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KNP in wider societal context
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Narrative
Critical social science literature (1)

[Peace Parks] are arguably the latest phase in a long and often unfortunate history of environment and development in Africa, in which the interests of the native African inhabitants have regularly been suppressed by colonial or neo-colonial interests in the protection of Africa’s wildlife and the economic exploitation of Africa’s natural resources.

Gibson 1999
Critical social science literature (2)

With South Africa’s Kruger Park suffering from elephant overpopulation, these wildlife corridors [into Limpopo NP] aid [South African] wildlife management by relocating ‘excess elephants’

Amerom & Büsher 2005
Several views (positions) on the relation between conservation and development
Development – Conservation

Four positions:

1) Poverty reduction and conservation are independent policy domains

2) Poverty is a critical constraint on conservation

3) Conservation should not compromise poverty reduction

4) Poverty reduction depends on living resource conservation
Your choice:

(1) conservation → poverty

(2) poverty → conservation

(3) poverty ↔ conservation

(4) poverty → conservation
Development – Conservation

Four positions:

1) Poverty reduction and conservation are independent (policy realms)

2) Poverty is a critical constraint on conservation

3) Conservation should not compromise poverty reduction

4) Poverty reduction depends on living resource conservation (Anton Rupert’s Peace Park idea)

Adapted from: Adams et al. (2007)

Heitkönig & Andersson / KNP network meeting, April 2008
“Dr Anton Rupert’s 1990 idea behind peace parks was that the parks could make a fundamental difference to Africa, using eco-tourism as a vehicle - by addressing one of its most pressing problems - abject poverty. Africa’s biggest asset is its people and its natural beauty.

Dr Rupert believed that the success of peace parks rested on four pillars, namely: space, management training, accommodation, and accessibility.”

Peace Parks website
Much effort is currently undertaken to improve tourism facilities such as accommodation, and some local people are trained to address this issue.

However, the main challenge *remains*: reduce abject poverty
The original Peace Park idea was

“an important conceptual shift away from the idea of strictly protected national parks towards greater emphasis on multiple resource use by local communities by introducing the transfrontier conservation area (TFCA) concept”
“TFCAs (or peace parks), were defined as relatively large areas that straddle frontiers between two or more countries.

Very often both human and animal populations traditionally migrated across or straddled the political boundaries concerned. In essence, TFCAs therefore extend far beyond designated protected areas…”

→ the GLTFCA became increasingly seen as a single socio-ecological unit
Some issues:

1. To protect Park neighbours from potentially damaging animals (such as baboons, lions and elephants):
   • spatially segregate villages from wildlife
   • create or recreate fences
   • instate damage control mechanisms in all three countries.

2. Very strict veterinary control

   Ironically, fences re-enforce spatial segregation, also among related villages, particularly the Shangaan peoples, who live in the entire GLTFCA.
GLTFCA as a social unit?

Policy domains in the GLTFCA
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GLTFCA as a social unit?

Hence:

The composition of policy domains varies per country and in time.

It thus appears that the GLTFCA as a social unit can be better understood as a construct rather than as a uniform entity.
GLTFCA as an ecological unit?
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GLTFCA as an ecological unit?

Hence:

The extension of the conservation area varies per country (and in time).

It also appears that the GLTFCA as an ecological unit can be better understood as a construct rather than as a uniform entity.

→ Understanding the GLTFCA requires a comparative approach rather than a systems approach
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