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In this paper we argue that there is a basic ambivalence in the managerial attempt of the South African Peace Park Foundation (PPF), presided by Anton Rupert, to foster cohesion within the development of TFCAs in southern Africa by focusing on community participation and development. Our argument is structured as follows: first we will describe the colonial and primitivist discourse on Africa and Africans. It shows how European notions of aesthetics included Africans in the concept of landscape; Africans were fitted in the African landscape. Noble savage mythology is rife in such conservationist dreaming, but contradicted by claims of tourism-driven economic development. This ultimately presents a problem for the TFCA development and its urge to develop local communities and lift them out of poverty: if local people did indeed economically develop, with all the material consequences, they would no longer belong in the inclusive European aesthetics of the African landscape. This dilemma creates a fundamental ambivalence in the PPF towards community development. We will conclude by showing the form of African cohesion and desire the PPF represents – as opposed to those affected by their dreaming.

An African Dream: ‘The Greatest Animal Kingdom’

According to South African Minister of Environment and Tourism, Mohammed Valli Moosa, Southern African boundaries have begun to fall as we and our neighbours embrace the world’s most ambitious conservation project, the creation of Africa’s ‘superpark’. This is the stuff dreams are made of. We are the fortunate generation of South Africans who have witnessed dreams turn to reality. So we continue to think the unthinkable. John Lennon shared his dreams with us when he sang: ‘Imagine there’re no countries. It isn’t hard to do. Nothing to kill or die for . . .’ The creation of the great Gaza-Kruger-Transfrontier Park is the single most significant and ambitious conservation project in the world today. It promises to bring a better life to some of the poorest citizens of southern Africa, and is also a real, living and demonstrable manifestation of the African Renaissance. . . Nature and dreams know no boundaries. As John Lennon sang: ‘You may say that I’m a dreamer, but I’m not the only one; I hope some day you’ll join us, and the world will live as one.’

Dreaming has been and still is a common theme of the Afrikaner white community in southern Africa; dreams about a special relation with God, about the necessary order in the political sphere and about the future of South African business. Most recently a post-national vision has crystallised of large cross-boundary conservation areas to serve peace and

---

stability in the region – *Trans-Frontier Conservation Areas* (TFCAs). One of the prime lobbying and facilitating organisations for these TFCAs in southern Africa is the South African *Peace Park Foundation* (PPF), presided over by Anton Rupert whose career encompassed earlier nationalist phases of such dreaming. It is worth remembering that such ideas are not new to the continent and were anathema to the Afrikaner Nationalists when the apartheid regime rose to power in 1948. The new dream is nobly formulated as a politically neutral initiative to conserve Africa’s biological diversity. Suggesting that the creation of TFCAs will be a prime motor for economic development and upliftment of local communities in southern Africa, the initiative claims social legitimacy. With this they follow the new global conservation priority of ‘people and parks’, which developed in the wake of the Bali declaration of 1982, that protected areas should from now on ‘serve human society’. In 1987 the Brundtland-report confirmed this political line in which environmental concerns were linked to economic development through the agenda of ‘sustainable development’. In conservation circles this integrative approach is called ICDPs (Integrated Conservation-Development Projects). Later this, maybe too obvious priority accorded to conservation, was veiled by the terminology of international and multilateral conservation organisations which put human development ahead of the conservation effort, best epitomised by the term ‘Community-Based Natural Resource Management’ (CBNRM). Wildlife management increasingly becomes people management.

The PPF has accordingly taken the global vision and dream of CBNRM to heart and started a ‘Peace Park Development Programme’ (PPDP). In an overview of its mission statement the then Director of the PPDP, Mr. Leonard Seelig, formulated it as follows:

> The mission of the PPDP is to bolster the sustainability of southern African transfrontier conservation areas in which the PPF is active, by promoting rural economic opportunity and development based on the sustainable consumptive and non-consumptive use of indigenous resources while fostering ecosystem integrity and bio-diversity preservation.

The PPF also worked through the media to disseminate this message, mainly through the formidable lobbying and fund-raising capacities of John Hanks, its then Executive Director

---

5 The idea of Peace Parks was first mentioned in Mozambique in 1937 by a Portuguese ecologist, A. Gomes e Soussa, who was writing about tensions at the USA-Mexican border. As a solution they created a nature reserve to symbolise the harmony between the two. Similar to the American example he suggested that a peace park could be created on the Mozambique-South Africa-border. In the 1940s Jan Christian Smuts established the Dongola Wildlife Sanctuary in co-operation with Rhodesia. The Nationalists fought him on the issue and swept it away when they came to power in 1948 (Carruthers, J. (1997), ‘Nationhood and national parks: comparative examples from the post-imperial experience’, in: Griffiths, T. & Robin, L. (eds), *Ecology and empire. Environmental history of settler societies*, Keele University Press; Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, pp. 130, 131).


who was initially headhunted for the mission.10 When the first TFCA was launched in 1999 the Saturday Argus reported that ‘in a move hailed by conservationists as a model for the future, South Africa and Botswana have signed an historic agreement that will see the creation of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park – the first official “peace park” on the African continent’.11

Dr. John Hanks is adamant that communities living adjacent to Peace Parks will benefit directly from the tourism generated, resulting in stability and the use of land for conservation . . . Communities hankering after the entire eastern bank of Ndumo Game Reserve should lend an ear to Hank’s proposals for community involvement in TFCAs. ‘We feel very strongly about making the communities our partners in the growth of tourism – small loans will go to local communities associated with Peace Parks who want to do anything associated with the tourist industry from small campsites to the marketing of quality curios’, he said.12

Maybe it is because the PPF is predominantly financed by the German development bank, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau,13 that also the German media pay significant attention to the TFCA-development in southern Africa.14 In the Afrikaans newspapers, the PPF and its president Anton Rupert are promoted as a beacon of hope for Africa’s future.15 It seems clear that TFCAs are ‘conservation’s grand dream for Africa’. Noel de Villiers of the Open Africa Initiative called it ‘the African dream . . . when he conceptualised the idea at the time of the IUCN declaration on cross-border parks’.16 The local and global press are almost universally enthused with this dream- come-true.17 Amongst this snow of confetti, some correspondents have wielded the hatchet by pointing out that the dream is turning into the nightmare of dispossession, marginalisation and counter-protest so familiar in colonial conservation.18 A correspondent for Idasa (a prominent South African NGO working to promote human rights and democracy) investigated rural life surrounding the game reserves on the South African side of the border of Mozambique in Maputaland. Her investigations made her wonder whether the economics of ecotourism can in reality hold the line against ‘eco-colonialism’.19 The response to critics from Moosa’s ministry is that ‘characterising this initiative as disorganised and branding it as “killing fields” is tantamount to Afropessimism.’20 Here we need to make our position clear: the sceptical stance of the social scientist must not be construed as cynicism.

TFCAs, especially the Great Limpopo or GKG, have come to represent so much that begs explanation. Realistic analysis that digs deeper than the prolific hopeful gloss, and examines

11 Saturday Argus, 17/18 April 1999, Botswana, SA set up Africa’s first ‘peace park’.
12 Unknown, ‘Mandela approves first Trans-Frontier Conservation Area’.
16 Pp. 66, Addison, A. (1997), A dream without frontiers, in: Leadership, 16-97, no. 4
the historical and social forces at work, is called for. A good start was made by Duffy who showed how Zimbabwe’s initial response hid economic concerns of revenue loss behind objections about the challenge to sovereignty.21 At the same time Carruthers, whose work has highlighted how important surges of global protectionism, coinciding with local currents of nationalism, are in facilitating or impeding conservation projects, warned that such contemporary initiatives bring ‘the possibility of a new kind of imperialism by way of intervention from a power base outside the region’.22 Sensitised by this past, we seek continuities and breaks in the nature of conservation policies in southern Africa and try to make sense of the new wave of regionalism that TFCA’s exemplify in the context of processes of globalisation. If such are a manifestation of the ‘African Renaissance’ as embodied in the Rupert-Mandela-Moosa triumvirate, then the layers of global cultural agency driving such policy need to be unwrapped.

These projects attract substantial international capital. Indeed, it is claimed that they are to be effected without cost to taxpayers. Whether the local communities will eventually win or lose, however, is a moot point. According to Neumann, African local communities tend, in the perception of interventionist agencies dominated by western capital, to be divided into ‘good’ and ‘bad natives’ depending on how close they are to nature. The closer they are to nature the ‘better’ they are and the more they have the right to stay in the area and taste the financial privileges of western donor attention. The more ‘modern’ they are, the more they pose a threat to the success of nature conservation and the farther away they should be held from these conservation areas; i.e. they should be removed.23 This process of dividing communities into categories of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ is at the heart of a process of Othering, which is solidly grounded in a primitivist colonial discourse about Africa and Africans. As in the discourse on the African Renaissance, most notably that of the current SA president, Thabo Mbeki, modernisation is a theme which reveals an unresolved ambivalence rather than a coherent vision of the continent’s future.

In this paper we want to argue how the specific focus on community participation and upliftment in the development of TFCAs in southern Africa is a product and continuation of mythical and primitivist imagination as much as anything else. Our argument is structured as follows: first we will describe the colonial and primitivist discourse on Africa and Africans. It shows how European notions of aesthetics included Africans in the notion of landscape; Africans were fitted in the African landscape. But this causes a problem for the TFCA development and its urge to develop the poor local communities, because if the poor communities would indeed economically develop, with all the material consequences, they would no longer belong in the inclusive European aesthetics of the African landscape. In Neumann’s distinction they would develop from ‘good’ to ‘bad natives’. This dilemma creates a fundamental ambivalence in the PPF and PPDP towards community development. We will conclude by showing the form of African identity and desire the PPF represents – as opposed to those affected by their dreaming. Such clashes of identity are, as Mamdani has revealed, a widespread legacy of late colonialism in Africa.24 Similarly, TFCAs in the southern African context are a more visible manifestation of the dilemmas of globalisation than a unique product of an African Renaissance shedding the paper-thin borders of its

imperial legacy. Bauman’s depiction of ‘globalisation and the new poor’ makes no mention of TFCAs, but for those affected on the margins of nation-states, is uncannily vivid:

Globalization is not about what we all or at least the most resourceful and enterprising among us wish or hope to do. It is about what is happening to us all. It explicitly refers to the foggy and slushy ‘no-man’s land’ stretching beyond the reach of the design and action capacity of anybody in particular.

How has this vast expanse of man-made wilderness (not the ‘natural’ wilderness that modernity set out to conquer and tame; but the postdomestication wilderness that emerged after the conquest and out of it) sprung into vision with that formidable power of obstinacy which is taken to be the defining mark of ‘hard reality’? 25

According to the South African eco-tourism magazine Getaway, which heralded ‘the impossible dream’ of superparks in 1996, the remaining wildness of Africa may be its only hope for overcoming its poverty and competing in the global economy: ‘probably the safest prediction that one can make is that shortly the world’s fastest-growing market, tourism, will be chasing the world’s fastest shrinking product: wilderness’. 26 The same year National Geographic was glad to find that the new South Africa was intent upon maintaining and expanding upon its wildlife legacy and concluded that ‘South Africa may be the continent’s best hope for preserving wildlife in a wild land’. 27 The ‘hard reality’ is thus paradoxical: develop but do not develop. In the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) Mbeki has rounded up the heads of 15 African states to form a strategy of sustainable development, to halt the marginalisation of Africa in the globalisation process and eradicate poverty. This initiative has been criticised for failing to involve ordinary people and being top-heavy with African presidents dancing to the tune of international capital. Considering that the GKG (Gaza/Kruger/Gonarezhou) alone is the size of the Netherlands – the homeland of one of the authors of this paper which possesses no wilderness – we need to look deeply into the eyes which gaze across at Africa and come to terms with the paradoxical desires they project.

African landscapes and African Others in European Imagery

The concept of landscape has two distinct but related usages. In the first place it denotes ‘an artistic and literary representation of the visible world, a way of experiencing and expressing feelings towards the external world, natural and man-made, an articulation of a human relationship with it’. The second usage is in current geography and environmental studies. ‘Here it denotes the integration of natural and human phenomena which can be empirically verified and analysed by the methods of scientific enquiry over a delimited portion of the earth’s surface. These two usages are ‘intimately connected both historically, and in terms of a common way of appropriating the world through the objectivity accorded to the faculty of sight and its related technique of pictorial representation’. It is important to note explicitly that ‘the concept of landscape is a controlling composition of the land rather than its mirror’. 28

27 National Geographic (July, 1996).
So landscape is about constructing images. In southern Africa, the Scottish Reverend John Croumbie Brown, is described by Grove as the ‘single most influential voice’ in creating a colonial discourse on landscape. Grove argues that the Scottish landscape and environmental sensibilities were the ‘major vehicle’ for the expression of their national identity in opposition to the English and English rule. The Scot’s perspective was a highly aesthetic one, rooted in Romanticism that was firmly wrapped and strengthened by a mythology about their specific Scottish history, which separated and distinguished them sharply from the English. They translated their love for their own Scottish aesthetic landscapes to Africa in general and (virtually) followed, for instance, the Scotsman Mungo Park on his travels through the African interior around the River Niger, bewailing his tragic death making him a martyr whose example should be followed. Africa even became a ‘national obsession’ in Scotland, according to Grove. Southern Africa was given a starring role because a particular journal. *Penny Magazine* paid especially generous attention to southern Africa through the efforts of the poet Thomas Pringle who wrote numerous articles about the region in which he compared the Scottish landscape, so important to his and their sense of social and national identity, with that of South Africa. From there it was only a small step to romanticise and sacrilise the landscape in South Africa in the same fashion, and derive a new and strong identity from it. From this perspective it is not difficult to see why the European imagery about Africa’s landscape is often expressed in terms of the ultimate aesthetic natural icon, their ‘lost Eden’. ‘Much of the emotional as distinct from the economic investment which Europe made in Africa has manifested itself in a wish to protect the natural environment as a special kind of ‘Eden’, for the purposes of the European psyche rather than as a complex and changing environment in which people actually have to live … (thus) Africa has been portrayed as offering the opportunity to experience a wild and natural environment which was no longer available in the domesticated landscapes of Europe’. Africa, or Eden, in other words, became synonymous with a European sense of authenticity, both naturally and as a model of how people should relate to nature, and blend into it. ‘The game reserve might be said to theatricalize a framing, primal past for modernizing Europe’. The usage of the term ‘Eden’ for describing African landscapes from a European perspective is probably one of the stronger metaphors to describe the norms for perfect natural aesthetics.

---


30 Ibid: 142-143


33 In this context we were therefor amazed and a little amused that especially in the usually fiercely critical periodical *New African* of February 2002, there was a two-page review of a book entitled: ‘Tanzania. African Eden’, (Jafferi, J. & Mercer, G. (2001). In the article Mercer says: ‘That much sought after, endlessly elusive phenomenon “The real Africa” exists only in the mind, or more appropriately, the heart. For all of Africa is, of course, real. But the Africa most often imagined is not the Africa of desert wastes or high-rise Johannesburg, not the gloomy *Heart of Darkness* jungles or the
vision of the landscape was capable of accommodating an African presence, because incorporated in the Eden myth is the myth of the noble savage. The noble savage, being closer to nature than civilization, could, hypothetically, be protected as a vital part of the natural landscape’.  

This positive image of an African Eden contrasts sharply with the European fear for the ‘dark continent’ with all its connotations of death and destruction. Both images taken together, let us call them Eden and Armageddon, form the paradoxical European imagery of Africa(ns): ‘(o)ne “unresolved ambivalence” has been the incompatible European images of Africa as forbidding wasteland or Edenic paradise’. It is not without meaning in this respect that in Joseph Conrad’s ‘Heart of darkness’ his gloomy descriptions of landscape and his stereotypical descriptions of the ‘primitiveness of African people can be perceived as two equally important ‘characters’ in directing Marlow’s search and ‘descend’ to Colonel Kurtz:

At night sometimes the roll of drums behind the curtain of trees would run up the river and remain sustained faintly, as if hovering in the air high over our heads, till the first break of day. Whether it meant war, peace, or prayer we could not tell. The dawns were heralded by the descent of a chill stillness; the wood-cutters slept, their fires burned low; the snapping of a twig would make you start. We were wanderers on prehistoric earth, on an earth that wore the aspect of an unknown planet. We could have fancied ourselves the first of men taking possession of an accursed inheritance, to be subdued at the cost of profound anguish and of excessive toil. But suddenly, as we struggled round a bend, there would be a glimpse of rush walls, of peaked grass-roofs, a burst of yells, a whirl of black limbs, a mass of hands clapping, of feet stamping, of bodies swaying, of eyes rolling, under the drop of heavy and motionless foliage.

It seems that in the European perspective on Africa and its people only get shape, meaning and a personality against the physical background of landscape. Landscape is the necessary context of describing and relating people to Africa. Europeans developed a similar paradoxical image of the African Other. On the one hand the African was considered an authentic ‘noble savage’, on the other hand the African was considered a violent and promiscuous barbarian. Both images are in fact the two sides of the same coin: an image of

steamy estuarine cities of the Atlantic coast. It lies essentially in the east. Each of East Africa’s major countries – Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania – has elements of the wild Africa, the Africa of ivory and slaves and spear-toting warriors, of explorers and “Here there be dragons” wildnesses, which help to make up the myth. But one – Tanzania – comes closer than the others to the African ‘reality’.

35 Ibid: 17
37 Not only Africans, but also Europeans in Africa for that matter, as the masculine descriptions of fearless ivory-hunters indicate. The white hunters derive their masculinity solely in the context of their surviving the African landscape, in which descriptions of fierce wildlife, harsh climate and pristine landscapes play an important role. This might well be one of the reasons for the successes of for instance Wilbur Smiths’ books on Africa: it appeals to and seems to verify the European image of Africa and Africans.
what Erlmann has described as ‘spectatorial lust’.

Elsewhere this is described as ‘a carnival act consciously designed to play up their abnormalities – i.e., their radical deviation from European norms of dress and behavior’. Torgovnick argues how this primitive Other was crucial in the construction of a European identity. ‘In this way the production of images of the non-Western Other and its place is integral to the formation of a contrasting identity of self’. No wonder that especially abnormalities, positive and negative, were much sought after. It led to a highly ambivalent primitivist discourse based on a very asymmetrical power relation in which Europe was the dominant party. The ‘abnormalities’ can be categorised, according to Corbey, into four main themes dominating the European image of the African Other during the colonial era: violence, sexuality, eating habits and dress codes. Africans were seen as violent warriors, capable of the worst types of barbaric violence towards their enemies and towards Europeans. The European image of Shaka Zulu is probably one of the most well known examples of this aspect of the European image of the African Other.

The aesthetic aspect of the African Other came especially prominently to the fore in the European image of African women. During the colonial era the number of male Europeans travelling to and through Africa was far larger than European women. In depicting the African Other, the African women played an important role in the sense that they were ‘measured’ and contrasted to European aesthetic standards of women. The German ethnologist Stratz wrote a study about ‘Die Rassenschönheit des Weibes’ in which he placed European aesthetic standards upon African women. His assumption, which was the general European assumption at the time, was that ‘Die weiße Rasse besitzt als höchststehende die vollkommenste Schönheit; je nach ihrer Entwicklungsstufe nähern sich ihr die anderen durch das maß ihrer Vorzüge’. These kinds of comparisons were by no means the prerogative of German scientists alone, but were widespread among scientists from other countries as well.

One of the important representations of this European aesthetic imagery of African women was photography, and more specifically what Corbey has labelled the ‘colonial nude’. This type of photography was especially dominant in representations on postcards sent to Europe from French and Belgium colonies in black Africa:

---

41 Neumann 2000: 227, italics added.
‘Heureusement pour la carte postale, il est de par le monde des peuples dont la nudité est le costume quotidien, et d’autres où le sentiment de pudeur, n’est pas le nôtre. (…) Le [nu] culturel sera une merveilleuse excuse à ce vaste étalage de chairs dénudées qui va se déverser des colonies, pour le plus grand plaisir des bidasses, des vieillards libidineux et des collégiens boutonneux’. 45

These postcards can be seen as a popularised or vulgarised form of the anthropological approach at the time in France, which followed in the wake of social Darwinism. In France this approach was formulated by Paul Broca, ‘the founder and preliminary director of the Société d’Anthropologie de Paris. (…) Under his direction anthropology at the Société became dominated by the physical description, measurement and classification of racially defined bodies’. His method came to be known as anthropometry. 46 This science also gave a ‘solid’ legitimation for instance for French scientists to ‘explain’ genital mutilations of women in Nubia and Sudan. In 1872 ‘Larousse had defined this practice, explaining that the genital ‘deformities’ of Egyptian, Syrian and Arab women had necessitated this operation (…)’. 47

One of the better known examples in southern Africa in this respect and who featured in many visual representations of Europeans is the Khoisan Saartjie Baartman whose bones were finally repatriated to South Africa this year. 48 Far from being only an example from times gone by, she is still part and parcel of a struggle between European imagery of and domination over Africa and African self-determination. Saartjie Baartman was a Hottentot woman who was first presented to the European audience in 1810 in London, from which she toured the English provinces and Paris as a sensational curiosity and representative of and for Africa and African women. She died in 1815, 25 years of age, because of an infection. She suffered from steatopygia, enlargement of the behind, which was shown naked when ‘on stage’ and which stimulated many (male) sexual fantasies of European spectators. She came to be known as the Hottentot Venus. The Hottentot / Bushmen were at that time considered to be, together with Australian Aborigines, a race coming closest to primate monkeys. In other words, on a hierarchical scale from the superior Western Caucasian race to primate monkeys, the Bushmen featured close to the lowest hierarchical level. This combination of steatopygia and status as lowest ranking race, secured the exploiters of Saartjie Baartman tremendous interest from the European audience. In France, the most respected anatomist at the time, George Cuvier, took a keen interest in her bodily composition in line with the anthropometric fashion of the day. When alive she never allowed the famous scientist an analysis of her private parts, in which he was interested most, because of what has popularly become to be known as the ‘Hottentot apron’, ‘or hypertrophy of the labia minora’. Some Khoisan women develop that peculiar condition, but many do not. Only when she died was he able to analyse

them in detail. ‘The final product of Cuvier’s artists’ examination depicts a landscape in which the photographic realism of the woman’s three-quarter portrait fuses seamlessly with a beautiful landscape full of such “typical” Venus figures’. Body-landscape and natural landscape, both fuse aesthetically in a painting of Louis-Jean Allais in his representation of Saartjie Baartman in 1815. Saartjie had to bear what Daniels and Gerson, in relation to black personalities in British television, call the ‘burden of representation’.  

But this was not yet the end of Saartjie Baartman, not in terms of artistic display, nor in terms of academic attention. A plaster cast of Saartjie Baartman appeared on display at the Musée de l’Homme in Paris until 1982. From the 1980s onward she began to draw new scientific attention in the literature on nineteenth century exhibitions of people, and especially through the work of Stephen Jay Gould and Sander Gilman on the constructions of sexuality in science and medicine. In 1993, a dispute arose after the Orsay museum in France tried to redisplay the plaster cast of Saartjie Baartman. But South African organisations began demanding that her remains be returned to South Africa instead. Their demands have recently been satisfied following the remains of a man, only known as ‘El Negro’, returned to Botswana, where he was given a ‘decent burial’. In an attempt to get back what was originally theirs but taken during the years of ‘colonial plunder’, full attention was turned to Saartjie Baartman.

The French proposed that her remains be granted to a South African museum on an extended loan, rather than be repatriated for a dignified burial. But such a move would have to be endorsed by the French parliament, which regards the museum’s contents as national treasures. (…) The French have denied that Baartman had been treated badly and kept in France against her will in the 19th century, and rejected claims that body parts were being kept in jars. (Cecil le Fleur), who represented the Khoi-Khoi Indigenous First Nations of South Africa organisation (pleaded:) ‘She had to display her posterior and genitalia in order to amuse callous, inhumane, insensitive crowds and white audiences as one of their peculiar finds in Africa.

In January 2002 the remains of Saartjie Baartman returned to South Africa. It was the French who were most interested and have had a particular fascination with colonial nudes and adorned their postcards with them. Such German, English and Portuguese cards are not as common. This can probably be explained by differences in Christian confessionals between these countries and the ascribed role of sexuality and eroticism. But all the imperial nations swung, in Young’s terms, on the ‘ambivalent axis of desire and aversion, [or] . . . attraction and repulsion’. Racial theorizing of the time, ‘did not just consist of essentializing differentiations between self and other: they were also about a fascination with people having

---

50 Strother 1999: 1.
51 The Star, 6 October 2000, ‘El Negro’ is home – will Saartjie be next?’
52 Krog, A., ‘Ken de zeden van de schede waarmee je bezig bent!’ In: Trouw, 19 January 2002
53 Corbey 1989: 23
sex – interminable, adulterating, illicit, inter-racial sex.’

The landscape and bodyscape blended into one penetrating projection of desire.

The alternate pole of revulsion is found in the European idea of the eating habits of Africans stereotyped as cannibalistic. The familiar cartoon cliché of Africans dancing around the cooking-pot while preparing Europeans for their dinner is as classic in this respect. Cannibalism was very rare indeed in Africa. Finally the Africans, especially in the context of Victorian prudence, were stereotyped as underdressed. The fact that women were walking around bare-breasted was ‘proof’ of their state of primitiveness and strongly reinforced the image of sexual willingness of African women. At the same time, by way of contrast, it reinforced the Western idea of its superior civilisation.

European standards of aesthetics, i.e. ethnocentric aesthetics, both with regards to landscape and African people, played an important role in the representations through photographs, literature and art on Africa and Africans in Europe. Most representations depict the paradoxical attitude of fear and attraction, which many Europeans had with regards to Africa and Africans. Such a combination was often deliberately manipulated in visual and literary representations to keep the audience fascinated without the risk of reality involved. In this fashion a complete ‘Otherness-industry’ emerged in Europe in the second half of the eighteenth century to represent Africa and Africans to a European audience. The Otherness-industry manifested itself in Europe in various forms such as photographs, postcards, museums, travel-literature and world exhibitions. All manifestations were primarily oriented to Europeans who did not have the opportunity, or didn’t dare, to travel to Africa themselves, but who nevertheless wanted to experience ‘the authentic Africa’ through the representations of people ‘who had been there’. People who travel and can say that they have been at places, or have been close-by at least, are readily believed by the home-front. ‘Being There’ was an accepted ‘proof’, never mind how weird it sometimes sounded in the European context. It seems that the more exotic and deviating from European standards the representation, the more possible it seemed. To characterise much of what they encountered in a rather weird way is not surprising if we follow Fabian who argues that

there is overwhelming indirect evidence that that European travellers seldom met their [African] hosts in a state we would expect of scientific explorers: clear minded and self-controlled. More often than not, they too were ‘out of their minds’ with extreme fatigue, fear, delusions of grandeur, and feelings ranging from anger to contempt. Much of the time they were in the thralls of ‘fever’ and other tropical diseases, under the influence of alcohol or opiates (laudanum, a tincture of alcohol and opium, was the principal drug used to control acute and chronic dysentery), high doses of quinine, arsenic, and other ingredients from the expedition’s medicine chest. (... I thought there might be interesting material in these travelogues for a paper to be titled ‘Travel as Tripping’.

The higher the (delirious) contrast suggested, the more it seemed to verify European superiority. In that sense, the African Other became a type-caste as contrast to hold up to

European standards, against the backdrop of a powerful image of the African landscape. What was written and told about Africa actually teaches us more about the European narrator than about Africa. Torday’s treatise in 1925 is explicit about this:

My book has no pretensions of being a scientific treatise; it is a simple account of what I have seen, and, if it appears now and then egotistical, the reader will bear in mind that observations have to be judged according to the mood of the person who makes them.

There is perhaps more of me in those parts of the book in which I speak of other people than in those in which I am the principal actor.  

Romantic aesthetics of landscape were the major undercurrent in these forms of representation. The old Romantic and European rhetoric of the aesthetics of African landscape is still the dominant unique selling point of TFCAs to the international tourist. Wherever TFCAs are advertised it is by referring to these old age landscape aesthetics. In the in-flight magazine of South African Airways in January 2001 there is an article on the Kgalagadi TFCA. The title of the article is ‘Mega desert’ and the photo’s accompanying the article all refer to the aesthetics of landscape, like ‘A pristine place… the magical, mysterious Kalahari Desert’. Like the music in a film makes you aware that something romantic is going to happen! The GKG (i.e. Gaza/Kruger/Gonarezhou) Transfrontier Park is promoted as to ‘include South Africa’s world-famous Kruger National Park with its extraordinary abundance of wildlife (…) as well as the stunning geological splendour of Gonarezhou in Zimbabwe. A superb wildlife area in Mozambique will be added and introduced for the first time to the general public (…)’. In the PPF magazine, ‘Peace Parks News’, the back page is reserved for ‘Travel news’. Every issue a new stunning destination is promoted in which the landscape usually plays a dominant role. ‘(Phinda) (s)ituated in the heart of Maputoland in South Africa’s picturesque KwaZulu/Natal region, where the myth and mystery of wild Africa first began…’. Or the advertisement for an exclusive member tour through the Kgalagadi TFCA: ‘Listen to the sounds of the Kalahari by night and treasure the unique opportunity of experiencing one of Africa’s most pristine eco-systems’. And to conclude: ‘you will spend the morning quietly exploring the mysteries of Africa (…) you will soon leave life’s stresses far behind’. As argued above, the African landscape actually included the Africans as well, but Africans that ‘fit’ the myth of the ‘real Africa’. In other words: Africans have to blend in our image of African landscapes. Africans should blend in an aesthetically dominated European image of African landscape. That is why European tourists, for example, usually perceive huts with thatched roofs and African women with water buckets on their head as ‘authentic Africa’, while Cape Town is considered ‘not the real Africa’. Thatched huts and women with buckets on their head blend in our perception of African landscapes, while bubbling, cosmopolitan city-life is alien to that image. Can this myth be reconciled with the notion of community development? Does a discourse of economic development fit in the European aesthetics of the African landscape?
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Protected areas, ‘good natives’, ‘bad natives’ and the paradox of development

Here we wish to explore Neumann’s distinction, introduced above, between ‘good’ and ‘bad natives’ in relation to protected areas’ policy on the issue of buffer zones. ‘Good natives are those having a ‘traditional’ livelihood sustained by ‘indigenous knowledge’. They are perceived to be closer to nature and thus consistent with the environmental managers’ design for parks in protected areas. Bad natives are those who are in some sense ‘modern’, and thus removed from nature, their modified lifestyles and greed for consumer goods representing a particular threat to the natural treasures enclosed. The good native is given a place to stay in wildlife areas or buffer zones. The bad native is ‘naturally’ evicted. Many stories from the early wardens of protected areas in southern Africa testify to this categorisation. When one reads the memoires of pioneer wardens like Colonel James Stevenson-Hamilton of Kruger National Park in South Africa or Ted Davison of Wankie National Park in Zimbabwe, one can fill Neumann’s categorisation with almost countless empirical examples. The white warden feeling himself heir to this wild world and responsible for keeping it in, or bringing it back to, pristine condition, primarily defending it against the ‘bad’ native, i.e. the malign native poacher.

The celebrated first warden of what finally became the undivided Kruger National Park, was James Stevenson-Hamilton. He started as a warden in July 1902 and continued to be its Chief Warden till 1946. In his extensive memoirs he relates, already in the second chapter, that ‘(b)efore leaving Pretoria it had been impressed on me that the first difficulty would probably be with the natives, since these and the game could not be expected to exist together. I had already decided in my own mind that, so far as it might prove possible, the game reserve would have to be cleared of human inhabitants if a beginning was to be made at all’, because ‘(g)iven full opportunity, the lowveld natives were ever more destructive to game than white men’. His image of the ‘natives’ was so strongly imprinted in his mind that he could hardly see anything else than confirmation of his ideas in their behaviour. In that way his image of the ‘bad native’ provided a self-fulfilling prophesy as the following quote from his memoires illustrate: ‘The kraal natives were surly and disobliging, especially when they understood my mission, and would tell me nothing of the country. From their hang-dog look I judged them capable of murdering any number of traders, but no doubt I was prejudiced. Afterwards we had considerable trouble with them, and a few years later I had the kraal moved out of the reserve’.

The definition of a good native, in Stevenson-Hamilton’s view, is one who would tell all about the country. Not only was it native wisdom that should be shared but also everything known about the business of other local Africans, most significantly poaching: ‘As scouts and guides, Stevenson-Hamilton could not do without the “native police”. They accompanied him wherever he went, teaching him veldlore.’

In the Zululand reserves where the idea of wilderness was officially put on the map in the 1950s, indigenous Zulu ideas were fundamental to such an evolving philosophy and
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management practice. So much so that poachers, though fought tooth and nail, were often respected, especially those who hunted with spears, knobkerries and dogs rather than wire snares and western traps. Especially respected were those who put up a ‘good scrap’ when resisting arrest in hand-to-hand combat.

Carruthers suggests that Stevenson-Hamilton’s career represents a nascent romantic philosophy of wilderness preservation, ‘like Aldo Leopold in another context.’ He was suspicious of the national park concept, as well as interventionist science. In some ways he was surprisingly non-racial in his outlook for his time, even grudgingly sympathetic of poachers and viewed the bushman’s genocide as ‘brutal injustice.’ Carruthers maintains that he was not romantic about Africans, but on the other hand points out that it could have been his early visits to Zululand as a British soldier in 1888 ‘which first kindled in James a love of both the African landscape and the outdoor life. “The Zulus are magnificent” he declared.’ As relief from the stilted Victorian garrison procedure, ‘Zulu dancing was sometimes arranged and this could include an “Intombi” race of naked unmarried girls.’ There is much more evidence that could be assembled to prove that Stevenson-Hamilton, while subscribing to the social Darwinism of his time, was deeply ambivalent about Africans. For instance, when the National Parks Board decided to replace all African skilled labour with whites, “he was appalled, believing that “good natives” were far better workers than “poor whites.”” Yet, as Carruthers shows, he held similar views to the sportsman William Cornwallis Harris who “was explicit in his disparagement of Africans: he compared the physical features of the Khoi Khoi with those of the bush pig, and those of the San with those of the baboon. Not only were Africans compared with certain undesirable wild animal species in terms of physique but also in behaviour”.

Later in Southern Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, this comparison with wild animals, was still used by the first warden of its biggest National Park, Wankie, now Hwange National Park, Ted Davison. He started to work in the area in October 1928 and remained at his post till 1961, when he was transferred to headquarters in Salisbury, now Harare. The ‘poachers’ Davison had to deal with were Bushmen. ‘These people fell into two classes, the ‘wild’ bushmen and the ‘tame’ bushmen. The tame ones were those who had drifted into the settled areas and taken up occupations with farmers or Railway Employees. In contrast to these ‘tame’ bushmen, were the ‘wild’ bushmen who were not under white control, but lived permanently in the ‘widuals’ of the area’. Davison and his men were rather afraid of the Bushmen, as at one incident, a revenging Bushman had shot a ranger-guide. A ‘tame’ Bushman did this. Because of their interaction with whites and earning some money, they were usually better armed and more familiar with fire-arms, than the ‘wild’ Bushmen. These latter usually had to rely on muzzleloaders, which were brought in the area by the middle of the 19th century by early traders and hunters like the famous Frederick Courtney Selous. The ‘tame’ Bushmen who had shot the warden guide was, according to the story, later found, tried and hanged. It resulted in a European image of (‘tame’) Bushmen as dangerous opponents: ‘(...) I had no illusions about the [‘tame’] Bushmen along the border [working for white farmers on the other side of the border] and my staff, too, never felt very safe while patrolling
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the area'.

In Matopos National Park in Southern Rhodesia, the relation between park management and local African communities was obviously very similar to the ones described above. Although at the proclamation of the area as National Park in 1926 a few kraals in the park were seen as belonging to the landscape of this ‘unspoilt Eden’, in the second half of the 1930s they were already no longer seen as ‘picturesque’, but a ‘threat to the soil and water resources in the Matopos’. The common end of all these stories is that in almost all cases the local African communities were evicted from their land to make room for the wildlife areas. In the end even ‘good natives’, fitting nicely and ‘naturally’ in the African landscape, had become a ‘bad native’, considered a threat to the wildlife. They were evicted and the borders of the wildlife areas were zealously guarded to make sure that no one intruded the wildlife sanctuary. As Ranger notes for the African communities in the Matopos in Zimbabwe, ‘it had become the remoteness not of romance but of backwardness, i.e. from ‘good’ to ‘bad native’. It made national parks and other protected areas detached from its local history and its management increasingly icons of the international conservation movement and international tourism. Crucial to the detachment of wildlife areas from local history, and a common theme through all the stories, categorisations and descriptions of Africans and African communities, is the Othering of ‘the African community’ in a similar vein as the European colonial primitivist discourse. Moreover, Draper has written of the complex intimacy and essentialising politics operating on the Mozambique border of KwaZulu Natal, South Africa during the last half century.

The method used by KwaZulu’s conservationists in creating the game reserves of Maputaland might have involved some level of compensation as a carrot, but the state wielded a stick which made local people’s livelihoods difficult to pursue as before. The legal acts passed made aspects of people’s behaviour in their relationship with nature illegal and conservation officers prosecuted them. Such a strategy is that which Ian Player, the globally celebrated conservationist, came to find distasteful. He recalls the beginning of his career establishing the Ndumu reserve in the 1950s:

There were unpleasant tasks too, and the main one was to arrest people who lived in the reserve when they committed even a trivial of fence. It was the policy of the Department to try and have the reserve cleared of human beings. Many years later when my interest in Jungian thought was growing, I wondered if not wanting anyone to live in the reserve was not part of our shadow. It was an equivalent to the Garden of Eden in which there was not room for both Caine and Abel. In retrospect I believe it was a mistake not to have left at least half of the people there. After all they were part of the ecology.

Player, a self-confessed romantic, was moved by such wilderness people, but spiritually since they
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blunted our Western mindset and subconsciously led us on new paths... Their situation would come to haunt us. They had been part of the landscape, and although it was true that they had killed most of the antelope, it was their slash and burn practices that later enabled the game to increase dramatically when the last person left.\footnote{Player, I. (1997) \textit{Zululand Wilderness: Shadow and Soul}, Cape Town: David Philip, p.47.}

While the American and Australian idea of wilderness has been roundly criticised for the sublime being associated with 'virgin' or 'empty' land, the same could not be said of Africa where, in its formal birthplace in Zululand, the architects of wilderness recognised that the land had been occupied for millennia. Piety did not derive from an imaginary depopulation of the land, but from its indigenous inhabitants as well as their environment from where they have been banished by the irresistible serpent of modernity. The World Wilderness Congress was founded by Player in 1977, inspired by a vision of Magqubu Ntombela, his Zulu game scout mentor, friend and spiritual guide. Player claims that the Congress, which from the outset provided a platform for indigenous people to voice their concern about the rising tide of modernity, was part of his repayment of a debt to the people who he disherited from their land. Judging from the papers and debates of the last meeting in 2001, when the Congress returned home for the first time since the first, it continues to be dogged with ambivalence about the place of people in wilderness. Hence the accord that came out of Port Elizabeth included the following:

\begin{quote}
Wilderness - all of its many services and values - undeniably informs and supports human communities and is an essential element of the spirit and practicality of the 21st century. HOWEVER, our convention recognized the inescapable truth: where vast wilderness once surrounded and supported humankind, pervading and persisting with ease, it is now small and dispersed islands in a sea of humanity, retreating daily while assaulted by human numbers and greed, and cloaked by an atmosphere which is not of its own making, nor life-giving.\footnote{Port Elizabeth Accord, 7th World Wilderness Congress, 8 November, 2001. \texttt{http://www.worldwilderness.org/7th-resolutions/pe_accord.htm}}
\end{quote}

One of the major signs of hope for the Congress was that of the ‘mega-wilderness’ promised by the development of TFCAs. As we have tried to show, African wilderness is a curious blend of alienation of African land tenure and indigenisation of white identity with local cultures and landscapes.

\textbf{TFCAs and Community Development}

In his opening speech at the official launch of the Kgalagadi TFCA, President Mogae of Botswana, stated that the further development of the Kgalagadi should also ‘(...) include the mobilization of our respective local communities for meaningful participation in the sustainable commercial exploitation of natural and tourism resources within their vicinity. It should also promote the respect, protection and preservation of their cultural and social environments. (...) The communities should (...) realise that they also have a major responsibility to assist the Conservation Authorities we have entrusted with the joint management of this park by co-operatively working with them to promote environmental conservation and to combat poaching’.\footnote{Speech by His Excellency Mr. F.G. Mogae, President of the Republic of Botswana. On the occasion of the official launch of Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park at Two Rivers on 12th May 2000, point 10 and 12. Italics added.} Central in the representation of ‘local communities’ by these authorities is the idea that the Other (i.e. the communities) should become aware of their role and function in nature conservation policy. The centrality of this idea also becomes clear when one looks at the answers in an interview of the then head of the PPDP of the PPF, Leonard Seelig, to a question about the ‘criteria for choice of communities’ to be included or
financed by the PPDP:

I turn down a lot of requests of communities that are just too far away. That’s how we keep the focus. (…) So, our first criterion is obviously a geographical criterion. The second criteria is a commitment criteria. (…) I want actually see people commit to these projects. So commitment, not financial, but in the form of time and what we call ‘sweat equity’.\(^88\)

The ‘commitment’ Seelig is referring to is made explicit later in the interview where she emphasises the importance of basic environmental and conservation education:

It’s critical for any other work we want to do, that they begin to understand what this is all about and why they shouldn’t chop down the trees and why they shouldn’t let their cattle eat everything. (…) I would say that almost anything I do is basically within the context of CBNRM because what I’m trying to show communities through small projects is that they can actually benefit from the preservation of their environment and by taking care of their environment properly.\(^89\)

So the required commitment refers to the PPF conservation policy of the proper way to deal with the natural environment. If they show that commitment they will be considered ‘good natives’ and granted project money. If not they will be labelled ‘bad natives’, and considered a problem for the further execution of the PPF nature conservation policy in need of correction. With regard to the implementation of buffer zones, Neumann describes a similar process: the ‘good’ native communities should protect the wilderness pearl of bio-diversity kept inside the shell of the buffer zone, against ‘bad native’ communities which (no longer) live close to nature and which seem to have lost ‘that harmonious relationship with nature’.\(^90\)

In order to keep their position in the buffer zones, these ‘good’ communities must live up to the parameters which are formulated by the (Western dominated) (inter)national conservation agencies like IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) and WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature), or PPF to show them again and again that they still perform their reputation as Guardians of Eden. They must constantly show a state of ‘purity’, which in the Western vocabulary is meant by the word ‘primitive’, i.e. they have to show they are ‘primitive’. Primitivism has ‘always implied original, pure, and simple cultures’.\(^91\) The ambivalence inherent in the discourse has a long tradition in western thought as indicated before. The ambivalence runs exactly along the lines of the ‘good’ and ‘bad native’ distinction. This is not to argue that international conservation bodies are unaware of the problems of so-called enforced primitivism, their researchers have been pointing it out for some time.\(^92\) We argue however, that such may not be conscious policy, but becomes practice through the unconscious imposition of latent, but deeply held values. To understand their operation we need to consider how mythologies work. Good natives are compliant to conservation bureaucracy imperatives. Conservation organisations are relentlessly paramilitary. So, Ian Player and Nick Steele claim that were it not for the loyal militarism of Zulu game guards, not only the white rhino but the Zululand reserves would have been lost forever.\(^93\) For conservationists, the saluting game scout is a reassuring figure. For Roland Barthes, the salute demonstrates not only how empire but myth operates:

\((The \ French \ Empire? \ It’s \ just \ a \ fact: \ look \ at \ this \ good \ Negro \ who \ salutes \ like \ one \ of)\)
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our own boys). This constituent ambiguity of mythical speech has two consequences for the signification, which henceforth appears both like a notification and like a statement of fact. Myth has an imperative, buttonholing character. . . . it is the bourgeois ideology itself, the process through which the bourgeoisie transforms the reality of the world into an image of the world, History into Nature. And this image has a remarkable feature: it is upside down.94

Barthes goes on to show how myth depoliticizes speech and naturalises people. Myth thus enables the glib glossing which is so characteristic of Peace Parks Foundation propaganda: a virtual reality best appreciated by a visit to their website. Yet on the ground, the disciples of CBNRM are jealously guarding the reality of conservation and the role of communities in that process. An elite few working for the conservation bodies are in the know. The assumption is that much of the ideas about conservation and the specific role of communities in it, fall outside the consciousness of the community members themselves. It reserves the ‘true’ consciousness and knowledge about these issues for the policy makers of conservation bodies. The Other is naturalised and objectified, and in the same process, separated from the policy makers. The conservation authorities increasingly assume airs of superiority in their own construction of reality, to the neglect of those of Others. Their research in the field of CBNRM becomes observation instead of communication. Their approach in fact shapes and produces knowledge in accordance with the researcher’s (i.e. conservation organisations) method and paradigm. The distance is increased through the use of a distancing vocabulary, which, in its application, seems an exact replica of the discourse on (colonial and primitivist) Othering as described above. Concepts like, for instance, ‘local communities’ and ‘CBNRM’ function in the same objectifying way as the ‘rhetoric of visualism’ displayed in the postcards and photographs described above.95 If we, for instance, look at the extensive booklet produced by South African National Parks, to position themselves in the debate on the involvement of communities in nature conservation, particularly striking are the photographs of the Other, i.e. the communities which they promise to give their fair share, which catch the imagination. The opening photograph of the chapter on Kalahari Gemsbok National Park for example, is a familiar ‘descendant’ of colonial photography showing a San family, i.e. a man and a woman carrying a child, in front of their hut, wearing traditional cloths. Like most photographs in the booklet it is a strictly composed picture. It could almost be considered a form of outdoor studio-photography. The text accompanying the picture fits the images perfectly as a ‘genetic clone’ of colonial photography: ‘The Nama welcomed all who come to inhabit this land. After all suffering as a result of that, they can still smile’.96 Among the photographers for this booklet is not one black African.97 In the letter accompanying the booklet it is said that ‘Social Ecology is a process and a strategy that actively engages local communities neighbouring national parks in an open dialogue to build positive relationships and identify opportunities for mutually beneficial partnerships’. Soon after the election of a democratic government in South Africa, Beinart and Coates concluded ‘The future of parks and reserves in a rapidly changing context might depend on the universalization both of a set of environmental values and of a non-racial sense of nature’s heritage’.98 No doubt this ‘open dialogue’ is a real attempt to build this set of values, but we need to ask from whence they
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derive. European colonial discourse on primitivism, with its inherent ambivalence, still seems
to haunt conservation and development policies in the third millennium. More specifically it
is still part and parcel of ICDP-rhetoric in Africa, epitomised in the debate on CBNRM in
relation to TFCA development, notwithstanding that one of the PPDP objectives is to
“encourage a transparent, open and inclusive process”. In its project description this open
dialogical approach is left for old-fashioned conservation rhetoric like in the Mbangweni
Conservation Awareness Programme, which says: ‘(t)he programme will emphasise the
benefits of conservation to the community, create improved relations between the community
and the local park management, and provide an introduction to improved agricultural
skills’.100 Who is assumed to have superior knowledge here?

A final case of illustrating our argument: the GKG TFCA was meant as a multiple use area,
especially to help impoverished communities in communal land areas in Mozambique.101 If
one looked at the map accompanying the objectives one could see that the communal areas
enclosed in the TFCA-plan were even larger than the included Coutada 16 Wildlife
Utilization Area (directly opposite South African Kruger National Park) Zinave National Park
and Banhine National Park combined. Just as in the other TFCAs, ‘funders and park planners
hoped that through the use of participatory approaches local people would feel that they have
a real stake in protecting wildlife.’102 The idea since 1995 has always been that the GKG
would become a TFCA with multiple land use.103 But what came out of it is the road to the
creation of a game park, which does not allow for communities living inside its boundaries.
What started as a process to become a Transfrontier Conservation Area ended in agreeing
about a Transfrontier Park. According to one member of the National Steering Committee
and the Technical Committee for the GKG, what they agreed upon was something
‘completely different’ from which they worked so hard to establish for five years.104 At the
same time of the agreement, the PPF ‘dropped a community project in Zinhave National Park’
for which they had promised US$ 300.000. After only US$ 8000 was spent, they stopped the
project through ‘writing one single letter’ and no further comments.105 In the brochure about
the establishment of the TF Park it is formulated as follows:

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

According to Mozambican counterparts, after the agreement over the establishment of a park
including Coutada 16 only, Zinhave and Bahinya National Parks are considered ‘second
class’. And ‘Coutada 16 will become and appendix to Kruger National Park’.107 A problem
with proclaiming Coutado 16 a national park and fencing it in is a community of
approximately 4000-5000 people.108 In order to proclaim a national park in Mozambique all
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existing rights have to be considered. These rights can only be ‘extinguished for reasons of public interest’. Furthermore the people concerned have to be compensated. According to one source ‘Anton Rupert wants his name attached to the park’. This could maybe explain why PPF drops everything else in Mozambique now the agreement about Coutada 16 is settled and solely concentrates on the further development of the GKG.

Going with the Flow: Super Africans and Super Parks

Critics point out how an ‘old boy’ network of South Africans and western backers pushed for the release of elephants from Kruger into Mozambican territory on Rupert’s 84th birthday. Symbolically presided over by Nelson Mandela in October 2001, it was an extraordinary celebration of Africanism running roughshod over the wishes of an estimated 30 000 affected villagers across the border. One reading could see it as a celebration the marriage of nations, with the elephants being Mandela’s lobola (bridal price) for his wife, Graça Michel. Another view is of a rushed exercise in social engineering not witnessed since the machinations of the apartheid regime came grinding to a halt. It was a culmination of Rupert’s career which has spanned being founder and chairman of the Rembrandt Tobacco Company and head of Rothmans International, close involvement with the Afrikaner Secret Society, the Broederbond and the status of one the richest men in South Africa. Most telling was his work establishing the South African Nature Foundation (SANF) in the late 1960’s and early 1970s. This was the local division of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF, formerly the World Wildlife Fund) and was established when the world had begun to isolate South Africa. The SANF was conceived through close alliance with the WWF’s first President, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands who was considered to be an ally of white South Africa. The connection tempts one to see African landscapes being shaped by Dutch-Afrikaner nationalist forces. Suspicion mounts as rumours reach our ears from high places that Rupert relieved John Hanks of his responsibility because he was, like Smuts before him, too inclusively internationalist for Afrikaner nationalists. Hanks apparently had not delivered fast enough for Rupert. For good reason it turns out. Moreover, the story has it that Afrikaners increasingly staffed the PPF. But such a mono-causal conspiracy would be too simplistic. The Mandela-Moosa-Rupert triumvirate represent a push for an inclusive African identity – a new idea of homeland. Moosa’s vision of ‘the greatest animal kingdom’ is a sincere attempt at resolving the riddle of the national question in South Africa. How? Through identifying with nature above nation. The issue of identity is as acute for Indian South Africans as it is for Afrikaners. Kader Asmal (now the SA Minister of Education) made it clear upon taking office as Minister of Water Affairs and Forestry in 1994, that he did not believe that the borders inherited from colonial legacy are real: ‘. . . no one can tell me that my moral obligation stops with the Tsongas in the Eastern Transvaal and does not encompass those who live in the western parts of Mozambique.’ Asmal was careful to point out that South Africa was not going to be the leader as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) embraced internationalism. SA would play an important but not ‘hegemonistic role . . . Modesty is part of reconstruction . . . particularly for those of us who work in the rural areas. We must learn some modesty in our relations with our neighbours too.’
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Those were the days of SADC and RDP speak. The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) was the ANC’s election promise document, drawn up in consultation with organised labour and civil society, in which the state intervened heavily in economic life to bring a better life to all. Within a couple of years, their macro-economic policy changed to the neoliberal supply-oriented approach to development of GEAR (Growth, Equity and Redistribution) that emphasised the opening of trade and a heavy private sector role in development. The switch took place at the level of the elite following the trend of the pacts made in the negotiation process prior to 1994.\textsuperscript{114} While this revealed deep-seated confusion about how development should be brought about by the new government, it also had a good deal to do with coming to terms with limited capacity by way of economic and other forms of capital. In relinquishing a much responsibility, so was the control over the development process and ‘modesty’ in international relations lost. The ANC took control of South Africa just as, around the world, the nation-state’s power in global affairs was on the decline. Cyril Ramaphosa, a former giant of ANC politics and leader of the country’s biggest trade-union federation, COSATU, left politics for business where he leads initiatives for black economic empowerment. He best demonstrated such a loss of modesty when he followed Moosa’s opening of the World Wilderness Congress in 2001. Introduced by dramatic overture of African wildlife film, his face was projected onto the screen and he boomed into the microphone ‘Did you hear the lion roar? That’s ME!’ He had come to announce the ‘My Acre of Africa’ project at Kruger National Park seeking to raise, mostly foreign capital for conservation and black empowerment by appealing to donors’ desire for, amongst other things, immortality. Ramaphosa’s Johnnie is poised, however, to take the lion’s share. Mark Gevisser wrote in an insightful biographical sketch of Ramaphosa that;

As the Randlords harnessed capital in the service of Empire and the Broeders harnessed it in the service of Afrikaner Nationalism, Ramaphosa goes to battle for Black Empowerment. In all three of these phases of South African capitalism, there is a synergy between the ideological aspirations of a ruling class and the personal ambitions of the entrepreneurs themselves: it is not inaccurate, on one level, to compare Ramaphosa to a Rhodes or a Rupert.\textsuperscript{115}

Rhodes sought immortality on a granite hill in the Matopos National Park in Zimbabwe, among other places. Ramaphosa is best remembered for his fishing trip with the Nationalist’s Roelf Meyer during a deadlock in the Kempton Park negotiations in 1992. They bonded in ‘nature’ sufficiently to get the peace process on track again.\textsuperscript{116} Like Moosa, Ramaphosa is given to lyricism about our natural heritage, his soul, and the ecopoetics of nature.

The project of expanding the Kruger over the neighbour’s borders is driven by a combination of a new form of African nationalism, coupled with local and international capital. This is not new. A settler’s desire for an African identity provided a major impetus in the creation of the WWF. Such came in the form of a letter from Victor Stolan to Sir Julian Huxley in 1960:

Since my naturalisation, I am proud to call this country mine, but I cannot help feeling that it has become a country of understatements, of gentle talk with not enough push behind it. If, on the other hand, what is left of wildlife in Africa (and elsewhere for that matter) is to be saved, a blunt and ruthless demand must be made to those who, with their riches, can build for themselves a shining monument in history . . .

\textsuperscript{115} \textit{Mail & Guardian}, October 11-17, 1996.
While it is not clear from whence Stolan was writing, it is certain that he was identifying his naturalisation with Africa’s nature rather than any particular nation. It was this concern that prompted him to declare that there is ‘no time for Victorian procedure’. The ‘blunt and ruthless demand’ was also for African land on which people lived. Writing during the apartheid government’s twilight, Ellis saw in Rupert’s dream of extending the Kruger into Mozambique, the drive for territorial control and a boerestaat (white homeland) outside of the South African constitution in which some control over the means of violence is retained. In other words ‘a Super-Park’ for ‘Super-Afrikaners’. There are other conspiracy theories such as that of the LaRouche League which point out the genocidal tendencies of the WWF’s 1001 club of global elite.

The Malthusian imperative is, however, barely disguised. For better or for worse, TFCAs are in direct continuity with the centuries-old process of the enclosure of the commons as industrialisation and capitalism reach deeper into the countryside. Socialist regimes did the same either way. Proletarianisation and enclosure change forever people’s relationship to land, livelihood and freedom. Protest comes the loudest where population is denser in the relatively well-watered and hospitable areas in the east. African politicians, it seems, have reached a point called the ‘recognition of necessity’ in Hardin’s classic essay The Tragedy of the Commons (1968):

Perhaps the simplest summary of this analysis of man’s population problems is this: the commons, if justifiable at all, is justifiable only under conditions of low-population density. As the human population has increased, the commons has had to be abandoned in one aspect after another. First we abandoned the commons in food gathering, enclosing farm land and restricting pastures and hunting and fishing areas. These restrictions are still not complete throughout the world.

The WWF seized Hardin’s words with the enthusiasm of the vindicated. Peter Scott had, a few years before, advocated the necessity of man learning ‘to apply the science of ecology to himself’. There is no room to explore their ideas further here. Suffice to say that they believed that large doses of capital and technocratic planning could go a long way towards resolving the issues. Today it seems that little has changed, except that the rhetoric of people’s participation and indigenous knowledge systems has complicated the equation.

Pushing from what Castells has called the ‘space of flows,’ the global conservation network of elite have collided with local interest in what he calls the ‘space of places’:

What is distinctive of new social structure, the network society, is that most dominant processes, concentrating power, wealth, and information, are organized in the space of flows. Most human experience, and meaning, are still locally based.

This is why, on top of livelihood concerns, the local response is that of environmental justice: ‘not in my backyard’, elephants especially! The quest for identity and fulfilment from the global elite, that money cannot buy, is that of the restless settler. As Mamdani defines settlers, they need not be white, only constantly on the move. They may be in quest of greener pastures for profit making, or perhaps manipulating global capital in an elusive quest for homeland.

There remains much to be said about the TFCA phenomenon looking behind their manifest functions and excavating the latent and often unintended consequences. For instance, the stated aim of demilitarisation could also be understood as remilitarisation with a privately financed paramilitary force not properly controlled by any nation-state. Control over the means of violence and policing of national borders has shifted to an amorphous product of the global space of flows representing a trans-national form of social identity quite distinct from anything ever before. We have tried to expose the roots of the values behind the quickening flow. It may have its source in Europe, but modernisation has made settlers out of some elite Africans who are caught in an ambivalent position regarding development, and project desires onto Africans more closely tied to, and dependent upon the land. In some of the areas concerned at least, local Africans do not associate wildlife with development, but with backwardness. Murombedzi has shown how such efforts ‘re-invent native administration in the post-colonial era’.

As Gilbert Rist has argued, development as ever-lasting growth is the current global faith. While maintaining that this virtual reality is one which builds Magic Worlds rather than cathedrals, his prime example of the proliferation of ‘Disneylands’ does not quite fit. Africa’s assets are worth more than money can buy, but the ‘realm of the commodity’ has been expanded into the margins of the nation-state to include wilderness and wildlife. This may be a necessity of Africa’s global embrace. Yet taking advantage of the absence of built infrastructural products of development should be a process approached with caution, patience, modesty and realism. It is an arena in which the demythologising social scientist has a crucial if unwelcome role to play.
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