Safari : a journey through tourism, conservation and development

Article · January 2010

1 author:

René van der Duim
Wageningen University & Research
203 PUBLICATIONS   **2,193** CITATIONS

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Project   PhD project - Productive Conflicts in Conservation Tourism View project

Project   Women in Tourism Industry View project

SAFARI

A journey through tourism, conservation and development

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim

Inaugural lecture upon taking the post of Special Professor of Tourism and Sustainable Development at Wageningen University on 9 December 2010

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY

WAGENINGEN UR

• • •

2

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

SAFARI

A journey through tourism, conservation and development

Introduction

This inaugural address is anchored in a 35-year personal journey through tourism studies, the voyages to and research projects in Costa Rica and sub-Saharan Africa that I have undertaken in the last 15 years, and numerous academic explorations of tourism, conservation and development studies, governance literature and actor-network theory. It reflects the idea that a research agenda is the result of a personal and scientific expedition; a relational consequence of a network of heterogeneous materials as it is ordered and materialized in and through conferences, reading and writing publications, writing and submitting grant applications, executing projects, travelling to different places, meetings with practitioners, colleagues and students, teaching and, of course, this address. By merging in this inaugural address the personal, the public and the academic, I hope to show that a research agenda is not a hegemonic and stable entity situated in one place, but a set of ongoing practices (see Ren et al., 2010). As a consequence, this address is a temporary stabilization of an uncompleted process. Developing and executing a research agenda is enactment, where only temporary results are inscribed in a publication like this or the presentation I gave on 9 December 2010.

My journey started in 1972 as a student in Breda. Mass tourism had just taken off – to the joy of its proponents and the dismay of its first opponents. Advocates adopted tourism as a development strategy for its potential contributions to local economies in terms of generation of income, foreign exchange, employment and government revenues (see van de Mosselaer and van der Duim, 2010; Meyer, 2011). And indeed, according to the UNWTO the global number of international tourism arrivals grew from 25 million in 1950 to 1 billion in 2010. The overall export income generated by inbound tourism, including passenger transport, exceeded US$1 trillion in 2009, or close to US$3 billion a day, and tourism now generates directly or

· · ·

Wageningen University

indirectly 1 out of 12 jobs worldwide (UNWTO, 2010). But the global growth of international tourism has also been and remains inequitable (Sharpley, 2009), and critics have relentlessly pointed to the social and environmental costs of such tourism. For example, in their famous book *The Golden Hordes*, Turner and Ash (1975) described tourists as 'nomads from affluence' creating a newly independent, social and geographical realm: the 'pleasure periphery'. According to Turner and Ash, international tourism was like 'King Midas in reverse; a device for the systematic destruction of everything that is beautiful in the world' (ibid.: 15). Thirty-five years later these accusations have not disappeared. On the contrary, as illustrated by, for example, the seminal work of Mowforth and Munt (2009), in which they discuss the relation between tourism, globalization and development. In the foreword to the third edition of their book *Tourism and Sustainability* they state that:

> The core of our argument, however, remains unchanged in that development is an inherently unequal and uneven process, symbolized arguably by the diasporic and increasingly thwarted movement of Third World migrants to the First World, starkly contrasted to the accelerating movements of relatively wealthy western tourists to the Third World and the ideology of freedom of movement that supports this.
> (Mowforth and Munt, 2009: xii)

By the time I started studying sociology at Tilburg (1975-1979) and teaching in Breda (1978-1985), tourism studies had developed into a 'serious domain of research' as illustrated by, for example, the influential work of MacCannell (1976) and De Kadt (1979). When I returned to academia in 1991, after having worked for the Dutch NGO 'Stichting Recreatie' (1985 – 1994), the discussion on tourism had broadened under the influence of the pre- and post-Rio discourse on sustainable development; the strong focus on tourism and economic development and related management issues had widened to include tourism and cultural change (cf. Boissevain 1996; Bruner; 2001; Cohen 1998; Crick, 1989; Smith, 1989), ecotourism (cf. Weaver, 2001; Wearing and Neil, 2009) tourism and gender (cf. Aitchinson, 2009; Kinnaerd and Hall, 1994; Pritchard, Morgan, Atlejevic and Harris, 2007), and more recently pro-poor tourism (cf. Mitchell and Ashley, 2010; Meyer, 2011) and tourism and climate change (cf. Becken and Hay, 2007; Hall and Higham 2005). All these debates amalgamated in the 21st century in one particular and dominant tourism development paradigm: 'sustainable tourism development'.

. . . .

4

Obviously, sustainable tourism development includes a diverse set of contestable discourses and practices, which however have come to occupy a central place within tourism studies as the organizing principles of one of its most important new discursive fields (Gunder, 2010).

Although I have participated in many of the above debates (see e.g. van der Duim, 2005 and 2008; van de Mosselaer and van der Duim, 2010), and will continue to do so, a particular ordering of people, granted project proposals, readings and travels shaped the focus of my research agenda. In order to develop an international tourism portfolio in terms of education and research at Wageningen University, I and Jan Philipsen and, later, Janine Caalders managed to acquire a number of externally funded projects, first in Kenya and soon after in Costa Rica (see van der Duim, 2005). This was when I started my personal travels, looking at rhetoric and realities of Costa Rican ecotourism, the relation between tourism and biodiversity (see van der Duim and Caalders, 2002), and the intricate relations between tourism, conservation and development in sub-Saharan Africa. The framework of a Nuffic project that created a partnership with MOI University in Kenya, an international project with six African and two other European universities, funded under the framework of EDULINK (see *www.3astep.eu*), and a cooperation with the African Wildlife Foundation, allowed me to travel around Africa, develop PhD and MSc projects, and focus my attention on the role of tourism in the conservation – development nexus in sub – Saharan Africa.

Tourism, conservation and development in sub-Saharan Africa: a brief history
One of the greatest challenges the world is facing in the 21st century is to balance nature conservation and development in Africa. It is widely acknowledged that especially in sub-Saharan Africa biodiversity loss and poverty are linked problems, and that conservation and poverty reduction should be tackled together. But there is also a fierce debate about the socio-economic impacts of conservation programmes and the success of community-based approaches to conservation (Adams et al., 2004). Although tourism plays an important role in this debate, its role in the conservation – development nexus has not been fully assessed, either theoretically or empirically – and that is a crucial task if we are to adopt constructive solutions. This research agenda aims to contribute to this assessment.

. . .

A concern about the extinction of species, especially in Africa, motivated 20th-century conservation ideas and practices. Both an ideological and an economic foundation was laid under preservation by European hunters; it was strengthened by safari hunters in the 1920s and 1930s, and then by those who came after World War II armed with cameras as their primary means of obtaining trophies (Adams, 2004). Modern transport widened the scope of tourists from Europe to Africa, coinciding with the process of national park creation after World War II. As a consequence, many controlled hunting areas and game reserves were reclassified as national parks: Nairobi National Park in 1946, Tsavo in 1948 and Serengeti in 1951 (see Adams and Hulme, 2001). As part of these and similar developments, tourism became a source of income, a means to show and to enjoy the values of nature and wildlife, and to gain public support for conservation purposes (Adams, 2004). People and nature were separated and local people were predominantly seen as a threat to the protected areas and reserves that were being established. The result was a 'coercive conservation' approach (Peluso, 1993), later to be known as 'fortress conservation', that excluded people and limited or inhibited their rights for consumptive use, and was paired with a strict enforcement of these rules through a 'fines and fences approach' (Büscher and Dietz, 2005).

While ideas about conservation were central to the establishment of Africa's protected areas, they were also partly a by-product of the ideology of national development that dominated the late-colonial and independence periods (Adams and Hulme, 2001). In this era of modernization, Africa was mapped and carved up not only for industrial and agricultural development, but also for conservation and increasingly for tourism. The latter was identified as a development strategy that could help emerging nations in Africa to increase employment and GDP, attract foreign capital and promote a modern way of life based on Western values (see Sharpley and Telfer, 2002; Scheyvens, 2007). As Sindiga (1999: 21-22) argues, the proponents of modernization supported tourism as an agent of change, and within a short period of time incipient tourism, undertaken by a few rich people interested in hunting game and collecting trophies, turned into 'mass tourism' whereby beach holidays and safaris became part of all-inclusive packages.

. . .

6

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

However, around the 1970s there arose a critical stance towards the develop-ment and conservation patterns of thinking and acting, which slowly led to a broader definition of conservation and development goals and of the role of tourism in general.

There was strong criticism of the fortress conservation paradigm: it was recognized that an approach based on site protection and maintaining biodiversity for its own sake was neither sufficient nor feasible (Adams, 2004). Especially excluding locals from, or limiting their access to areas destined for conservation, caused severe economic, social and ethical conflicts over land and resources and the increase in poverty, leading to the realization that development and livelihood issues should have been included in the global conservation agenda (e.g. Kiss, 1990; Colchester, 2002). The focus of conservation policies and plans slowly shifted to a community conservation counter-narrative where the involvement of communities, also through tourism initiatives, was seen as a necessary step to ensure conservation. For example, Manyara and Jones (2007) explain that in Kenya, community-based tourism mainly stems from the realization that success in conservation could not have been achieved had local communities not been involved in and benefited from conservation strategies. However, it was not until the 1980s that `the community´ began to be taken seriously as a major actor in natural resource management (Barrow and Murphree, 2001).

There was also strong criticism of the modernization paradigm and the role of tourism within it. Economic growth policies and practices were heavily criticized since they seemed incapable of addressing and solving the growing social and political problems, especially in developing countries (Sharpley, 2000). Influenced by dependency and political economy theory and structuralist schools of thought, it was argued that poor local people in non-Western countries were typically excluded from or disadvantaged by what development, or more specifically tourism development, could offer (Scheyvens, 2007). Indeed, authors like Britton (1982) and Turner and Ash (1975) pointed at core–periphery relationships that prevented destinations from fully benefiting from tourism.

An alternative perspective on development evolved after the 1970s. Alternative forms of tourism were developed, focusing on small-scale tourism ventures and involving local communities into management plans. They were often situated in

. . .

7

Wageningen University

the vicinity of natural hot spots, which increasingly became tourism hot spots. Additionally, following the green agenda of the 1980s, attention was paid to environmental and ecological issues, and tourism programmes and plans were urged to favour conservation and take into account the environmental consequences of selected tourism strategies (Scheyvens, 2007).

At this stage, the conservation and the development agenda began to converge and tourism was seen as a means to achieve both conservation and poverty alleviation goals. Several international organizations (e.g. World Wildlife Fund, IUCN World Conservation Organisation, and Conservation International) and national, international and local NGOs interested in local community development, started to fund and/or support programmes, including tourism programmes, to achieve conservation goals while simultaneously addressing development issues (e.g. Butcher, 2007). For example, the mid 1980s saw the introduction of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs). Within these ICDPs especially ecotourism was considered a tool to address conservation and development goals for local communities (Scheyvens, 2002). Such projects, which were set up in several developing countries, argued that people and livelihood practices were a threat to biodiversity resources, and that communities would act to conserve resources if they had a 'stake' in decision-making about use and management of the resources (Hughes and Flintan, 2001). In practice, these projects primarily focused on supporting communities, offering them compensation if they were negatively affected by the establishment and management of parks and protected areas, in exchange for their support of conservation (Newmark and Hough, 2000). They were implemented through a number of arrangements that involved communities through revenue sharing, consultation, provision of community services and infrastructures, educational projects, etc.

The 1990s were characterized by an increasing global awareness of environmental and development issues and the international agenda emphasized the need to identify innovative ways to address these issues in an integrated manner. For example, the 1992 Rio Earth Summit challenged actors at various levels, also in the tourism field, to adopt sustainable strategies and pursue goals that were meaningful for both environmental and development purposes. Agenda 21 enriched the

. . .

8

discussion by emphasizing the need for community empowerment and participation in policy and planning, also in the case of tourism resources (Jackson and Morpeth, 1999). Ideas about equity, gender sensitivity and empowerment were embraced. Communities were encouraged to take more control over resources and management plans. `Ecotourism´ became the buzzword and started to dominate the development agenda (Scheyvens, 2007), culminating in 2002 in the International Year of Ecotourism, which was proclaimed by the UN General Assembly. A considerable amount of aid was channelled through NGOs into the developing world, often on local levels, favouring the development of bottom-up initiatives and thus sustainable livelihoods (Butcher, 2007). Researchers and practitioners focused their attention on community-based tourism and locally owned developments (Sharpley and Telfer, 2002). For example, several projects were established within the broad family of Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) programmes. These programmes mainly used a bottom-up approach, reduced the role of the state and took local communities as a point of departure, aiming to empower them and to create a social movement around managing local natural resources. Unlike the ICDPs, they did not offer development services in exchange for conservation, but mainly focused on devolving management responsibility for natural resources to communities. Based on this, several community-based ecotourism enterprises were developed with the support of donors and conservation and development organizations.

However, the effectiveness of community-driven initiatives for conservation and development has been under constant debate for the last 10 years. Although some positive results have been reported – with regard to, for example, increasing the skills, education, responsibility and empowerment of local communities, as well as care and awareness of the environment (e.g. Fischer et al., 2008; Spenceley, 2008) – many argued that achieving the twin goals of conservation and development through tourism has proven infeasible and that local people have not been able to effectively conserve wildlife and biodiversity (e.g. Oates, 1999), that heavy reliance on donor funding in the long run only reinforces dependency (Manyara and Jones, 2007), that initiatives often collapse after funding dries up (Mitchell and Muckosy, 2008), that internal conflicts and power struggles among community members hamper the development of successful initiatives (e.g. Southgate, 2006), and that

. . .

there are often equity issues concerning the distribution of benefits especially in terms of individual households (Manyara and Jones, 2007).

Partly as a result of these discussions, in the late 1990s both the development and the conservation agenda showed a profound rise of corporatism: conservation and development organizations started to learn to think as business people (Adams, 2004: 204). In the wake of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg 2002) and the Millennium Development Goals, partnerships were encouraged and more actors, particularly private sector organizations, were allowed to participate in the formation of tourism – conservation – development coalitions. For example, as Arts (2006) argues, environmental movements became strongly professionalized, and they realized that the industry was part not only of the problem but also of the solution. In addition, businesses increasingly started to recognize that fulfilling their social responsibilities was not necessarily a bad proposition. The role of private business actors was therefore encouraged and communities, which often lacked business skills, started to develop joint ventures with private interests. Both neo-liberal and liberal pluralistic arrangements developed (Arts and van Tatenhove, 2004; Liefferink, 2006), as exemplified by the model of conservation enterprises of the African Wildlife Foundation (see below) and so-called Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs), which encompass many different actors and a variety of land tenure systems besides protected areas.

Büscher and Dietz (2005) assert that although communities are included in some programmes as partners, these programmes mainly use the argument of local participation and empowerment in order to gain the support of donors and locals, and that in practice communities are playing a marginal role, or none at all, in the process leading to the establishment and management of these areas. They also argue that in many cases the underlying force and focus of TFCA arrangements remain state-enforced structures of regulation and authority in conserving nature, which are typical of the 'back to the barriers' movement (Hutton et al., 2005). Advocates of a return to strictly protected areas with hard barriers argue that we need to rethink the 'conservation with development approach' and return to the principles on which conservation organizations were founded, namely the preservation of nature for its intrinsic value and the aesthetic pleasures it brings to people (Adams, 2004: 208)

. . .

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

Institutional arrangements aimed at tourism, conservation and development[i]

Over the years, the convergences and divergences in the conservation and development agenda have led to a large variety of institutional arrangements using tourism in different ways and representing etatist, neo-corporatist, neo-liberal and liberal pluralistic perspectives (Arts and van Tatenhove, 2004; Liefferink, 2006). The process has not been a simple, diachronic or evolutionary process; it has been, and still is, a complex one, synchronic and largely unplanned (see also Arts and van Tatenhove, 2004).

Moreover, the array of institutional arrangements illustrates the importance of social texture, path dependencies, local contexts and footprints (Kremer et al., 2009). They reflect different historical and political–economic trajectories, processes of colonization and decolonization, and different balances between states, market and civil society over time. As a result, institutional arrangements range from 'traditional' government-managed national parks and reserves, either with or without tourism benefit sharing programmes, to Community Based Natural Resource Management programmes in Namibia and Botswana, conservation enterprises initiated by the African Wildlife Foundation in, for example, Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda, to such relatively new arrangements as Peace and African Parks. Consequently, there are different ways to classify these arrangements (e.g. Ashley and Garland 1994; Ashley and Jones, 2001; Ashley and Ntshona, 2002; Brockington et al., 2008, Barrow and Murphree, 2001; Eagles, 2009; Spenceley, 2003). For example, arrangements can be classified according to the type of actors involved, the degree of centralization/decentralization, sustainable use versus preservation, the type of management body or the main sources of income.

Graham and colleagues (2003) suggest four models for protected areas: government management, multi-stakeholder management, private management and traditional community management. They suggest that government management can be performed by a national, provincial, state or municipal government agency, or be delegated to a non-governmental body. Multi-stakeholder management can take the form of collaborative or joint management. Private management can be provided by individuals, not-for-profit organizations or for-profit corporations. Traditional community management is performed by indigenous peoples or local communities.

· · ·

Wageningen University

Barrow and Murphree (2001) developed a framework based on land tenure and resources to classify arrangements. They used tenure to cover the rights of secure, long-term access to land and other resources, and the benefits, authority and responsibility related to these rights. The nature and distribution of rights of tenure among actors will to a large extent define configurations of power, authority and responsibility among actors, and will determine the capabilities of communities and other actors to operate and negotiate in tourism programmes. Tenure is therefore a key element in determining the performances of various actors in institutional arrangements of conservation initiatives. In southern and eastern Africa, tenure is uncertain (especially for residents of most communal lands) and decisions on the use of resources are subject to a plethora of conditionalities. As in colonial times, communal lands continue to be in various degrees of fiefdoms of state bureaucracies, political elites and their private sector partners (ibid.: 31). Focusing on community conservation models, Barrow and Murphree (2001) developed a typology in which they identified three types of community conservation approaches, namely protected area outreach, collaborative management and community-based conservation.

Building on the work done by Barrow and Murphree (2001), Graham and colleagues (2003) and Spenceley (2003), I distinguish seven categories under which institutional arrangements can be classified: (1) the state owns land, manages resources and tourism; (2) the state owns land, communities manage resources and tourism; (3) the state owns land, partners manage resources and tourism; (4) the community owns land, manages resources and tourism; (5) the community owns land, partners manage resources and tourism; (6) private parties own land, manage resources and tourism; and (7) multi-stakeholder partnership owns land, manages resources and tourism. These categories are obviously not all-encompassing, and in daily realities many combinations are found.

Conservation arrangement	Examples of tourism-related development initiatives
State owns land, manages resources and tourism	Tourism revenue sharing programmes
State owns land, communities manage resources and tourism	Conservancies in Namibia
State owns land, partners manage resources and tourism	Public–private partnerships
Community owns land, manages resources and tourism	Community-based tourism enterprises
Community owns land, partners manage resources and tourism	Community–private ventures AWF conservation enterprises
Private parties own land, manage resources and tourism	Private game reserves (South Africa)
Multi-stakeholder partnership owns land, manages resources and tourism	Transfrontier conservation areas/Peace Parks

Table 1 Relation between conservation arrangements and tourism

Below, I present within each of the above categories some examples of how tourism fits into the conservation – development nexus, which developed at various points in time following the evolution in conservation and development paradigms in sub-Saharan Africa. However, to a large extent they still exist side by side.

In the classical case of conservation, where the state owns and manages the land through the creation of parks and reserves, tourism generates large sums of money through entry and user fees, concessions, and leases or the direct operation of commercial activities (see Font, Cochrane and Tapper , 2004).. For example, in 2007 almost 70% of the income of Kenyan Wildlife Services was directly generated through tourism, that is, through entry fees, operation of tourism services, etc. (KWS, 2008). In order to address the development needs of people living around these national parks, some countries have set up tourism revenue-sharing programmes. These schemes are based on the assumption that providing financial support (a share of the revenue derived from entry and user fees,

. . .

concessions, etc.) to communities affected by restrictions imposed on them for conservation and tourism purposes, can help to reduce pressure on natural resources and thus support conservation and development. In exchange for the costs that the community needs to bear due to its lack of or reduced access to land and resources, the community receives a financial incentive.

In order to offset the costs incurred by locals who are obliged to move out of established national parks, and to improve local attitudes towards conservation and build support for parks, in Uganda a portion of the revenue from tourism is given to locals (Ahebwa et al., 2008; Archabald and Naugthon-Treves, 2001). Experiments in tourism revenue sharing in Uganda were started in 1952. They were extended in subsequent years and led to the establishment of a national tourism revenue sharing policy for parks. According to this policy, all parks in the country were required to set aside 12% of their total income for revenue sharing (Archabald and Naugthon-Treves, 2001). A study carried out in three national parks in Western Uganda (i.e. Bwindi Impenetrable, Mgahinga Gorilla and Kibale national parks) reveals that tourism revenue sharing programmes can play an important role in improving local attitudes towards conservation (ibid.). The analysis indicates a number of conditions that may lead to the success of these programmes. Long-term institutional support is a key element for achieving success. Additionally, revenue sharing programmes can be more effective when the target community is properly identified and the programmes are combined with complementary projects (conservation education, problem animal control, etc.). Transparency and accountability are other aspects that can play an important role in improving local attitudes towards conservation. Similar findings are presented by Ahebwa and colleagues (2008) in their analysis of tourism revenue sharing programmes at the Lake Mburo Conservation Area in Uganda. They point out that the revenue that goes directly to the community needs to be substantial if it is to improve local attitudes towards conservation.

Conservancies in Namibia are a good example of the second category. A conservancy is an institutionalized organization that is formed by a community and has a constitution, registered members, a committee and locally-agreed boundaries, to which the Namibian government devolves conditional consumptive and non-consumptive rights of use over the existing wildlife (Ashley, 2000; Novelli

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

and Gebhardt, 2007). The major driving forces behind this were the Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programmes, which were launched after independence with the aim of linking conservation and rural development. According to the Namibian CBNRM Support Organizations (NACSO), there are currently 59 registered communal conservancies in Namibia, covering over 16% of the country and embracing 1 in 4 rural Namibians. Although tourism in conservancies is community based, conservancies derive the vast majority of their tourism income from joint-venture tourism lodges and camps by imposing levies or signing income sharing agreements. A total of N$17 million of cash and in-kind benefits were earned from these ventures in 2008, representing 52% of all conservancy income (NACSO, 2009). Quite a number of additional joint-venture agreements are being finalized, and many new conservancies are being formed. In many communal areas, conservancies have facilitated the large-scale recovery of wildlife, including large predators and rare, high-value species such as the endangered black rhino (NACSO, 2009). Nevertheless, according to Lapyere (2009: 666), insecure community land tenure and the resulting reduced value of land, the remoteness of lodges, and the community's impatience and attitude towards risk could explain why rural communities have so far not been able to capture the lion's share from tourism activities in communal lands. As an institutional solution, clearer and more secure land use rights need to be devolved locally in order to increase the value of land and allow communities to really benefit from their tourism resources. The current situation is one of legal pluralism whereby traditional and formal rights often overlap and conflict (Pellis, 2011).

Public–private partnerships are a typical example of the third category of institutional arrangements. Especially in the current climate of shrinking funds for the management of protected areas, coupled with increasing awareness of the value of managed market forces, there is now a trend towards greater cooperation with the private sector. Governments increasingly recognize the value of providing an enabling environment for the private sector to operate within protected areas. According to Font, Cochrane and Tapper (2004), around one in five protected areas uses some form of concession or licensing system and the increasing privatization of service delivery in protected areas will increase their popularity. South African National Parks (SANParks) has a policy of increasingly outsourcing commercial services and functions, increasing the funds available for management and allowing management to

• • •

15

focus on the core business of conservation. While there was considerable resistance to this initiative, it has proven highly successful. Nine tourism concessions are likely to generate profits of $35-53 million over the next twenty years, create some 700-800 new jobs, and due to their design increase the participation of formerly disadvantaged individuals and enterprises (ibid.: 45; see also Varghese, 2008).

The fourth category – community-based tourism (CBT) enterprises – was particularly supported by NGOs and INGOs in the 1980 and 1990s. The Santawani Lodge (AWF, 2005) and Buhoma Community Rest Camp in Uganda are two examples that claim to be rather successful. However, there is increasing evidence that the large majority of CBT initiatives are not doing too well. A review of 200 CBT projects across the Americas showed that many accommodation providers had only a 5% occupancy rate. According to the review, the most likely outcome for a CBT initiative is collapse after funding dries up. The main causes of collapse are poor market access and poor governance (Mitchell and Muckosy, 2008; Goodwin and Santilli, 2009; Jones and Epler Wood, 2007). In 2006 a survey of 150 CBT organizations by ResponsibleTravel.com and Conservation International revealed that 25 (16.6%) had a non-functioning email address, and that of the 53 (35.3%) that did return a questionnaire, only 27 (18%) qualified as CBT organizations. The average bed occupancy rate was again close to 5% (Goodwin and Santilli, 2009). Similarly, Spenceley (2008) analysed 217 CBT enterprises in 12 southern African countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe) and identified that next to accessibility, the important constraints to the development of community-based enterprises are market access and advertising. As in other fields, such as agriculture, CBT initiatives are unlikely to succeed unless the community is able to penetrate the market (see e.g. Nel and Binns, 2000). According to Kiss (2004: 232), many community-based ecotourism projects (CBET) cited as 'success stories, actually involve little change in existing land and resource-use practices, provide only a modest supplement to local livelihoods, and remain dependent on external support for long periods, if not indefinitely. Investment in CBET might be justified in cases where such small changes and benefits can yield significant conservation and social benefits, although it must still be recognized as requiring a long-term funding commitment'.

. . .

Not surprisingly, communities have increasingly partnered up with private-sector organizations, as joint ventures can help bridge the knowledge, management and experience gap faced by communities that are trying to enter the tourism business (Kiss, 2004: 235). One of the first such community-private ventures – the Kimana Wildlife Sanctuary – was set up in Kenya in the 1990s (see Box 1), and has been characterized by 'institutional failure, corrupt governance, and increasing resentment amongst community members to the very principle of "ecotourism"' (Southgate, 2006).

> *Box 1. Amboseli National Park and Kimana Community Wildlife Sanctuary*
>
> Kimana Sanctuary – Kenya's first community-run ecotourism venture – is situated east of Amboseli National Park. Amboseli has been a reserve since 1906 and was gazetted as a national park in 1974. The national park is under severe internal threat (tourist crowding, overpopulation of elephants, etc.) and external threat. The main issues are the potential degazettement of the national park, agricultural expansion, water scarcity (combined with severe droughts), depletion of plant resources (Okello, pers. com. 2010), and the subdivision of land and the consequential and inevitable erection of fences and barriers to wildlife movements (see also Ntiati, 2002; Okello et al., 2009). One of the consequences of the subdivision of land is a strong growth of tourism facilities (private sanctuaries, lodges and hotels) especially in the south-east of the Amboseli ecosystem. Kimana itself has been a community sanctuary (with 4 tourists camps; 200 beds and an airstrip bringing in tourists from Mombasa and Nairobi), founded on a 10-year agreement between Kimana Group Ranch and the African Safari Club. This agreement ended in December 2009. Since then, Kimana has been an 'empty place' and the dispute between the Group Ranch and the African Safari Club is still (a year later) before the court. The original agreement afforded around €100,000 a year income for around 840 Group Ranch members and around 70 jobs for locals. However, the complexities of interactions between the community and tourism operators are illustrated by inter- and intra-group ranch conflicts, lack of transparency over funds (e.g. cash payments to Group Ranch officials), corruption, poor leadership, inequitable patterns of access to and control over resources, and poor communication between the African Safari Club and the Group Ranch. Existing conflicts between, for example, tourism and livestock were not addressed and cash payments to Group Ranch officials led to resentment. As a consequence, the highly fragmented community of Kimana has failed to capitalize on its immense ecotourism potential (Southgate, 2006: 80).

• • •

Wageningen University

The Kimana case clearly illustrates the need for external support in the multifaceted processes of negotiation and communication. Especially the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) has addressed this need and has promoted conservation enterprises, which exemplify the fifth category. Conservation enterprises are commercial activities designed to create benefit flows that support the attainment of a conservation objective; such enterprises include ecolodges, campsites, cultural villages, fishing villages, and the harvesting and processing of natural resource products. AWF supports around 30 of these projects in eastern and southern Africa. Examples of tourism-related conservation enterprises in Kenya are Satao Elerai Safari Camp (Kiyiapi et al., 2005), Koija Starbeds (Sumba et al., 2007) and Ol Lentille (see Box 2). So far, investments in conservation enterprises amount to US$11 million. The enterprises employ about 225 community members full time, while approximately 76,000 local people benefit directly from associated capacity building, share in net benefit streams and profit from community-designed social development projects. In terms of conservation value, these enterprises secure commitments to improve conservation across 180,000 acres (approx. 73,000 ha) of communal and private land (Elliot and Sumba, 2010). Conservation enterprises are likely to do well with sound private-sector and community partners, clear contractual agreements and community ownership, transparent intra-community benefit sharing arrangements and a clear conservation logic (Sumba and Elliott, 2010; Elliot and Sumba, 2010).

Box 2 Conservation enterprises in Kenya

Laikipia is one of the most important areas for biodiversity in Kenya. In the area, 28 tourism operations with 41 separate accommodation facilities offer a total capacity of 1,106 beds, generating an annual revenue of US$20.5 million (up from US$13 million in 2001). In 2007, Laikipia's tourism operations contributed approximately US$3.5 million to social and infrastructure development activities and approximately US$5 million to support wildlife conservation (LWF, 2008).

Koija Starbeds Lodge and Ol Lentille Lodge have attracted international attention to the region. Koija Starbeds is a partnership between the Koija Group Ranch, Loisaba Ranch (represented by its management vehicle Oryx LTD) and AWF. It has been operational since 2001. By the end of 2006, the ecolodge had generated around US$100,000 in distributable profit for the community, based on an occupancy rate of around 15-20% and a fixed bed night

fee of US$85. Overall it has been concluded that Koija Starbeds has had good commercial success, 'with good but less clear-cut results on conservation impact and improvement on livelihoods' as it still requires 'considerable partner support for indirect costs, e.g. in governance issues in the community and costs of natural resource management on Group Ranch land' (Sumba et al., 2007).

The Sanctuary Ol Lentille is a top-end tourism enterprise, operated as a partnership between the Kijabe Group Ranch, AWF and a private investor, Regenesis Ltd. In 2005, the Kijabe Group Ranch signed a 25-year management agreement with Regenesis Ltd. to manage the business and conservation area. Whereas the direct and indirect investment costs of Koija Starbeds were just less than US$100,000, so far more than US$2 million has been invested in Ol Lentille. For the last 4 years, approximately US$250,000 per year has been accrued to the Group Ranch, of which US$150,000 comes from donations and gifts, predominantly from the rich tourists visiting the lodge. The remaining US$100,000 consists of a fixed fee of US$20,000 per year and a bed night/conservation fee of US$80 per person per night (based on an average occupancy rate of 25-30% per year and an average price of US$700-900 per person per night). The partnership has created a conservancy of 14,500 acres (5,870 ha). As at Koija, at Ol Lentille livelihood benefits are predominantly increased health care and education bursaries for primary and secondary education (Mosiany, pers. com., 2010). Similarly, Ol Lentille has been confronted with governance issues and deficient cooperation within the Kijabe Trust, especially in the second and third years of operation (Elias, pers. com., 2010).

The Sanctuary Ol Lentille

The sixth category is well exemplified by private game reserves. Especially in South Africa, wildlife utilization has become the fastest growing form of land use (Prins et. al., 2000). Although the effects of private conservation are often not studied in depth, it is argued that private landholders have played a significant role in the growth of wildlife conservation, and that private conservation is an effective tool to promote wildlife recovery (Child, 2009). Jansen (2010) recently compiled an overview of the current state of knowledge and debates on private game reserves

Wageningen University

in South Africa. The main sources of income of the roughly 9,000 private reserves in South Africa are tourism, hunting and trade in animals. In the 2003/4 hunting season, around 5,000-6,000 foreign hunters shot approximately 53,000 animals and generated a turnover of roughly €26 million (Smith, 2005). Further, each year around 20,000 animals are traded, generating a turnover of around €10 million (Jansen, 2010). For Namibia it has been recorded that wildlife numbers and diversity on private land increased substantially in recent decades and continues to increase (Barnes and Jones, 2009). The same trend is described in the case of South Africa (Bothma et al., 2009). Private conservation is therefore considered an interesting alternative to state-protected areas, which are often degraded as a consequence of their underfunding (Child, 2009).

Research also indicates that tourism investments on private land can contribute to the socio-economic development of local communities, although in only a limited way. For example, Spenceley and Goodwin (2007) investigated the impacts of nature-based tourism enterprises in South Africa, including two private enterprises – Jackalberry (which is in the Thornybush game reserve in the province of Limpopo) and Sabi Sabi (a private game reserve in Mpumalanga) – developed on privately owned land and operating safari tourism as their core business. The study suggests that only a small proportion of individuals living in neighbouring communities benefited from the tourism activities of these private enterprises. However, the impacts on those individuals were both positive and significant. The majority of the employees of those enterprises lived locally; on average, 62% of staff resided within 25 km of the establishment. In the case of Sabi Sabi, about 4.1% of the local population had been lifted above the poverty line of US$1 per day through local employment. In order to increase net benefits and reach a wider section of the local population, it is suggested to improve the mechanism for advertising jobs. In fact, locals who were interviewed pointed out that although they want to work in the tourism industry, in some cases the lack of information about the recruitment process is a barrier to accessing new jobs.

In addition, results suggest that attention should be paid to the procurement of goods and services by the tourism enterprises. In the case of Jackalberry, the private enterprise purchased about the 60% of its needs locally (within 50 km). But only

0.2% of expenditure was on locally made products, therefore missing the chance to create opportunities for poor communities. In the case of Sabi Sabi, 65% of the services required by the enterprise (e.g. laundry and gardening) were provided by locals living within a 50 km radius, thereby contributing to the economic development of adjacent communities. Furthermore, the research shows that the private sector enterprises have contributed to local education by, for example, funding conservation education for local children (in the case of Jackalberry) and supporting the development of a community environmental education centre and library (in the case of Sabi Sabi).

Finally, in the last few years the shift from government to governance has favoured the development of new programmes that involve a multitude of actors. Environmental and social issues in the developing world became so intertwined with global actors that this produced a new kind of global politics (Duffy, 2006). As a consequence, complex and close relationships between states, NGOs, landowners, donors, and public and private organizations from developing and developed countries were established and liberal–pluralism arrangements were created. An example of the evolution of arrangements towards the inclusion of an increasing number of stakeholders is offered by the Bwindi National Park in Uganda. In Bwindi, especially the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) – which is supported by, for example, the World Wildlife Fund, Flora & Fauna International, the African Wildlife Foundation and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) – developed around gorilla tourism a number of policy interventions in villages around the park. In 1993 they organized direct community involvement in tourism businesses by helping community enterprises in Mukono village to take advantage of tourism (see also Sandbrook, 2006). Second, to support the community they developed from 1994 onwards tourism revenue sharing arrangements, with 20% of total entry fees and 5% of the fees for gorilla visits channelled to communities surrounding the park. Third, and more recently, illustrating the increasing number of stakeholders involved in the partnership, they developed the Clouds Mountain Lodge. The state (e.g. Uganda Wildlife Authority), the private sector (e.g. Uganda Safari Company), INGOs (e.g. USAID, IGCP and AWF) and local communities (Nkuringo Conservation and Development Foundation NCDF) were all involved in the development of this lodge. The

. . .

Wageningen University

land on which the lodge is built belongs to NCDF, while the adjacent land belongs to the state (Ahebwa, 2010). Although it is still too early to assess the results of especially the third model, a comparison between the community rest camp and private lodges in Mukono village revealed that the estimated annual revenue of private lodges in Mukono predominantly leaks out of the region, while the revenues of the Buhoma Community Rest Camp largely remain in the village. A comparison with other sources of revenues to the area revealed that despite leakages, retained tourism revenue was clearly the dominant input to the local economy (Sandbrook, 2006).

In addition, the need to expand and manage natural areas and parks beyond established national borders has favoured the development of transboundary initiatives involving a variety of actors and states. Rationales advanced for transboundary conservation include the development of ecological integrity and biodiversity conservation, the socio-economic empowerment of marginalized communities by considering them partners in established multi-stakeholder ventures including ecotourism ones, cultural harmonization of divided ethnic groups, and the encouragement of peace, security and good political relations among governments by giving them an agenda for mutual action on issues of common concern, such as disputed borderlands and competition for resources (Wolmer, 2003). These initiatives indicate a shift from a state-centric system to a multi-centric global system involving various actors with shared authorities and responsibility (Duffy, 2006). Investments in tourism are considered a key opportunity for cross-border collaboration and for favouring ecological conservation and social economic development. Transnational initiatives led to, for example, the establishment in 2001 of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park. The park covers an area of 99,800 km2 and includes the Kruger National Park in South Africa, the Gonarezhou National Park in Zimbabwe, the Zinave and Banhine national parks, the Coutada 16 Wildlife Utilization Area in Mozambique, private game reserves and communal land (Büscher and Dietz, 2005). This initiative, which favours sustainable tourism development, was supported by a number of bilateral and multilateral donor-funded projects (funded by the World Bank, USAID, etc.). However, Transfrontier Conservation Areas (TFCAs) have increasingly become the subject of 'critical' research, as exemplified by the work of, for example, Büscher

• • •

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

(2009), Büscher and Dietz (2005), Draper and Wels (2002), Duffy (2001; 2006) and Ramutsindela (2007). According to Büscher (2009: 2), TFCAs are to be seen as contemporary manifestations of the neo-liberal governance of conservation and development, constituted by three modes of political conduct: a consensus rhetoric, a political strategy of anti-politics and a marketing strategy entailing the 'manipulation of abstraction in order to gain competitive advantage in the conservation/development market-place' (ibid.: 308).

Institutional arrangements for sustainable development: a theoretical exploration

This brief summary of the tourism – conservation – development nexus in sub-Saharan Africa identified a variety of institutional arrangements reflecting geopolitical developments, changing conservation and development narratives, the rise of global – local linkages, the emergence of new actors and the persistence of conflicting interpretations of reality. It illustrates that the role of tourism in the conservation–development nexus in the last 15 years has become increasingly important and has led to a lot of relatively new institutional arrangements (conservancies in Namibia, conservation enterprises, the enormous extension of private game reserves in South Africa, etc.) and many new challenges for the actors involved. It raises important questions about the implementation of tourism as a strategy for conservation and development.

It also leads to more fundamental, scientific questions and critique, especially from a political economy perspective. For example, Schroeder (2008) recently argued that revenue sharing programmes in Tanzania have often failed to come to grips with the underlying demands for fair compensation and the fundamental social, political and economic changes articulated by rural groups. In such circumstances, the use of economic incentives could be construed as a form of economic coercion rather than a just resolution to resource management conflict (ibid.: 592). Moreover, also from this point of view the changing balances between states, market and civil society and the rise of neo-liberal arrangements have been questioned. Brockington, Duffy and Igoe (2008, pp. 5-6; see also Büscher, 2009) argue that:

. . .

23

> Conservation and capitalism are shaping nature and society, and often in partnership. In the name of conservation, rural communities will organize themselves, and change their use and management of wildlife and landscapes. They ally with safari hunters and tourist companies to sell the experience of new tourist products on the international markets (....) as these types of interventions spread and become more sophisticated, it becomes increasingly different to determine if we are describing conservation with capitalism or capitalism with conservation as its instrument. The lines between conservation and capitalism blur. While it is debatable whether this alliance of conservation and capitalism is capable of saving the world, there is no doubt that it is most capable of remaking and recreating it.

Although I believe that these 'critical' views are important, also in terms of 'where' and 'what to look at' when studying these institutional arrangements (see also Fine, 2005), I also believe that political economists sometimes tend to mix up what explains and what should be explained. I shall therefore take a more unpresumptuous point of departure and greet the idea of a 'modest' sociology (Law, 1994). Actor-network theory (ANT) is such a sociology, and I shall continue my explorations into ANT. My introduction of ANT to tourism studies via my dissertation (van der Duim, 2005) has not been concluded: it is an ongoing process and part of my scientific journey, which will lead to, for example, a Routledge publication titled *ANT and Tourism* (van der Duim et al., 2012). This will be my main contribution to the theoretical debates in the coming year or so, of course augmented by empirical research into the tourism–conservation–development nexus (for which I believe an ANT perspective on institutional arrangements is heuristically fruitful). Here are some reasons.

First, ANT is a very good tool for making scientific journeys. In line with the title of this inaugural address, ANT shows researchers 'where to travel' and 'what is worth seeing there', 'which is nothing but a way of saying in plain English what is usually said under the pompous Greek name of "method" or, even worse, "methodology"' (Latour, 2005: 17; see also Büscher, 2009: 10). Now, ANT has of course been criticized for positioning itself as a method. Commentators argue that is too light on theory (see e.g. Fine, 2005; Woods, 1997) and does not account for 'structural' or 'macro' forces, or refrains from starting research from a predefined conceptual framework (see Latour, 2005). Indeed, ANT advises us against explaining everything in predefined categories like 'governance', 'the market',

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim   SAFARI

'capitalism', 'globalization', etc. (Steins et al., 2000). Nevertheless, these categories exist and have invaded the articles I read, the work of my colleagues, the projects of students and consequently my own scientific practices. How to deal with this? I recommend following the suggestion of Charmez (2003: 259 in: Bowen, 2006) and Giddens (1984: 326 in: Buizer, 2008) that predefined concepts and categories could function as 'sensitizing concepts', giving us a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching, as in this case, institutional arrangements, and offering ways of seeing, organizing and understanding experience, as they are already embedded in our disciplinary emphasis and perspectival proclivities. However, at the same time, we must avoid attaching explanatory weight to the conceptual framework and concepts that guide detailed descriptions. If such imported concepts as 'capitalism', the 'state' or the 'market' are fraught with a posteriori assumptions, then the research is already done (Passoth and Rowland, 2010). After all, these imported concepts do not offer an explanation, but are what need to be explained.

In this process of explanation, ANT as a method invites us to ponder not what institutional arrangements are, but how they work. Instead of merely worrying whether these institutional arrangements are to be conceptualized as predominantly organizational configurations, rule systems, norms or cognitive frames, and/or ideas and discursive interactions (see e.g. Arts, 2006; Jentoft, 2004; Schmidt, 2010), ANT leaves the task of defining and ordering the social to the actors themselves. In changing the focus from what institutional arrangements are to how they were and are made possible, attention is shifted from identity, function, stability, core and essence, to relations, enactments, translations, innovations, interventions and (at least provisional) stabilization (van der Duim et al., 2012). According to ANT, studying the relation between tourism, conservation and development (like any other form of analysis) should come down to following the actors as they stitch networks together. One should observe the trail of associations between heterogeneous elements (Latour 2005). The researcher has to grasp how meanings and tasks are attributed to and distributed between people and things. He or she has to follow and elucidate the endless attempts at ordering. Take, for example, Bwindi National Park. Bwindi is a 'messy world' that consists not only of a large number of people and organizations performing 'gorilla tourism' – like Uganda Wildlife Authority, International Gorilla Conservation Programme, USAID and World

· · ·

Wageningen University

Wildlife Fund, inhabitants of the surrounding Nteko, Rubuguri or Mukono parishes or the Batwa – but also of 'things', such as permits, snares, forest products (e.g. herbs and honey), written agreements between communities and conservation organizations, and of course gorillas, which are 'habituated' in order to enact their roles in the advancement of conservation and development.

Second, ANT entails seeing the world as composed not of absolute, solid entities, but of continually constructed relations-gone-solid, known as actor networks. As a consequence of their composition, actor networks can never be defined as purely 'social' or as purely 'natural', 'technological', 'political', 'economic', 'cultural', etc. The understanding of actor networks as being composed of human and non-human entities is related to a general ontology according to which the social and the natural are not pre-existing entities, but constructs that have been separated and divided through a long and ongoing process of purification (see Latour 1993). Nature/society, but also actor/structure, endogenous/exogenous, global/local and organization/substance (as in policy arrangements; see Arts, 2006; Arnouts, 2010), rather than being determinant of particular phenomena, emerge from heterogeneously constructed networks. They are outcomes rather than causes, as institutional arrangements are the results of processes of translation. Translation builds actor networks from entities, all kinds of bits and pieces, some of which we might label 'social', 'economic', 'natural', 'cultural', 'political' or 'technical', and so on. Translation refers to the processes of negotiation, representation and displacement between actors, entities and places. It involves the redefinition of these phenomena so that they are persuaded to behave in accordance with network requirements, and these redefinitions are frequently inscribed in the heterogeneous materials that act to consolidate networks (van der Duim, 2005 and 2007: Murdoch, 1998).

Studying such institutional arrangements as conservation enterprises (e.g. Ol Lentille or Koija Starbeds), conservancies in Namibia or private game reserves in South Africa in terms of translation, consequentially addresses such questions as: are they local or global? Are they economic, natural or social? Are they organizational or substantive? Are they to be understood in terms of rules, norms, values or cognitive frames? Should we look 'at' these arrangements and locate the unit of

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

analysis in its historical, social, political–economic and discursive context (see Clement, 2010)? Or should we instead look 'into' these arrangements (see e.g. Van Huystee et al., 2007; Visseren – Hamakers, 2009) and subsequently see how NGOs/INGOs, market parties, communities and governmental bodies, coalesce natural, social, physical and financial resources and develop out of global–local interfaces? ANT tells us that they most probably are all of this and invites us to follow ANT's main tenet 'that actors themselves make everything, including their own frames, their own theories, their own contexts, their own metaphysics, even their own ontologies' (Latour, 2005: 147). Questions that guide the ANT study concern how certain technologies, practices, rules, ideas or structures have (or have not) come about, how they are made possible, thanks to what and to whom, and finally what the effects are of these workings. It advocates considering how potentially quite different interests have been translated, compromises have been made, and people with diverse interests have been persuaded that moving towards their objectives can best be achieved by working with certain others (Rutland and Aylett, 2008). Consequently, the examination of institutional arrangements in terms of actor networks addresses and includes inquiries into what is commonly known, scientifically 'purified' and claimed, such as the political domain (governance, policy, participation, representation, empowerment, corruption, etc.); the economic domain (livelihoods, access to resources and markets, issues of equity and revenue sharing, etc.); the social domain (actors and organizations, formal and informal social networks, 'communities'); the cultural domain (identity constructions, conflicting interpretations of reality, belief systems, values of nature); as well as the ecological domain (responsibilities towards the natural environment) (see also CIDIN, 2007).

Moreover, the empirical inquiries into the institutional arrangements that bring together tourism, conservation and development, aim at a deeper understanding, for example in terms of their multiplicity and variance (ranging from public–private partnerships, CBT ventures and private game reserves, to very complicated arrangements that include a variety of actors) or lack of such, and the extent to which they are indeed increasingly multi-actor in nature, combining state, market and civil society. As I have described above, they also are increasingly of a multi-scalar nature (linking local and global) (Giller et al., 2008). However, as actor-net-

. . .

work theory implies, processes of globalization and localization should be framed within a topological rather than a geographical sense. In a topological view, the question what is 'near' and what is 'far', what is 'local' and what is 'global', is not simply one of geometric measurement between fixed points; rather, it is a question of connection and simultaneity, as different groups and institutions mark their presence through interaction in all kinds of powerful and not so powerful ways (Allen, 2003: 192; see also Clegg, 2003). Studying, for example, Ol Lentille (see Box 2) will lead the researcher not only to 'local' group ranches or fractured Masai communities, but also to the offices of the African Wildlife Foundation in Nanyuki, Nairobi and Washington, the office of the Directorate-General for International Cooperation (DGIS) of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or the homes of wealthy Americans who visit and sponsor the local communities in the Kijabe Group Ranch. As a result, research will reveal different versions of Ol Lentille and will also show that these different versions engage with and are engaged by networks, discourses and practices in a number of disparate (but partially connected) ways (see Ren, 2011).

In the process of explaining, research will also have to address the extent to which these institutional arrangements are informal or formal and temporary or enduring, and the extent to which they lead to compliance and resistance (and therefore include processes of inclusion and exclusion), as processes of translation may lead to convergence as well as divergence, and even after successful mobilization may eventually decline or even collapse, as illustrated by, for example, the case of the Kimana Sanctuary (see Box 1). We should think of institutional arrangements as more or less precarious recursive outcomes. And a lot of effort is needed to understand how durability, whether for example material, strategic or discursive, is achieved (Law, 2007). We therefore have to ask ourselves such questions as: how do institutional arrangements get performed and perform themselves into relations that are relatively stable and stay in place? How are conservation or development impacts through tourism generated and sustained? As Murdoch (1998) explains, there are those institutional arrangements where translations are perfectly accomplished: the entities are effectively aligned and the arrangement is stabilized; despite the heterogeneous qualities of any previous entities these entities now work

. . .

28

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

in unison, thereby enabling the enrolling actors to 'speak' for all. However, there are also arrangements where links between actors and intermediaries are provisional and divergent, where norms are hard to establish and standards are frequently compromised. Here, the various components of the arrangement continually renegotiate with one another, form variable and revisable coalitions and assume ever-changing shapes. In both extreme cases, however, it is important to stress that conformity and nonconformity in institutional arrangement is performative, an effect of processes of ordering (ibid.: 369; see also van der Duim, 2007).

Finally, research into institutional arrangements for tourism, conservation and development should also address the extent to which such arrangements are or are not successful. In my discussion of the various institutional arrangements that evolved over time, I took into account various normative criteria and the points of view of insiders and outsiders, and of scientists and practitioners. Although it is far too early to draw conclusions, I acted almost like a judge in balancing these logics, criteria and views (see Arts and Goverde, 2006: 90). But one should not forget that the question is not whether a project is successful or how a project succeeds, but how 'success' is produced (Mosse, 2005). Just as the power of actors does not merely exist as part of their nature but is a network achievement, so are the 'successes' or failures of the institutional arrangements in terms of conservation and development. They are network accomplishments (Passoth and Rowland, 2010). Actors in tourism, conservation and development are constantly engaged in creating order and unity through political acts of composition, in which heterogeneous entities – people, interests, animals, objects, building structures and technologies – are tied together by translation into the material and conceptual order of a successful project (Latour, 2000; Mosse, 2005). Similarly, failures 'arise from the inability to recruit local interests, or to connect actions/events to policy or to sustain politically viable models and representations' (Mosse, 2005: 232). To be able to examine how tourism, conservation and development projects work and how successes and failures are produced, I therefore have to open the black box of implementation and continue my empirical and theoretical journeys. The next and final section of this address explains how I will try to do that.

· · ·

Wageningen University

Research agenda

By studying institutional arrangements in terms of actor-network theory, this research agenda aims to examine the processes of ordering and translations that produce institutional arrangements (seen as actor networks) in the realm of tourism, conservation and development, and assess their implications in terms of conservation and development. In terms of empirical focus, this research agenda will pay special attention to institutional arrangements in sub-Saharan Africa. It aims to contribute to scientific knowledge and to make recommendations that are relevant to the practices of the organizations that support this research agenda, as well as other interested stakeholders. However, as the Dutch Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR, 2010) recently warned, it is fine to be ambitious, but one should not be pretentious. A historical review of conservation (see Adams, 2004) and development policies (see WRR, 2010), and following the tenets of ANT, clearly shows that there are no 'one size fits all' solutions or even magic bullets, and even no best-practices policies that will always yield positive results (Kremer et al., 2009: 22). Tourism-related interventions, aimed at conservation and development, are necessarily imperfect and will always lead to overflowing (see van der Duim, 2005).

This research agenda has already produced a number of very interesting MSc theses and reports that have contributed to the body of knowledge (see e.g. Ampumuza, 2009; Hendriks, 2010, Jansen, 2010; Koopmans, 2008; Pellis, 2011; Sirima, 2010; van de Mosselaer, 2010; van der Wouw, 2008; Zellmer, 2008). I will continue to encourage students to follow this path of exploration. The core of the agenda will of course consist of PhD projects. At the moment, five PhD research projects are under way (Wilber Ahebwa, Nelly Maliva Bisanda, Chalermpat Pongajarn, John Hummel, and Rita Nthiga). This research agenda is also the relational effect of a network of heterogeneous materials as it is ordered and materialized in and through the African–European Academic Alliance for Sustainable Tourism Development, Environmental Sustainability and Poverty Reduction (3A-STEP) project funded by the ACP-EU Cooperation Programme in Higher Education (EDULINK) (see: *www.3astep.eu*) and the conferences organized by Atlas Africa. Especially the Young Leaders programme of the 3A-STEP project created a lot of learning opportunities by facilitating visits to

. . .

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

projects in South Africa and Kenya (and Namibia in April 2011). To promote education and research in tourism on the African continent, in 2000 the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS) founded an African chapter during its inaugural conference in Mombasa, Kenya.[ii] Atlas Africa subsequently organized five conferences. The proceedings of the conferences in 2003, 2004 and 2006 were published in 2007 in three volumes.[iii] Two new volumes[iv] were published in October 2008 and another two in October 2010.[v] These seven volumes, together with a book edited by Wishitemi, Spenceley and Wels[vi] and three new publications on tourism development in Southern Africa,[vii] give a nice overview of the current state of the art of predominantly applied research in tourism in Africa. I also intend to continue working together with the African Wildlife Foundation. Especially in 2011-12, this research agenda will focus on conservation enterprises, through the PhD research projects of Rita Nthiga and a postdoc research project in the framework of the project titled 'Exploring the Void: Institutional Entrepreneurship in Nature-based Tourism in Eastern Africa'. This project is a cooperation between Maastricht School of Management and Wageningen University, and is financed through the NWO Responsible Innovation Program, 2nd call.

Dutch networking has also been very instrumental. In the first place the quarterly meetings and annual conference of the IDUT (the Dutch association for sustainable outbound tourism), and in the second place the recent foundation of the Centre for Leisure and Tourism Studies (CeLToR). This new centre (see *www.celtor.eu*) will work with a range of key partners from both the private and the public sector in a number of 'academic workspaces', which are designed to bring together researchers and practitioners to concentrate on topical issues. One of these workspaces focuses on 'tourism and sustainable development' (see also Richards, 2010). I also intend to intensify cooperation with my colleagues in the Socio-spatial Analysis chair group, as well as those working in other chair groups (e.g. the Forestry and Nature Policy Group) within and outside Wageningen University. Internationally I seek to continue the cooperation with the universities now participating in the 3A-STEP project, especially Moi University (Bob Wishitemi and his colleagues) in Eldoret, Kenya, and Makerere University in Uganda. In terms of education, my focus remains on the MSc in Leisure, Tourism and Environment

. . .

Wageningen University

programme and the newly established BSc in Tourism, which is provided in cooperation with the NHTV University for Applied Sciences in Breda.

Words of gratitude

I consider this special professorship a personal reward for spending 35 years wandering in the field of tourism studies and making small contributions to the education of hundreds of Dutch and international students. But above all, it should be seen – as stipulated in the introduction to this address – as the outcome of a particular and fractionally coherent grid of actors and networks, rules of the game, particular assets, an own identity and style of doing things, and specific and shared ideas about how to move forward. And indeed it is. Many people and 'things' both within and outside Wageningen University have contributed to and will continue to enact this research agenda. I thank you all, and some of you in particular:

- Rector Magnificus, members of the Executive Board and members of the Appointment Committee: thank you for appointing me after a long process of extensive consultations. I will do my best to make a success of it.
- World Wildlife Fund Netherlands, IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands, Cordaid, and KLM Royal Dutch Airlines, who are supporting this special professorship. I am very grateful, as this opportunity opens many new avenues for me.
- Colleagues in the Socio-spatial Analyses chair group and students of the MSc in Leisure, Tourism and Environment, with whom I spent so much time in and outside the classroom. Thank you for the productive, inspiring and pleasant cooperation.
- WUR colleagues outside the chair group, particularly the Forest and Nature Policy Group and Alterra. I look forward to intensifying our cooperation and extending it to many other groups in this university. I am sure that the newly established BSc in Tourism, which is a collaboration between NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences and Wageningen University, will lead to new alliances, not only in education but also in research.
- PhD students John, Wilber, Nelly, Rita, and Aan. I am sure we will have a fruitful cooperation in the coming years.
- Jan Philipsen, Janine Caalders, Rene Henkens, Marlies van Hal, Marjolein Kloek, Valentina Tassone, Ferry van de Mosselaer, and of course Carla van

. . .

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

Zwaaij and Katharina Zellmer, all of whom were or still are very supportive of my journey.

- My 'tutors', all of whom played an important role in various stages of my career: Joop Hintzen back in the 1970s, then Hans Adriaansens and, in different periods of time, Theo Beckers, Adri Dietvorst and, last but not least, Jaap Lengkeek, who played an important role in developing this special professor ship. I hope and expect that Claudio Minca and I will have a similarly fruitful cooperation in the next couple of years.

- The Dutch tourism and sustainability 'scene', members of IDUT (the Dutch association for sustainable outbound tourism) and especially Jakomijn van Wijk, with whom I hope to continue working in the coming few years.

- Friends – some of whom I have now known for more than 35 years, and especially Marian and Jos (who from time to time in the last 15 years have taken tender care of our children) – neighbours and my family, however small that family now is.

- Last but not least, Elize, Daniël and Eveline. They carry the burden of a partner and father who works too hard and is too often abroad. They have often said that they want to visit Africa. Well, here is my promise: one day we will go on safari together.

Ik heb gezegd

· · ·

References

Adams, W.M. (2004) *Against Extinction: the Story of Conservation*. Earthscan: London.

Adams, W., Aveling, R., Brockington, D., Dickson, B., Elliot, J., Hutton, J., Roe, D., Vira, B. and Wolmer, W. (2004) Biodiversity Conservation and the Eradication of Poverty. *Science* 306: 1146-1149.

Adams W. and Hulme, D. (2001) Conservation and community. Changing narratives, policies and practices in African conservation. In: Hulme, D. and Murphree, M. (eds.) *African wildlife and livelihoods: the promise and perfor mance of community conservation*. James Currey Lt.: UK, pp. 131-147.

Ahebwa, W. (2010) *The Clouds Mountain Lodge; a policy arrangements approach*. Research report, Wageningen University: the Netherlands.

Ahebwa, W. M., van der Duim, V.R and Nyakaana, J.(2008) Tourism, Communities and conservation: an analysis of the tourism revenue sharing programme at Lake Mburo Conservation Area in Uganda. , In: Kloek, M. and van der Duim, R. *Tourism, nature conservation and wealth creation in Africa*, Volume 4; Thematic proceedings of ATLAS Africa conferences. ATLAS: Arnhem

Aitchinson, C. (2009) Gender and Tourism Discourses. Advancing the Gender Project in Tourism Studies. In: Jamal, T. and Robertson, M. *The SAGE Handbook of Tourism Studies*. SAGE: London, pp. 631-664.

Allen, J. (2003) *Lost Geographies of Power*. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.

Ampumuza, C. (2009) *Multi-level Partnerships in Uganda's Gorilla Tourism: Power, Processes and Poverty, The Case of Bwindi Impenetrable National Park*. MSc thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Archabald, K. and Naugthon-Treves, L. (2001) Tourism revenue-sharing around national parks in Western Uganda: early efforts to identify and reward local communities. *Environmental Conservation* 28 (2) 135-149.

Arnouts, R. (2010) *Regional nature governance in the Netherlands: four decades of governance modes and shifts in the Utrechtse Heuvelrug and Midden-Brabant*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Arts, B. (2006) *Forests, institutions, discourses: A discursive-institutional analysis of global forest politics*. Inaugural address, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

. . .

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

Arts, B. and Goverde, A. (2006) The Governance Capacity of (new) Policy Arrangements: A Reflexive Approach. In: Arts, B. and Leroy, B. *Institutional Dynamics in Environmental Governance*. Springer: New York.

Arts, B. and van Tatenhove, J. (2004) Policy and power: A conceptual framework between the 'old' and 'new' policy idioms. *Policy Sciences* 37: 339-356.

Ashley, C. and Jones B. (2001) Joint ventures between communities and tourism investors: experience in Southern Africa. *Journal of Tourism Research* 3 (5) 407-423.

Ashley, C. and Ntshona, Z. (2002) *Transforming roles but not reality? Private sector and Community Involvement in Tourism and Forestry Development on the Wild Coast*. Research briefing 1, ODI: UK.

Ashley, C. (2000) *The impacts of tourism on rural livelihoods: Namibia's Experience*. Working Paper 128, ODI: UK.

Ashley, C. and Garland, E. (1994) *Promoting community-based tourism development. Why, what and how?* Research Discussion Paper no. 4, Ministry of Environment and Tourism in Namibia: Namibia.

AWF (2005) *Community Owned and Run: A Case Study of Santawini Lodge, Ngamiland, Botswana*. AWF Working Papers, African Wildlife Foundation: Nairobi.

Barnes, J. and Jones, B. (2009) Game ranching in Namibia. In: Suich, H., Child, B. and Spenceley, A., (eds.) *Evolution and Innovation in wildlife conservation: parks and game ranches to transfrontier conservation areas*. Earthscan: London.

Barrow, E. and Murphree, M. (2001) Community conservation: from concept to practices. In: Hulme, D. and Murphree, M. (eds.) *African wildlife and livelihoods: the promise and performance of community conservation*. James Currey Lt.: UK, pp. 24-37.

Becken, S. and Hay, J.E. (2007) *Tourism and climate change: risks and opportunities*. Channel View Publications: Clevedon.

Boissevain, J. (1996) *Coping with Tourists. European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Berghahn Books: Oxford.

Bothma, J. du P., Suich, H. and Spenceley, A. (2009) Extensive wildlife production on private land in South Africa. In: Suich, H., Child, B. and Spenceley, A. (eds.) *Evolution and Innovation in wildlife conservation: parks and game ranches to transfrontier conservation areas*. Earthscan: London

. . .

Wageningen University

Bowen, G.A. (2006) Grounded Theory and Sensitizing Concepts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 5 (3) 1-9.

Brockington, D., Duffy, R. and Igoe, J.(2008) *Nature Unbound. Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas*. Earthscan: London.

Britton, S. (1982) The Political Economy of Tourism in the Third World. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9 (3) 331-358.

Bruner, E. (2001) The Maasai and the Lion King: Authenticity, Nationalism, and Globalization in African Tourism. *American Ethnologist* 28 (4) 881-908.

Buizer, M. (2008) *Worlds Apart. Interactions between local initiatives and established policy*, PhD thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Büscher, B. (2009) *Struggles over Consensus, Anti-Politics and Marketing. Neoliberalism and Transfrontier Conservation in Southern Africa*. PhD thesis, VU University: Amsterdam.

Büscher B. and Dietz,T. (2005) Conjunction of Governance: the State and the Conservation-development Nexus in Southern Africa. *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies* 4(2). 1-15.

Butcher, J. (2007) *Ecotourism, NGOs and Development*. Routledge: London and New York.

Child, B. (2009) Private conservation in southern Africa: practice and emerging principles. In: Suich, H., Child, B. and Spenceley, A. (eds.) *Evolution and Innovation in wildlife conservation: parks and game ranches to transfrontier conservation areas*. Earthscan: UK and USA.

Clegg, S. (2003) From Frameworks of Power. In: M. Haugaard (ed.) *Power: a Reader*. Manchester University Press: Manchester.

Clement, F. (2010) Analysing decentralised natural resource governance: proposition for a 'politicised' institutional analyse and development framework. *Policy Science* 43: 129-156.

CIDIN (2007) *Institutional arrangements in development: Poverty alleviation, participation and empowerment*. Research Programme 2007-2011, Centre for International Development Issues: Nijmegen.

Cohen, E. (1998) Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15 (3) 371-386.

Crick, M. (1989) Representations of International Tourism in the Social Sciences. *Annual review of Anthropology* 18: 307-344.

. . .

36

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

Colchester, M. (2002) *Salvaging Nature: indigenous peoples, protected areas and biodiversity conservation*. World Rainforest Movement: Uruguay.

De Kadt, E. (1979) *Tourism: Passport to Development?* Oxford University Press: New York.

Draper, M. and Wels, H. (2002) *Super African Dreams. The mythology of community development in Transfrontier Conservation Areas in Southern Africa*. Paper presented at the Seminar on Ecotourism and Nature Parks in East and Southern Africa, African Studies Centre: Leiden.

Duffy, R. (2001) Peace Parks: the paradox of globalisation. *Geopolitics* 6 (2) 1-26.

Duffy, R. (2006) Non-governmental organizations and governance states: the impact of transnational environmental management networks in Madagascar. *Environmental Politics* 15 (5) 731-749.

Eagels, P. (2009) Governance of recreation and tourism partnerships in parks and protected areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 17 (2) 231-248.

Elliot, J. and Sumba, D. (2010) *Conservation Enterprise – What works, Where and for Whom? A Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (PCLG)* Discussion Paper, African Wildlife Foundation: Nairobi.

Fisher, H., Magginis, S., Jackson, W., Barrow, E. and Jeanrenaud, S. (2008) *Linking conservation and poverty reduction: Landscape, people and power*. IUCN: Gland.

Fine, B. (2005) From Actor-Network Theory to Political Economy. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 16 (4) 91- 108.

Font, X., Cochrane, J., and Tapper, R. (2004) *Tourism for Protected Area Financing: Understanding tourism revenues for effective management plans*. Leeds Metropolitan University: Leeds.

Graham, J., Amos, B. and Plumptre, T. (2003) *Governance principles for protected areas in the 21st Century*. Institute on Governance: Ottawa.

Giller, K. E., C. Leeuwis, J., Andersson A., Andriesse, W., Brouwer, A., Frost, P., Hebinck, P., Heitkönig, I., van Ittersum, M. K .,Koning, N., Ruben, R., Slingerland, M., Udo, H., Veldkamp, T., van de Vijver, C., van Wijk, M. T., and Windmeijer, P. (2008) Competing claims on natural resources: what role for science? *Ecology and Society* 13(2) 34.

Goodwin, H. and Santilli, R. (2009) *Community-based Tourism: a Success?* ICRT Occasional Paper 11/GTZ: Leeds.

. . .

Wageningen University

Gunder, M. (2010) Sustainability: Planning's Saving Grace or Road to Perdition? *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26 (2010) 208-221.

Hall, C.M. and Higham, J.S. (2005) *Tourism, recreation, and climate change*. Channel View Publications: Clevedon.

Hendriks, N. (2010) *Assessing tourism impacts. Dutch development agencies measuring results?* MSc thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Hottola, P. (2009). *Tourism Strategies and Local responses in Southern Africa*. CABI: Wallington.

Hughes, R. and Flintan, F. (2001) *Integrating Conservation and Development Experience. A review and bibliography of the ICDP literature*. International Institute for Environment and Development: London.

Hutton, J., Adams, W.M. and Murombedzi, J.C. (2005) Back to barriers? Changing narratives in biodiversity conservation. *Forum for Development Studies* 2: 339-370.

Jackson, G. and Morpeth, N. (1999) Local Agenda 2001 and Community Participation in Tourism Policy and Planning: Future of Fallacy. *Current Issues in Tourism* 2(1) 1-38.

Jansen, K. (2010) Private Protected Properties in South Africa. *Tourism as a Tool for Conservation and Development?* MSc-thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Jentoft, S. (2004) Institutions in fisheries: what they are, what they do, and how they change. *Marine Policy* 28 (2004) 137-149.

Jones, H and Epler Wood, M. (2007) *Community Based Tourism Research Initiative. Survey Results Demonstrating the Connection that Community Based Tourism Projects have to Protected Areas.* EplerWood International: Washington.

Kinnaerd, V. and Hall, D. (1994) *Tourism: a Gender Analysis*. Wiley: London.

Kiyiapi, J., Ntiati, P., Mwongela, B., Hartfield, R. and Williams, D. (2005) *A Community Business: Elerai Ranch and Conservation Area, Kenya*. AWF Working Papers, AWF: Nairobi.

Kiss, A. (1990) *Living with wildlife. Wildlife resource management with local participation in Africa*. World Bank paper no. 130, Africa Technical Department Series. World bank: Washington

Kiss, A. (2004) Is community-based ecotourism a good use of biodiversity\

38

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

9039_binnenwerk_Oratie van der Duim.indd   38   10-3-2011   11:19:29

conservation funds? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 19 (5) 232-237.

Koopmans, R. (2008) *Monitoring and Evaluation of Rural Tourism Projects*. MSc thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Kremer, M., van Lieshout, P. and Went, R. (eds.) (2009) *Doing Good or Doing Better. Development Policies in a Globalizing World*. Scientific Council for Government Policy/Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam.

KWS (2008) *Annual Report 2008*. Kenyan Wildlife Service: Nairobi, Kenya.

Lapyere, R. (2009) Revenue Sharing in community-private sector lodges in Namibia: a bargaining model. *Tourism Economics* 15 (3) 653-669.

Latour, B. (1993) *We have never been Modern*. Harvester Wheatsheaf: Hertfordshire.

Latour, B. (2000) When things strike back: a possible contribution of science studies. *British Journal of Sociology* 5 (1) 105-123.

Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social. An introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Law, J. (1994) *Organizing Modernity*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

Law, J. (2007) Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics. Available at: http// *www.heterogenities.net/publications/Law-ANTandMaterioalSemiotics.pdf* (downloaded on 18th of May 2007)

Liefferink, D. (2006) The dynamics of policy arrangements: turning round the tetrahedron. In: Arts, B. and Leroy, P. (eds.) *Institutional Dynamics in Environmental Governance*. Springer: New York.

LWF (2008) Tourism Strategy. Laikipia Wildlife Forum: Nanyuki, Kenya.

MacCannell, D. (1976) The tourist. *A new theory of the leisure class*. Schocken Books: New York.

Manyara, G. and Jones, E. (2007) Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya. An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 15 (6) 628-644.

Meyer, D. (2011) Pro-Poor Tourism – Can Tourism Contribute to Poverty Reduction in Less Economically Developed Countries? In: Cole, S. and

Morgan, N. *Tourism and Inequality: Problems and Prospects*. CAB International, Wallingford.

Mitchell, J. and Muckosy, P. (2008) *A misguided quest: community-based tourism in Latin America*. ODI Opinion, May 2008, ODI: UK.

. . .

Wageningen University

Mitchell, J. and Ashley, C. (2010) *Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Pathways to Prosperity*. Earthscan: London.

Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (2009) *Tourism and Sustainability. Development, globalisation and new tourism in the Third World*. Third Edition. Routledge: London.

Mosse, D. (2005) *Cultivating Development*. Pluto Press: London.

Murdoch, J. (1998) The Spaces of Actor-Network Theory. *Geoforum* 29 (4) 357-374.

NACSO (2009) *Namibia's Communal Conservancies. A Review of progress 2008*. Namibian Association of CBNRM support organisations: Windhoek.

Nel, E. and Binns, T. (2000) Rural self-reliance strategies in South Africa: community initiatives and external support in the former black homelands. *Journal of Rural Studies* 16: 367-377.

Newmark, W.D. and Hough, J.L. (2000) *Conserving wildlife in Africa: Integrated Conservation and Development Projects and Beyond*. Bioscience 50 (77) 585-592

Ntiati, P. (2002) *Group Ranch Subdivision Study in Liotokitok Division of Kajiado District, Kenya*. LUICD Working Paper Series, number 7, LUICD: Nairobi, Kenya.

Novelli, M., and Gebhardt, K. (2007) Community Based Tourism in Namibia: 'Reality Show' or 'Window Dressing'? *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (5) 443 – 479.

Oates, J.F. (1999) *Myth and Reality in the Rain Forest: How conservation strategy are failing in West Africa*. University of California Press: London.

Okello, M., Ole Seno, S. and Nthiga, R. (2009) Reconciling peoples' livelihoods and environmental conservation in the rural landscapes in Kenya: Opportunities and challenges in the Amboseli landscapes. *Natural Resources FORUM* 33: 123-133.

Passoth, J. and Rowland, N. (2010) Actor-Network State: Integrating Actor-Network Theory and State Theory. *International Sociology* 25(6) 818-841.

Pellis, A. (2011) *Access to community based tourism benefits*. MSc-thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Peluso, N. (1993) Coercing conservation? The politics of state resource control. *Global Environmental Change* 3 (2) 199-217.

. . .

Prof. *dr. V.R. van der Duim*   SAFARI

Prins, H.T., Geu Grootenhuis, J. and Dolan, T.T. (eds.) (2000) *Wildlife Conservation by Sustainable Use*. Kluwer Academic Publishers: Dordrecht.

Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., Ateljevic, I. and Harris, C. (2007) *Tourism and Gender: Essays on embodiment, sensuality and experience*. CAB International: London.

Ramutsindela, M.F. (2007) *Transfrontier Conservation in Africa. At the Confluence of Capital, Politics and Nature*. CABI: Wallingford.

Ren, C. (2011) Non–human agency, radical ontology and tourism realities. *Annals of Tourism Research* (forthcoming)

Ren, C., Pritchard, A. and Morgan, N. (2010) Constructing Tourism Research. A Critical Inquiry. *Annals of Tourism Research* 37 (4) 885-904.

Richards, G. (2010) *Leisure in the Network Society: From Pseudo-events to Hyperfestivity?* Inaugural Address. Tilburg University: Tilburg.

Rutland, T. and Aylett, A. (2008) The work of Policy: actor networks, governmentality, and local action on climate change in Portland, Oregon. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 627-646.

Saarinen, J., Becker, F., Manwa, H. and Wilson, D. (2009) *Sustainable Tourism in Southern Africa. Local Communities and Natural Resources in Transition*. Channel View Publications: Bristol.

Sandbrook, G. (2006) *Tourism, conservation and livelihoods: the impacts of gorilla tourism at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Uganda*. PhD thesis, University of London: London.

Schroeder, R.A. (2008) Environmental Justice and the Market: The Politics of Sharing Wildlife Revenues in Tanzania. *Society and Natural Resources* 21 (7) 583-506.

Sharpley, R. (2000) *Tourism and Sustainable Development: exploring the theoretical divide. Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 8(1) 1-19.

Sharpley, R. (2009) *Tourism Development and the Environment: Beyond Sustainability?* Earthscan/James & James: London.

Sharpley, R. and Telfer D. (2002) *Tourism and Development, Concepts and Issues*. Channel View Publications: Clevedon.

Sindiga,I. (1999) *Tourism and African Development. Change and Challenge of Tourism in Kenya*. Ashgate/African Studies Centre: Leiden.

. . .

Wageningen University

Scheyvens, R. (2002) *Tourism for development: empowering communities*.
Prentice Hall: Harlow.

Scheyvens, R. (2007) Exploring the Tourism-Poverty nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism* 10 (2 & 3) 231-254.

Schmidt, V. (2010) Reconciling Ideas and Institutions through Discursive Institutionalism. In: Béland, D. and Cox, R. *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*. Oxford University Press: USA.

Smith, V. (1989) *Host and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*, Second Edition. University of Pennsylvania Press: USA.

Smith, C. (2005) De Wet: Professional Hunting Association of South Africa Conference (21/11/2005). Available at: from *http://www.polity.org.za/article/de-wet-professional-huntingassociation-of-south-africa-conference-21112005-2005-11-21* (accessed on 17th of March 2010)

Sirima, A. (2010) *Protected Areas, Tourism and Human Displacement in Tanzania. Interest and Challenges behind Ruaha National Park Expansion*. MSc-thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Southgate, C. (2006) Ecotourism in Kenya: the vulnerability of communities. *Journal of Ecotourism* 5 (1&2) 80-96.

Spenceley, A. (2003) *Tourism, Local Livelihoods, and the Private Sector in South Africa: Case Studies on the Growing Role of the Private Sector in Natural Resources Management*. Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa Programme, Environment Group, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex: Brighton.

Spenceley, A. (2008) *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development*. Earthscan: London.

Spenceley, A. and Goodwin, H. (2007) Nature based tourism and poverty alleviation: impacts of private sector and parastatal enterprises in and around Kruger National Park, South Africa. *Current issues in Tourism* 10 (2&3) 255-277.

Steins, N.A., Röling, N.G. and Edwards, V.M. (2000) *Re-'designing' the princples: An interactive perspective to CPR theory. Paper for the 8th Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property*. Bloomington

Sumba, D. and Elliott, J. (2010) *Conservation Enterprise. What works, Where and for Whom?* Presentation at the ZSL Symposium, London. Available at:

· · ·

42

Prof. DR. *V.R. van der Duim* SAFARI

9039_binnenwerk_Oratie van der Duim.indd   42   10-3-2011   11:19:30

http://povertyandconservation.info/docs/20100429-1130_Sumba-Elliott.pdf (accessed on 12th of November 2010)

Sumba, D., Warinwa, F., Lenaiyasa, P. and Muruthi, P. (2007) T*he Koija Starbeds Ecolodge: A Case Study of a Conservation Enterprise in Kenya*. AWF Working Papers, African Wildlife Foundation : Nairobi.

Tassone, V.C. (2008) Systematizing Scientific Knowledge in Sustainable Tourism, Poverty Reduction and Nature Conservation. In: Haan, H.J. de, van der Duim, V.R. (eds.) *Landscape, Leisure and Tourism, Socio-spatial Studies in Experiences, Practices and Policies*. Eburon: Delft.

Tassone, V.C. and van der Duim, V.R. (2008) An analysis of research developments and opportunities in tourism, poverty alleviation and nature conservation. In: Pineda, F.D., Brebbia, C.A. (eds), *Sustainable Tourism III*, WIT Press: Southampton

Tassone, V.C. and van der Duim, V.R. (2010) Tourism, Poverty Alleviation and Nature Conservation. The state of Contemporary Research. *Matkailututkimus Finnish Journal of Tourism Research* 6 (1-2) 7-29.

Turner, L. and Ash, J. (1975) *The Golden Hordes. International Tourism and the Pleasure Periphery*. Constable: London

Suich, H., Child, B., and Spenceley, A. (2009) *Evolution and Innovation in wildlife conservation: parks and game ranches to transfrontier conservation areas*. Earthscan: London.

UNWTO (2010) UNWTO *Tourism Highlights, Edition 2010.* UNWTO: Madrid.

Van de Mosselaer, F.H.H. (2010) Deliberating Pro-Poor Tourism Intervention Logic. *Learning from microfinance*. MSc thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Van de Mosselaer, F. and van der Duim, V.R. (2010) Pro-poor toerisme moet kleur bekennen. *Vrijetijdstudies* 28 (3) 25-43.

Van der Duim, V.R. (2005) *Tourismscapes: An actor-network perspective on sustainable tourism development*. PhD thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Van der Duim, V.R. (2007) Tourismscapes. An actor-network perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research* 34 (4) 961-976.

Van der Duim, V.R. (2008) Exploring Pro-poor Tourism Research: The State of

· · ·

Wageningen University

the Art. In: Haan, H.J. de and Duim, V.R. van der (eds.) *Landscape, Leisure and Tourism; Socio-spatial Studies in Experiences, Practices and Policies*. Eburon: Delft.

Van der Duim, V.R. and Caalders, J. (2002) Biodiversity and Tourism: Impacts and Interventions. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29 (3) 743-759.

Van der Duim, V.R., Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G. (2012) *ANT and Tourism*. Routledge: London (forthcoming)

Van der Wouw, M. (2008) *Linking is Thinking. Linking agricultural producers and tourism. An in-depth study of the opportunities and constraints*. MSc thesis, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

Van Huijstee, M.M., Francken, M. and Leroy, P. (2007). Partnerships for sustainable development: a review of current literature. *Environmental Sciences* 4 (2): 75-89.

Van Tatenhove, J.,Arts, B. and Leroy, P. (2000) *Political Modernisation and the Environment. The Renewal of Environmental Policy Arrangements*. Kluwer Academic Publishers: Dordrecht.

Varghese, G. (2008) Public–Private Partnerships in South African National Parks: The Rationale, Benefits and Lessons Learned. In: Spenceley, A. (ed.) *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development*. Earthscan, London.

Visseren Hamakers, I. (2009) *Partnerships in biodiversity governance. An assessment of their contributions to halting biodiversity loss*. PhD thesis. Nederlandse Geografische Studies, 387: Utrecht.

Wearing, S. and Neil, J. (2009) *Ecotourism. Impacts, Potentials and Possibilities?* Second Edition. Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.

Weaver, D. (2001) *Ecotourism*. Wiley & Sons: Milton.

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.

Woods, M. (1997) Researching Rural Conflicts: Hunting, Local Politics and Actor-networks. *Journal of Rural Studies* 14 (3) 321-340.

WRR (2010) *Minder pretentie, meer ambitie. Ontwikkelingshulp die verschil maakt*. Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid. Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam.

· · ·

44

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim SAFARI

9039_binnenwerk_Oratie van der Duim.indd   44
10-3-2011   11:19:30

Zellmer, K. (2008) *Tourism within Nature Conservation Organisations. Portfolio and Strategy Assessment of IUCN-NL and WWF-NL*. Unpublished Internship Report, Wageningen University: Wageningen.

· · ·

Wageningen University

i   This section also builds on previous literature research by Valentina Tassone; see Tassone, 2008 and Tassone and van der Duim, V.R. 2008 and 2010.

ii The conference papers are published in Akama, J. and Sterry, P. (eds) (2002) *Cultural Tourism in Africa: strategies for the new millennium*. Arnhem: ATLAS, and are also available online: *www.atlas-euro.org*

iii See Kloek, M. and van der Duim, R.,(2007) *Tourism and Nature in Africa*, Volume 1; *Local communities and participation in African tourism*, Volume 2; and *Aspects of Tourism in Kenya*, Volume 3. : ATLAS : Arnhem.

iv See Kloek, M. and van der Duim, R. (2008) *Tourism, nature conservation and wealth creation in Africa*, Volume 4; *New avenues for tourism and wealth creation in Africa*, Volume 5, ATLAS: Arnhem

v   See Zellmer, K., van der Duim, V.R. and Saarinen, J. (2010) *Tourism for development: environmental sustainability, poverty reduction and empowering communities* (Volume 6):and *Tourism, tourists and sustainable development in Africa* (Volume 7). ATLAS: Arnhem:.

vi See Wishitemi, B., Spenceley, A. and Wels, H. (2007) *Culture and Community. Tourism Studies in Eastern and Southern Africa*. Rozenberg: Amsterdam

vii See Saarinen, J., Becker, F., Manwa, H. and Wilson, D. (2009) *Sustainable Tourism in Southern Africa. Local Communities and Natural Resources in Transition,* Channel View Publications: Bristol: Hottola, P., 2009. *Tourism Strategies and Local Responses in Southern Africa,* CABI: Wallingford; Spenceley A. 2008, Responsible *Tourism. Critical Issues for Conservation and Development*. Earthscan: London:

• • •

46

Prof. dr. V.R. van der Duim   SAFARI

Wageningen University

• • •
48