

"Securing Space" : Mapping and Fencing in Transfrontier Conservation in Southern Africa

Marja Spierenburg and Harry Wels
Space and Culture 2006 9: 294
DOI: 10.1177/1206331206289018

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://sac.sagepub.com/content/9/3/294>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Space and Culture* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://sac.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://sac.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://sac.sagepub.com/content/9/3/294.refs.html>

“Securing Space”

Mapping and Fencing in Transfrontier Conservation in Southern Africa

Marja Spierenburg

Harry Wels¹

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

This article provides a brief history of the use of maps and fences in wildlife conservation. Analysis of the promotional materials of one of the main promoters of Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) in southern Africa, the Peace Parks Foundation, reveals the importance of mapping as a planning and promotion tool. These maps, however, appear to be quite silent about the communities that are supposed to benefit from the TFCAs. The fences around wildlife areas are resented by local communities because they prevent them from harvesting natural resources “on the other side.” Local communities also object to the fences because of their symbolic meaning and instrumentality, shown in warfare and policies “to control and divide.” Conservation organizations nowadays use the symbol of the fence to communicate their change in policy toward local communities: stressing the need to move “beyond the fences” by involving local communities in the management of protected areas and using these to promote economic development.

Keywords: wildlife conservation; community development; mapping; enclosure; southern Africa

Nature conservation in southern Africa has always been an important political tool, at least since the advent of European colonization. It has played a role in fostering Afrikaner nationalism (Carruthers, 1995)—as testified by the name of South Africa’s largest national park, Kruger National Park—and during the years of apartheid in plotting a policy of the political destabilization of neighboring countries (Breytenbach, 1997, 2001; Ellis, 1994; Potgieter, 1995). Conservation areas located on the national borders served as places through which weapons and saboteurs passed into neighboring territories. As a result,

nature, and more specifically nature conservation, often elicits deep-seated feelings of antagonism and mistrust between wildlife authorities and local populations living in and around wildlife areas (Anderson & Grove, 1987) and between the neighboring countries in southern Africa (Duffy, 2000, pp. 43-66). In the first instance, at the local level, this mistrust was dealt with by excluding local communities completely from wildlife areas, both physically through fences and by excluding them from the management of these areas. However, when it became clear that this strategy was counterproductive and had become socially unacceptable (see, e.g., Adams & Hulme, 2001), conservation organizations started advocating strategies to generate benefits for communities in proximity to protected areas and sometimes even community participation in the management of these areas. This new approach was often referred to as "moving beyond the fences" and was developed in the wake of the Bali declaration of 1982 and the 1987 report of the Brundtland Commission.

A more recent trend concerns bringing down the fences between countries to create Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs). Practically all international conservation organizations have embraced the concept of TFCAs (Aberly, 1999; Wolmer, 2003). The rationale for the support is that the boundaries of ecosystems generally do not overlap with national, political boundaries. The huge global threats to the interconnected ecosystems and migrating species allegedly require large-scale conservation efforts (Chapin, 2004, p. 22).

Especially in the south, TFCAs are hailed as opportunities for economic growth through tourism (Wolmer, 2003). By arguing that local communities living in or close to TFCAs will also benefit from this growth, TFCA proponents claim social legitimacy for large-scale conservation efforts. In this sense, they propose to continue to "move beyond the fences" that used to keep communities out. In this article, we look critically at the use of fences in conservation practices in southern Africa, both in the literal sense and semiotically. Do TFCAs indeed combine bringing down the fences between countries with moving beyond the fences to reach out to communities?

Fences were not the only way of excluding communities and confining them to certain spaces. In the imperial days, maps were a symbolic tool for the appropriation of spaces (see King, 1996). Large parts of the African continent were presented as white, suggesting empty spaces on the map, open to conquest, and only appeared on maps once "discovered" and secured by European colonial powers. In apartheid South Africa, for instance, mapmakers minimized Black settlement on their maps (Stickler, 1996), or as Carruthers (2003) formulated it, "particularly African communities were wiped off the map" (p. 956). In the promotion and planning of TFCAs, maps also play an important role. Especially the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF), one of the main promoters and fund-raisers for TFCAs in southern Africa, uses maps in its project presentations and provides geographic information system (GIS) support to TFCA managers. PPF's present CEO is actually a GIS specialist. In this article, we study equally maps and the use of maps by the PPF² to analyze whether these fit with the PPF's proclaimed focus on community participation in TFCAs. But first, we begin with a brief description of the history of the use of fences in wildlife conservation in southern Africa.

Fences and Warfare: A Brief History of Wildlife Conservation in Southern Africa

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, larger game animals became increasingly scarce, especially in southern Africa. This, according to Beinart (1987), contributed to

a significant shift in attitudes toward the preservation of wildlife. Hunting for subsistence and gain gave way, among a growing colonial elite, to “the Hunt” as a socially exclusive pleasure pursuit (p. 16). African rural dwellers, who had depended on subsistence hunting, increasingly became defined as poachers and acted against as such (p. 16). An important wildlife preservation strategy was the creation of protected areas or national parks. If any member of a local community dared to enter or touch any animal or other natural resource in the protected area, this person was immediately labeled a “poacher” and heavily fined if caught. This policy was appropriately called the “fines-and-fences approach” or “fortress conservation” (see, e.g., Brockington 2002). Wildlife management authorities and local communities developed antagonistic relations, and a negative form of exchange became more or less the norm: The communities “poached” and “trespassed” the boundaries and fences to express their protests, and wildlife managers “hunted the poachers down.” In Zimbabwe, this was taken literally, following the example of Kenya’s strongman of the Kenya Wildlife Services, Richard Leakey (2001), in a “shoot-to-kill” policy (cf. Wels 2003).

Poachers have always been the number one enemy of conservation authorities. When reading the (auto)biographical accounts of game wardens, their preoccupation with preventing and chasing poachers stares one in the face (see, e.g., Davison, 1967/1998; Kinloch, 1972, chap. 113; Stevenson-Hamilton, 1937/1993). To get the conservation message across, the “culprits” were juxtaposed with the romantic notion of an unspoiled, untouched, virgin African wilderness, which they were obviously in the process of destroying (Adams & McShane, 1996). In line with their often militaristic background, conservationists often reverted to the reflex they were taught in the military, which was to declare “war on the poachers” (see, e.g., Carruthers, 2001; Draper, 1998). Even today, the training of game wardens is highly militaristic, and the camouflage uniforms they wear resemble military uniforms (see, e.g., Leakey, 2001; Steele 1992).

One of the most striking symbols of warfare in general is a (barbed wire) fence (Razac, 2002).⁴ The idea of barbed wire was taken from thorn bushes, which were used all around the world for protection and to deter outsiders (Krell, 2002, p. 15). When Jan van Riebeeck, for instance, landed in South Africa, the first attempt to protect his station was made by erecting a hedge (i.e., a “living fence”; Krell, 2002, p. 15), of *Brabejum stellatifolium*, or wild almond. With its “dry and bitter” nuts, the hedge became symbolic for the bitter segregation that has been part of South Africa’s history ever since (Sparks, 1990, pp. xv-xvi). The road from the “natural” fence to barbed wire is a long one measured in time, but the effects of both have been the same: “Barbed wire has always functioned in that paradoxical zone, between protection and division” (Krell, 2002, p. 160).

In fact, South Africa has the dubious “honor” of being the country where barbed wire fences were first widely used in warfare, during the Anglo-Boer War of 1898 to 1901:

Keen to bring that conflict to a speedy conclusion, General Kitchener in early 1901 turned to a strategy of barbed wire and blockhouses, one that paralleled his other initiative, also involving barbed wire, the construction of what soon came to be called “concentration camps.” (Krell, 2002, p. 49)

Through this “barbed wire strategy,” an “immense space was brought under control” (Netz, quoted in Krell, 2002, p. 49). The “blockhouse system” was a grim but effective system of controlling space in South Africa in which “blockhouses” (i.e., control posts)

were connected with one another by barbed wire. For this purpose, the British in South Africa used some 3,700 miles of barbed wire (Netz, 2004, pp. 64-67). Netz (2004) drew a gruesome parallel between a hunting method developed by the Boers after the introduction of barbed wire in South Africa. The Boers drove game into the barbed wire fences, and when the animals got stuck there, they were easy targets. Along similar lines, during the Anglo-Boer War, Boers were driven toward barbed wire fences by the superior numbers and artillery of the British and when trapped against the wire were caught: "The British counted their 'bags,'" a term used in hunting to indicate the number of animals killed (Netz, 2004, p. 68).⁵ Because of these connotations, barbed wire, and by implication fences, has become a symbol for human rights abuses and oppressive control mechanisms worldwide; see, for instance, the familiar logo used by Amnesty International of barbed wire curled around a burning candle.⁶

Fences have always been very popular in wildlife conservation: They served both to protect wildlife and to keep it separated from the people outside the fences. Fences have been part and parcel of much of the ideological upbringing of generations of conservationists, an upbringing that, as noted above, has been characterized as a "fines-and-fences approach." For local communities, the fence became the symbol of a conservation ideology that focused solely on the welfare of wildlife inside the fence and far less on the well-being of the people outside the fence (Hulme & Murphree, 2001b).

In the second half of the 1980s, it became evident that the fines-and-fences approach was no longer socially nor politically acceptable; nor was it a sustainable way to manage and protect wildlife (McNeely, 1992). Not only was it too expensive in terms of deploying personnel and equipment, it was also counterproductive (i.e., it did not stop the poaching and further encroachment on wildlife areas). From then on, wildlife managers and policy makers in the field of nature conservation started to proclaim a different approach that emphasized that communities had to become actively involved in wildlife management (Adams, 2004, chap. 5). Instead of antagonistic parties, communities had to become cooperative partners. All kinds of projects were started in this vein, and some pioneering efforts that had already begun now received official political backing and legitimization. Conservationists in southern Africa were leading the way in this respect with groundbreaking projects in the field of community conservation, such as the Administrative Management Design in Zambia (Gibson, 1999), Living in a Finite Environment in Namibia, and the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources in Zimbabwe (Hulme & Murphree, 2001a; see also Kiss, 1990).

The new approach was referred to as moving "beyond the (boundary) fences"; the overall theme, for instance, of the Vth World Parks Congress, held in Durban, South Africa, in 2003 was "Benefits Beyond Boundaries" (International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, 2003). Hence, the fence is still used as a symbol in communicating the new conservation ideology, but it is given a new meaning. This process perhaps can be paralleled to descriptions of how farming communities in the United States attached new meanings to fences. The latter used barbed wire fences to connect their telephones. Barbed wire was literally and figuratively speaking used to communicate (Krell, 2002, p. 88).

In wildlife conservation, fences have always been a blessing and a curse. In Botswana, Marc and Deliah Owens (1985) mobilized the public against the government of Botswana by describing the devastating effects of a fence intended to protect against foot-and-mouth disease on migrating wildlife in the country. In Australia, the famous Dingo Fence, aimed at preventing dingoes (wild dogs) from eating sheep, stretches for some 5,309 kilometers through the Australian interior:

Enjoying a sympathetic relationship with the indigenous peoples, who incorporated it into their mythic stories, the animal, like its American counterpart, the coyote, was reconfigured by settlers into a mean and menacing creature. It is still possible to see dead dingoes hanging like trophies on the wire, a practice that parallels the (now diminishing) display of slain coyotes and other predators on the barbed wire fences of the American West. (Krell, 2002, p. 160)⁷

In a macabre parallel, local communities, including the Bushmen, or San, who were once hunted down like animals (Gordon & Sholto Douglas, 2000), run up against fences that separate them from the natural resources they need to survive.

"Going beyond the fences" indicates in a symbolically very powerful way attempts by conservationists to turn a metaphor of mistrust into one of trust (Borrini-Feyerabend, 1997). The metaphor of "beyond the fences" can be symbolically interpreted in (at least) two related ways. First, by using fences in wildlife conservation, authorities have protected the wildlife by immobilizing it. As Netz (2004) convincingly argued, "the purpose of barbed wire was to *prevent* motion" (p. 30). However, especially with the success of the conservation of the elephant, a highly symbolic animal, in southern Africa, it has become clear that fences not only preserve wildlife but also obstruct its mobility in the search for greener pastures, in a destructive way (Marshall, 2004). Increasingly, conservation organizations argue that the conservation of wildlife should not be confined to protected areas alone but also take place outside of these (see Bhattacharya et al., 2005). Fencing not only prevents mobility but in general allows only for static and *ceteris paribus* situations. W. H. Auden (quoted in Krell, 2002, p. 64) perhaps tried to capture this aspect in poetry when he wrote,

Between two hills, two villages, two trees, two friends,
The barbed wire runs which neither argues nor explains.

The second interpretation of the metaphor is that it tries to convey the message to local communities that the wildlife authorities will reach over or even remove the fences that have been obstructing their relations ever since the early days of wildlife conservation in southern Africa. Instead of excluding communities from conservation areas, they are now considered stakeholders who, through the sharing of benefits from wildlife, will develop a stake in conserving it.

Breaking Down the Fences: Transboundary Conservation Initiatives

In the early 1990s, a start was made to dismantle the system of apartheid. Within this context, aided by the different initiatives to reconcile local communities with wildlife managers, a normalization of relations within the region could be initiated. The idea of promoting the creation of TFCAs, popularly referred to as "peace parks," to stimulate this normalization matched perfectly with the political feeling at that particular time. The late Anton Rupert,⁸ founder and president of the PPF, had the political acumen to recognize it: "After 1990, when former President Mandela was freed, I knew the time was right to proceed with cross-border [transfrontier parks]. This was not possible before" (quoted in Ramutsindela, 2004, p. 63). The overall cooperative ideal was couched in romantic parlance about the way that the joint management of nature "would heal old wounds" at both the state and community levels, hence the

name peace parks (Koch, 1998). The PPF has formulated this threefold objective as follows:

to fund and facilitate the development of Transfrontier Conservation Areas, placing particular emphasis on the promotion of regional peace and stability, the creation of new jobs associated with the anticipated growth of tourism in southern Africa, and the conservation of biological diversity. (Hanks, 1997, pp. 2-3)

"Involving local communities" is mentioned in a policy document under the "specific objectives."

TFCAs are hence supposed to present the ultimate form of tearing down the fences. Literally, fences are taken down to allow the free roaming of animals across national borders, thus allowing the excess elephant population of Kruger National Park to move into Mozambique. Figuratively speaking, the TFCAs represent attempts to break down the fences that have hindered community participation in wildlife conservation. These two aspects of breaking down the fences were celebrated in a recent feature of *National Geographic* on the Web, with a digitized film that opens with scene of barbed wire disappearing from view (National Geographic Society, 2001). The idea behind the TFCAs is romantically referred to as the "dream of an Africa without fences" (Hanks, quoted in Wolmer, 2003, p. 264). The same symbolism is used in a film directed by Karin Slater called *Road to Restitution*, in which we see former antagonists (i.e., community members and park wardens) reach through the wires of a fence to shake hands.

In presenting its mission to the world and in convincing people around the globe of the legitimacy of its plans and vision, the PPF makes heavy use of maps showing the—planned—future TFCAs. On the PPF's Web site (<http://www.peaceparks.org>), the first link, "Securing Space," leads visitors to a list of all TFCA initiatives in southern Africa and a direct link to the maps of these areas. The maps are of course representations or, as Vivan (2000) formulated it, "rather a metaphor" (p. 49). These maps are astonishing in their splendor and vision. Actually, it is these cartographic specifications of the TFCA vision that mostly seem to justify the claims the PPF makes, much more than what is actually happening or is known on the ground. According to a provocative book by Monmonier (1995), this phenomenon could be labeled "mapism," which "implies the same mix of ignorance, prejudice, and arrogant conviction that leads seemingly honest, well-meaning people to assert the superiority or inferiority of a racial or ethnic group" (p. 3). This may seem a very harsh comment when discussing the noble objectives of the TFCAs, but we do need to ask ourselves what the use of maps tells us about the PPF and its stated mission to promote the economic betterment of local communities, especially when we acknowledge that cartography is often a violent practice, as Shapiro (1997) convincingly argued. In this article, we want to illustrate how the politics of cartography produce nature and space (Dalby, 2002, pp. xi-xiii, xxvi) in southern Africa and how this seems to prevent the involvement of local communities in the whole peace (park) process. The explicit emphasis on cartography by the PPF is seen by many people on the ground as a reinvention of imperialism, in this case ecoimperialism; it is as if the maps "precede the territory," to use Baudrillard's phrase (quoted in King, 1996, p. 1).

The Politics of Enclosure: Maps and Fences in TFCAs

In the 19th century, Cecil John Rhodes had the megalomaniac ambition to extend the British empire from the "Cape to Cairo." A famous cartoon shows Rhodes standing on



Figure 1. The Rhodes Colossus

Source: Reproduced with permission from *Punch Magazine* (<http://www.punch.co.uk>).

a map of the African continent trying to take a giant step from Cape Town to Cairo (Figure 1).⁹

What was staggering about Rhodes was not so much his drive to enlarge the British empire—many people in his imperial day and age had that ambition—but the sheer size of his ambition (Thomas, 1996, p. 351). “The evolution of the map of Africa over the past five centuries has been determined primarily by the nature of the relationship between Europe and Africa,” and “the greatest single influence on the evolving map of Africa was colonialism” (Stone, 1995, p. 1).¹⁰ Mapmaking and appropriating the land (i.e., contributing to the realization of Rhodes’s ambition) went hand in hand. Mapmaking is intricately linked to issues of access to land and visions of landscape all around the globe (Abrahamson & Theodossopoulos, 2000, p. 1). This holds particularly for South Africa and southern Africa, where White minorities seized land from Black majorities to foster their own agricultural production and create separate “European” and “African” areas; furthermore, Black majorities were also denied access to land and

other natural resources in the name of nature conservation (for a good example from Zimbabwe, see Ranger, 1999; see also Spierenburg, 2004).

Viewing the maps showing the PPF’s aspirations for transboundary conservation brings one close to the sensation one has when looking at the cartoon of Rhodes: It is an (almost) continental thing. Godwin (2001) concluded that “its goal is to change the conservation map of a continent” (p. 10). On the PPF’s Web site, or in the various magazines in which the idea of TFCA development is promoted, as well as the PPF’s annual reports, maps and the sizes of the proposed areas dominate the message (Douglas, 1997; Godwin, 2001; Peace Parks Foundation 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004a). Noel de Villiers (quoted in Wolmer, 2003) even made an explicit link between Rhodes’s ambitions and the TFCA dream, saying that “Africa should endeavour to join all its game parks contiguously from Cape to Cairo” (p. 264). A less nostalgic and more critical voice said that “TFCAs are driven by Cecil Rhodes clones—rather than seeing great expanses of red on the map [the color of the British empire] they want to see a great wedge of green as their legacy to Africa!” (Wolmer, 2003, p. 266). Maps indicating the size of the ambition seem to belong to the standard discourse of the PPF. Maps can be seen as a dominant tool for TFCA development in southern Africa (Godwin,

2001, p. 11). In its *Annual Review 2001*, the PPF (2001) described the importance of mapping for TFCAs as follows:

Peace parks are established because their environmental conditions have the potential to conserve biodiversity and develop ecotourism across international boundaries. These two factors combine to create land-use options that can be mapped with electronic media and satellite images through Geographical Information Systems (GIS). The Foundation's GIS laboratory uses all available data to do broad land-use planning for each of the peace parks in southern Africa. . . . The GIS laboratory is known for its high-quality mapping and has become an integral part of the Foundation's functional activities. It also provides the fundamental information needed for the Foundation's fundraising initiatives, its advocacy programme and the planning and development of peace parks. (p. 5)

How can we explain the popularity of the use of maps? Perhaps it is because maps "appear to offer scientific precision and comprehensiveness" and suggest "accuracy and objectivity" (Black, 1997, p. 9). "At the root of their [maps'] power is our frequently unquestioning acceptance of cartographic messages" (Monmonier, 1995, p. 1), which makes maps a formidable tool for publicity. However, it does not require much reflection to come to the conclusion that maps can only show a fraction of information in their two-dimensional representation of what is on the ground. In other words, "maps are [necessarily] selective representations of reality" (Monmonier, 1995, p.11). This means that it is interesting to know what a map actually does show, but equally interesting is the question what the mapmakers chose not to show, what Harley (1990, pp. 4, 6) called the "silences" in maps. This is especially relevant in the context of South Africa, where many—often White—South African mapmakers either completely ignored or minimized Black settlements on their maps, while even the smallest pockets of White settlement were given prominent places on the maps (Stickler, 1990). To challenge the choices of these mapmakers, a map was produced by Christopher (1993) showing the spatial bias of the apartheid regime, giving prominence to the spatialization and location of Black South Africans. Harley and the other authors quoted in this section belong to a school of cartographers who argue that "maps are about social control and are usually created to serve the designs of their creators, rather than to inform 'the public'" (Dorling & Fairbairn, 1997, p. 65). Following this school of thought, the least one could say is that maps can serve very diverse and even opposite objectives, made possible by what mapmakers choose to show and what they choose to keep silent about. This view provides a more nuanced interpretation of maps than presenting them as objective and accurate representations of reality, becoming even increasingly more accurate because of the ongoing technological advances in the field of remote sensing or Landsat imagery. Mapmaking has an "authorial intention" (Wood, 1992) and is therefore inherently linked to processes of knowledge and power.

Power is about space, and space is created through the exercise of power, as the imperial enterprise has made abundantly clear. Maps can therefore, by implication, be seen as metaphors of appropriation. This interpretation of maps can be illustrated by current processes in South Africa to change the names of all kinds of towns, provinces, and wildlife areas. The appropriation of space is often settled by giving it a name, which will then appear on maps. "All trust in the world begins with names, in connection with which stories can be told" (Blumenberg, quoted in Berking, 1999, p. 77). Especially in the former Northern Province of South Africa, many place names assigned under the apartheid regime are contested and changed to names that reflect

the current power configuration in the country. The province itself, for instance, is now called Limpopo Province, after the river forming the border between Zimbabwe and South Africa; Pietersburg, named after a famous Voortrekker, is now called Polokwane. The problem is that although these name changes are now officially accepted, they do not yet appear on most maps, nor on all road signs. The name changes have yet to reach the level of the mapmakers in South Africa. Another change of names is proposed for the famous Kruger National Park, which still carries the name of the late, well-known president of one of the former Boer republics. The chief executive of South African National Parks described the use of a former colonial leader's name as "offensive in the new South Africa." Mavuso Msimang told the *Sunday Independent*, "We would like to see a policy in South Africa that allows us to change irritating names. Kruger was a colonial and his name has now become an unlikely brand for our flagship park" ("Kruger National Park," 1998).¹¹ The integration of Kruger National Park in the Great Limpopo TFCA (see below) might well provide an occasion to erase the memory of the colonial name and replace it in tourist brochures and on tourist maps.

In this respect, it is interesting to note that especially the increase in travel and tourism has added to an increased "map consciousness" (Wood, quoted in Black, 1997, p. 22). Tourist maps are a medium through which people today have choices imprinted on them concerning what to include in their trips and what to exclude. The aggressively political use of maps witnessed in imperial days seems to be downplayed in the spread of map consciousness in the field of nature conservation and wildlife tourism. This could actually be interpreted as a smoke screen, because environmental mapping is usually highly politically aggressive, as many maps of diminishing rainforests and "decreasing" plant and animal distributions—these days often using aerial photography or satellite images—illustrate (Fairhead & Leach, 1996). Here, maps play an important role in generating a sense of urgency and crisis that justifies the actions of environmental organizations, including the appropriation of spaces for conservation.

In the case of TFCA development, the involvement with tourism also seems to shroud political consequences. Nature tourism is often seen as something politically neutral, affecting local livelihoods only in a positive way by bringing possibilities for income generation for local communities and economic development (see, e.g., the World Bank's publication on nature tourism, conservation, and development in KwaZulu-Natal, edited by Aylward and Lutz, 2003, pp. 14-15). Yet, tourists also—literally—take over spaces, reducing the access of local communities to natural resources (see, e.g., Brown, 2005, p. 92). In the process of mixing tourism and wildlife conservation, maps seem to become depoliticized (i.e., sanitized places). Or, as Black (1997) formulated it, "there is no wish to raise issues that might confuse" (p. 116). Yet in the same way as the imperial maps showed Africa as "open to appropriation," so do maps of future TFCA developments open the door to appropriation through private investments in lodges and all the luxury leisure amenities that modern-day tourism requires. Wolmer (2003) noted that a

rationale for transboundary conservation—which has won it some powerful backers—is the potential it holds for opening up new spaces for private sector investment [and] its potential for providing widespread tourism venture investment opportunities enables it to be portrayed as an "engine to propel economic development." (p. 265)

But where does this leave the local communities living in and around these TFCAs? What do the TFCA maps say about local communities and the claim by the PPF that

TFCAs contribute to local community development? We want to explore these issues by looking at the use of maps in relation to the Great Limpopo TFCA.

The Great Limpopo TFCA is one of the largest TFCAs in the world, linking nature reserves in South Africa, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe. "This covers an area of 99,800 square kilometres (66,000 in Mozambique, 22,000 in South Africa, and 12,000 in Zimbabwe)" (Wolmer, 2003, p. 268). This TFCA originally was supposed to become a multiple-use area, which would especially help impoverished communities in communal lands in Mozambique. The map accompanying the original objectives of the Great Limpopo TFCA (formerly available at <http://www.peaceparks.org/profiles/kruger.html>; see note 2) shows that the communal lands originally enclosed in the TFCA plan are much larger than the presently included Limpopo National Park (formerly known as the Coutada 16 Wildlife Utilization Area, located directly opposite Kruger National Park), Zinave National Park, and Banhine National Park combined.

Just as in the other TFCAs, "funders and park planners hoped that through the use of participatory approaches local people would feel that they have a real stake in protecting wildlife" (Duffy, 2000, p. 44). When the idea of the Great Limpopo TFCA was first put forward in 1995, it was presented as a TFCA with multiple land use (interview with Dr. Reino, Endangered Wildlife Trust, Maputo, Mozambique, February 2, 2001). However, the main focus is now on Coutada 16, which was a Wildlife Utilization Area and has about 27,000 people living within its borders. Soon after the signing of the agreement between the three governments involved to establish the TFCA, Coutada 16 was declared a national park and renamed Limpopo National Park. This was done without much thought about what it would mean for the communities living off the land concerned. A World Bank consultant who was initially involved in the TFCA remarked,

This was supposed to be a transfrontier *conservation area*, now it is becoming a trans-frontier *park*, that is not the same thing, that is not what we had agreed upon. This was supposed to bring benefits to the local communities, but the way it is going now it will not. (interview at the World Bank, Maputo, Mozambique, August 6, 2003)

The PPF (2004b) brochure celebrating the establishment of the Great Limpopo TFCA reflects the change in policy:

All a Transfrontier *Park* [italics added] means is that the authorities responsible for the areas in which the primary focus is wildlife conservation, and which border each other across international boundaries, formally agree to manage those areas as one integrated unit according to a streamlined management plan. These authorities also undertake to *remove all human barriers* [italics added] within the Transfrontier Park so that animals can roam freely.

Turning the conservation area into a park could be considered an act of what Sibley (1995) called "spatial purification" (p. 77). Representatives of various organizations (directly and indirectly) involved in the implementation of the TFCA (interviews in Maputo, Mozambique, April-May 2005) felt that the Great Limpopo TFCA had become a matter of prestige for the PPF: It would be the largest TFCA on the continent and contains a national park of world fame. This might explain why the multiple-use status of Coutada 16 was abandoned. To merge these two areas, the form of land use they were under had to be harmonized. Kruger National Park was taken as a model for the entire TFCA. During presentations to Mozambican authorities and communities, PPF staff members presented the success of tourism in Kruger as an example of what

the entire TFCA could become. They strongly suggested that the communities would benefit from these economic opportunities. However, by taking Kruger National Park as a model for the Limpopo National Park, the communities living within the latter's borders became an "obstacle" and "undesirable."

The majority of the people in the park live along the eastern and southern boundaries of the park. Seven villages with a total of about 7,000 inhabitants are located along the Shingwedzi River, which transects the southern part of the park. A study commissioned by the PPF concluded that the banks of the Shingwedzi River also hold the greatest tourism potential (interviews with PPF staff members, April 2005, and with members of the Project Implementation Unit of Limpopo National Park, May 2005). To free the area for tourism, a program is being developed to resettle the 7,000 people along the Shingwedzi River to an area to the southeast of the park. Both government officials in the Ministry of Tourism, responsible for the TFCA, and representatives of the PPF have insisted that no forced relocation will take place (interviews at the Ministry of Tourism, Maputo, Mozambique, June 2002 and May 2005, and with a PPF representative, April 2005). However, the new status of the area seriously impinges on the communities' livelihood strategies. According to national parks legislation in Mozambique—based on the Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (cited in Aylward & Lutz, 2003)—cultivation inside national parks is forbidden. The communities along the Shingwedzi River are allowed to continue farming the fields they had cleared before the declaration of the park, but they are not allowed to clear new ones. Most farmers rotate their fields every few years and are worried about what will happen if their current fields lose their fertility. Furthermore, accessing the "emergency pastures" used in times of drought has become illegal. Fishing is no longer allowed, nor is subsistence hunting. The communities receive no compensation for wildlife damage, as one of the park's employees remarked: "This is now a national park, agriculture and cattle keeping officially is forbidden in a park, so how can we compensate for damage to things that are not allowed?" (interview with a staff member of the Project Implementation Unit, May 2005). As a result of the restrictions and increased damage, many people living along the Shingwedzi River now believe that resettlement is inevitable. A village leader formulated it this way:

They say that the resettlement is not forced, but that is not true. We are forced because we are no longer allowed to live our lives as before, we can no longer cultivate where we want, we can no longer take our cattle out to graze. Yes, we agreed to move, but we did not do so freely. (interview, May 2005)

The park is also impinging on another livelihood strategy, that of (illegal) migration to South Africa to look for (temporary) work on commercial farms and as servants in communities living next to Kruger National Park. According to police officers of Guarda Fronteira, the increased presence of wildlife and the fact that people will now have to cross two wildlife areas (including Kruger) with predator populations will deter possible migrants, as will the increased antipoaching patrols. Although TFCAs promote the transboundary mobility of tourists and investors, communities increasingly become immobilized and bounded (see Hughes 2002). The first step in this process was to deny them access to natural resources farther afield and prevent them from crossing the border to pursue job opportunities. The second step has been to confine them to a new place outside of the park.

In other words, attempts are made to grant the mobile and transit tourists exclusive right of access to the space of the national park. Contrary to the tourists, local people are considered "undesirables," those who "spoil" the image of a wild and pristine landscape (cf. Wels, 2004).¹² The authorities interviewed kept repeating that "tourists and communities do not mix." Rangers and other park personnel are, as unobtrusively as possible for the tourists, constantly on the lookout for undesirables, often conveniently labeled "poachers." In the process, the national and by implication *public* park suddenly seems to have become a *private* space for tourists, who pay for the animals to stay instead of the people (cf. Sibley, 1995, p. xi).¹³

Looking at the representation of communities on the maps of the PPF, the following developments are notable. On the first maps of the Great Limpopo TFCA, the communities were not visible, despite the inclusion of communal areas within the TFCA. It is only recently that the PPF's Web site has been changed, and interactive GIS maps have been made available to the general audience. On these maps, it is now possible to view the locations of some of the communities inside Limpopo National Park. However, the map presented in the tourism plan (Peace Parks Foundation, 2004b) seems to presume the removal of the communities along the Shingwedzi River. This map shows the proposed locations of the different tourism facilities along the river, which actually replace the villages along the Shingwedzi River.¹⁴

To return to the issue of the fences, it seems that in the Great Limpopo TFCA, the fences were brought down mainly because they were believed to constrain nature conservation. It is therefore highly significant that the signing of the TFCA agreement by the governments of South Africa, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe was celebrated by releasing 30 elephants from Kruger National Park into Mozambique: the basic assumption underlying the slogan of "beyond fences" seems to be a recognition of motion as a new *sine qua non* in nature conservation. The very words *transfrontier* and *transboundary* conservation areas seem to breathe this new interpretive mobility framework. Yet although fences were removed to allow elephants to cross the border, the fences to keep communities out seem to have been resurrected in the case of Limpopo National Park. Despite the proposed removal of communities from the park, the rhetoric of "moving beyond the fences" (i.e., community participation and development) has been maintained. The official Web site of Limpopo National Park (<http://www.limpopopn.gov.mz>) states that "fundamental to the concept of the Limpopo National Park is the requirement that it contributes to the welfare of the people of Mozambique through sustainable eco-[a]nd cultural tourism development." In an interesting twist, the head of the Project Implementation Unit of the TFCA in Mozambique, speaking at a press conference on May 23, 2005, argued that the removal itself would be beneficial to the communities. Announcing the resettlement of the first 100 families in October 2005, he remarked,

It is hoped that this will lead the remaining families to understand that the park will not damage their interests but will actually improve their lives. Families in this area can never rely on farming to escape from poverty: the soils are poor and the semi-arid climate guarantees that yields from agriculture will always be low. (Smart News Network International, 2005)

A report by a consultant on possible resettlement areas denies this: "They utilise alluvial soils in the Shingwedzi valley which have higher agricultural potential than generally occurs in the region. They have access to vast areas of grazing for livestock

and to other forest resources. . . . The villages have access to reasonable supplies of water in nearby rivers" (Impacto, 2005, p. 1).

The developments on the Mozambican side of the TFCA seem to justify the conclusion that (so far) much of the rhetoric about community-based natural resource management in southern Africa has never materialized. Dzingirai (2003) concluded on the basis of a case study of the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources in Zimbabwe that

with the support of global finance and its clients, the state and private business are inviting communities to lay down their spears and traps and to take part in community-based wildlife conservation, in return for promises of control over wildlife, and revenue and other services generated from safari hunting in rural areas. It is an invitation which those communities, with years of experience of failed development, from the state especially, treat suspiciously, and often accept only with encouragement of environmental organizations. Rather than passing the benefits or the ownership of wildlife to indigenous communities, however, the new programme is allowing wildlife to be monopolized by the state and the private sector. . . . community conservation or even wildlife management are not what they seem or claim to be; they are not about conservation but are part of a strategy to continue the traditional disqualification, restriction or even total exclusion of rural people by the state and its partners. (p. 259)

Community-based natural resource management programs often serve to bring communities in remote areas under the control of the state (Schafer & Bell, 2002) and introduce new stakeholders with entitlements to resources hitherto controlled—either *de jure* or *de facto*—by local communities (Spierenburg, Steenkamp, & Wels, 2006).

Recent developments and discussions suggest that not only local communities are disappointed with the results of community participation in nature conservation. Environmental organizations seem less and less keen to work with local populations, and the hype of community involvement in nature conservation appears to be on a (steep) decline, as Chapin (2004) argued in a thought-provoking article: "Discussions of 'natural' alliances between conservationists and indigenous peoples and the need to work closely with local communities, common just a few years ago, has largely disappeared" (p. 18).¹⁵ Chapin quoted a biologist from Conservation International working in Brazil as having said, "Quite frankly, I don't care what the Indians want. We have to work to conserve the biodiversity" (p. 21). Chapin argued that environmental organizations lack the knowledge and capacity to deal with development issues. Furthermore, community participation is a complex process and may result in the realization that the organizations' goals differ significantly from those of communities when communities choose their economic well-being over the preservation of natural resources (Chapin, 2004, p. 18; see also Roué, 2003). Conservation organizations translate this discrepancy as proof that local communities are not the good environmental stewards they were believed to be. The result is a growing distrust between conservation organizations and local communities. The South African pendant of the quotation provided by Chapin comes from a project officer from the PPF:

For community representatives to participate on the actual management of a national park is something unfair to the community themselves. In most cases the people that are appointed to manage a national park have gone and done years of studying to gain a tertiary education. They're well qualified. . . . I know a lot of critics are advocating for it [community involvement], but in my mind it is the same as having someone living next to an airport come and sit next to the air traffic controller. . . . You can't make them air traffic controllers. (quoted in Tanner, 2003, p. 83)

Some Tentative Concluding Remarks

Cartography owes much of its reputation, as well as its development and "progress," to warfare and imperialism or colonialism; that is, it was instrumental to strategies of appropriation and exclusion (Harley, cited in Black, 1997, pp. 17-19). To complement the power of maps, fences have been used to keep the enemy out and mark the boundaries of (assumed) property (Krell, 2002; Netz, 2004; Razac, 2002). Fences have been used to further marginalize and silence those who were strategically excluded from representation on maps. In nature conservation, local communities have always been and are becoming again the "silences" or gaps in the maps.

In the widely proclaimed new approach to conservation, fences have remained, but conservation organizations claim that this is only as a metaphor and that fences have been assigned a different meaning; the objective is to "move beyond the fences" and include local communities in the management of conservation areas. The suggestion is that the physical fences are a thing of the past. However, the way fences are used by the PPF seems to contradict this new use; they continue to mark the boundaries between "nature" and cultural landscapes. It seems that the fences "are coming down" only for certain categories of people: international tourists and investors. The fences remain firmly in place or are even resurrected for local communities.

Analyzing the PPF's promotional materials, including the maps presented therein, it becomes clear that its stance toward local communities is ambivalent, to say the least. On one hand, the PPF indicates a will to move "beyond fences" but remains, however unintentionally, forcefully "silent" about the communities in most of its maps. Its flagship TFCA, the Great Limpopo TFCA, merges "silence" with "purity" through its policy of transforming the Mozambican part of it in a *park*.

The main parties involved in negotiating the establishment of TFCAs (i.e., the PPF and the governments concerned) assume that TFCAs will contribute to the economic development of local communities rather than negotiate the ways in which communities can benefit from TFCAs. In other words, the metaphor of "going beyond fences" is reserved for the general public but not the subject of negotiations. The negotiations focus mainly on the areas to be included in the TFCAs; hence, they focus on the maps (Duffy, 1997). Local communities are excluded from and silenced in these negotiations (Dzingirai, 2004). Consequently, the latter leave only few traces on the maps or in the organizational texts of the PPF.

Notes

1. We would like to thank the organizers and participants of the panel "Trust in and Around Organizations" at the July 2003 conference of the European Group for Organizational Studies in Copenhagen, Denmark, for their constructive criticism of an earlier version of this article. We also thank the organizers and participants of the conference "Science, Disease and Livestock Economies," held at St. Anthony's College, Oxford, United Kingdom, in June 2005 for their helpful comments. Finally, we are also indebted to the anonymous reviewers of *Space and Culture*. Research conducted by Marja Spierenburg for this article was supported by the Transboundary Protected Areas Research Initiative, a program running under the auspices of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources of South Africa and funded through the Center for Integrated Study of the Human Dimensions of Global Change, by way of a cooperative agreement with the National Science Foundation (SBR-9521914). Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Harry Wels, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,

Department of Culture, Organisation and Management, De Boelelaan 1081 (Metropolitan), 1081 HV The Netherlands; e-mail: h.wels@fsw.vu.nl.

2. Unfortunately, the PPF did not grant us permission to use their maps to illustrate our argument in this article.

3. Chapter 11 is titled "Poaching, the Age-Old Problem." The chapter title is particularly noteworthy because Bruce Kinloch is most well known for the establishment of the College of African Wildlife Management, or Mweka College, a famous training school for game wardens in Tanzania. Kinloch wrote,

I remember, in particular, how obsessed we all were with the age-old problem of poaching, the illegal killing of game in a multitude of ingenious, hard-to-combat ways, the reason, in fact, why game keepers and game wardens came to be created in the first place, some hundreds years ago. (p. 215)

This perspective probably is also reflected in the curriculum of the training school.

4. In his book, Razac (2002) described the three "heavy memories" associated with barbed wire: the wiring of the American West, which ended the myth of the cowboy; the trenches of World War I; and the concentration camps of World War II.

5. A bag is "the amount of game shot by a hunter" according to *The New Oxford Dictionary of English*.

6. See also, for instance, the campaign against the "security wall" Israel is building (<http://www.stopthewall.org>). The campaign is called "The Grassroots Palestinian *Anti-Apartheid* [italics added] Wall Campaign," explicitly referring to the history of barbed wire in South Africa. On the site, a book titled *Stop the Wall in Palestine* is marketed that prominently features the symbol of barbed wire on its cover. The same site also urges visitors to "get maps." The various maps indicate the route the wall is taking through the landscape.

7. Another huge fence going through the Australian landscape is the Rabbit Fence, in an attempt to curb and contain the spread of rabbits all over the country. This fence was symbolically used in a film about the eugenic policies practiced in Australia until the 1970s. The film is titled *Rabbit-Proof Fence*, directed by Phillip Noyce.

8. Anton Rupert passed away on January 18, 2006.

9. It was this type of British nationalism that resulted in the decision made at the first International Meridian Conference in Washington in October 1884 to make Greenwich the cartographic axis, the meridian marking point zero of the world (Wilford, 2000, 258-260).

10. This central influence of imperialism and colonialism probably also explains why Dutch (and Belgian) mapmakers played such a central role in the development of mapmaking between 1570 and 1670 and "produced in some respects the greatest map-makers of the world" (Tooley, 1952, p. 29). See also Norwich (1993) and van der Krogt (2002).

11. The *Kruger Park Times* (2005) reported that the following name changes were proposed to the Limpopo Provincial Geographical Names Committee: Olifants River to Lepelle River, Nyl River to Mogalakwena River, Hout River to Mowadi River, Bloed River to Molaudzi River, Sand River to Polokwane River, and Blyde River to Mutlatse River.

12. Black British photographer Ingrid Pollard "placed herself in cherished English landscapes in order to emphasize her exclusion" (Sibley, 1995, p. 108).

13. The irony is that on the other hand, local communities are often considered to be "closer" to nature than tourists. So who in the end defiles nature (cf. Sibley, 1995, pp. 26-28; see also Neuman, 1998, 2000)?

14. A copy of this map is in our possession, but the PPF did not grant us permission to use it in this article.

15. This shift can be partly explained, according to Chapin, by

the presumption that biological science should be the sole guiding principle for biodiversity conservation in protected natural areas. This notion has produced a running debate between those who do not see human inhabitants as a part of the ecological equation, and

those who argue for partnerships and the inclusion of indigenous and traditional peoples in protected area plans, both on human rights grounds and for pragmatic ecological reasons. (p. 26)

References

- Aberly, D. (1999). Interpreting bioregionalism: A story from many voices. In M. V. McGinni (Ed.), *Bioregionalism* (pp. 13-42). London: Routledge.
- Abrahamson, A., & Theodossopoulos, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Land, law, and environment: Mythical land, legal boundaries*. London: Pluto.
- Adams, J. S., & McShane, T. O. (1996). *The myth of wild Africa: Conservation without illusion*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Adams, W., & Hulme, D. (2001). Conservation & community: Changing narratives, policies & practices in African conservation. In D. Hulme & M. Murphree (Eds.), *African wildlife & livelihoods: The promise and performance of community conservation* (pp. 9-23). Oxford, UK: James Currey.
- Adams, W. M. (2004). *Against extinction: The story of conservation*. London: Earthscan.
- Anderson, D., & Grove, R. (1987). The scramble for Eden: Past, present and future in African conservation. In D. Anderson & R. Grove (Eds.), *Conservation in Africa: People, policies and practice* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Aylward, B., & Lutz, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Nature tourism, conservation and development in KwaZulu Natal, South Africa*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Beinart, W. (1987). Introduction. In D. Anderson & R. Grove (Eds.), *Conservation in Africa: People, policies and practice* (pp. 15-19). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Berking, H. (1999). *Sociology of giving*. London: Sage Ltd.
- Bhattacharhya, D. K., Brondizio, E., Spierenburg, M., Ghosh, A., Traverse, M. de Castro, F., et al. (2005). Cultural services. In K. Chopra, R. Leemans, P. Kumar, & H. Simons (Eds.), *Ecosystems and human well-being: Policy responses* (pp. 401-422). Washington, DC: Island.
- Black, J. (1997). *Maps and politics*. London: Reaktion.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Beyond fences: Seeking social sustainability in conservation*. Gland, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.
- Breytenbach, J. (1997). *Eden's exiles: One soldier's fight for paradise*. Cape Town, South Africa: Queillerie.
- Breytenbach, J. (2001). *The plunderers*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Covos Day.
- Brockington, D. (2002). *Fortress conservation: The preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania*. Oxford, UK: James Currey.
- Brown, T. (2005). Contestation, confusion and corruption: Market-based land reform in Zambia. In S. Evers, M. Spierenburg, & H. Wels (Eds.), *Competing jurisdictions: Settling land claims in Africa* (pp. 79-102). Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill Academic.
- Carruthers, J. (1995). *The Kruger National Park: A social and political history*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of Natal Press.
- Carruthers, J. (2001). *Wildlife and warfare*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: University of Natal Press.
- Carruthers, J. (2003). Friedrich Jeppe: Mapping the Transvaal c. 1850-1899. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29(4), 955-976.
- Chapin, M. (2004, December). A challenge to conservationists. Available at <http://www.world-watch.org>
- Christopher, A. J. (1993). *Atlas of apartheid*. London: Routledge.
- Dalby, S. (2002). *Environmental security*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Davison, T. (1998). *Wankie: The story of a great game reserve*. Bulawayo, Zimbabwe: Thorntree Press. (Original work published 1967)

- Dorling, D., & Fairbairn, D. (1997). *Mapping: Ways of representing the world*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Douglas, R. (1997). Peace parks: Vision for prosperity. *Africa Environment and Development*, 5(4), 31-39.
- Draper, M. (1998). Zen and the art of garden province maintenance: The soft intimacy of hard men in the wilderness of KwaZulu-Natal, 1952-1997. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 24(4), 801-828.
- Duffy, R. (1997). The environmental challenge to the nation state: Superparks and national parks policy in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 23, 441-451.
- Duffy, R. (2000). *Killing for conservation: Wildlife policy in Zimbabwe*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Dzingirai, V. (2003, April). The new scramble for the African countryside. *Development and Change*, 34(2), 243-263.
- Dzingirai, V. (2004). *Disenfranchisement at large: Transfrontier zones, conservation and local livelihoods*. Harare, Zimbabwe: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources/ROSA.
- Ellis, S. (1994). Of elephant and men: Politics and nature conservation in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 20(1), 53-69.
- Fairhead, J., & Leach, M. (1996). Rethinking the forest-savanna mosaic: Colonial science & its relics in West Africa. In M. Leach & R. Mearns (Eds.), *The lie of the land: Challenging received wisdom on the African environment* (pp. 105-121). Oxford, UK: James Currey.
- Gibson, C. C. (1999). *Politicians and poachers: The political economy of wildlife in Africa*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Godwin, P. (2001, September). Without borders: Uniting Africa's wildlife reserves. *National Geographic*, pp. 2-29.
- Gordon, R., & Sholto Douglas, S. (2000). *The Bushmen myth: The making of a Namibian under-class* (2nd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hanks, J. (1997, September). *The origin, objectives and activities of the Peace Parks Foundation*. Paper presented at International Conference on Transboundary Protected Areas as a Vehicle for International Co-Operation, Cape Town, South Africa.
- Harley, B. (1990). Cartography, ethics and social theory. *Cartographica*, 27(2), 1-23.
- Hughes, D. M. (2002). *When tourist cross boundaries and peasants don't: Inequality and regional metaphors in southern African conservation*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Human Ecology, Rutgers University.
- Hulme, D., & Murphree, M. (Eds.). (2001a). *African wildlife & livelihoods: The promise & performance of community conservation*. Oxford, UK: James Currey.
- Hulme, D., & Murphree, M. (2001b). Community conservation in Africa: An introduction. In D. Hulme & M. Murphree (Eds.), *African wildlife & livelihoods: The promise & performance of community conservation* (pp. 1-8). Oxford: James Currey.
- Impacto. (2005). *Possible voluntary resettlement of communities living along the Shingwedzi River: Preliminary identification of areas with potential for resettlement*. Maputo, Mozambique: Author.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. (2003). Vth World Parks Conference 8-17 September 2003, Durban, South Africa. Retrieved January 31, 2005, from <http://www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa/wpc2003/>
- King, G. (1996). *Mapping reality: An exploration of cultural cartographies*. London: Macmillan.
- Kinloch, B. (1972). *The shamba raiders: Memories of a game warden*. London: Harvill.
- Kiss, A. (Ed.). (1990). *Living with wildlife: Wildlife resource management with local participation in Africa*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Koch, E. (1998). "Nature has the power to heal old wounds": War, peace and changing patterns of conservation in southern Africa. In D. I. Simon (Ed.), *South Africa in southern Africa: Reconfiguring the region* (pp. 54-71). Oxford, UK: James Currey.
- Krell, A. (2002). *The devil's rope: A cultural history of barbed wire*. London: Reaktion.
- Kruger National Park to change name? (1998, May). *Africa Travel News*.

- Kruger Park Times*. (2005, February 23).
- Leakey, R. (with Morell, V.). (2001). *Wildlife wars: My battle to save Kenya's elephants*. London: Pan.
- Marshall, L. (2004, November 5). South Africa weighs killing "excess" elephants in parks. Retrieved January 31, 2005, from http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2004/11/1105_041105_elephants.html
- McNeely, J. A. (Ed.). (1992). *Parks for life: Report of the IVth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas*. Gland, Switzerland: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.
- Monmonier, M. (1995). *Drawing the line: Tales of maps and cartocontroversy*. New York: Henry Holt.
- National Geographic Society. (2001). Without boundaries: Uniting Africa's wildlife reserves. Retrieved November 16, 2005, from http://magma.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/data/2001/09/01/sights_n_sounds/media.1.2.html
- Netz, R. (2004). *Barbed wire: An ecology of modernity*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Neuman, R. P. (1998). *Imposing wilderness: Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Neuman, R. P. (2000). Primitive ideas: Protected area buffer zones and the politics of land in Africa. In V. Broch-Due & R. A. Schroeder (Eds.), *Producing nature and poverty in Africa* (pp. 220-242). Stockholm, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Norwich, O. I. (1993). *Maps of southern Africa*. Johannesburg, South Africa: A. D. Donker.
- Owens, M., & Owens, D. (1985). *Cry of the Kalahari*. London: Collins.
- Peace Parks Foundation. (2000). *Annual review 2000*. Available at http://www.peaceparks.org/new/images/files/annual_2000.pdf
- Peace Parks Foundation. (2001). *Annual review 2001*. Available at <http://www.peaceparks.org/new/images/files/review2001.pdf>
- Peace Parks Foundation. (2002). *Annual review 2002*. Available at http://www.peaceparks.org/new/images/files/PPF_AR_FS_2003.pdf
- Peace Parks Foundation. (2003). *Annual review 2003*. Available at <http://www.peaceparks.org/new/images/files/wokjvbtnxwdjdtuu41a2cbbe797f9.pdf>
- Peace Parks Foundation. (2004a). *Annual review 2004*. Available at <http://www.peaceparks.org/new/images/files/isxhzhknjlbwgsfv432543f3c1d22.pdf>
- Peace Parks Foundation. (2004b). *Tourism plan Limpopo National Park*. Die Boord, South Africa: Author.
- Potgieter, D. W. (1995). *Contraband: South Africa and the international trade in ivory and rhino horn*. Cape Town, South Africa: Queillerie.
- Ramutsindela, M. (2004). Globalisation and nature conservation strategies in the 21st-century southern Africa. *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, 95(1), 61-72.
- Ranger, T. O. (1999). *Voices from the rocks: Nature, culture & history in the Matopos Hills of Zimbabwe*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Razac, O. (2002). *Barbed wire: A history*. London: Profile.
- Roué, M. (2003, December). US environmental NGOs and the Cree: An unnatural alliance for the preservation of nature? *International Social Science Journal*, 178, 619-628.
- Schafer, J., & Bell, R. (2002). The state and community-based natural resource management: The case of the Moribane Forest Reserve, Mozambique. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 28(2), 401-420.
- Shapiro, M. (1997). *Violent cartographies: Mapping cultures of war*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sibley, D. (1995). *Geographies of exclusion: Society and difference in the West*. London: Routledge.
- Smart News Network International. (2005, May 25). Limpopo Park to take off in August. Available at http://www.snni.org/cgi-bin/snni2/list_item.cgi?peserta/mozambique/mo2505_2.txt
- Sparks, A. (1990). *The mind of South Africa: The story of the rise and fall of apartheid*. London: Mandarin.

- Spierenburg, M. (2004). *Strangers, spirits and land: The struggle for control over land in Dande, Northern Zimbabwe*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill Academic.
- Spierenburg, M., Steenkamp, C., & Wels, H. (2006). Resistance against marginalization of local communities in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area, southern Africa. *Focaal, European Journal of Social Anthropology*, 47, 18-31.
- Steele, N. (1992). *Poachers in the hills: Norman Deane's life in Hluhluwe Game Reserve*. Melmoth, UK: Nick Steele.
- Stevenson-Hamilton, J. (1993). *South African Eden: The Kruger National Park*. Cape Town, South Africa: Struik. (Original work published 1937)
- Stickler, P. J. (1990). Invisible towns: A case study in the cartography of South Africa. *Geographical Journal*, 22, 329-333.
- Stone, J. C. (1995). *A short history of the cartography of Africa*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen.
- Tanner, R. J. (2003). *Transfrontier Conservation Areas of southern Africa and community involvement in the context of international law*. Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, University of Montana.
- Thomas, A. (1996). *Rhodes: The race for Africa*. Harare, Zimbabwe: African Publishing Group.
- Tooley, R. V. (1952). *Maps and map-makers* (2nd ed.). London: B. T. Batsford.
- van der Krogt, P. (2002). The map image of Africa in Dutch atlases of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In T. Dietz, K. Kusters, and D. Foeken (Eds.), *Dutch geography and Africa* (pp. 118-141). Utrecht, the Netherlands: Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap.
- Vivan, I. (2000). Geography, literature, and the African territory: Some observations on the Western map and the representation of territory in the South African literary imagination. *Research in African Literatures*, 31(2), 49-70.
- Wels, H. (2003). *Private wildlife conservation in Zimbabwe: Reciprocity and joint ventures*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill Academic.
- Wels, H. (2004). About romance and reality: Popular European imagery in postcolonial tourism in southern Africa. In C. M. Hall & H. Tucker (Eds.), *Tourism and postcolonialism: Contested discourses, identities and representations* (pp. 76-94). London: Routledge.
- Wilford, J. N. (2000). *The mapmakers* (Rev. ed.). New York: Vintage.
- Wolmer, W. (2003). Transboundary conservation: The politics of ecological integrity in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29(1), 261-278.
- Wood, D. (1992). *The power of maps*. London: Routledge.

Marja Spierenburg is an assistant professor at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Earlier publications include The Quest for Fruition Through Ngoma (coedited with R. van Dijk and R. Reis, James Currey, 2000); Strangers, Spirits, and Land Reforms: Conflicts About Land in Dande, Northern Zimbabwe (Brill Academic, 2004); and Competing Jurisdictions: Settling Land Claims in Africa (co-edited with S. Evers and H. Wels, Brill Academic, 2005).

Harry Wels is an associate professor at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. Earlier publications include "Formidable Fences: Organisational Co-Operation and Boundary Bullies in Zimbabwe" (in Managing Boundaries in Organisations: Multiple Perspectives, Palgrave, 2003) and Private Wildlife Conservation in Zimbabwe: Joint Ventures and Reciprocity (Brill Academic, 2003).