason they inform their friends about sightings too so that they can earn a good tip because they know the Rs. 700 is grossly insufficient *(Interview)*.

Although the opposition to regulation stems from the community itself, it exposes a major flaw in developmental policies as the government has not only underinvested in improving the sustainability of the park but has also failed in diversifying the economy of Yala. Therefore, when a majority of individuals are dependent on a singular occupation, it is unsurprising that they would protest any policy that threatens that one industry.

3. **Limited reinvestment into park management, minimal support for park staff, and weak park regulations result in unpleasant tourist experiences which impact long-term tourism revenues and the support for national parks by tourists, thus endangering one of the island's largest export industries and the conservation agenda.**

The complex web of issues illustrated above matters to conservationists, policymakers, and the tourism industry because they threaten the support for national parks, and conservation in general, by tourists and local communities and endanger Sri Lanka's status as a popular destination for sustainable tourism, an increasingly popular export.

Unpleasant and overcrowded safari experiences could contribute to reduced interest in conservation, reduced recommendations and revisits, as well as unsustainable actions. Rossi (2015) and colleagues demonstrated that visitors' environmental values constructed how they perceived other park users and the appropriateness of their activities. They observe that if park management is incompatible with both the value systems responsible for originally creating these parks and with those of many contemporary park visitors, said park management could endanger public support for conservation.

4. **This study could present additional data to support policy recommendations such as…**
    - Benefit-sharing mechanism - e.g. share a portion of national park income with local residents (Makame and Boon, 2008; Mariki, 2013; Swemmer et al., 2015).
    - Improvement of tourism opportunities and local inclusiveness in the park's tourism supply chain (Adiyia et al., 2015; Bennett and Dearden, 2014; Budhathoki, 2004; Egger and Maurer, 2014; Pfueller et al., 2011; Richins, 2009).
    - Investment in human capital development, education, and training for internal and contracted staff to improve tourism skills such as language, entrepreneurship, understanding tourist expectations, and capacity building – biodiversity product development, agrobiodiversity conservation, etc. (Kariyawasam et al, 2020; Givá and Raitio, 2017; Prakash et al, 2019)
    - Creation of a more conducive regulatory and financial landscape for local involvement: subsidies for financial capital, avoid government and hotel chain crowding out by large investments, and evaluating Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority (SLTDA) regulation (particularly the existing 1% tax on income of registered tourism operators) (Kariyawasam et al, 2020; Givá and Raitio, 2017; Prakash et al, 2019).
    - Diversifying the local economy to ease resource pressure and dependence on Yala National Park.

Summary:

The exclusion of rural communities and resource mismanagement in YNP have effects on conservation, poverty, and the future of the tourism industry. This is because if the status quo is maintained, it endangers tourist and community support for national parks, and conservation, in general, disincentivizes civilians from pursuing a career in conservation (especially in the public sector, thus endangering the national conservation agenda), and threatens Sri Lanka's status as a destination for sustainable tourism (an increasingly popular

export). Therefore, the complex web of issues illustrated above matters to conservationists, policymakers, and the tourism industry.

Introduction

In light of climate change and shrinking biodiversity, conservation is becoming increasingly important, urgent, and popular. However, the conservation equation, which includes flora and fauna as the protectorate and human beings as perpetrators, often excludes the crucial stakeholder of human beings who fall victim to pro-environmental efforts. For example, the ban of plastic sachets under 20ml in Sri Lanka was considered a win by environmentalists, however poor communities who purchase their hygiene products on-demand can't afford to buy bottles of shampoos and body wash; they rely on these small packets and were left with no alternative when they were banned (Weerasinghe, 2021).

Despite the evidence for national parks as a tool for poverty alleviation (Roe, 2008; Adams and Hutton, 2008; Agrawal and Redford, 2006), parks in Sri Lanka experience a conundrum characterized by inequitable distribution of the costs and revenues of park management; rural communities suffer as central government and large tourism operators thrive (Givá & Raitio, 2017; Kariyawasam et al, 2020). Nineteen percent of Sri Lanka's land area is allocated for conservation (Department of Wildlife Conservation, 2015). My thesis unearths the social costs of this celebrated statistic by (xx) . I will identify ways in which this number can grow in tandem with local communities and not in opposition to them. Further, it aims to explain resource mismanagement at Yala National Park (YNP) and its subsequent implications on **conservation, rural poverty, and the (sustainable) tourism industry**.

Methods

This study conducted 52 interviews: 27 virtual interviews on a phone call or Zoom call with conservation experts, environmental activists, domestic tourists who identified as wildlife enthusiasts and photographers, and sustainable tourism officers (Group A) and 25 in-person interviews with residents in towns neighboring Yala National Park (Group B). Interviews were conducted from July to August 2021. I used snowball sampling in which I interviewed those recommended to me by other interviewees. Solicitation for participation will be facilitated by my acquaintances in the locality and the conservation field. The interview

invitations and advertisements are attached as Appendix I. All virtual interviewees were offered the option to accept or deny compensation and provide their bank details, all of them denied it. All in-person interviewees were simply granted compensation (cash in an envelope) at the end of their interview (LKR 3000 ($15) per interview). Only individuals over the age of 18 participated. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board. Each interview took between 30 and 90 minutes, averaging at 60 minutes. The funding for compensation was from Georgetown University's Science, Technology, and International Affairs Department ($1000 for a non-service stipend from the STIA capstone funding 2021). The interviews were semi-structured with interview guides (Appendix II) relevant to each demographic: conservation experts, wildlife enthusiasts, residents of the area, etc. All interviewees in Group A were asked about their experience with Yala National Park as a visitor in addition to their professional perspectives on it. All Group A interviews were conducted in English, all Group B interviews were conducted in Sinhalese, the native tongue of the residents. All interviews were recorded with the consent of the participant. Virtual interviews were automatically recorded and transcribed by Zoom; iPhone voice recordings of in-person interviews were transcribed and translated from Sinhala to English by an online automatic translation service called Simon Says.

To do

- Ty's methods
- Being in Yala (place making)
    - Research team
    - Where we stayed
    - For how long
    - When we interviewed people

- Table of who was interviewed
    - story of how I found them
    - ~~Story of their interviews (discussion) → main findings, story to animate each~~
    - Observations → hotels, temples, etc.

Lit Review

National Parks

Definition

According to Dudley (2008), the main objectives of a National Park and a Protected Area include the following points.

1) To protect natural biodiversity along with its underlying ecological structure and supporting environmental processes, and to promote education and recreation.
2) To manage the area in order to perpetuate, in as natural a state as possible, representative examples of physiographic regions, biotic communities, genetic resources, and unimpaired natural processes.
3) To maintain viable and ecologically functional populations and assemblages of native species at densities sufficient to conserve ecosystem integrity and resilience in the long term.
4) To contribute in particular to the conservation of wide-ranging species, regional ecological processes, and migration routes.
5) To manage visitor use for inspirational, educational, cultural, and recreational purposes at a level that will not cause significant biological or ecological degradation to the natural resources.
6) To take also into account the needs of indigenous people and local communities, including subsistence resource use, in so far as these will not adversely affect the primary management objective.
7) To contribute to local economies through tourism and other income-generating means.

Pros

The world is facing compounding crises such as biodiversity loss, climate change, food insecurity, and population pressure, and protected areas (PAs) are suggested to help alleviate these catastrophes. For example, deforestation accounts for 20% of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions and with wider consequences on food security and human health (Kinver, 2005; United Nations Joint Press Report, 2007), site conservation is generally believed to be one of the most effective means of reducing global biodiversity loss and subsequently addressing climate change. Due to the key role of trees in carbons sequestration, Natural Protected Areas (NPAs) have become the preferred means of implementing site

conservation (Garcì-Frapolli et al., 2009). Beyond climate change mitigation, national parks are considered to reap a plethora of benefits including the sustainable use of resources (food, medicine, and forest products), ecosystem and biodiversity conservation, conservation education, recreation, tourism, community identity, cultural resource protection, and economic benefits to local populations (Millenium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005; Kothari, 2008; Brandon et al., 2008; Convention on Biological Diversity, 2008; Haq, 2018; Richardson et al., 2018). The economic benefits of national parks are perhaps the least understood and also the most controversial.

According to Richardson et al. (2018), based on a study of the United States National Park Service (NPS), there are two broad categories of economic benefits of national parks: contributions to the economy and net economic values. Contributions to the economy are the jobs, sales, tax revenues, and other positive economic activity generated by national park visitation and operations in local, state, and national economies such as local purchases of supplies and services for park operations, by visitors, and park employees. Another socio-economic characterization is ecosystem services – benefits that people derive from properly functioning ecosystems, such as water purification, flood regulation, and scenic views.

The economic value of recreation has been accounted for since 1962 when the U.S. Congress required that recreation be considered in benefit-cost analyses for water projects (Banzhaf 2010). The 1960s witnessed significant developments in nonmarket valuation as the concept of consumer surplus became established as the relevant measure of economic benefits (Richardson et al., 2017). Today, the travel cost method is used extensively to value recreation opportunities on public lands. Examples of applications to national parks include the following (values have been inflated to 2017 dollars): Melstrom (2014) estimated the per person value of a visit to Stones River, Monocacy, and Fort Donelson national battlefields at around $34, $10, and $11, respectively; the direct use-value of a visit to Great Sand Dunes National Park & Preserve has been estimated at $74 per person per day (Heberling and Templeton 2009); the value of a visit to Yellowstone National Park has been estimated at $59 per person per day (Benson et al. 2013); a day of bear viewing at Katmai National Park and Preserve has been found to have a direct use value of $301 per person (Richardson et al. 2017).

Ultimately, Americans perceive the benefits of the NPS to be so significant that according to a 2016 study, 95% of the American public said that protecting national parks for current and future generations is important to them whether they visit or not, and 81% would be willing to pay higher federal taxes to prevent cuts to national park units and ensure that the park system is protected and preserved (Haefele et al. 2016a, 2016b).

However, benefits of national parks aren't confined to the U.S., according to the World Bank (2002), more than 1.6 billion people depend at varying degrees on forests for their subsistence and livelihoods and 500 million to 1 billion indigenous people are wholly dependent on forests (World Resources Institute, 2005). For instance, Sundarban National Park in Bangladesh highlights ways in which local populations benefit from protected areas. In Sundarban, the park supports the livelihood of approximately 3.5 million people living in proximity to the forest (Asian Development Bank, 2008) and 3.5 million people directly benefiting from ecosystem services. Sundarban offers wood, honey, and fish as ecosystem services and a means of profession as the indigenous Munda community and others are mostly woodcutters, honey collectors, and fishermen (Hossain et al., 2008). Similarly, villagers in proximity to Na Hang Nature Reserve, Vietnam, used 80% of medicinal plants harvested in the reserve, and 20% were sent to neighboring communes.

Despite the range of benefits and significant potential that national parks offer, there may also be illegal extraction of economic benefits from PAs (Adams and Hutton, 2007). Direct illegal benefits stem from practices such as hunting, grazing, charcoal production, and food collection. On the other hand, indirect benefits are derived from practices associated with the licensing of use or access by state agencies and their employees, the extraction of illegal rents through granting or overlooking illegal access, or threatening local people with punishment for real or imagined trespass (Brandon et al. 1998; Smith et al. 2003). Nonetheless, Protected Areas generate legal and illegal benefits but also reproduce existing economic inequalities (Paudel, 2006). For example, illegal activities such as xx will be tolerated but hunting and other forms of resource use by locals are unlikely to be. The benefits accrued from tourism is a manifestation of this inequitable distribution

Tourism and national parks

National parks boast immense biodiversity and beautiful landscapes which make them breeding grounds for tourism. In fact, tourism was central to the creation and development of national parks in North America (Runte, 1987; McNamee, 1993; Wilson, 1992) and later in South Africa (Carruthers, 1995; Brooks, 2005). In the early twenty-first century, ecotourism emerged as the fastest developing sector of the tourism industry, ranking as the second-largest sector of the global economy after oil (Wienberg, Bellows, and Ekster, 2002). According to Wunder (2000), ecotourism should have minimal physical and social impacts, educate tourists ecologically, and yield economic benefits to local residents; it should generate low visitor impact, help conserve biodiversity, and it should generate beneficial socio-economic outcomes for local populations to help reduce poverty (Agrawal and Redford, 2006).

Benefits to local communities are boasted by the industry; the potential exists due to job generation by hotels, transport services, and locally owned commercial activities such as food or cultural performances. Additionally, there is potential for income generation by land leasing, licensing arrangements, and profit-sharing (McNeely and Miller, 1984; Wells and Brandon, 1992; World Conservation Union, 2005). Yet, these benefits are seldom realized in a meaningful way as access to benefits from tourism are typically in the hands of employees of the state national park authority, the central government, or private corporations in the tourism industry.

Tourism, like most industries, is subject to 'gatekeeping,' due to rules of eligibility (e.g. formalized membership of a selected community in immediate proximity to the park border) and compliance with a range of regulations (Adams and Hutton, 2007). Under these circumstances, there is ample opportunity for revenues to be monopolized by the elites. Paudel (2006) scrutinizes the distributional inequities of conservation programs in Nepal, including those intended to benefit locals to demonstrate that xx.

Conservation-Poverty Debate

The notion that national parks have the capacity to affect regional poverty and inequality isn't recent. In fact, it emerged in the 1970s when environmental concerns in the Global North, such as acid rain in Sweden and marine pollution in Japan arose (Guha, 1999), prompting international institutions to reconcile different priorities over economic development and environmental conservation. The United Nations Conference on the Human

Environment held in Stockholm in 1972 was the first international event that invited the governments of both developing and developed countries with the specific aim of exploring the links between environment and development (Sandbrook, 1984; Strong, 2003). UNESCO's 'biosphere reserve' concept, developed at this time, was based on zoning, with a strictly protected core and a surrounding buffer zone where only appropriate economic activity could take place. It continued in the 1980s through to the mid-1990s when the two areas of concern merged as a result of the phenomenon of sustainable development and the rise of the indigenous rights movement.

The Zaire Resolution (1982) advocated for joint-management strategies between PA authorities and communities that have traditionally managed resources. "Part One, aimed at the development community, called for recognition of indigenous peoples' rights and the need for prior informed consent in any development intervention; it also called for small-scale, locally controlled initiatives as the basis for future Amazonian development. Part Two, To the Community of Concerned Environmentalists, acknowledged the role of the international conservation community in rainforest conservation but expressed concern over their preoccupation with wildlife over and above local communities." (Roe, 2008). During this time, the conservation literature was booming with exchanges on the role of indigenous people in conservation, the apparent contradiction between indigenous values and mainstream conservation priorities (Redford, 1990; Alcorn, 1993; Redford & Stearman, 1993), and the need to ensure benefits for local communities (although in some places this was more normalized, e.g. revenue-sharing in Zimbabwe as early as the 1970s) (Child, 2003).

Subsequently, the late 1990s and early 2000s saw resistance against community-based conservation (Kramer et al., 1997; Brandon et al., 1998; Oates 1999; Struhsaker, 1999; Rao & Geisler, 1990; Terborgh, 1999, West & Brechin, 1991), and funding transitioned to poverty reduction and direct budget support. For instance, the UK Department for International Development published a White Paper on poverty reduction (DFID, 1997) which translated into the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals in 2000 (Roe, 2008), gaining an unprecedented level of international commitment to poverty reduction (Satterthwaite, 2003).

The World Parks Congress in 2003 changed the tides again as the conservation agenda experienced a 'resurgence of the protectionist paradigm' (Wilshusen et al. 2002) or the 'back to the barriers' movement (Hutton et al. 2005). Since then most theorization has been around

protected area conservation and its impacts on poverty. Adams and Hutton (2007) argue that advocates of strictly protected 'people-free parks' (Redford et al., 1998; Schwartzman et al., 2000) or 'hard parks' (Terborgh 2004) reflect the long-standing conservation conviction that the preservation of biodiversity is an overwhelming moral imperative (Kramer et al. 1997; Terborgh 1999). Protected Areas (PAs) such as large dams which were shared with other major state projects in partnership with international actors (Scudder, 2005), had acquired the capacity to deliver significant public goals but also to impose significant local costs.

Cernea and Schmidt-Soltau's (2003) review of central African case studies found that that there was no compensation or relocation plans to assist displaced communities Adams and Hutton (2007) urge that standards for responsible resettlement established by organizations like the World Bank need to be adopted by conservation NGOs and in 2004 the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) agreed, under its Programme of Work on PAs, that resettlement of indigenous communities should only take place with full prior informed consent. This furthered the 1975 IUCN General Assembly Kinshasa Resolution on the Protection of Traditional Ways of Life, calling on governments not to displace people from PAs, and to take specific account of the needs of indigenous populations (Colchester 2004).

By 2005, over 100,000 PAs covered more than 2 million km2 or 12 percent of the earth's land surface (Chape et al. 2005), and PAs existed in every country, wealthy and poor alike (Naughton-Treves et al. 2005). Still, the debate remains and scholars have argued across the spectrum (Roe, 2008): whether conservation of biodiversity can realistically alleviate poverty (World Resources Institute, 2005); act as a safety net, ameliorate the causes of poverty (Angelsen & Wunder, 2003); or even cause, or exacerbate poverty through the use of strategies such as restrictive protected areas (McShane, 2003; Lockwood et al., 2006) or bioprospecting (Castree, 2003; Swiderska, 2006).

On the other hand, some scholars argue that conservation and poverty are unrelated issues and those who manage parks are unfairly held responsible for addressing poverty, unequal land, and resource allocation, corruption, injustice, and market failure (Brandon, 1998). Similarly, Sanderson and Redford (2003b: 246) commented that 'as conservationists, we have neither the legitimacy nor the power to redress the distributive inequalities nor the damages of development in our work'. Some conservationists have even expressed concern that the momentum of the development agenda has taken precedence over biodiversity

conservation (Sanderson and Redford 2003a) and even that conservation has 'fallen off the bandwagon' (Sanderson 2005: 326).

However, Agrawal and Redford (2006) offer a more nuanced argument that the literature on programmatic interventions that seek to address conservation and poverty (community-based wildlife management, extractive reserves, and ecotourism) depends on relatively simplified understandings of poverty and biodiversity in stark contrast to the theoretical literature on the two concepts individually. Further, they contend that writings on programmatic interventions tend to operationalize poverty and biodiversity in distinct and quite different ways. For example, biological diversity has been measured in a variety of ways such as genetic or population diversity and poverty has been measured by incomplete metrics such as the poverty line which ignores the intensity of poverty and wealth disparities. Agrawal and Redford (2006) rightfully observe that any single choice of a single measure of biodiversity or poverty is arbitrary.

Cons

Whether national parks can alleviate poverty or not, there is a valid argument that PAs have detrimental effects on proximate communities and in some cases have exacerbated poverty and hardships despite international commitments such as the Kinshasa Resolution that recognize the importance of preventing such externalities. The most direct implication on communities is displacement. In 2004, 500 people were displaced from Nechasar National Park in Southern Ethiopia and resettled outside the park's borders (Pearce, 2005). The forced displacement by the Ethiopian government was in order to minimize the park's encumbrances before entrusting it to a private Dutch-based organization, the African Parks Foundation, to manage it (Adams and Hutton, 2007). This raises the question, for whom are protected areas set aside? On whose authority? And at what costs?

Since most published studies focus on particular cases of displacement, for example in Nicaragua (Kaimowitz et al. 2003), Tanzania (Neumann 1998; Brockington 2002), Uganda (Feeny 1999), or Zimbabwe (Ranger 1999), there is no accepted estimate of the total number of people displaced from PAs across the globe. Furthermore, some widely quoted cases of eviction, notably Turnbull's (1974) account of the plight of the Ik people following removal from Kidepo National Park, have subsequently been judged inaccurate (Turnbull 1974; Heine 1985) while others are still inadequately documented (Colchester 2002) (Adams and Hutton,

2007). However, Geisler and de Sousa (2001) estimated that there may be 14 m to 24 m 'environmental refugees' as a result of exclusionary conservation on the African continent alone while Cernea and Schmidt-Soltau (2003) estimated that 40,000 to 45,000 people had been displaced or directly affected economically by displacement from nine Protected Areas in central Africa (Adams and Hutton, 2007). Although the analysis on which these figures are based has been challenged, and they should be treated with skepticism (Maisels et al. 2007), there is sufficient peer-reviewed literature to demonstrate that population displacement is a real, and in many instances a significant, problem associated with PA establishment in a number of contexts (Brockington and Igoe 2006; Agrawal and Redford 2006).

Forced displacement as a result of infrastructural development projects such as dam construction has provided insight into the complexity and enduring nature of resettlement in the short-term and long term (e.g. Scudder, 1993; 2005; Cernea and McDowell, 2000) (Adams and Hutton, 2007). Displacement has vast circumstances and impacts. In 2004, the World Bank changed its guidelines on resettlement, extending the definition of 'involuntary displacement' to include the restriction of access to resources in PAs, even where no physical removal occurs (Cernea 2006, Adams and Hutton, 2007). The phrase 'involuntary restriction of access' on the use of resources pertains to people living outside and inside a PA. According to these guidelines, displacement is characterized to include: loss of rights to residence, loss of rights to use land and resources, foreclosure of rights to future use, and loss of non-consumptive use values, for example, access to places of religious or cultural value. Further, opportunity costs may be considerably high as agricultural benefits foregone are likely to be significant (e.g. Norton-Griffiths and Southey 1995), even if offset by factors such as carbon storage in protected forest vegetation (e.g. Kremen et al. 2000) (Adams and Hutton, 2007).

Further, population displacement as a result of PAs has a direct impact on livelihoods (e.g. Brechin et al. 2003; Chatty and Colchester 2002; McElwee 2006). Forced resettlement makes displaced people and those in receiving communities susceptible to a wide range of risks of impoverishment (Scudder 1993; Cernea and McDowell 2000) such as landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, economic marginalization, food insecurity, increased morbidity and mortality, loss of access to common property and services and social disarticulation (Cernea 1997, Adams and Hutton, 2007).

It is also crucial to note that displacement isn't always immediate and associated with the inception and creation of parks. Interestingly, according to Adams and Huton (2007), the more common historical pattern is for initial acceptance of human presence in a park to give way to intolerance either as ideas about the need to protect 'pristine' nature change or as human populations grow or both. For example, the Parakuyo and Maasai pastoralists from the Mkomazi Game Reserve in Tanzania were eventually evicted in 1988, a full four decades after it was first designated (Brockington, 2002). Similarly, Brooks (2005) reports a measure of tolerance of people in and adjacent to the Hluhluwe Game Reserve in the Zululand in the 1930s, prior to fencing and eventual eviction in the 1940s.

Ironically, not all human presence is purged from PAs, as noted earlier, identity matters. For instance, tourists and scientists have often been tolerated in PAs even where local resource users have been excluded (Adams and Hutton, 2007). It is easy to imagine why conservationists might think that the work of scientists should be dealt with differently from other human activities, because of the role of natural science in conservation planning.

Unfortunately, costs aren't limited to displacement, neighbors and residents of national parks experience hazards from crop and livestock depredation by wild animals (Naughton-Treves, 1997; Sekhar, 1998; Woodroffe et al., 2005), the cost of crop damage, the labor and opportunity cost of crop defense (e.g. children who take up this job and can't attend school), human-animal conflict, the fear of it, and fatalities from it (Adams and Hutton, 2007). Additionally, communities experience costs from park-affiliated tourism such as inflation from tourism and competition for water and resources with both wildlife and tourism accommodations. Furthermore, Adams and Hutton (2007) elaborate on the human threat associated with living near national parks. Park neighbors can also be exposed to corrupt rent-seeking behavior by PA staff, particularly linked to minor infringements of park boundaries (e.g. impoundment of stock alleged to be grazing illegally), or of regulations (e.g. informal charges to avoid arrest or fines for cutting fuelwood, or collecting medicinal plants).

Land Without People

- Land without people (Nelson, 2011; Fairhead et al., 2012, Peace et al., 2012; Adams and Hutton, 2007)
    - Colonial Gaze: People
    - Colonial Gaze: Land

- Colonizers “didn’t see” people in order to plow the land
- Logging companies “don’t see” people in order to profit off the land
- Green Grabbing as a new appropriation of nature
    - Land taken from people under the guise of environmentalism
    - Green economy, commodification, and privatization
        - Eco-tourism
- Contemporary environmentalists “don’t see” people in order to “save” the land” + green grabbing
    - Pristine national parks as an example
    - Reconnect displacement here

The displacement caused by protected areas masquerades itself as a modern-day issue but strongly echoes colonial practices of conservation and the nature of colonial interaction with the land as if it were *terra nulius* – a land without people.

The colonial history of national parks and ‘wilderness’

Prior to implicating national parks in post-colonial politics, it is crucial to contextualize them in history and their role during colonization itself. Particularly in colonial Africa, governments conceived national parks as a tool in their civilizing mission; they not only wanted to ‘tame’ native populations but also, to protect the land against the “rapacious and unnatural humanity” of these people (Neumann, 2004) and civilize the land itself. As a result, strictly protected game reserves became a mainstay of British colonial rule – “a resort for gentleman hunters, whether traveler or colonial servant to experience hunt and kill ‘wild’ nature” (MacKenzie, 1988; Neumann, 1996; Prendergast and Adams, 2003; 2004; Adams and Hutton, 2007).

Game reserves, as the name implies, were sports fields for hunting, and areas such as Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) were idealized in colonial discourse as wild and exotic lands, where colonial youth could develop a sporting spirit and(Wolmer, 2005; Adams and Hutton, 2007). Land was intentionally marked off to create game reserves and attempt at wilderness creation in formerly inhabited lands. Regardless of the intended purpose of the cleared land, colonial governments attempted to ‘cleanse’ people, native populations, from nature (Adams and Hutton, 2007).

For example, in colonial Tanganyika, the attempt to divorce nature and people in Liwale District was partly motivated by the sanitary objective of reducing sleeping sickness, concentrating people in agricultural districts, and leaving the land further from the coast, deemed both wild and unhealthy, for nature (Neumann 2001). Similarly, in the Belgian Congo, the Parc National Albert expanded onto land cleared in 1933 by the colonial state as part of its drastic sleeping sickness campaign in the Belgian Congo (Fairhead and Leach 2000; cf. Lyons 1985). Similar ideologies were at work elsewhere in Africa (Ranger 1999; Neumann 1996; 2001), and in South Asia (Rangarajan and Shahabuddin 2006).

However, the important question on who is excluded and who is tolerated on land remerges. After 1949, when national parks were designated in England and Wales they sought to protect beautiful lived-in landscapes (Sheail 1981; MacEwen and MacEwen 1982). Although they were created in fairly remote hill or coastal areas such as the Peak District, Lake District, Exmoor, or Dartmoor (Sheail 1975; Adams 1996) these parks comprised mosaics of private landholdings, mostly under low-intensity agriculture and livestock farming (Adams and Hutton, 2007). In contrast, PAs abroad in the British Empire were imagined as wilderness – necessarily free from human influence. The ideas of pristine nature and un-peopled wilderness spread in the twentieth century as an ideological framing of nature. Hence, the notion of Africa as an 'unspoiled Eden' (Anderson and Grove 1987: 4), or 'a lost Eden' begging for protection and preservation (Neumann 1998: 80) was a potent element in the colonial approach to national parks on the continent. The 'wilderness' of the Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania was created by the displacement of some 40,000 people (Neumann 1998). This 'wilderness', similar to the first national parks in the US, had to be invented before it could be protected (Neumann 2004a).

Adams and Hutton (2007) observe that conservation planners have often been entrepreneurial in this way in recognizing the value of 'created wilderness.' For instance, the land lost by the Meru Mbise people in Tanzania to the Arusha National Park in Tanzania was initially taken for white settler farms and forest reserves, only subsequently being purchased by the state and conservation NGOs to extend the park (Neumann 1998). Similarly, the violent forced resettlement of Tonga people from their land along the River Zambezi before the flooding of the reservoir behind the Kariba Dam in the 1950s (Howarth 1961) preceded the creation of new 'wilderness' PAs in Zimbabwe (McGregor 2005).

The idea of 'wilderness' (lands free from human presence and believed un-transformed by human action) is deeply engrained in the conservation vocabulary (Nash, 1973; Schama, 1995; Cronon, 1995, Rangarajan and Shahabuddin, 2006). It has been central in perceiving national identity, for example in the U.S. and Australia (Nash 1973; Dunlap 1999; Pyne 1997) and therefore a concept that is relevant beyond conservation debates. What is now known as 'natural wonders' were often inhabited by indigenous populations who were displaced and whose heritage was excluded from maps. The degree of anthropogenic transformation of the ecology of pre-Colonial North America has only been widely recognized relatively recently (Denevan 1992; Whitney 1994).

The culpability of the colonial venture in displacing local inhabitants or immensely restricting their land and resource use rights and practices in the interest of a greater national or global good is evident in the colonial creation of forest reserves and parks in Africa, the construction of state-sponsored plantations and timber reserves in Southeast Asia, and the series of dramatic enclosures that have affected South America's rural history (West et al. 2006, Brockington et al. 2008).

The colonial gaze

Lefebvre (1974) claimed that all space is "social space" so we can only understand and experience it through our own highly subjective cultural lenses. Ultimately, who is and isn't tolerated in nature is related to the social function of seeing, which itself is not 'pure' or 'natural' and takes place in a cultural context (Nelson, 2011). The intersectional lens of perceiving labor, property, and nature in the colonial era has come to be called the 'colonial gaze.' Nelson's (2011) review of colonial history and nature speculates how and why colonizers were able to see populated areas as 'empty.' He builds on Pratt's (1992) analytical shift away from what 'happened' in the colony to exploring what colonizers 'believed they saw.'

Pratt explains what she calls a 'planetary consciousness' – the rise of science and rational classification in Europe, which endowed European travelers with the sense that theirs was a universal ordering system that would conquer and bring under the high modern lens all the flora, fauna, and land of the world "out there" (Nelson, 2011). Pratt introduces the concept of 'imperial eyes,' and the inclination to make order of (and thus make controllable) the chaos of the periphery, to become the 'monarch of all I survey.' Since colonial

scientist-travelers were attempting to justify conquest, they attempted a docile representation of the land – only describing natural history and failing to mention people. In the accounts of colonial travelers such as Alexander von Humboldt, places like Southern Africa were 'ripe for British improvement', 'open and beckoning for colonization', and possess domesticated animals but their domesticators were nowhere to be seen. However, when people were present in the narrative, they were 'uncivilized' and similarly, 'inviting' colonization (Nelson, 2011). Pratt argues that this rhetoric exists in contemporary development discourse as formerly directly colonized areas of the world, earlier deemed "uncivilized," are now described as "less developed."

After analyzing the perception of people and land beckoning to be civilized as a justification to colonize, Nelson (2011) elaborates on the colonial gaze during land acquisition in colonies. Barbara Arneil's (1996) commentary on John Locke's *America: The Defence of English Colonialism* exposes the Lockean roots of the 'right of conquest' – Locke sets out to philosophically and legally explain when and why it is acceptable to take what is not yours. It must be noted that in doing so, Locke established a rationale that would be used to the present day to justify everything from colonial invasion to legal expropriation of land in modern democratic societies. Locke deemed 'fences' as the line of demarcation, invoking the term *vacuum domicilem* – land empty of cultivation and yearning for the plow. Hence, people who failed to practice modern modes of production 'disappeared'; in the domesticated space, *ius gentium,* a law existed, beyond this frontier, the law did not apply.

Banner (2007) offers four comparative case studies, aborigines in Australia, Maoris in New Zealand, the native elite in Hawaii, and indigenous groups in California, to demonstrate the manifestation of the colonial-Lockean approach to land rights. In Australia and California, the Aborigines and unallied indigenous groups, respectively, were non-farming so upon arrival, the British in Australia and the encroaching whites in California deemed this land *terra nullius*, owned by no one and ready for the taking. On the other hand, in New Zealand, the Maori farming of the land helped them conceptualize "private property" and thus challenge any "easy gaze of emptiness" (Nelson, 2011).

Similarly, the landowning native elite in Hawaii performed pre-emptive strikes in the 1890s out of fear of U.S. annexation and created their own system of land tenure reform, which eventually urged American annexationists to buy the land, not steal it. Banner (2007) argues that it wasn't as simple as respect for farmers or an aesthetic symbol of land use, but

instead, those who farmed were more advanced in their political formations and therefore able to unite and present a formidable military alliance. Still, in New Zealand, once white settlers had comfortably established themselves they stole land through impossible legal bureaucracies in the 1880s that masqueraded as "land tenure reform."

Yet, by the end of westward expansion in the US and British encroachment into future British Columbia, the white settlers were strong enough to avoid treaties with indigenous populations, as a result, by 1900 most indigenous and native populations suffered despite how their land was once taken. However, the means by which settlers occupied matters. For instance, in New Zealand, as a result of historic treaties, legal arguments have been able to win Maori substantial settlements whereas no such victories are visible in Australia where land was taken in the absence of negotiation (Nelson, 2011).

NEED TRANSITION ON THEORIZING WILDERNESS

Adams and Hutton (2007)

> The most influential model for conservation in twentieth century was the US national park, developed in the late nineteenth century, and epitomized by Yellowstone and Yosemite (Runte 1987; 1990). This was founded on a conception of nature as something pristine that could be distinguished and physically separated from human-transformed lands.

Neo-liberalism, private companies, and the colonial gaze

Commodification or rationalization sets the stage for the neo-liberal 'green economy.' Rationalization is recognized as the dynamic and self-driving process that underpins capitalism and bureaucracy; it involves treating non-human nature as if it were truly plastic, malleable to meet human demands (Murphy, 1994). This economic approach has bred support for the 'sustainable use' or 'incentive-based conservation' which argue that conservation can be optimized if rural people are offered a direct economic interest in the survival of species, thus literally channeling the success of conservation to securing livelihoods (Hutton and Leader-Williams, 2003). For example, safari hunting in Southern Africa, although opposed by animal rights movements and its supporters in Global North conservation NGOs, has shown some success as a sustainable use strategy (Duffy, 2000).

However, non-consumptive uses of wildlife such as ecotourism appear to be a more compatible sustainable use approach with the ethical and ecological predispositions of most Global North conservationists.

The 'neo-liberal turn' has resulted in this 'pristine' nature being masqueraded as a prop under the guise of 'sustainability,' 'conservation' or 'green values' only to be commodified and appropriated. What is known as 'Nature ™ Inc' is contributed to by the neo-liberalization of environmental governance (Peck and Tickell 2002, Larner 2003, Castree 2003, 2008a, 2008b, McCarthy and Prudham 2004, Robbins and Luginbuhl 2005, Liverman and Vilas 2006) and the commodification of nature (Mansfield 2004, 2008, Bakker 2005, 2009, Heynen and Robbins 2005, Heynen et al. 2007), adding an additional dimension to critical political and economic ecology.

The new global 'green economy' or 'economy of repair' (Leach et al, 2012) is culpable in this appropriation. The 'economy of repair' is based on the premise that unsustainable use 'here' can be repaired by sustainable practices 'there'; it includes commodities such as carbon, biofuels, and offsets (biodiversity, species, or climate) and activities such as biodiversity conservation, biocarbon sequestration, the protection of ecosystem services, or ecotourism. Some believed the 'economy of repair' would offset the 'economy of growth' that is worsening environmental harm; that nature might be sold to save it (McAfee (1999). However, prices in the economy of repair appear to be maximizing both economies and pushing nature to its maximum efficiency (Fairhead et al, 2012).

A clear example of commodification is when the Nature Conservancy and the African Wildlife Foundation invite their patrons to 'adopt an acre' – or perhaps 50 acres for USD 1750 – in order to protect ecosystems (Fairhead et al, 2012). Furthermore, a company with British capital negotiated a lease with the Mozambican government for 15 million hectares (19% of the country's surface area) to grow trees in order to trade its carbon stocks in emerging carbon markets (Nhantumbo, 2011). Another instance is the extensive expansion of palm oil plantations for carbon-neutral fuel. These are manifestations of what John Vidal (2008) terms, 'green grabbing' – the appropriation of land and resources for environmental ends. The word appropriation is significant here as Fairhead and colleagues (2012) describe it "implies the transfer of ownership, use rights, and control over resources that were once publicly owned – or not even the subject of ownership – from the poor (or everyone including the poor) into the hands of the powerful."

Although land acquisition on the grounds of sustainability doesn't always alienate land from existing claimants, it often restructures the rules and authority around management, access, and use of resources that may have alienating effects (Fairhead et al, 2012). This is why some argue that the 'ecological modernization of the 'green economy' where growth and conservation operate simultaneously, is engrained in capitalist networks (Mol and Spaargarden, 200; UNEP, 2011); 'green' businesses have become lucrative industries in the mainstream economy and benefit from the colonial gaze of 'not seeing' people too.

For example, logging companies "don't see" habitants of the land in order to profit. Similar to nineteenth-century "empty" maps of British Columbia that eliminated indigenous populations and merely list resources, that were drawn by surveyors for the Crown, large forestry companies in the 1990s indicated that trees were "unused" and ripe with potential. In opposition to these actions, indigenous populations had to play the Lockean game and prove continual use (Braun, 2002). For example, similar to the preemptive actions by the Hawaiians, scientists swarmed in to "prove," in a Western court, that First Nations peoples have used trees for a multitude of purposes such as boats and baskets since "time immemorial."

Privatization is complicit in green-grabbing. For example, the sale of grazing land to foreign wildlife and ecotourism companies (Brockington et al. 2008, Snijders 2012, Gardner 2012; see also Duffy 2000, 2010), and the sale of farm and forest land to mining companies (Seagle 2012) are examples of privatization of public assets from state control to private control. Although, privatization can be a tool to secure ownership rights for the poor, often in these cases, poor individuals are often subject to being temporary landholders before subsequent processes of dispossession by violent appropriation, delegitimizing claims through legislation, or crucially, 'through the market' where those who have valuable natural assets inevitably have to sell them because their income is too low to facilitate social reproduction (Fairhead et a, 2012).

This now routine commodification of nature, similar to the birth of national parks, originates from European imperialism. From the sixteenth century onward, a process of tightening a 'government' of nature began (Drayton, 2000) and paved the way for a new science of forestry in eighteenth-century Prussia. The complex ecosystem of the forest was measured in terms of statistical units, thus permitting nature to be represented in terms such as 'maximum sustainable yield' or 'annual allowable cut.' The reductionist approach of

colonial science allowed people and nature to be classified, counted and controlled by bureaucratic government agencies that were established to optimize relations between state, society, and nature (Hays 1959; Willems-Braun 1997; Demerrit 2001; Mackenzie 2000). In the twentieth century, such reasonings became standardized in the global approach to 'renewable resources' such as forests.

The (eco)tourism industry is a poignant illustration of the intersectional implications of neo-liberalism and the colonial gaze. Tourism developments infamously exclude locals from economic benefits by vertically integrated corporate investment and profit concentration in national elites (Fabinyi 2010; Parnwell 2009; Schiller 2001). Ecotourism and sustainable tourism initiatives are similarly culpable in these costs (Borchers 2009; Cochrane 2009).

Braun (2002) identifies that eco-tourists are so infatuated with the idea of wilderness that they don't want to see people in the land they venture into, especially not 'modern' people because it disrupts their own escapism, which is arguably the true purpose of their trip, not environmental conservation. Braun describes the ludicrous behavior of eco-tourists in an anecdote where he accompanies a group of sea kayakers; he observes that they spend a lion's share of their resources in the White town of Tofino, after kayaking for an afternoon, the paddlers settle on a suboptimal beach after passing two good campsites because from the first site you could still see the lights of Tofino (electricity is not a part of the authentic experience they are seeking), and the second site was so good that often another set of adventure kayakers might show up; as Braun explains, there is nothing eco-tourism hates more than other eco-tourists. However, the following morning, when the kayakers land at the village of Marktosis, inhabited completely by members of the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nation, the adventure tour company pays for an organized lunch there, seeking to spend at least a tiny fraction of its funds in Native communities.

Yet even this visit does not fulfill the fantasized indigeneity the adventurers anticipated: "[S]ome clients explained that they were disturbed by the extreme poverty; others were troubled by what they saw as conspicuous acts of consumption (satellite dishes received the most comment). They were equally surprised to see that the bed-and-breakfast was housed in an old, weathered trailer, that the "traditional" meal they had been promised included mashed potatoes and root beer, and that a large-screen TV remained on during the entire visit" (Braun, 2002).

Framing: Language and Imagery

Moore (2000) contends that every phase of capitalism emerges from a restructuring of nature-society relations. This supports the importance of analyzing discursive framing as the value of nature is affected by global discourse that attributes value to it (Fairhead et al, 2012). For instance, without the science-policy discourses that have discerned global warming (Newell and Patterson, 2010), carbon trading is unlikely to exist, similarly, in the absence of the scientific and discursive processes that identified the importance and threat to biodiversity (Corson and MacDonald 2012), there would be no biodiversity enclosures. This analysis of language and imagery is important as it has a role in dissecting the relationship between humans and nature, including the perpetuation of the colonial gaze.

Peace and colleagues (2012) observe that threats to the environment generate "strongly polarized discourses at local, regional and nation-state levels. Whether the threat comes from a wind farm, a motorway extension, global warming or biodiversity loss, and whether the likely impact is on a peat bog, a sacred site, farmland productivity, or human health" proponents and opponents are prepared to argue. They elaborate that threats to the environment specifically characterized as 'pristine nature', 'untouched landscape' and 'the earth's atmosphere,' generates a severe intensity of emotions.

This highlights the danger of vastly consumed media platforms such as National Geographic, a magazine much beloved of America's prosperous middle class, that through its language and imagery perpetuates the colonial gaze by manufacturing a 'pristine nature.' For instance, the 'natural' features of the Chacabuco Valley are idealized by the magazine by removing from its imagery evidence of human presence. Yet according to Peace et al (2012) "within the valley, a very different perspective on the conservationist project prevails, especially among the gauchos who were central to the historical development of this region, but whose continuing presence is increasingly at hazard."

Wilderness: Contemporary environmentalists and the colonial gaze

This colonial gaze manifests itself outside of a strict settler-native paradigm as well. Environmentalists in Clayoquot Sound are guilty of the colonial gaze, in this case, a sort of colonial hearing. In 1993, during the protests at Clayoquot Sound, environmentalists generated a sound map for the media which depicted two areas: space being degraded by

loggers and pristine, empty wilderness, thus erasing a majority of the sound population: the First Nations peoples (Braun, 2002).

Braun (2002) identifies the inclination to portray land as "pristine" and untouched by man; it produces a binary that argues, if people are in this land, it is no longer "nature." Nelson (2011) contends that it is always wrong for "nature lovers" to believe that the "untouched" nature they experience is more primordial" and "more real" than a forest with a logger in it. It is also key to note what human presence is accepted, for instance, Braun (2002) deconstructs a coffee-table tome of images in *On the Wild Side, published by the Western Canada Wilderness Committee*. Amidst pictures of empty longhouses and rotting totem poles in Clayoquot Sound (which arguably depicts First Nations people as dying or dead autochthonous people), Braun points to one particular colonial nod: an image of a First Nations person paddling a canoe in the distance and argues that an image of the same person operating an outboard motor would have been taboo. Nelson (2011) rightfully concludes that "Modern" Natives disrupt the political message of the environmentalists, and what is more, it confuses and annoys them." This strict polarization and use of binaries of what is and isn't nature have colonial roots. As a result of Enlightenment thinking, colonial travelers were infatuated with conceptual distinctions and binaries such as natural/social which eventually influenced conservation and the idea of nature as 'pristine' where any semblance of human presence was perceived as a destructive force (Adams and Hutton, 2007).

Communities are depicted either as environmentally destructive, backward, and disordered, needing reconstruction to conform with modernist visions of 'sustainable development' (Adams 2004), or naturalized and romanticized as 'green primitives', part of increasingly globalized media spectacles (Igoe et al. 2010). This form of imaging observes that when actors do *see* indigenous people, they either vilify them or romanticize them (Peace et al, 2012). Ethnographic studies of sustainable livelihoods and indigenous environmental knowledge among hunter-gatherers, small-scale agriculturalists, pastoralists, and fishers have become a romanticized source of inspiration for contemporary environmentalists (Brosius 1997; Hames 2007).

'Green custodians' are either disciplined in the way that new green markets define (Leach et al. 2012), re-constructing indigenous peoples and land users as new green collective subjects, capable of and charged with caring for and repairing nature – within the values and logics prescribed by market discipline, or they are forced into being out of

circumstance. Ordinary people such as farmers and mothers have become transformed into environmental activists, and often very reluctantly. According to Peace et al (2012), "Grassroots environmental activists are made, they are brought into being, by external forces and agencies which impinge on their normal life worlds unexpectedly and hegemonically; and because of their invariably involved interests as farmers and miners, as mothers and others, not only do they rise individually and collectively to the occasion, for they are as much concerned about the future faced by the next generation as their own fate in the present, they also demonstrate time and again that they have no need for someone else to talk for them; they are perfectly able to defend themselves and to do so very adeptly."

This is a particularly important claim for Australian anthropologists to advocate for since increasingly influential right-wing commentary on environmental issues depicts environmental activism as the realm of full-time and committed professional operators as opposed to, what is empirically the case: the conduct of ordinary civilians who were (as they themselves often express it) 'simply minding their own business before being forced to take on the mantle of active grassroots political agent by processes and institutions of which previously they were quite unaware' (Peace et al, 2012).

Tuvaluans subjected to the discourse of their potential as climate refugees demonstrate an understandable antipathy to such loaded language (Farbotko and Lazrus, 2011). They challenge narratives of victimhood that ignore local knowledge and practices; Tuvaluans oppose the hopelessness surrounding the climate crisis and advocate for long-term policies to strengthen existing communities as opposed to waiting for an 'inevitable exodus' (Farbotko and Lazrus, 2011).

Actors and processes that facilitate 'green-grabbing'

Forceful alignments of military and paramilitary agencies with the conservation agenda, where waging war on environmental degradation is conveniently compatible with other 'battles' such as removing drugs (Ybarra, 20212) or social/ethnic groups deemed threatening to the government (Cardenas, 2012).

Business entrepreneurs are an obvious group, seeking to profit from the new era of 'green capitalism', they range from private wildlife operators (Gardner 2012, Benjaminsen and Bryceson 2012) to companies developing forest carbon offset projects (Tienhaara 2012), biochar companies (Leach et al. 2012) or pharmaceutical firms (Neimark 2012), all

presenting themselves as ‘green’ and engaging in various ways with h local elites, national and international NGOs and diverse state actors to secure land and resources for their investments (Fairhead et al, 2012).

However, these stakeholder relationships are complex due to the introduction of a novel brand of intermediary actors as critical go-betweens to secure and enable resource appropriations. For instance, consultancy and advice firms profit from the technical complexities of constructing and negotiating green deals; such as GIS companies involved in constructing and pinpointing ‘marginal lands’ for investment (Nalepa and Bauer 2012), consultants specializing in the carbon stock measurements and scenarios needed to construct REDDþ and carbon offset projects (Corbera and Schroeder 2010), or experts in the calculations required to create and implement biodiversity offset or payment for environmental services projects (Robertson 2004),

Another group is the company-appointed agents who negotiate land and resource deals with local communities. Fairhead et al. (2012) identify that the agents, “sometimes drawn from local elites, sometimes outsiders, the cases here only begin to document the complexities of allegiance, accountability, and entanglements in local politics involved in these relationships. While development actors try to identify the ‘pro-poor’, ‘benefit-sharing’, ‘win-win’ opportunities for such schemes (Angelsen 2008, Cotula and Mayers 2009, Lawlor et al. 2010, Peskett 2011, Peskett and Brodnig 2011), it is the local political dynamics that define winners and losers.”

Green-grabbing can also aggravate local, especially agrarian, tensions and relations. For example, in Sierra Leone, biofuel development by foreign agribusiness contributes to features of the agrarian reality that already marginalizes young people and gatekeeps them from land and decision-making rights (Mokuwa et al., 2011). As chiefs mobilize their power to strike deals with business agents and sign away village farmland, rural youth are “doubly dispossessed, first by local agrarian structures and then by business grabbing” (Anane and Abiwu 2011), thus heightening an existing flight to the cities. This example highlights a cycle in which enclosures and dispossession lead to a rural exodus that ultimately leaves lands as ‘empty’ and therefore much easier to label as ‘under used’ and open to further appropriation (Fairhead et al., 2012). This circle mimics the history of rural land control (Peluso and Lund, 2011), and colonial land acquisition, but the contemporary ‘green economy’ adds fuel to such dynamics.

However it would be a disservice to ignore that land and resource users resist this dispossession, whether through collective smallholder mobilization against green territorial ordering in the Amazon (Baletti 2012), or the highly-organized resistance by Maasai communities to the creation of a private nature refuge for ecotourism in Loliondo, Tanzania (Gardner 2012). Yet, the ubiquity of 'green market' logic and valuations of nature in global discourses, media, and consumer practices permits the dismissal of peasant resistance as an individual, isolated opposition and "anachronistic holding-out against a common-sense green tide" as opposed to valid social mobilization. According to Fairhead and colleagues (2012), ameliorating this will require "inserting firm requirements for distributive justice and equitable development into market arrangements. It will mean asking who wins and who loses and whose collective, the public good is being served by such arrangements."

Yala

- Yala (Jazeel, 2013)
    - Colonial history
    - The religious and archaeological history
        - Decolonizing mission
    - Civil war
    - Post-conflict tensions
    - How all of the above manifests itself in Yala
    - Quotes

National Parks in Sri Lanka are designated areas reserved for wildlife into which people may enter on permits issued by the Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWC). This thesis concerns itself with Yala National Park in Sri Lanka. Ruhuna, or Yala as it is more commonly known, was converted from game reserve to national park in 1938. It is located in the arid southeast of the island, roughly 300 miles from the commercial business district and most well known city, Colombo. The park, a contiguous system of nine Natural Reserves (377 square miles), welcomes over 200,000 local visitors and over 200,000 foreign visitors a year, reaping a revenue in the early 2000s that accounted for more than half the total income of Sri Lanka's Department of Wildlife Conservation (Pethiyagoda, in de Silva and de Silva 2004). In 2019, albeit a pandemic year, Yala earned an income of 3 billion LKR, nearly 4% of

the country's GDP. The park's popularity is credited to its abundance of native flora, fauna, megafauna, and avifauna, making it conducive to wildlife tourism and scientific research. Yala has fairly dense secondary forest but is predominantly thorn bush landscapes with plains, water holes, and rocky outcrops where wildlife can be observed without significant effort. According to Jazeel (2013), boasting a population of over 35 leopards, Yala Block I is home to one of the world's highest densities of leopards, who as the island's apex predator is a highly sought out *exotic* sighting alongside elephants, sloth bears, elephant tuskers, and an abundance of bird life.

Tissamaharama, is considered the most accessible town nearest to Yala; twelve kilometres away, it is where visitors stock up on provisions such as water, meat, groceries, fuel, alcohol, and mosquito repellent. Visitors typically go on three game rides per trip (one early morning around 5am and one around 5pm on the same day, and the last one the morning the following day), accompanied by a DWC official (known as a tracker) who assists the jeep driver with wildlife observation on designated tracks for four-wheel vehicles (Figure). Visitors stay in either DWC bungalows or camps closer or inside the Park, or private sector hotels further away from the Park.

Colonial History

As discussed above/similar to most National Parks, Yala too has its roots in colonial history. The Kandyan Kingdom of Sri Lanka was conquered in 1815 by the British empire, resulting in the formation of a socio-political island colony under a single centralized administration, Ceylon, resulting in what Perera (1998) identifies as the homogenization of Ceylonese space from what was formerly a plurality of Kingdoms. Ruhuna National Park was considered to harbour poor forestry potential due to seasonal extremes of alternate aridity and monsoonal overgrowth, however, forestry reports reveal a history of former agricultural prosperity, for instance ruins of abandoned reservoirs (tanks). In mainstream British colonial fashion, where land had low potential for agriculture or forestry, they pursued hunting to bring both practically and symbolically wild space under their control; "to civilize the savagery that inhered in 'jungle' as word and space" (Jazeel, 2013).

The subjugation of 'unruly nature' serves many purposes in the British empire: affirmation of colonial masculinities, opening up the 'jungle' and liberating it from 'beasts of the field' and 'lords of the soil' (Sir Henry Ward, 1856), all while continuing the civilizing

mission by ‘taming’ the periphery of a colony. This amplifies John MacKenzie’s (1988) suggestion that Britain’s classically educated elite working in the colonies were influenced by ancient Roman and classical Greek tales of the spread of civilization through man’s heroic subjugation of nature. By the end of the twentieth-century, hunting was a foremost gentleman’s pursuit in Sri Lanka. Tariq Jazeel (2013) identifies the vast literature in the nineteenth and early twentieth century that asserts the ‘romance and virtues of ‘the hunt’’ in Ceylon’s peripheral rural areas: “Samuel Baker’s The Rifle and Hound of Ceylon (1882), ‘Snaffle’s’, Gun, Rifle and Hound (1894), and Harry Storey’s Hunting and Shooting in Ceylon (1907). The literature made explicit the links between nobility, masculinity, and ‘the hunt’s’ performative capacity to spread civilization across peripheral Ceylon.”

As a result of the recognized importance of ‘the hunt’, preservation of fauna for these hunts became increasingly important. The Game Protection Society asserted pressure that eventually led to the enclosure in 1898 of the Yala Game Sanctuary (now roughly corresponding with the Yala Strict Natural Reserve including the Kataragama and Katagamuwa Sanctuaries) and adjacent Resident Sportsmen’s Reserve (including what is now Block 1 of Yala National Park). The Sanctuary served as a strict no shooting zone as it intended to replenish the neighboring Reserve. Additionally, in order to distinguish the ‘noble hunt’ from ‘morally reprehensible poaching’, boundaries demarcated the Sanctuary to keep poachers out.

The Waste Lands Ordinance (1897) permitted the Crown to declare as British property all land that was not ‘legally’ owned by any person, native or otherwise, embodying the principle formerly discussed as terra nullius. This legislation is considered as both discursively and practically violent in that it inscribed bureaucratic proprietorship into space that was otherwise managed through communal understandings and agreements that if documented were done so in scripts of languages native to the island but that the British did not recognize (Jazeel, 2013). As a result, it is unclear how many people’s livelihoods were drastically affected by the enclosure of land for the Sanctuary and the Reserve that was previously used for shifting cultivation and hunting then reclassified as ‘poaching’, thus asserting the history of the contemporary argument of displacement by National Parks. Jazeel (2013) argues that “The early history of Yala’s emparkment was as much about the colonial state’s power to restrict a colonized Ceylonese population’s access to land and natural resources, as it was about the preservation of fauna. From its inception, Yala fixed in space

the relationships of power, proprietorship, and morality that were central to colonialism's civilizing zeal; central to the very operation of colonial modernity in Ceylon."

In 1934 there was a change of tide in the discussion of wildlife in Ceylon, as a report by Ceylon's Fauna and Flora Protection Committee declared that 'game' was an inappropriate term for discourse on the preservation of fauna as animals should not be protected solely for blood sport (Bayne et al., 1934). The report further suggested the following: (1) Strict Natural Reserves entirely dedicated to wildlife with entry strictly prohibited except where absolutely necessary. (2) National Parks where wildlife should be protected the public can enter in a regulated manner for educational and recreational observation of wildlife. (3) Intermediate Zones where game sports were permitted under strict control. However, Ceylon's Fauna and Flora Protection Committee recommended a fourth category unique to Ceylon influenced by rich archaeological 'discoveries' in the nineteenth and early-twentieth-century complemented by the growing interest by locals in the religio-historical stories to which these ruins were the basis of (Jazeel, 2013).

> "We would include in such places several of the localities held especially sacred by Buddhists. In and around these places we feel that public sentiment would strongly favour the protection of wildlife. We cannot, however, constitute such areas as National Parks as a considerable part of the land is already in private hands. We, therefore, propose that a special law should run in such areas prohibiting, except under definite conditions, the destruction of wildlife. We propose to term these Sanctuaries." (Brayne, et al. 1934)

The implementation of these recommendations in the 1938 Ordinance is a manifestation of the continued governmentalization of colonial power in Ceylon, transitioning colonial power from 'rule of force' to the 'rule of law' (Scott, 1995). Although the colonial administration is responsible for racializing and ethnicizing religious minority groups, the recommendations to enact national Sanctuaries does not mention places held sacred by those very minorities: Hindus, Christians, and Muslims (Angell, 1998, Scott, 1999). This lays the foundation for equating 'national' flora and fauna with an 'indigenous religion' as the Ordinance established a way of recognizing Buddhism and its majority ethnicized correlate, the Sinhalese. Jazeel (2013) argues that "Even though the category 'Sanctuary' was suggested for private land, the recommendation set in motion state-sponsored recognition of the confluence between wildlife and Buddhism, because the

Ordinance's reference to religion was quite obviously a byword for Buddhism." This notion was solidified by the name change of the park in 1943 from Yala to Ruhuna National Park; an attempt to increase the park's popularity. It succeeded in doing so by converting the landscape into a "public palimpsest recalling a 'glorious' and 'heroic' past civilization and kingdom…as a crucible of Sinhala spirit and Buddhist rootedness" (Jazeel, 2013). Additionally, up until the early 2000s the name boards and signage in the Park were only in Sinhala and English, never in Tamil.

Religious and Archaeological History

> "In Sinhala, the word swarbhawadharmaya is used commonly to refer to the bio-physical world, and its use concords two semantic prosodies. The noun swabhawaya refers to the nature of a thing (where swa denotes thing), but that 'nature' is perhaps best understood as qualities, like hardness, coldness, smoothness, for example. In this sense swabhawaya alone might represent the closest literal equivalent to the Latin n̄atur̄a, or English 'nature', which, as Raymond Williams writes, used in its earliest sense refers to the essential quality of something (1983 [1976]: 219), but has come to connote a bio-physical object world exterior to the human. But swabhawaya is never used alone. It is commonly used in conjunction with dharmaya, which comes from dharma, and so connects the etymology back into a notion of Buddhist principles or philosophy (also see de Silva 1998: 29–53)." (Jazeel, 2013)

> "Most visitors will also stop to visit some of the Park's rich archaeological landscapes: Situlpahuwa, Magulmahavihara, or Akasachetiya, for example. At the rock outcrop Akasachetiya, the summit is reachable by a short, steep twenty-minute climb. Here there is a small pool in which Lotus flowers bloom next to the ruins of a Buddhist dagoba just a few metres high, dating back to the second century BCE, and there are breathtaking views, the elevation offering a sense of Ruhuna National Park's territory. In the distance, the gleaming white towers of the restored Sithulpawwa temple complex, which receives some 50,000 Buddhist pilgrims each year, are clearly visible. On one of my visits to Ruhuna National Park, my friends and guides, Anil and Dharshenie (both Buddhist, and both Sinhalese), were keen to show me this view. Staring across Ruhuna's expanse, I could not help but think that all that territory between here and there was somehow just as sacred. The Sinhala-Buddhist resonance of these two places, Akasachetiya and Situlpahuwa, seemed to pervade the landscape stretching before me. As Ruhuna's portal inscription implies, there is something about this place. There was also something very normal about my experiences on top of Akasachetiya; an awareness of how the poetics of that moment were indissoluble

from this place's Sinhala history and its concordant Buddhist aesthetics, part of its nature." (Jazeel, 2013)

The intense archaeological and historiographical work in Yala revealed the island's rich national and historical heritage, implicating the Park in a degree of spatial religio-ethnic politics. Today, inside Block I, Sinhala-Buddhist pilgrims visit the restored shrine of Sithulpawwa, but Block I is also home to the restored Sinhala-Buddhist ruin sites of Akasa Chetiya and Mahul Maha vihara. Additionally, both Tamil-Hindu and Sinhala-Buddhist pilgrims visit the adjoining Kataragama Sanctuary. Besides these pilgrimage sites, the history of Yala's original name, Ruhuna, lies in the entire park being said to overlie the former Sinhala kingdom of Ruhuna, a vastly irrigated, wealthy hydraulic civilization that dominated the southeast of the island between the fifth and thirteenth centuries BCE.

One of Sri Lanka's sacred texts, the Mahavamsa, suggests that during the second century BCE, the South Indian Tamil king, Elara, 'invaded' and conquered Anuradhapura, the capital of the northern Sinhala kingdom to which the Sinhala king Dutthugemenu was the rightful dynastic heir (Jazeel, 2013). Fleeing south, Dutthugemenu took refuge in the Ruhuna kingdom and used the thick jungle as a home in exile that supposedly nurtured and protected him and his entourage, preparing them to wage a fifteen-year war with the Tamil Elara, which Dutthugemenu eventually won to regain control of the Anuradhapura kingdom (de Lanerole, 1999: 41–48 in Jazeel, 2013). In Sri Lanka's highly ethnicized 'postcolonial' present (one in which a 26-year long civil war took place along ethnic lines) this narration of the island's history highlights the perspective that identifies the modern nation state of Sri Lanka as foundationally Sinhala and Buddhist.

In fact, the power of myths of origin to draw together imagined ethnicized communities (Bhabha, 1990) is demonstrated by the Dutthugemenu narrative which lent authority to Sinhalese claims of rooted belonging in Sri Lanka, thus configuring Tamils as foreigners who were previously invaders but are not tolerated. The trope of tolerance, embedded in the hospitality of the cosmopolitan Sri Lankan state manifests itself in the concession that Sri Lankan nature is, and has always been, accommodating. According to Jazeel (2013), sites of nature on the island do not explicitly exclude, rather, and on the contrary, they are actually very accommodating spaces where diversity is encouraged. For instance, even during the civil war when, Ruhuna National Park was closed due to terrorist

(LTTE) presence, the state actively attempted to secure the landscape for the use of all its citizenry. However, in doing so, the authority of the Sinhala host is empowered to tolerate a Tamil or Muslim presence within Sri Lanka's environmental terrain; what Jazeel (2013) calls, an "ethnicized sovereignty."

With Sri Lanka's 200 years of thorough uninterrupted wildlife protection the attempts at marrying Sinhala-Buddhist historiography and wildlife conservation are unsurprising. As Nicholas (1954) identifies in Buddhist chronicles and inscriptions, it was a traditional duty and customary for Sinhalese Kings, who were also Buddhist, to protect wild animals, birds, and fish. Similarly, besides the Mahavamsa, the Jataka Tales, a voluminous body of literature detailing the previous births of the Buddha in both human and animal form, also show the immediate relationship between man and animal in Buddhist antiquity. Furthermore, Buddhist texts suggest that humankind cannot be separated from nature, this deepened a sense of the indivisible 'oneness' with nature, which lended itself to the rhetoric that the land was Sinhala since Sinhala people once lived there.

Sri Lankan archives offer significant evidence of the ethnicization of Yala's flora and fauna. For instance, cattle inside the Park were referred to as 'Sinhala wild cattle' in a 1954 DWC report (Nicholas, 1954). Additionally, in 1935, two years prior to the Fauna and Flora Protection Ordinance, permission was granted to shoot fifty elephants in Hambantota (Hudson, 1936) who were considered a risk to local livelihood and survival (an enduring problem of human-elephant conflict even today), however, they soon started to be perceived as sacred.

Following the 1938 Ordinance, archives become speckled with textual suggestions of the elephant's position as iconic in Sinhala history and the Mahavamsa. Although elephants have occupied revered positions within local traditions, the representational presence in the archives after 1938 suggests a decolonial intention. Elephants continued to serve as a symbolic image for Sinhalese heroism as references were drawn to King Duthugemunu's war elephants playing a significant role in the battle of Vijithapura (Adithiya, 1981). As a result, by the 1950s, the primary wildlife attraction at Ruhuna had become elephants, prompting the Smithsonian Institute to begin a large-scale scientific research project on elephant behavior into the late 1960s. The media only heightened the coupling of conservation and Buddhism:

> "Popular newspaper accounts through the 1980s and 1990s also made similar triangulations between Buddhist precepts, nature, and the nation, in turn implicating

similar structures of feeling. The Daily News, for example, ran a regular series of photo-essays entitled ‘My Own Native Land’, which provided short accounts of some aspect of Sri Lankan wildlife accompanied by one or two photographs. Unsurprisingly, many were about Ruhuna National Park. Typical of such pieces is that shown in Figure 3.2, an example textually invoking a historical image of the park’s landscapes during the times of the Ruhuna kingdom. It is an image littered with Buddhist iconography: monasteries, viharas, monks, devotees, and Brahmi inscriptions.” (Jazeel, 2013).

Decolonizing mission

Reconnecting Yala National Park to its historical, Sinhala-Buddhist, roots is considered an element of an imaginative decolonization of space, positioning the Park in a national imaginate congruent with the former Sinhalese kingdom ‘Ruhuna’. The 1933 appointment of Senarath Paranavithana as the Head of the Archaeological Survey Department marks a vital juncture with regards to Yala’s reinscription as Ruhuna National Park, a name change considered vital in the anticolonial linguistic efforts. Parnavaithana’s archaeological approach was notably decolonial; he found inscriptions that suggested claims of native ownership of land at Yala that predated the Crown’s colonial claims, therefore, the land was never really terra nullius. For instance, Paranavithana, a Buddhist himself, identifies that an inscription found and translated at Korawakgala near Sithulpawwa, “mentions that the cave, in which the record is incised, was a gift, to the sangha, of the treasurer of Pita Maharaja (the Great Father-King).” However, these traces precluded Tamil claims to any attachment to Yala. In fact, Paranavithana aimed to unearth and inscribe narratives of the Mahavamsa’s refrain (Sinhala glory, Tamil destruction, Sinhala reconquest, and accommodation) across the colonial space, which he perceived as allowing igneous history to speak for itself (Jazeel, 2013).

Consequently, the perception of Yala was changing; no longer ‘mostly forest and low jungle, infested with wild animals and fever haunted’ (Assistant Government Agent, F.C. Fisher, 1874), but instead the land of the past Ruhuna Kingdom rooted in connections to a rich Sinhalese historiography. This perspective manifested in the Archaeological Survey Department Reports in the 1940s and 50s and the initial reports of the Department of Wildlife Conservation (the newly independent Ceylon’s Wildlife Department founded in 1949).

Therefore it is evident that the re-connection to Sinhala and Buddhist history, by staking a pure and simple claim to pre-coloniality and cultural authenticity, can be a fervent anti-colonial political tool (Jazeel, 2013). Overall, to consider any space in Sri Lanka, particularly Ruhuna National Park, as a 'secular' public space of normative nature and conservation is a disservice that contributes to the illusion that Sinhala-Buddhist nationalism is one necessarily camouflaged and armed with guns or adorned in saffron robes.

Civil War

The ethnicized history of Ruhuna National Park isn't solely rooted in its pre-colonial kingdoms and colonial politics, it extends as recently as the island's civil war from 1983-2009. The war was characterized by an intermittent insurgency against the Sri Lankan government by the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE, also known as the Tamil Tigers). Velupillai Prabhakaran led the LTTE who fought to create an independent Tamil state called Tamil Eelam in the north-east of the island, due to the historic and continuous discrimination and violent persecution against Sri Lankan Tamils by the Sinhalese dominated Sri Lankan Government. The Yala Protected Area straddles multiple administrative provinces and contains the Kumbukkan river, the border between the Eastern and Southern Provinces, which for 26-years marked the southernmost extent of Eelam. The park was a site of contested claims, encounters, and surveillance by both State and the LTTE, hence between the 1980s and early 2000s only Block I and II were publicly accessible; throughout the late 2000s in order to protect wildlife from the disturbances of the post-war tourism boost, only Block 1 was open to the public.

The contest over Ruhuna wasn't exclusively for territory but, according to Tariq Jazeel (2013), the two parties also 'fought' on the terrain of environmental knowledge and aesthetics, including the "semantic meanings of 'jungle' and 'tiger.' The state sought to purge both the physical landscape and the textual field of non-native iconographies and symbolic impurities to achieve a holistic sense of 'security.' This manifests in the journalistic coverage, particularly the linguistic choices around species endemicity.

For example, in the aftermath of the 1996 attacks on the park and its subsequent closure, reports began to utilize the LTTE's own iconography of the tiger to quip about the presence of 'tigers' amidst Ruhuna's natural landscapes. Thus, the tiger became a potent metaphor and symbol for the LTTE's occupation of Ruhuna and any problems that beset the

park. For the LTTE, the tiger has been an official symbol since 1972 because of its association with bravery and the rich historical associations in Dravidian civilization (which Sri Lankan tamils descend from), however, tigers are not present in nor endemic to the island, a biodiversity fact used as a rhetorical tool on the foreignness of Tamils in Sri Lanka.

The media used the well known fact that Sri Lanka's largest endemic and wild feline species is the leopard, to strengthen the semantic force of the LTTE's violation of Ruhuna, which was now a violation of not just territory but also the the rightful order of Sri Lankan biodiversity, that is to say, the tiger has no place in Sri Lanka's nature. Following Ruhuna's closure in 1996, the media asserted how a trusted and sacred landscape was now closed to the citizens because an aggressive animal presence had penetrated its jungles. Headlines such as the following proliferated local newspapers: 'Tigers Prowling Around Yala' (DWC, 1996), 'Massive Search for Tigers in Yala' (Weerawarna and Palihawadana 1996), 'Tigers Stalk Yala Waiting for Weapons Ships?' (Defence Correspondent 1996), 'Tigers Infiltrate Yala Again' (Bulathsinhala 1996), 'The Latest Addition to Wildlife at Yala Appears to be Terrorists' (Wijeratne 1996), 'Army, Police Comb Yala to Track Down Tigers' (Dinapurna and Liyanarchchi 1996), and 'Move to Prevent Tiger Infiltration' (Bulathsinhala 1996). Here, the refrain of Sinhala rootedness, Tamil invasion, and Sinhala reconquest, is repeated like a refrain, now in the context of a non-native species belonging.

> Additionally, this rhetoric also took a sexually predatory nature:
>
> "Symbolically, this kind of rhetoric was also already pervaded by the violently sexualized image of predatory feline LTTE cadres actively terrorizing a more passive natural and feminized national resource such as Ruhuna National Park. If Ruhuna was helpless and stricken in the face of 'Tigers Stalking', so to speak, then this language was layered over a genre that, since 1983, had written Ruhuna as a landscape that required protection by the patriarchal guns of state in the face of an LTTE whose incursions into the park were written as the sexual defilement of national nature. As a Daily News piece wrote in 1985: '"Yala East is being raped ... and unless there are guns to help, there is nothing we can do about it," the Director of Wild Life Conservation, Dr Shelton Atapatu, told the "Daily News" yesterday'. The piece's headline read: 'Yala Raped ... but Dept. Helpless'" (Jazeel, 2013).

Internal Colonialism

- Internal colonialism
    - How this contemporary engagement with land, specifically in YNP, is a form of internal colonialism (Nelson, 2011)

- Examples of internal colonialism (Allen, 2005; Guiterrez, 2004; Stone, 1979)
    - Black people and chicanos in America
    - Palestinians in Israel
    - Celtic Fringe in Britain
    - German empire
        - Rural poor
        - Polish
        - Jewish (?)

The historic displacement of people as a result of land enclosure for 'conservation' by colonial governments is fairly well established. However, continued displacement (of locals by locals) in post-colonial contexts under the guise of environmentalism as a form of 'internal colonialism' is understudied. Some scholars of colonialism theorize internal colonialism on linguistic evidence; the same words used by the colonizer to describe the colonized, such as "dirty," "backward,", "uncultured," and "possessing an improper understanding of the value of work and property", were also used by high income, urban, modern, and educated people to describe those who were poorer, rural, not-yet-modern, and uneducated (Nelson, 2011). For example, urban, educated bourgeois British writers were known to first look down upon the urban poor, then the rural poor, followed by the Scottish, the "half-civilized" natives of North America and then finally the Aborigines of Australia; the critique begins in the metropole, identifying groups of people who 'lacked' something the same way colonizers perceived natives in colonies as yearning for civilization because they were short of the 'norm' at the height of modern progress.

This form of categorization is what James Scott (1998) calls high-modernist ideology which is embodied by a muscle-bound self-confidence of scientific and technical progress, the expansion of production, the increasing satisfaction of human desires, the knowledge of nature (including human nature), and above all, the rational design of social order compatible with the scientific understanding of natural laws. The 'modern' eye is eager to measure and order everything it perceives and is infatuated with taxonomies.

Agrarian economist Max Sering (1983) argues that colonization is characterized by bringing under plough any 'unused' or 'wasted' property, and Robert Nelson's (2011)

detailing of the inner colonization in the nineteenth century German Empire testifies to this theory. Germans were 'imported' from the overcrowded, disease-ridden west to the heavily Polish eastern provinces of the Empire with healthier land, in order to 'colonize' and shift the demographic balance against local Poles. Consequently, this policy would strengthen the Empire through food security and raising healthy soldiers. Germany demonstrates the claim that imperialism is often first invoked in the metropole prior to overseas populations– in the German Empire it began in the fields outside German cities, then extended to rural areas in the borderlands such as Alsace-Lorraine and only then migrated to overseas colonies such as German East Africa. Nelson (2011) and Sering (1983) both contend that labor, property, and colonization are inextricably linked and Sering specifically makes the controversial claim that how you farmed was more significant than the color of your skin.

The theory of internal colonialism also manifests itself in Weber's (1976) work on the modernization of rural France. The history of France is rooted in the conquest and colonization of people on the periphery, who were then assimilated through 'modernizing' strategies cuh as universal language and school curriculum that spread the 'glory of the colonizer.' Weber argues, "There can be no clearer expression of imperialist sentiment, a white man's burden of Francophony, whose first conquests were to be right at home." Scott (1998) summarizes the internal modernization-colonization argument as "The aspiration to such uniformity and order alerts us to the fact that modern state- craft is largely a project of internal colonization, often glossed, as it is in imperial rhetoric, as a "civilizing mission." Nelson (2011) agrees that "the builders of the modern nation-state do not merely describe, observe, and map; they strive to shape a people and landscape that will fit their techniques of observation."

On the other hand, African American and Chicano activists in the United States during the mid-1960s and 1970s theorized internal colonialism as a form of racial domination and subordination. The literature emerged among Latin American development economists interrogating the unequal terms of trade between the 'First' and 'Third World' and between 'dominant' and 'subordinate' groups within these nations (Guiterrez, 2004). Racial minorities in the United States valued these theoretical foundations and adapted them as an explanation to their own territorial concentration, spatial segregation, disparities in civil liberties, and their de-facto status as second-class citizens, brutalization by the police, and daily racism.

In 1945, W.E.B Du Bois discussed the “colonial status” of black people in the U.S. and in 1962, Harold Cruse wrote that the circumstances of black people in America was “nothing more or less than a condition of domestic colonialism.” Similarly, in 1964, in the year before his assassination, Malcolm X began describing himself as a black nationalist struggling for the right of black people in America to control the economic, social, and political insititutions in their own community (Sales, 1994); he was advocating for self-determination for the black internal colony. Additionally, in 1965, Kenneth Clark argued that, "the dark ghettos are social, political, education- al, and-above all-economic colonies. Their inhabitants are subject people, victims of the greed, cruelty, insensitivity, guilt and fear of their masters" (Clark, 11). Clark's book foreshadowed the rise of Black Power and the internal colonialism thesis. Despite the novelty of terminology explicitly relating to colonial liberation, as early as 1852, Martin Delany, declared that “We are a nation within a nation” and is considered the first black nationalist. The nature of the white power structure in seeking to maintain hegemony by replacing direct white control of the internal black colony with indirect neo-colonial control is revealed through the use of black intermediary groups–a class of black professionals, politicians, bureaucrats, and businessmen–to act as a buffer and act on its behalf in controlling African-American communities.

Although the United States was never a traditional ‘colonizer’ in the same way nineteenth century European powers were, the country developed economically through violent conquest and seizure of indigenous land, enslavement of African people, and usurpation of Mexican territory through war (Blauner, 1972). Guitierrez (2004) summarizes Blauner’s definition of internal colonialism “as a modern capitalist practice of oppression and exploitation of racial and ethnic minorities within the borders of the state characterized by relationships of domina- tion, oppression, and exploitation.” Such relationships were apparent according to (Blauner, 1972) as:

> (1) forced entry—“The colonized group enters the dominant society through a forced, involuntary, process”
> (2) cultural impact—“The colonizing power carries out a policy which con- strains, transforms, or destroys indigenous values, orientations, and ways of life”
> (3) external administration—“Colonization involves a relationship by which members of the colonized group tend to be administered by representatives of the dominant power There is an experience of being managed and manipulated by outsiders in terms of ethnic status”—and,

(4) racism—"racism is a principle of social domination by which a group seen as inferior or different in terms of alleged biological characteristics is exploited, controlled, and oppressed socially and physically by a superordinate group."

Given these characterizations, examples of internal colonialism are not scarce: apartheid in South Africa (x), black ghettos of America (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967) (Blauner, 1969), the Celtic fringe of Britain (Hechter, 1975), and Palestinians in Israel (Zureik, 1979).

"Ritual Citizenship"

Inside Yala National Park, 4 men and 2 women sit in a safari jeep in their fifth hour hoping, praying to see a panthera pardus kotiya, a leopard. Please God, at least one. As wind blows and dust swirls the hot dry southeastern air, everyone except the driver and the tracker are dozing off. Reluctantly, they abandon their desires and surrender to sleep. Before they see one in their dreams, suddenly, everyone is awoken to monkeys in distress, alarm calls are ringing. A leopard is near. The two men in front are already attuned, their ears are trained and they switch directions, calibrating. They are on the hunt. The two men in the back are not startled for long, they quickly reach for sandbags, one places it on the edge of the open roof and the other on the window closest to him. They then quickly but tentatively grab their cameras, long and heavy, expensive and fragile; they position themselves and focus through the eyepiece, holding their camera, just like a rifle in ready position. And when their beloved leopard enters sight, they shoot.

Besides, we are not many generations removed from being hunters, warriors, and only one generation removed from a 26 year long civil war.

In Staging Indigeneity: Salvage Tourism and the Performance of Native American History (2021), Katrina M Philipps, identifies a sinister version of tourism, called 'salvage tourism.' Salvage tourism is different to heritage tourism such as African Ancestry trips (traveling to places and taking part in activities that aim to represent the stories of the past) because what is being salvaged in American Indian Pageants, World Fairs, Wild West Shows, and Outdoor Dramas, is not actual heritage but an ethnopornography aiming to salvage a

static, sensationalized, idyllic, and purified version of America's indigenous heritage. In Philipps' case studies, salvage tourism is intimately tied to a romanticized Indianness (Phillip Deloria) complicit in the construction of wilderness.

In Sri Lanka, taking after our colonial forebears, domestic tourists construct the wilderness of Yala National Park, by erasing the existence of people from their consciousness–embracing terra nullius–land without people. In America, the construction of wilderness relies on the conscious acknowledgement that there were once people on these lands. Philipps argues that 'salvage tourism' acts on a desire for non-Native American tourists to "reaffirm connection to what was once untamable wilderness" and a reassurance that they belong to a "civilization that has subdued previous inhabitants."

The stratification of urban and rural life during the industrial revolution resulted in a "search for the 'familiar." Thus began the American agenda for "thrilling uncivilization"; to solve their national identity crisis they turned to the American Indians. There is 'salvage' here, not only in the attempt to save a "fauxstalgia" of the American Indian, but also for tourists to find "sanctuary, safety, and security" amidst an identity crisis of nationality.

Sri Lanka has undergone (and continues to experience) a similar identity crisis (chapter 3) enmeshed in ethno-religious conflict over land. National Parks as a site of 'wilderness' is implicated in a colonial, religious, and archaeological history of protected/conserved areas. Yala National Park, specifically, is both a site of a government decolonizing mission and as a majoritarian political tool during the civil war from the 1980s to the early-2000s. Tariq Jazeel explores this nation-building through national parks in depth in his book Sacred Modernity (2013). Now, wildlife tourism is a glorified hobby amongst Colombo's Urban elite.

Although domestic tourists view their ritualized trips to the jungle as harmlessly entertaining and go as far as to call them educational, they are complicit in an extractive 'salvage tourism' economy dependent on "anthropologic contact with select primitives" (Jane Demond). In America, Philipps explains this contact through 'outdoor dramas', in Yala, this contact is through select class alliances with locals living in the periphery of national parks through tourist transactions such as driving, cleaning, and cooking. However, unlike in America, in Sri Lanka, the performance of romantic imaginations of the American native are replaced by a fetishization of endangered species such as the leopard through photography–a

capturing of wilderness. Capturing photographs of the leopard has become one way Sri Lankans practice "ritual citizenship" (Phillips, 2021).

My curiosity lies in the relationship between (indigenous native) animals and performance – not only in circuses and World Fairs but also in the popular contemporary phenomenon of wildlife tourism (implicated in salvage tourism). How do we perform our relation and kinship to more than human indigenous beings?

I am also curious about how emotional and material investments in "wild" lands and peoples results in a disinvestment in the hyperlocal—your own neighborhood, the urban environment, more and more under threat by eco-fascism, climate change, and gentrification under the false greenwashed premise of "sustainability."

Integrate

- Comments on Lit Review Notes doc
- Comments on this doc
- Lit review Notes 2 Quotes

Parking Lot

Jazeel (2013) rightfully observes that "Only the bungalows, camp and archaeological sites, and pilgrim routes offer the opportunity for more direct somatic connections with ground. Ruhuna National Park is better described as a vast formerly colonial park, graspable as a whole only in the imagination."

Jazeel (2013) argues that Buddhist history "is inscribed in the environmental fabric of this state-consecrated geography of the island; Buddhism sits in the place of environmental origins." He elaborates that like nature, religion is also a post-Enlightenment concept that is in many ways constructed, which is important in Sri Lanka because although Buddhism is considered a formally organized religion it is also "present in Sri Lankan society as a metaphysics, an aesthetic, a structure of feeling that the word 'religion' cannot quite capture."

- Dutugemunu complex

- Origin of ‘sinhala’ race

Abeysekara (2002) argues that Sri Lankan ethnic fratricide has roots in the corruption and betrayal of an authentic Buddhist religion (Tambiah, 1992). This perspective offers that if religious orthodoxy were restored, ethnic fratricide would cease.

Jazeel further insists that the rise of “post-colonial” architecture on the island, where infrastructure serves as an extension of the environment, dismantling the separation of the inside and the outside is not necessarily “anti-colonial” because of its roots in architects such as Geoffrey Bawa and Minette De Silva, who similar to the aforementioned environmentalists, albeit local Sri Lankans received extensive training from Europe and North America.

Findings and Analysis part 1

Part 2

What is the problem? What is causing the problem? What is the solution?