

**How to Create a Successful National Park:
The Role of International Donors and the Local Community in Conservation Success**

**Senior Capstone for Completion of Honors in SIS
Spring 2008**

**Lindsey E. Marburger
1 May 2008
Hegemony & US Foreign Policy
Professor Peter Howard**

Rain drips slowly from the treetops as you stand at the edge of a trail staring into the dense foliage, cocking your head to again hear the elusive sound of a rare bird from the canopy, the rustling of the underbrush that marks the movement of a small mammal, or the high-pitched buzzing of ten thousand insects in concert. Where are you? In a dream? No, not a dream, but a national park—one of hundreds of natural places worldwide that have been officially defined as such. But what is a national park, how did those in the semi-periphery and periphery countries come into existence, how are they funded, and what are the conditions necessary for them to be successful?

This paper will look at national park creation in the semi-periphery using the lens of constructivist hegemony as core state actors seek to bring semi-peripheral states further into the international order through the funding and development of national parks. After laying out the hegemonic theory of why core states fund and develop national parks, the national park model itself will be explored by looking at the history and development of national parks. In modern park implementation in the semi-periphery, success will be explored using the notion of the local community as the veto player, upon which park success ultimately depend. This idea will be explored by looking at three national parks in Indonesia: Komodo, Kerinci Seblat, and Tanjung Puting. By analyzing the management and development policies, conservation achievements, community economic and political relationships, and specific international donor-led projects, the paper will analyze the successes and failures of each park. The paper will conclude by first, relating the case of Indonesia to the broader international context. Second, a set of recommendations aimed at core-based donors will be put forth on how to develop successful national parks in the semi-periphery

Research Hypothesis

This paper proposes that the success of national parks in semi-periphery or barrier states is dependent upon the involvement of the local population in the process of creating, placing, and setting governance rules and management practices of the park. This need for local support is expected to be particularly relevant and pronounced where the local population is directly reliant at least in part upon the park's natural resources for their livelihood or survival¹. As the goal of the national park under the current definition is to promote conservation, without regards to the local population's integration or economic benefit, park planners and funding agencies generally fail to account for the necessity of local involvement—often to the detriment of the park's conservation goals. Noting the conservation goal of the park as well as the necessity of local inclusion and positive economic impact upon the local community, park success will herein be defined according the three factors: conservation, level of inclusion of the local population in the park's management and protection, and economic impact of the park on the local population². Moreover, conservation is in many cases directly related to, and even dependent upon, the latter two factors and so even conservation that has been highly successful is in many cases unstable when the latter two are unmet.

¹ This hypothesis is based on the fact that that subsistence-level communities are economically poor and therefore less able to weather exogenous shocks such as a growing population, a natural disaster, or a drought. With little in terms of savings and few resources, the community is more likely to use park resources as a means of survival, especially in situations where oversight is lax and there is little perceived benefit flowing from the park. The logic behind this economic argument essentially states that as a regulatory problem, park success depends upon incentive-based regulations at the park level. The author agrees that this form of regulation is essential to park success, but argues that economic incentives alone will not create a truly successful park as exogenous shocks may still drive the population to park resource exploitation. The parks also need ideological legitimacy within the population. Anup Shah's logic statement is the inspiration for the author's arguments about the relationship between parks and the economic well being and motivations of the local community. For reference, Shahs logic statement has been included as Appendix A.

Shah, Anup. *The Economics of Third World National Parks: Issues of Tourism and Environmental Management*. Edward Elgar Publishing Company (Brookfield, VE: 1995): 9-14.

² For definitions of conservation, local population inclusion, and economic impact as applied herein see Appendix B.

Modern Hegemony

This paper will approach the issue of national parks and park building as a method of disseminating international ideology through the lens of constructivist hegemony. This particular lens has been chosen due to its ability to explain the importance of ideology in gaining legitimacy and subsequent cooperation from multiple parties, especially in situations where stakeholders have differing and, in fact, opposing interests.

At the end of the Second World War the Allied Powers had achieved victory, yet the populations and economies of the European Allies had been devastated and they were incapable of economic or political leadership on a grand scale. With this power vacancy in Europe, economic and political rebuilding was largely controlled by the United States, as it was the only victorious power to escape the war with its economy in-tact and, in fact stronger than when it entered the war. Moreover, the United States possessed the advantage of being a non-European third party without an extensive empire, rendering American control more palatable to their European counterparts and former enemies. Working in cooperation with the Europeans, the US set out to build a new liberal world order based on free market capitalist economics, democratic nations, and mutually assured security³. The ideology underpinning this order was based on the national political ideology of United States itself: pluralistic, transparent, and open for participation and input from a multitude of stakeholders⁴.

The United States held a dominant power position during the post-World War II period and was therefore the instrumental power in creating the new international order. Their ability to create this order was based not on raw coercive power, but on other nations' need for the stability, security, economic growth, and forward-thinking ideology that only the United States

³ Ikenberry, G. John. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ: 2001): 211.

⁴ Ibid, 211-214.

could provide at this time⁵. Since the end of European reconstruction in the 1950s, maintenance of American hegemony has been based on international acceptance of the “dominant ideology” created by America and its allies⁶ as well as on the demonstrated willingness of America to abide by its touted liberal relations and practices⁷. In abiding by and encouraging others to adapt to the international order, the United States garners legitimacy for its hegemon status.

The model of hegemony herein used is based on that of Robert Latham, wherein the hegemon is not a hegemon simply because it has the world’s largest military or economy, but is the hegemon because it acts as an agent of the hegemony or, as defined here, the dominant international order⁸. Thus, in order for the hegemon to retain its power it must be able to “shape practices and ideas in the international realm” which it accomplishes through maintaining a measure of control or influence over its “institutions, norms, material resources”⁹. This can be done through a variety of means, including those of a military, economic, cultural and political persuasion. In the case of creating national parks, the hegemon and its allies use economic funds, political pressure, and the introduction of international norms and practices to perpetuate and extend the current hegemonic order. But no matter the means, the goal is always to maintain legitimacy.

Under a hegemonic system requiring ideological legitimacy a hegemon does not act through dominance (absolute control over other states) alone. Rather, it acts through a combination of coercion and cooperation, and other states in the order have the capacity to

⁵ Ruggie, John Gerald. “International Regimes, Transactions and Change”. *International Organization*, 36(2), Spring 1982: 379-415.

⁶ Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Eds. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. International Publishers (New York: 1971).

⁷ Latham, Robert. *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order*. Columbia University Press (New York: 1997): 60.

⁸ Ibid, 62.

⁹ Ibid, 62.

choose or be coerced into acting in a particular fashion according to their own interests or the interests of the order; the hegemon is therefore responsible for prompting or providing the coercive means to convince states to act in coordination with the ideology and goals of international order. For example, in order to bring another nation into the liberal economic order, the US as the hegemon can provide financial incentives for other countries to open their markets to international trade. Simultaneously, it can use its coercive power to either unilaterally raise tariffs against or to use its plurality vote in the World Trade Organization (WTO) to punish a country that fails to open its market as the United States wishes.

Many realist and hegemonic stability theorists treat hegemony as an entity that a state either has in its totality or does not have at all¹⁰. Thus, the hegemon must be dominant in all areas and all states must conform to the liberal ideology. This approach, however, directly contradicts the idea that hegemony is maintained through the hegemon's willingness to itself act in accordance with the international order, thereby maintaining its legitimacy. And as the current order is a liberal order, based on an ideology of openness, plurality, and transparency, there are many stakeholders influencing decisions both at the international level and at the domestic level where the United States makes its international policies. Under the democratic system, policy creation requires constant negotiation between conflicting interests; these compromises all consider the differing ideologies and goals of multiple stakeholders in their formation. And when individual policies, themselves an amalgamation of interests, coalesce to create broader international policy, this policy reflects many interests, not all of which perfectly align with the

¹⁰ Prominent realist scholars include Barry Posen and Robert Giplin, whose positions can be found in their the following articles:

Posen, Barry. "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of US Hegemony". *International Security* 28(1). Summer 2003.

Giplin, Robert. "The Theory of Hegemonic War". *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8(4). Spring 1988. pp. 591-613.

liberal international order¹¹. This disunity at the domestic level creates a situation where the policies of the hegemon (and in fact all states in the order) unevenly adhere to the ideology of the international liberal order.

From this assumption one can conclude that the individual international policies of the hegemon fall on a continuum of adherence to the international order, from perfectly fitting its ideals to contradicting its ideals. And, as has already been noted, legitimacy is based upon the hegemon adhering to the norms and ideology of the international order in its own practices. Thus, the legitimacy of the hegemon in a given area also falls on a continuum from very strong to very weak based in large part on its demonstrated adherence to the international ideology. This allows the hegemon to retain high levels of legitimacy in one area, in international trade policy for example, low levels of legitimacy in another area, environmental issues for example, and moderate legitimacy in a third area.

This approach to hegemony is a marked departure from the traditional realist notion, which states that hegemonic power is based solely on military power¹². In the realist notion of power, hegemony cannot influence others through any means other than military coercion and

¹¹ The assumption that many stakeholders within a system have the capacity to influence policy and ideology is strictly at odds with non-constructivist hegemony. Though Gramscian hegemony believes that ideology influences states, this Marxist-based ideology is defined as the “domination” and “intellectual and moral leadership” of the ruling class over others within a society; in this lens, the purpose of hegemony is to coerce all members of the society into acquiescing to the dominant class’ ideals, but the theory leaves no room for compromise or for situations where multiple conflicting domestic ideologies influence state policy (Gramsci, 57) (Augelli and Murphy, 128) (Murphy 26-28). Moreover, the Gramscian notion of the hegemonic state and its order being a “dialectical unity” denies the potential for the hegemon’s uneven adherence to the international order’s ideology (Murphy 27) (Forgacs 424).

Augelli, Enrico and Craig Murphy. “Gramsci and International Relations”. *Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, MA: 1993).

Forgacs, David. *An Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings, 1916-1935*. Lawrence & Wishart (London: 1988).

Gramsci.

Murphy, Craig. *Global Institutions, Marginalization, and Development*. Routledge (New York: 2005).

¹² See: Wohlforth, William C. “The Stability of a Unipolar World”. *International Affairs*, 24(1), Summer 1999: 5-41. Or See: Posen, 5-46.

the theory denies the notion of exerting meaningful hegemonic influence through ideology and norm building.

Moreover, unlike the liberal view of the hegemony, this approach does not assume hegemony based solely on economic preponderance of the state¹³. Rather, in the model applied herein, one state need not have hugely greater economic power than all others so long as the ideological norms of the international institutions and regulatory frameworks the state initially set up remain in place. The dependence on the ideology of the system allows for the current situation in national park funding wherein the United States, other world leaders, international organizations, and NGOs independently implement national parks projects. Their doing so actually strengthens the international order as adherence to and practices based upon the single hegemonic order reinforce its power structure and the legitimacy of its dominance.

The Modern National Park

In the current international order aid money is sent from the core, economically successful countries to lesser-developed nations, which form the so-called periphery and semi-periphery. Though the vast majority of this aid goes toward infrastructure and economic restructuring projects, donors designate portion of this aid to create and improve the management and implementation of national parks. The money and technical aid for parks are distributed through a variety of bodies, including state governments, especially the United States and Western European nations, international organizations such as the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) and World Bank, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as the

¹³ The notion of economic predominance as the necessary factor for the acquisition of hegemony is found in the arguments of many liberal authors. While some contend that maintenance of economic dominance is necessary (Lake), others such as note that institutionalization of economic practices and norms may allow for a continuation of hegemony beyond the point where economic dominance declines.

Nye, Joseph S. "Soft Power and American Foreign Policy", *Political Science Quarterly*, 119(2), 2004: 255-270.
 Lake, David A. "Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy", *International Studies Quarterly*, 37(4), December 1993: 459-189.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the Nature Conservancy (TNC) and Conservation International (CI).

While each national park is inherently different in its creation, policies, and management, the national park model is comprised of certain component parts or attributes. Each park will contain some, but likely not all of these component parts, allowing the observer to see a family-type resemblance when looking at a group of parks that will be less obvious when only comparing two parks¹⁴. In other words, looking at the component parts of a national park will not yield one commonality between all the parks, but a series of similarities and relationships between the parts¹⁵. This set of possible park components is based on the model envisioned by the American creators of the first national parks and the components closely align to the international order America would soon create, with its notions of public goods, transparency, plurality, capitalist economic growth, economic integration, and openness.

Looking closer at the components that make up the park model, one notices that the recommendations and requirements extend beyond the expected biological conservation and barrier zones measures. Though these components are obviously important aspects of a park, the recommended components transcend simple conservation to include the ideology upon which the park and conservation itself are based. And this ideology, in turn, reflects both the norms of the park planners and implementers and those of the American-created international order. While it

¹⁴ The concept of the family of characteristics was theorized by Ludwig Wittgenstein in his notion of “language games”. Through this notion Wittgenstein contends that there is no one component part or set of component parts common between all language games (in this case we will substitute national parks for language games). Instead, when considered as a group, these individual parks possess “family resemblance” wherein “if you look at them you will not see something that is common to all, but similarities, relationship, and a whole series of them at that”. Only when considered in aggregate does the group obviously fit together under the name “national park”. Applying language games to national parks reveals that though the official definitions denote certain specific requirements for a park, in reality there exists such a great deal of variation among parks’ physical appearances, method and rationale for creation, funding, uses, management, etc. that only by looking at many components of many parks can the commonalities that make each park a national park be observed.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Tr. G.E.M. Abscombe. The Macmillan Company (New York: 1953): 31.

¹⁵ Ibid, 31-35.

would be impractical to list all possible components of a national park, several components form the fundamental basis of the national park. First, each park was created and continues to be managed by a collective of stakeholders, whose primary responsibility lies in protecting and controlling access to the natural and/or cultural resources and value of the park, limiting use to those activities that do not detract from the value of and future usefulness of the park¹⁶.

Additionally, national parks have multiple uses, including recreation, aesthetic enjoyment, and research activities, and often serve to preserve a specific flagship species, rare ecosystem, or unique cultural relic. Looking at fundamental management components, the multiple stakeholders are accountable for their management and development decisions, must make decisions in a transparent manner, and open the park to some degree of capitalist business. Though not all parks have all of these components, they form the basic model of what a successful national park should look like.

In analyzing why governments and other bodies in the international order choose parks as a development mechanism, several factors appear to contribute. Parks obviously form an important biodiversity cache and are in some cases globally important in reducing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas levels, providing biological resources that may be used in future medical discoveries, and providing a multitude of other “ecosystem services”¹⁷.

However, the value of biodiversity varies greatly across ecosystems and while biodiversity value may account for the desire of the US to set up and fund parks in some particular cases, it does not account for park creation in ecosystems with low value and little endemism.

Desire to glorify and preserve wild nature also explains particular cases of park building both in the US and internationally; this ideology of nature’s innate importance accounts for cases

¹⁶ Shah, 2.

¹⁷ Ehlich, Paul R. “The Loss of Biodiversity: Causes and Consequences”. *Biodiversity*. Eds. E.O. Wilson and Francis M. Peter. National Academy of Press (Washington DC: 1988): 21-27.

where funds are given for the purpose of buying and conserving the land itself, saving it from future development¹⁸. However, the sole goal of conserving wild nature does not account for all of the funds given toward bettering park management, education, and outreach.

The primary reason, rather, for funding national parks in developing countries lies in the fact that national parks are seen as a way of bringing underdeveloped states further into the norms of the international order, namely open decision-making, pluralism, transparency, and an open market. By establishing national parks imbued with a set of specific norms that are considered desirable for the international community, the park acts as both practice for the country in conforming to those norms and as a model of what is expected of that country should it wish to further integrate into the international order. An example of the value-based norm taught by parks is the principle of the public good wherein one individual or collective cannot use the public good, because private use will degrade its innate usefulness for the future.

Due to the nature of the norm-teaching ideology behind national park projects, this mechanism is seen to be a particularly effective project to implement in so-called barrier or semi-periphery states¹⁹. For the purposes of this paper, the semi-periphery or barrier countries

¹⁸ Cooper, Marilyn. "Environmental Rhetoric in the Age of Hegemonic Politics: Earth First! and the Nature Conservancy". *Green Culture*. Eds. Carl G. Herndl and Stuart C. Brown. The University of Wisconsin Press (Madison, WI: 1996).

¹⁹ In his "World Systems Theory, Immanuel Wallerstein presents the role of the semi-periphery as being one of the link between the core and the periphery. The nations in the semi-periphery are important trading partners for core and periphery countries, and they exhibit economies with a mix of primary source and manufactured goods. As such, semi-periphery nations are important allies to the core countries and it is the goal of these core countries to bring the semi-periphery politically and economically further into the international order. Barnett views these nations (which he terms the "barrier" states) through a security lens, where he contends that the key to future security is to support the barrier countries with the eventual view of reducing "the Gap"—the numerous countries that have not benefited from modernization and globalization. Under this model, barrier countries are key allies that should be supported through generous economic investment and aid packages; in return, the countries will grow politically and economically; they will in turn help to stabilize their regions and be more securely tied into the international order. For measurement purposes, since states are constantly in fluctuation relative to other states, the states that will be included under the barrier category in this paper are those ranking between 50 and 100 on the UN Development Programme's 2007-2008 Human Development Index (HDI) and that are listed as barrier states in Barnett's book *The Pentagon's New Map*. This dual measurement attempts to create a list of moderately economically successful and politically or militarily strategic states. Their strategic importance indicates a strong likelihood that the state will receive substantial social and institutional building aid from the core countries. In addition their moderate economic income increases the chances that the country has a functioning civil service to

comprise those American-allied countries seen to be regional economic or political leaders, but who are not a part of the core, economically and politically powerful nations of Western Europe, America, and Japan. Examples of such countries would include the Asian Tigers in East Asia, India, Eastern Europe, Brazil, Argentina, and South Africa.

Assuming that the creating and funding organizations or personnel base all national parks worldwide off the same basic set of components, one would expect parks worldwide to be nearly identical and to be similarly successful. Yet this is not the case. In order to understand this observation, one must determine what factor accounts for the wide variety of park characteristics and success rates, which range from highly successful to absolute failure. Success depends both upon the policies and implementation of the park. The more the international implementing body involves multiple stakeholders and seeks legitimacy from all groups rather than simply acquiring enough legitimacy from the national government to get the legislation passed, the more successful the parks will be. By acting in a manner fitting the previously discussed norms of the international order the implementing body (be it governmental, super-governmental, or non-governmental) will garner greater international legitimacy and with it, more funds and more harmonious stakeholder relations. But money and willing international stakeholders alone do not create a successful national park. Parks worldwide show that even parks with high levels of

manage aid dollars and that the government is stable enough to make long term investment a viable option (regardless of the extent to which foreign investment or aid is actually taking place). This assumption is based on the rationale that the vast majority of failed states and warring states experience a drop in GDP and human welfare that will either keep them out of the moderate category of the HDI. Based on a comparison of the two country lists, the possible countries to include in this analysis are Mexico, Brazil, South Africa, Morocco, Algeria, Greece, Turkey, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia. To this list I have added the relevant former Russian Republic states, particularly Bulgaria, as international funding agencies have heavily targeted these countries since the early 1990s in an attempt to bring the countries closer to capitalism and the western political and economic order.

So, Alvin Y. *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-System Theories* (178). Sage Publications (Newberry Park, CA: 1990): 181

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "World-System Analysis". *Social Theory Today*. Eds. Anthony Giddons and Jonathan H. Turner. Stanford University Press (Stanford, CA: 1987): 309-324.

UNDP. "Human Development Index rankings". UN Development Report. 2008. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

Barnett, Thomas P. *The Pentagon's New Map: War and Peace in the Twenty-First Century*. G.P. Putnam's Sons (New York: 2004).

funding can fail in their conservation goals. So since international legitimacy makes park management easier, but is not enough to create a successful national park, the next logical factor to look at is legitimacy among the local population.

This paper proposes that the local community plays the role of the “veto player” in the success of a national park. While the local community in semi-periphery states is not necessary to the creation of the national park—local communities rarely possess the political or economic power to influence state legislation and they lack the scientific expertise to influence park placement or conservation policy—they are critical to its maintenance. While the notion of the “veto player” is defined by George Tsebelis as “an individual or collective actor whose agreement...is required for a change in policy”, in this context the veto power of the local communities lies in the community’s ability to resist the park after its creation²⁰. Their resistance thwarts the practices that maintain the superior or hegemonic roles of park creators, donors, and developers.

Normal methods of resisting a park are both ideological and behavioral, and they are often informal, below the direct notice of authorities and focused on immediate gains for the resisting party²¹. Resistance can be particularly effective where the method of resisting is based on a habit or cultural practice that was acceptable prior to the parks’ implementation (such as forest exploitation) due to the high potential for popular complicity on the part of all or most community members²². When this non-supportive subculture of complicity exists throughout the whole community, a social movement dedicated to resistance may become established, as the

²⁰ Tsebelis, George. *Veto Players. How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton University Press. (Princeton: 2002): 301.

²¹ James Scott discussed the notion of ideological and behavioral resistance among peasants and peasant communities in his book *Weapons of the Weak*.

Scott, James. *Weapons of the Weak*. Yale University Press (New Haven, CT: 1985): 33.

²² Ibid, 35.

community-wide nature of it ensures that the risk to each individual community member diminishes. Large-scale resistance can be thus sustained and continue uninterrupted unless some form of external monitoring or enforcement mechanism is in place. Examples of local community resistance include: continuing to make incursions into the park to obtain resources, overexploitation of the buffer zone²³, refusal to allow park-related development in and around the community, hampering access to the national park, and otherwise discouraging park tourism.

As Tsebelis and Helms note, the number of veto players²⁴ often does not matter as much as the position of the veto players²⁵. In all situations, the favorable positioning of the local community refers to a literal geographic positioning; as the closest population to the park, this population can influence park access, conservation, and security with relative ease. Favorable positioning in impacting national park success may be further improved where the local community has higher levels of political or economic power. Greater power in a multiple-stakeholder decision-making process renders the community more capable of impacting the park creation process rather than merely the outcome.

²³ The buffer zone comprises the area outside of a national park or nature reserve in which limited economic activity may occur, including grazing and non-timber floral removal. However, the buffer zone frequently falls victim to overexploitation as the area is public and generally poorly monitored. As an open access area, the a poorly managed buffer zone will suffer from reciprocal externality as too many economic players (i.e. members of the local community) attempt to undertake the same economic activity within the zone, degrading it for future use. Though all suffer in the long run as resource availability diminishes, sustainable use policies are often unpopular as they require all parties giving up a share of their short-term economic opportunity and as a result require stringent enforcement. Overexploitation of the buffer exposes the park itself to the fringe effect, wherein the quality and quantity of biodiversity on the edge of the park suffers from exposure to a degraded environment. Shah, 4-7.

²⁴ In this case the number of veto players refers to the number of different local communities surrounding the park. Following the Tsebelis veto model, each community will be modeled as one veto player. While it must be recognized that one community may contain numerous individuals with very different interests, the scale of the case studies in this paper necessitate simplifying the communities. Scott, 301.

²⁵ Tsebelis.

Helms, Ludger. "Working Paper No. 03.2 Executive Leadership and the Role of "Veto Players" in the United States and Germany". 2003. London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

It is important to note that community buy-in is especially crucial in situations where the local community is largely rural and has previously depended on the park territory's resources for either basic subsistence or as a supplement to their diet or income.

The Creation of the National Park Model

To fully understand the nature of the national park model, one must look at its origins. The American National Park Service (NPS) was created in 1916 with the goal of preserving some of America's vast natural heritage from development. Though protected areas in the United States had been in existence since the 1830s and national parks had existed since the 1870s, this piece of congressional legislation signaled both the increased importance of preserving nature and the power of the environmental lobby, which included outdoorsmen, hunters, elites, and women's societies. Though the young country lacked many of the art, music, and literature achievements of the European nations, it surpassed them in wild, open spaces; thus, on one level national park creation and consolidation was motivated by nationalist zeal and Romantic ideals of nature²⁶. The parks would be, as stated by George Catlin, "America's contribution to humanity"²⁷.

The park system also sprung from an understanding of the importance of nature and natural heritage for their own sake and a desire of natural lovers (such as the Sierra Club) to preserve these resources for the future. This desire is reflected in the park's founding purpose and rules, which state that "every activity of the service is subordinate to the duties imposed upon it to faithfully preserve the parks for posterity in essentially their natural state"²⁸. Thus it is

²⁶ The Romantic Movement in America (c. 1850-1920), most-often propagated by transcendentalists such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, marked a new relationship between man and nature. No longer was nature subservient to man as man created and transformed the wild frontier into the civilized "city on a hill" envisioned by Puritan leader John Winthrop. This new relationship viewed nature as God's perfect and pristine work and as such celebrated its wild, untouched state.

²⁷ Nash, Roderick. "The American Invention of National Parks". *American Quarterly* 22(3). 1970: 730.

²⁸ Albright, Horace M. and Robert Cahn. *The Birth of the National Park Service The Founding Years, 1913-1933*, Howe Protehrs (Salt Lake City, 1985): 69.

the duty of the NPS and its rangers to ensure that the parks are readily available for recreation, education and aesthetic enjoyment, specifically banning all activities and industry that mar the aesthetics or reduce the utility of the park's natural resources for the future²⁹.

Despite the altruistic rhetoric framing national parks, since their birth industry and enterprise have always played an important role in the parks. Indeed, in an early speech to the Montana State Chamber of Commerce, park administrator Horace Albright extolled that “Parks are Good Business”³⁰! From the roads and infrastructure to the tourist services and “gateway communities”, parks have been seen as development projects for an area—often one that is underdeveloped or mired in poverty³¹. The majority of early national parks, in fact, were created with land either donated to the government by wealthy benefactors such as the Rockefellers or gained in land swaps with railroads, mining companies, and other industries³². The growth of NPS coincided almost directly with that of the automobile industry and the increased mobility and expendable income brought by America's status as a world leader in manufacturing and agriculture³³. This industry-park connection was fundamentally based in neoliberal economics, wherein capitalist expansion and enterprise should be encouraged as they form the basis of economic expansion. Even in cases such as a national park, where industrial opportunities are strictly controlled due to legal limits or bans on development within the bounds of the park, park

²⁹ Ulman, H. Lewis. “Chapter 2”, *Green Culture: Environmental Rhetoric in Contemporary America*, eds. Carl G. Herndl and Stuart C. Brown, University of Wisconsin Press (Madison: 1996): 46.

³⁰ Foresta, Ronald A. *America's National Parks and Their Keepers*. Resources for the Future, Inc. (Washington, DC: 1984): 24.

³¹ Sellers, Richard West. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History*. Yale University Press (New Haven, CN: 1997): 8-11.

³² Ibid, 12.

³³ During this period, manufacturing grew as factories increased in size, achieving profits through economies of scale and abundant national resources and immigrant labor. While factory workers earned little (this would not substantially change until the principles of the Fordist bargain took root in the late 1910s), the growing middle class benefited from the economic growth. Not only were wages higher but the cost of urban living also decreased due to improved transport (roads, automobiles, and extensive train networks) allowing rural produce to be cheaply sold in urban centers. The United States also took the role of the world's leading manufacturer from Great Britain.

administrators encouraged extensive park-related enterprise just beyond the park's boundaries (i.e. hotels and condos, souvenir shops, and tour companies).

Though a preference for conservation undoubtedly played a large role in the park system's creation and economics played helped to shape its formation, the question remains: what factors made the formation of the NPS possible and how did those factors impact the ideology of what a national park should be and what role it should play in a society and a nation? Roderick Nash suggests that four variables, collectively unique to America, form the historic and ideological background on which the national park model was founded:

1. America's unique experience with nature placed wilderness as essential to the grand narrative of the American pioneer. Without wilderness to conquer, the American pioneer ideal ceases to exist and national parks and environmental conservations provide a substitute challenge behind which the nation and individual communities can coalesce.
2. The democratic ideals upon which the country and government were founded, especially the ideology of equality, openness, and plurality (as embodied in the legislature and the generally merit-based NPS appointments) created an understanding of government land as a public good and a government obligation to provide this good. Unlike the European model of nature reserves, which could only be used by the elite classes, national parks were to be accessible to almost all citizens for recreation and enjoyment. In short, the key to national park creation was an extensive public domain.
3. The fortunate coincidence of an abundance of undeveloped land and enthusiasm for the notion of wilderness conservation. As destruction of America's wilderness hastened,

the remaining tracts gained value in their growing scarcity. Important to this is the settlement pattern of east to west, allowing a developed country and economy to emerge in the east without destroying the vast swaths of open land in the west.

4. National affluence allowed the government to subsidize national parks and to set aside land for its “non-material values” as its was not needed for subsistence survival by the population.³⁴

Thus the concept of the national park as it is currently conceived and implemented owes its origins to a very specific set of circumstances and ideology. It was created in part as a nation and community-building tool and in part as a result of fortuitous timing, but most importantly the parks reflected the ideals of pluralist decision-making, a strong public domain, and government responsibility for providing services for and subsidizing the public domain.

In desiring that the parks be financially open to the general public and noting in its charter “every opportunity should be afforded the public, wherever possible, to enjoy the national parks in the manner that best satisfied the individual taste”³⁵ and that “education, as well as recreation use of the parks should be encouraged in every practical way,” the NPS established itself firmly in the realm of the public domain and as a provider of public goods³⁶. In this paper, the public domain refers to the goods, services, and ideas that are made available to the general public and which are not privately owned, controlled, or held in any way. While goods, services, and ideas within the domain need not be completely free, their cost must not be beyond that easily affordable to the majority of the community or society concerned. Governments and communities most frequently employ legislation and subsidies to maintain this affordability.

³⁴ Nash, 726-735.

³⁵ Albright and Cahn, 70.

³⁶ Ibid, 71.

The park itself is a public or common good, as its value lies in its service to the community or society at large rather than to a specific group or individual. Upon the creation of the public good, the creators do not necessarily know who will benefit, but acknowledge that its existence will infer some benefit upon society at large. One public good can, in fact, serve many diverse groups within a community; the public good's survival depends upon its legitimacy as the community continually validates its existence through intra-community dialogue. Building support for the public good depends on aligning the good with the values of the relevant community or communities, which can be done either by manipulating community values or perception of the public good³⁷.

By this definition, from the first park, the success and survival of America's national parks was dependent upon the communal agreement that the parks were valuable and they served a useful purpose for a multitude of persons regardless of their individual preferences for park use³⁸. Due to the highly individualistic nature of American society, which seeks to preserve individual rights before common rights, success continues to depend on the acceptance of a broad range of stakeholders and community players. This democratic model of the park requires stakeholder acquiescence and support in both the initial planning and creation phase and in the later maintenance and growth phase. Continual reaffirmation of park legitimacy moreover requires openness in park creation and management and a pluralistic manner of making decisions related to the formation, administration, and policies of the park. And while the park model recognizes plurality and equal opportunities for participation and voice not every stakeholder in

³⁷ This concept of the public good is based upon the communitarian definition, which can be found in the works of Amitai Etzioni.

Etzioni, Amitai. *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society*. Basic Books (New York: 1996).

³⁸ It is important to note that not everyone must legitimize the park, so long as the government has the power and will to relocate or ignore a given population. This was a common practice with regards to Native Americans, whose land was often stolen to create the large western national parks.

the park community need have equal influence. It must be recognized that certain groups and individuals (especially the funding body, the legal body responsible for passing park creation laws, and the local community) possess veto power over a park's creation and continuation; without the support of these groups the park will fail and therefore the goal and ideology associated with the park must maintain a high level of legitimacy within these specific community groups even more so than within the society as a whole.

The National Park Model Develops

Within less than a year of Yellowstone's foundation, industrialized countries such as the British Commonwealth states, Japan, the Netherlands, and Germany began creating national parks in their countries and their colonies. These parks were not the result of individual inspirations, but were all uniformly based on the American model. In fact, many were created after foreign delegations visited American national parks (especially Yellowstone and Yosemite, the early park system's "crown jewels") and they were often run by officials trained in American national parks or by American park rangers. Evidence of the direct application of the American park model lies in the written memos and records of foreign ministers of forestry and resource use, who praise the American parks and state their intention of creating national parks that are likewise modeled on aesthetically-based nature conservation and enjoy the pluralist support of the common man.³⁹

The NPS has grown and changed from its earliest manifestation, but the basic principles and ideology have remained constant. Aside from expansion from one park to the current fifty-eight, the most significant change has been the growth of the environmental movement in the 1960s and the power of environmental lobbies and NGOs on the environmental and national park

³⁹ Albright and Cahn.

polycymaking⁴⁰. Their lobbying has led to an increase conservation goal, with less emphasis on tourist services and access. In recent years, international environmental agreements and a global understanding of the importance of conserving biological diversity have aided in this transition⁴¹. And in reaction to greater conservation pressures, this component of the park now has greater emphasis within not only the American park system, but within worldwide parks. For the model of the national park created in the nineteenth century US continues to be applied throughout the world, with the financial, technical, and training support of leading world governments, intergovernmental or international organizations, and international NGOs.

Modern Park Implementation in Barrier States

While the first wave of park expansion in the core countries was planned and funded at the national level, parks creation in the developing or gap countries and the barrier nations results not just from national or sub-national action but from international funding, planning, and implementation as well. In fact, the initial impetus for national parks often comes from the international community with its ideology glorifying environmental conservation and wilderness. Official international support for national parks throughout the globe began at the 1969 10th General Assembly of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), where the group called for new national parks conforming to a set of criteria⁴². Having

⁴⁰ The modern environmental movement is understood to have begun with the publishing of Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring* in 1962, which exposed the negative impact of the chemical industry on the environment and on human health.

⁴¹ The most important show of international support for biological diversity (biodiversity) lies in international adherence to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Created in 1992 as part of the larger Rio Summit, 168 countries signed the treaty and 190 are party to the convention. Since its creation the CBD Secretariat has overseen hundreds of biodiversity meetings, the creation and implementation of national and regional action plans, scientific monitoring, and biodiversity awareness campaigns. Though the United States signed the treaty and informally follows most of the language, it has not been ratified. Secretariat of the Convention Biological Diversity. "List of Parties". *The Convention*. 2007. <http://www.cbd.int/convention/parties/list.shtml>.

⁴² Gülrz, Sümer. "Effect of Public Opinion on National Park Planning in Turkey: A Case Study". *Environmental Management*, 16(3), 1992: 355.

divided protected areas into seven categories, the IUCN officially designated the national park as a natural area of land and/or sea, designated to:

(a) protect the ecological integrity of one or more ecosystems for present and future generations, (b) exclude exploitation or occupation inimical to the purposes of designation of the area, and (c) provide a foundation for spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational, and visitor opportunities, all of which must be culturally compatible⁴³.

Various countries have adopted this basic framework and adapted it to their specific national preferences, needs, or funding capabilities.

Whether a government, intergovernmental organization, or NGO, funds or founds a national park, the model or guidebook used roughly follows the ideology and norms of the American national park system. In addition to ideology, Conservation International Vice President Bruce Beehler notes that national park creation is also a business transaction. The NGO or core government trades the value of the in situ biodiversity, which has worth in the current international system, for an amount of services, personnel trainings, supplies, or monetary investment that the government or local community values. In this sense, the international funding bodies are “logging without logs”; paying to keep resources intact⁴⁴. The “why wilderness conservation?” explanation that the goods exchange model provides states that individuals will conserve nature in return for a payment that is perceived as having equal or greater value. Under this model, international funding agencies would merely pay communities to not utilize a particular area’s resources. However, as an explanatory tool this model is limited

⁴³ Harmon, David. “The Source and Significance of Values in Protected Areas.” *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible*. Eds. David Harmon and Allen D. Putney. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Lanham, MD: 2003): 14.

⁴⁴ Beehler, Bruce. Interview at Conservation International Office. 13 March 2008.

as it cannot explain why funding bodies choose to institute the specific national park models and fund the particular projects they do; if nature conservation were the only goal, almost all funds would go toward buying and protecting land rather than training and education. However, funding patterns prove this expectation false. While conservation is indeed a primary goal, funding agencies also aim to bring nations closer to the international order and to sustainably develop local communities. These multiple goals are important to keep in mind when analyzing park success and where a particular park fits within the park model family as the following case studies will seek to do.

Case Study Design

In order to test the hypothesis that local involvement in the national park primarily accounts for a park's success or failure, this paper will look at three case studies, each from a different park in Indonesia. Using multiple case studies from one country will control for government interaction with and control over the park, government legitimacy and wealth, trade relations, and relative socioeconomic status of the local population. As such, these differences do not have to be accounted for in studying the differences between the parks.

Indonesia in particular provides an ideal country in which to test this theory for several reasons. On a basic level, Indonesia allows several more variables between parks to be controlled for. While Indonesia has high levels of human and linguistic diversity, being composed of 6,000 inhabited islands, all of the islands have very similar climates and very similar species, being rich in tropical marine and terrestrial biodiversity⁴⁵. Parks are thus expected to have similar problems and physical features. In addition to, and largely as a result of this climate similarity, primary industry on most of the islands looks very similar, consisting

⁴⁵ CIA. "Indonesia." *The World Factbook*. 15 April 2008. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html>.

largely of fishing, forestry, mining, and agriculture or tropical plants such as palm oil and canes⁴⁶. The welfare of Indonesia's population falls within the central range of the UN's Human Development Index (positions 50-100 of 177), indicating an aggregate standard of living above the poverty level. Additionally, this country of over 230 million people has a steadily growing GDP per capita (currently \$3,400), strong growth of 6.1%, and is considered one of the Asian Tigers—economically successful Asian nations⁴⁷. However, the huge public and private debt that led to the 1998 Asia-wide economic crisis remains unresolved in Indonesia and growth is therefore tenuous. These factors are important as they show a population generally living above the poverty line and with good future economic prospect, but the country still lacks the resources to lavishly fund its own non-critical state services, such as national parks. Even more importantly, Indonesia's size (the largest in Southeast Asia), huge population, resource wealth, and key geographical positioning between the Indian Ocean and East Asian states make it the “political and strategic center of gravity for Southeast Asia”⁴⁸. The country has supported the US military presence in the region for many years and is a crucial member of regional organizations such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF). These factors ensure that,

“Indonesia's future is critical to the stability of Southeast Asia and a matter of vital national interest to two U.S. allies, Australia and the Philippines, and to friendly Thailand and Singapore. Positive U.S. relations with a stable Indonesia help Washington manage its position in the region.”⁴⁹

⁴⁶ The obvious exception to this generalization is the capital Jakarta on Java, where the majority of the country's advanced industry and financial sector is located. In addition, the population density is too high for most primary resource-based economic activities to be carried out. However, all of the national parks that will be considered in this paper are located in rural areas (Sumatra, Borneo, and Komodo) and the economic situation of the locals, agricultural and industrial activities, resource dependence, and interactions between the locals and the provincial and national government will be similar across parks.

⁴⁷ CIA.

⁴⁸ Montaperto, Ronald. M. et. al. “Indonesian Democratic Transition: Implications for United States Foreign Policy”. *Strategic Forum* 171, April 2000. <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/sf171/forum171.html>.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

However, despite the support of the U.S. military and relatively good relations, Indonesia democracy has yet to prove itself, with the country electing its first president in 1998 after the twenty-one year rule of President Suharto. This dictator's "presidency" ended in 1998 and due to his economic failures in the Asian Financial Crisis of that year, the transition government had many difficulties. The new government under President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono is built on a loose coalition and has many obstacles to overcome in achieving stability. As a highly decentralized country, with most domestic power lying at the provincial level, considerable disconnect often exists between government policy and local implementation. Moreover, under dictator Suharto Indonesia repeatedly violated human rights conventions in invading the nation of East Timor and committing various purges against the civilian population in attempting to "smoke out" the opposition guerilla troops. Because of its economic and political importance and its history of failing to properly respect democratic governance and human rights, western democracies have considerable incentives to work with Indonesia's leaders and general population to promote the expectations and value-driven obligations of the international order. As part of this promotion, core countries have given Indonesia considerable aid and development funds, including millions of dollars for national park development—much more than is given to most other nations.

Another important factor in the decision to use Indonesia as a case study is Indonesia's signing and ratification of the World Heritage Convention, which shows its willingness to work with international governments and NGOs to preserve and promote its natural and cultural history. Placing a natural site on the short list of sites for World Heritage status requires that the government and a critical stakeholder or stakeholders (in many cases international environmental conservation groups) consider the site to be regionally or globally significant.

Not only does achieving this status mark governmental recognition of a site's importance, it also promotes the site to the international community, making it a more likely target for international attention and funds. As such, World Heritage sites in non-core countries almost universally receive some form of international aid and support and this case holds true for Indonesia, which has used its World Heritage status to promote tourism and international funding of all its national parks.

Moreover, Indonesia is one of the seventeen "Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries" (LMMC). These nations all possess high rates of biodiversity and have agreed to vote together in international forums to protect their biodiversity and to claim full ownership over their natural and biological resources. This group has become an important force within the modern conservation and resource ownership movements as well as within conventions such as the Convention on Biodiversity. This membership indicates that the government of Indonesia has placed a high value on its natural resources. While environmental violations continue to rage throughout Indonesia, especially with regards to deforestation for the timber industry and for tropical monocropping, LMMC status marks the national government's desire to gain greater control over its resources and a willingness to do so by working with environmentalists and foreign governments to manage and properly fund the protection of these resources.

Each case study will begin with a brief history and description of the park and the local community or communities in question. Next, in order to ascertain whether the national park was in fact formed according to the international norms and values of a national park, its policy model, conservation plan, and management characteristics will be studied and the park's fit within the "family" of national parks determined. Next a selection of important and relevant national and international funding sources of each park will be analyzed according to the stated

and achieved goals of each project. As many parks have numerous international donors, the analysis will focus on projects that relate to training, local development initiatives, tourism or economic capacity building of parks, and park planning or management. The rationale for choosing these projects or aid packages lies in that each is focused not solely on the park's biodiversity (i.e. an orangutan breeding program) but also on park policy or on the humans working and living in and around the park. Finally, each park will be analyzed for success in conservation, inclusion of the local population in the park's management and protection, and economic impact of the park on the local population. This analysis will determine the relationship, if any, between conservation success and involvement level of the local population.

Indonesia's National Park Management Structure

The Directorate General of Forest Protection and Nature Conservation in the Ministry of Forestry oversees the thirty-four national parks in Indonesia. Parks and their barrier zones are also protected at the national level; however, there is little enforcement capacity. In fact, while police have the legal right to shoot all loggers in national parks and bugger zones, police often collude with loggers due to poor pay and minimal oversight. Enforcement of protection laws primarily falls to the provincial authorities, who under Indonesia's decentralized constitution possess a great deal of control over how national laws are enforced within their territory. And while the parks are technically managed at the national level, their barrier zones fall into the territory of the provincial authorities and police, who can choose to either comply or to consider other interests above those of the national government. As such, conservation policies and legislation in Indonesia require not just federal approval, but also provincial-level approval in order to even be enacted, much less sustained⁵⁰.

⁵⁰ Werner, Sylvia. *Environmental Knowledge and Resource Management: Sumatra's Kerinci-Seblat National Park*. Dissertation. University of Berlin, (Berlin: 2001): 67-69.



Figure 1: Map of Indonesia showing Sumatra, Borneo/Kalimantan, & Komodo

Komodo National Park, Lesser Sunda Islands

Komodo National Park and World Heritage Site, created in 1980, consists of 173,000 ha of territory, of which 35% of is terrestrial, and an operating budget of just over \$67,000⁵¹.

Consisting of three islands, Komodo, Padar, and Rinca, as well as all water within 1,000m of shore, the park's best-known draw is the Komodo monitor lizard, better known as the "Komodo dragon", though the reefs also draw many divers and snorkelers. The parks conservation legislation permits no resource extraction from either terrestrial or marine areas, though access to the marine resources has proven harder to restrict due to the economic realities and traditions of the native population. The park has two primary gateways: the cities of Labuan Bajo and Sapo

⁵¹ Sumardja, Effendy A. *Public Sector Support and Management of Protected Areas in Indonesia*. Vth World Parks Congress: Sustainable Development Stream, Institutions Session, Panel A: Government structures for financing protected area systems. (Durban, South Africa: September 2003): 7.

as well as one village located within the park, the village of Komodo located just inside the entrance of the park on Komodo Island.

Looking at the economics of the three islands, fishing and agriculture form the primary backbone of the economy, with tourism playing a distant third role⁵². In aggregate, tourism provided \$1.25 million in revenue to the islands from 1995 to 2000 as well as approximately 600 partial or full jobs⁵³. Of these jobs, the vast majority require few specialized skills or allow career advancement, but rather consist of providing basic tourist services such as waiting tables at restaurants or taking tickets at the entrance to the park.

The park itself receives over 30,000 tourists each year, of whom 93% are foreign and two-thirds come as part of a cruise tour, spending little time or money in the gateway cities. Of the tourist money spent, the majority goes toward the transport industry, especially in the form of boat charters and cruises. Yet bookings in this lucrative sector are made almost exclusively in Bali, leading to a leakage rate of 90%⁵⁴. While for independent tourists leakage rates stand at greater than 50%, the prevalence of cruise-based tourism results in an extraordinary aggregate leakage rate of 80% for Komodo National Park tourism⁵⁵. In practical terms, this leakage rate means that while the local community receives \$1.25 million, the total spent is nearer to \$6.25 million and that the local community benefits much less from tourism than it has the potential to do.

As the largest city in the park vicinity, Labuan Bajo has a ferry terminal, harbor, government offices, and fair amount of infrastructure, including a landing strip. As such, most

⁵² Walpole, Matthew J. and Harold J. Goodwin. "Local Economic Impacts of Dragon Tourism in Indonesia." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 2000: 563.

⁵³ Goodwin, Harold. "Local Community Involvement in Tourism around National Parks: Opportunities and Constraints." *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(3&4), 2002: 342.

⁵⁴ Leakage rates refer to the percentage of money spent in Komodo or on a trip to Komodo that does not reach the local community, but which goes to either another region of Indonesia (in this case, Bali is an important end-destination) or a foreign country.

⁵⁵ Walpole & Goodwin, "Dragon Tourism", 570.

tourists spend their time in Labuan Bajo and most cruise ships land in this harbor. Tourism provides 420 jobs that are at least partially dependent upon tourism, including 256 full time jobs of a population of over 20,000⁵⁶. Each year, 11,000 tourists spend an average of three nights in this city; however, in Labuan Bajo, only 28% of restaurants and hotels are locally owned and of the hotels, almost all of the Class A and B hotels (high-end, above ~\$20/night) have non-local owners⁵⁷. Moreover, Labuan Bajo has begun to suffer from non-local land speculation, with foreigners and Balinisiens buying up most of the waterfront properties, leaving many locals worried about their further disenfranchisement from the benefits of tourism. In fact, while the vast majority of residents would like to see more tourism and abstractly think it may benefit their community, only 25% of the community believes that tourism has benefited their family in any way, be the benefits in the form of actual economic advancement or merely in the form of useful infrastructure improvements⁵⁸.

Sapo, the second gateway, has fewer and less expensive tourist facilities than Labuan Bajo, providing space for only 1,100 overnight visitors each year, though 11,500 pass through the village on their way between their and the park. In Sapo, locals own 94% of shops and 46% of restaurants, but many tourists never see these locally owned establishments due to inclusive enclaves. Inclusive enclaves exist as a relatively new phenomenon on Labuan Bajo as well, but have become especially prominent in Sapo, where cruise companies will contract with an enclave-like resort to create packages that involve the cruise, the park, reef diving, a serene surrounding, and no interaction with the local community. Despite the fact that a majority of visitors to Indonesia report visiting for “cultural reasons”, this form of tourism specifically

⁵⁶ Ibid, 561.

⁵⁷ Ibid, 563-569.

⁵⁸ Goodwin, “Local Community Involvement”, 542.

denies interaction between visitors and the community. And with the absence of interaction comes an absence of benefits to the Komodo National Park vicinity population.

The village of Komodo within Komodo National Park benefits the least and suffers the most as a result of the park. The creation of the national park in 1980 put the population into a Catch-22 situation: they cannot extract necessary resources from their environment, yet they do not benefit from park tourism in any substantive way save for the 2-3 people whose incomes partially derive from tourism. Indonesia's national park laws (numbering thirty-three, including national and regional laws) prohibit extracting, harvesting, or damaging any living species or mineral resource within the park⁵⁹. However, the people of Komodo once depended almost entirely upon use of their natural habitat in what is now the park and as the waters off Komodo have been designated a marine protected area (MPA), legal resource exploitation of reef fish and invertebrates is also highly limited. The resource-use ban also prevents many from practicing traditional crafts that could be sold to visitors as women cannot collect bark and fronds to weave baskets and similar items. Of the 5,000 visitors that annually visit this area of the park, none stay overnight due to a lack of facilities and most come solely to spend time in the visitor's center. And while the tourist entrance fee or "gate price" fails to cover both the in-park tourist facilities cost and the operational costs, government funding allows a portion of gate receipts to go toward compensating the local community⁶⁰. Most do not go to Komodo, but to villages outside of the park, creating a situation wherein 99% of all locally-held park and tourist revenue goes outside of the park, with Komodo receiving a mere 1% of all revenue⁶¹. A 2006 conservation

⁵⁹ Hoyt, Erich. "Case Study: A place for cetaceans in Komodo National Park, proposed for expansion." *Marine Protected Areas for Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoise: A worldwide handbook for cetacean habitat conservation*. Earthscan (London: 2005).

⁶⁰ Vaughan, David. "Tourism and Biodiversity: A Convergence of Interests?" *International Affairs*, 76(2), April 2000: 289.

⁶¹ Goodwin, "Local Community Involvement," 346.

contribution measure aims to make tourists pay for conservation by requiring that they pay this fee in addition to their entrance fee⁶². However, while some of the money is earmarked for enhancing local community tourism initiatives, the impact of this new fee on the community has not yet been studied.

In looking to the park's conservation goals, the park suffers from severe coral bleaching, over fishing, blast fishing, over-harvest of invertebrate marine resources, and growing pollution due to tourism, and especially watercraft. Little has been done to limit the impact of tourism on the marine environment, despite the British Department for International Development creating an action plan to do so in 1997 and tourism continues to degrade the quality and quantity of marine life⁶³. Prior to 2000, blast fishing had also severely damaged the reefs within the park, but The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) marine protection program has helped to reduce blast fishing by teaching local communities alternative means of fishing⁶⁴. While blast fishing still occurs in limited amounts within the park, blasting has declined by 90% and the certain reefs have begun to recover⁶⁵. Meanwhile, overfishing continues to result in declining fish populations, and in many cases the focus on conserving the park's marine resources has led to greater exploitation of non-park marine resources. The local population moves further afield or intensifies use outside of the park, often using less-destructive methods, but not necessarily actually reducing marine resource consumption⁶⁶. Komodo dragon conservation has proven

⁶² PT Putri Naga Komodo. "Contributing to the Future of Komodo National Park". Komodo Collaborative Management Initiative, 2006. <http://www.komodonationalpark.org/>.

⁶³ Goodwin, Harold J., et. al. *Tourism, Conservation & Sustainable Development: Volume III, Komodo National Park, Indonesia*. Unpublished, 1997.

⁶⁴ A project between TNC and quite successful project, blast fishing within the park is estimated to have declined by 90% from its high point by setting up floating ranger stations and providing alternative fishing means. The Nature Conservancy. *Komodo National Park: Effective Marine Protected Area Management*. The Nature Conservancy Southeast Asia Center for Marine Studies. http://www.nature.org/wherewework/asiapacific/indonesia/files/komodo_summary.pdf

⁶⁵ Ibid, 1.

⁶⁶ Some biologists contend that this strategy is preferable to moderate-high levels of fishing everywhere as fish will still grow large within the park, then move outside the park, creating a larger, healthier overall population. While

highly effective and poaching minimal, though this may be as a result of the fact that locals have traditionally avoided the monitor lizards due to their highly toxic bite.

There have been several community-based initiatives by international NGOs in the past eight years. However, most work has been in the form of management studies, which in many cases overlap and contain no legal implementation requirements. For example, TNC has created a twenty-five year management plan for the park's conservation, which includes a section on how to educate the local community and involve the community in park conservation efforts such as beach cleanups.

Meanwhile, the Department for International Development, Great Britain completed a three-year impact study on tourism and the local community, but brought in outside experts to perform the study and has produced no community-tourism engagement projects based on the results of their study. The project did, fortunately, hire ecotourism expert Harold Goodwin to carry out the study, but while it provided a comprehensive overview of tourism patterns, local community involvement in the tourist sector, and tourism and the environment, it made only limited recommendations that neither the Indonesian government nor any international body were under obligation to carry out⁶⁷.

A third management-oriented project undertaken by international bodies was the 2001 Komodo-Galapagos park exchange between the management teams of both parks, which was funded by TNC, USAID, and the Alex C. Walker Education and Charitable Trust⁶⁸. The project funded reciprocal visits between park managers, which served the stated purpose of bringing together senior park staff to discuss the similar problems and possible solutions to conservation

this argument may prove biologically sound and is certainly preferable to high exploitation everywhere, for populations highly dependent upon bottom-dwelling marine invertebrates (i.e. shellfish or anemone) intensification may lead to declining protein availability and thus population welfare over time.

⁶⁷ Goodwin, Harold J., et. al. *Tourism, Conservation, and Sustainable Development*.

⁶⁸“Tourism Lessons: Komodo National Park (Indonesian) & Galapagos Marine Reserve (Ecuador)”. *MPA News*, 7(2), August 2005: 2.

threats encountered within each park. Strengthening international collaborations and problem solving obviously benefits the park and information sharing has the potential to assist in conservation measures at Komodo, but the drawbacks to this project were: a) the focus on a one-time exchange, and b) the lack of local involvement.

Several months ago, the Galapagos hosted a discussion between park officials at Galapagos, the local community, and international parks and ecotourism experts on creating a school to train Galapagos Islanders in park and tourism-oriented services⁶⁹. The school will include programs to teach community members skills such as how to run restaurants or lodges, language training, how to use ecological knowledge to give tours, and will help graduates get micro loans to start or upgrade their own businesses. This project will both reduce the Galapagos' leakage rate and build local capacity to control the tourism industry, contribute toward conservation, and reduce natural resource dependence. However, due to the one-time nature of the TNC-USAID-Walker grant, Komodo's staff did not participate in the discussion either in person or remotely and therefore has not been involved in this new initiative and will not benefit from the lessons learned by the school, thereby losing out on what could have been of substantial benefit to park leaders.

Regarding the second criticism, the lack of community involvement, one comes upon a common problem with internationally funded projects: the level at which future plans are created. By creating plans with foreign experts, park officials, and national biodiversity specialists, one involves the same type of stakeholders who were involved in the initial creation process and the same stakeholders whose work the local community critiques. While the grant aims to benefit the local community through better tourism management, it still works via a top-down procedure wherein the local community is told how the park and park tourism will impact

⁶⁹ Morris, Douglas. Phone Interview. 22 April 2008.

them and how they should be involved rather than having a say in how the park and park tourism operate. Funding projects with this structure fails to resolve the legitimacy crisis that parks such as Komodo face and as the local community continues to play the role of the veto player in the park, this legitimacy crisis puts conservation goals, especially marine conservation goals, at risk.

At Komodo, local-park ties are limited and where evident, the local community is involved late in the management process in the “student” role as opposed to having any substantive role as an active stakeholder. Though some international initiatives such as the TNC project to reduce blast fishing have been successful in promoting local community-based conservation, in the case of the village of Komodo especially, the park’s strict resource use regulations have proven economically detrimental to the community. Moreover, the majority of the community feels they have not benefited in any way from the park. Thus, while the conservation goals of the park have met with relatively good terrestrial success, and moderate to poor marine success, this success has been achieved without benefit to and in some cases at the expense of the residents of Komodo, Padar, and Rinca Islands.

Kerinci Seblat National Park, Sumatra

Kerinci Seblat National Park and World Heritage Site was created in 1982. The largest national park in Indonesia, the 1,358,000 ha territory cuts across four provinces and houses several lowland and montane endangered species, including the Asian rhinoceros, Asian elephant, tapir, and the focus of the most conservation attention, the Sumatran tiger. These large mammal species were the primary determinant in park boundaries; though some consideration was given to agricultural needs and some lowland areas were at one point moved into the buffer zone to accommodate local needs and logging or plantation concessions, soon after almost 400,000 ha were moved back into the park due to large animal territory needs. Throughout this

process buffer zones were adjusted around villages, but the villages were not consulted in the process. In addition, of the twelve high elevation villages located within the park, five were resettled, but in every case the majority of villagers have moved back into their former settlement⁷⁰. Clearly, the park and the international organizations involved in resettlement face local legitimacy issues due to their failure to consult with or properly consider the needs and wishes of this population.

And as at Komodo, Kerinci Seblat has strict laws concerning resource extraction, allowing no part of a living species or any mineral materials to be removed.

In addition to the land contained within the bounds of the park itself, the park also contains a buffer zone—the land in which limited economic activity can be carried out. Especially on the north and east sides of the park numerous communities of people, collectively referred to as the *orang Kerinci*, inhabit, farm in, and use the resources of the buffer zone. The local villages both those within and outside of the buffer zone depend heavily on agriculture, which accounts for 90% of their income⁷¹. Agriculture itself takes several forms, including wet rice production, increasing amounts of agroforestry or forest mixed gardens⁷², and community fields⁷³. This system of agriculture directly reflects traditional land tenure rights and has a huge impact upon the economic well being of the local population.

⁷⁰ Werner, 75.

⁷¹ Werner, 53.

⁷² Agroforestry or forest mixed gardens refers to the practice of growing multiple crops interspersed amongst one another, including trees to provide canopy shade, bush-height crops, and low-growing crops to stabilize the ground. Grown together, the crops provide a variety of ecosystem services, reducing the need for fertilizers and the prevalence of land wasting. Crops commonly grown as part of an agroforestry setting include export-oriented crops such as cinnamon trees, rubber, cassiavara, and coffee bushes as well as fruit trees and food crops. The past ten years have seen increasing export-oriented integration into agroforestry plots as well as a rise in individual capitalism.

Aumeeruddy, Yildiz. *Local representation and management of agroforests on the periphery of Kerinci Seblat National Park, Sumatra, Indonesia*. UNESCO (Paris: 1994): 2.

⁷³ Murnaiti, et. al. “The contribution of agroforestry systems to reducing farmers’ dependence on the resources of adjacent national parks: a case study from Sumatra, Indonesia”. *Agroforestry Systems*, 52, 2001: 173.

According to custom among the *orang Kerinci*, each village has a set area of land it can farm and within that area land can be divided into communal land and individual land.

Traditional land tenure rights, an important element of the natural law of Sumatra, state that if a man clears a piece of land that piece of land belongs to him regardless of whether it is under cultivation or not. As such, individuals have every incentive to clear as much land as possible even if they do not need all of that land, as it will belong to them and their heirs in the future. This creates a competition for land that has grown even greater as the population increases, and as the population growth rate in Sumatra is 2.2%,⁷⁴ without better protection land clearing will likely continue at unprecedented rates within the buffer zone and the park itself⁷⁵. By 2001, 11,300 ha of Kerinci Seblat had been cleared to make way for agroforestry and rice plots and many villages have extended their area of cultivation several kilometers into park territory⁷⁶.

Moreover, the decentralization of the government, accompanied by a growth in international demand for oil palms, has led to a situation where the benefit to encroaching on park territory has substantially increased, while the park's legitimacy has declined⁷⁷. Ironically, a government-sponsored plan to decrease deforestation by paying villagers to plant trees actually increased the problem as villagers cleared park area, thereby claiming it as theirs, then planted trees (mainly cinnamon and oil palms) on the land to begin an agroforest or oil palm plantation and were compensated for their actions⁷⁸. Several similar government-run conservation programs have also failed to link in that they do not link community development with conservation, a necessary prerequisite for success.

⁷⁴ At a 2.2% growth rate, the population rate will double within twenty years.

⁷⁵ Aumeeruddy, 9.

⁷⁶ Werner, 87.

⁷⁷ The recent increase in demand for oil palms derives from increased use of ethanol for "environmentally friendly" cars in western countries; the negative impact of ethanol on global food prices and biodiversity has only recently come to light.

⁷⁸ Ibid, 90.

Agroforests themselves present a dilemma: on one hand, an agroforest supports more biodiversity than a monoculture field and raises income, but on the other hand, support of agroforestry often leads to further park fragmentation.

Studies of the *orang Kerinci* indicate that the population has high levels of illiteracy and even higher rates of functional illiteracy, with few having education above the primary level⁷⁹. Moreover, less than half of the villages in and around the park have any form of medical facility, up to 10% of villages are considered very poor, 55% almost poor, and only 35% not poor⁸⁰. The average family earns \$421 per year, of which they derive 10% from gathering natural resources within the park, generally in the form of fuelwood, timber, medicines, and minimal amounts of other floral products such as resins and rattan⁸¹. However, villagers who grow only rice are the poorest families and gather the greatest amount of resources from Kerinci Seblat (by volume, worth, and percentage of income), with villagers who only own mixed forest gardens having the next lowest income and park resource harvesting habits. Those who have both wet rice land (the primary dietary staple) and agroforests (allowing monetary income from cash commodity crops) utilize park resources the least and have the highest income⁸². Thus, agroforestry reduces incursions into the park, which positively benefits the conservation goals of the park. On the other hand, since many agroforests have been built inside of the park, their presence, along with that of oil palms plantations, increases fragmentation, currently the largest threat of the survival of species such as the Sumatran tiger and Asian rhinoceros.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 44-49.

⁸⁰ The very poor ranking equates to a per capita income is less than \$27 per year; almost poor equates to a per capita income of between \$27 and \$54 per year, and not poor equates to a per capita income of greater than \$54 per year. Ibid, 55.

⁸¹ Murnaiti, 181.

⁸² Ibid, 177-182.

As an indicator of the success of the park's conservation mission, the total number of tigers, was estimated at over 1,000 in 1978 and has declined to less than 400, of which 136 currently live in Kerinci Seblat, down from 150 in 2007. The majority of tiger death occur because of habitat loss and though some tiger death results from poaching rather than habitat loss, deforestation contributes to tiger poaching as it forces the tigers to interact more with the buffer zone and increases accessibility of tigers to poachers.

Logging forms a second major threat to Kerinci Seblat's conservation goals. Usually financed by one or two major backers living either in Sumatra or Jakarta, the logging takes place at night by hired locals. Moreover, due to post-1998 decentralization, provincial officials are in charge of enforcing of anti-logging laws, such as the 1990 law on forest conservation, a duty they often lack the money or incentive to properly carry out. In fact, in many cases corrupt military or police personnel guard clandestine logging operations, which capitalize upon the inability of the national government to pay living wages to their officials or to provide assistance to low-income citizens⁸³. While 25 million cubic meters of wood can be legally extracted from the buffer zone of the park each year, the Indonesian-US Tropical Forest Management Program estimates that the area actually produces 75 million cubic meters annually, an unsustainable harvest rate that will result in permanent land degradation in both the buffer zone and the park, from where much of the illegal wood is being harvested⁸⁴.

In addition to being the largest park, this park also has by far the largest budget of any park at over \$710,000⁸⁵. This budget allows 100 rangers to be hired, but even this is not enough to fully patrol the boundaries of the park. In addition, this park receives among the highest

⁸³ Jepson, Paul et. al. "The End for Indonesia's Lowland Forests?" *Science*, New Series, 292 (5518), 4 May 2001: 859-861.

⁸⁴ Purnomo, A. "Overcapacity in Forestry Sector". *The Jakarta Post*, 27 January 2000: 4.

⁸⁵ Sumardja, 7.

amounts of international support, primarily via the World Bank and its partner international institutions and, to a lesser degree, through tiger conservation NGOs. Despite this large budget, the park has hired few locals and most of the guards are not from the local community. Direct park contribution to the economic welfare of *orang Kerinci* is not feasible as unlike at Komodo, where a portion of the money from gate receipts goes toward the surrounding villages, Kerinci Seblat is frequently closed to tourism due to volcanic activity on Sumatra's highest peak, Kerinci and the local community can therefore neither depend on park contributions or tourist dollars to improve their economic welfare.

The largest project in Kerinci Seblat has been the World Bank and Global Environmental Trust Fund's Integrated Conservation Development Project (ICDP). Instituted initially in 1990 for six years (later extended) at an initial cost of \$47.3 million, this ICDP has the same basic goals of all other ICDPs: to decrease local incursions into the park and increase local incomes, especially focusing on farmers in this case⁸⁶. To this end, development officials encourage locals to stop using park resources in exchange for direct compensation, infrastructure, and social services, ranging from electricity and improved schools to monetary payments⁸⁷. Implementing officials, all of whom work for BAPPEDA, Indonesia's regional development planning agency and are not locals, have utilized the available resource exchange tools primarily to promote resettlement. Under this strategy, infrastructure aid and social services go to villages further from the park along more accessible routes in order to convince those villagers living within or right along the edge of the park to move to villages further from the park. While a good theory,

⁸⁶ D'Andrea, Claudia. *Field Report on World Bank/GEF Integrated Conservation Development Project in Sumatra' Kerinci Seblat National Park*. The Sustainable Development Institute, March 1996, http://www.susdev.org/kerinci_seblat.html

⁸⁷ Barret, CB and Arzose, P. "Are Integrated Conservation Development Projects (ICDPs) Sustainable?" On the Conservation of Large mammals in Sub-Saharan Africa". *World Development*, 32(7), 1995: 1073.

this strategy has proven highly unsustainable as even those who initially move to the destination village tend to move back to their home village.

Analysis of this project reveals many problems. In the destination village, traditional land tenure has not changed and so the migrants reach the new village where they receive little or marginal personal farmland as the majority of the land is held hereditarily—a critical problem for a population so heavily dependent upon agriculture. Moreover, with incentives and the right tools, the buffer zone villages have the potential to act as forest guards, keeping poachers away from their village territory and helping to protect their nearby resources. Removing villagers creates a physical void that the already overstretched park rangers now have to guard. In addition, the implementation by non-local officers increases confusion and decreases ICDP effectiveness as the locals often mistrust the officials, who they see merely as government agents with ulterior motives⁸⁸.

On a positive note, while the project employs non-local government workers, during the initial design the government and World Bank involved the locally based consortium Conservation Information Forum (WARSI), in its initial design⁸⁹. This did give the project a more local focus, a highly important consideration in such a decentralized political atmosphere. However, as in many semi-periphery and periphery countries the NGO membership consists of the literate elite and thus while the NGOs represented the interests of the local conservation movement, no actual villagers were involved in the planning process. This further contributed to disconnect between the villagers, many of whom were never properly informed of the development money's conditions, source, or the implication of receiving the money, which was not a monetary gift, but a loan.

⁸⁸ D'Andrea.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

While this project achieved some successes in bringing electricity, new schools and clinics, and agriculture minor-loans to some villages, it was hindered by its failure to consider the culture of the *orang Kerinci* and to include local villagers in development planning, project implementation, and management development. By using only outsiders for leadership roles in the program the disconnect between villagers and outsiders has grown and while the development level of the population has improved, the project has failed to substantively link development and conservation, has missed out on opportunities to develop community-based conservation, and has not involved the local community in the work and management of the park, a necessary step to legitimize the park and its government representatives in the eyes of the *orang Kerinci*.

Tanjung Putting National Park, Central Kalimantan Province, Borneo

Located on the south coast of Borneo, Tanjung Puting National Park was named a biosphere reserve in 1977 and officially became a national park in 1982. At 412,000 ha, this park contains over 200 species of birds, sun bears, clouded leopards, and the proboscis monkey. However, the park's best-known resident is the orangutan⁹⁰. Like at both Komodo and Kerinci Seblat, Tanjung Puting's creation, administration, and territory delineation was carried out at the national level. According to its founding documentation, the primary goals of the park are conserving the resources and species within the park, limiting local incursions into the park by reducing local dependence on park resources, protecting species ecosystems, scenic sights, and resources within the park, encouraging research, and developing tourism possibilities⁹¹. And while the development goals of the park state the desire for "close co-operation with local

⁹⁰ UNESCO Office, Jakarta. "Tanjung Putting Biosphere Reserve". Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Project, 2008. http://www.unesco.or.id/Sci_ECO_MABTPuting.html

⁹¹ Susilo, Harry Djoko. "The Tanjung Puting National Park and Biosphere Reserve, Indonesia". *Working Papers*, 22. South-South Cooperation Programme for Environmentally Sound Socio-Economic Development in the Humid Tropics (Paris: 1997): 6. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001092/109214eb.pdf>

communities”, neither the goals nor the elaborative explanations offer specific activities or policies⁹².

A great deal of the recent park planning has been as part of the Indonesian UNESCO Man and Biosphere (MAB) Reserve program, which works with MAB officials, government officials, especially from the Ministry of Forestry, national park and biosphere reserve officials, and international conservation NGOs such as Conservation International (CI). Through this program, several strategy workshops have been held such as the 2003 workshop hosted by CI that included all of the above parties, plus donor organizations and national research institutions. Output from the meeting specifically stated that “community participation is necessary” and recommended that the MAB officers identify local stakeholders. However, nowhere does the discussion of community involvement in planning come about; in short, planners should consider the desires or needs of the local community, but will retain complete control over the management of park and park-related development project. And tellingly, the participant list includes no local leaders and almost exclusively officials from the Indian Institute of Sciences (LIPI)⁹³. Once again, an influential planning meeting denied the relevance of including those living around Tanjung Puting in deciding the future legal status and goals of the park⁹⁴.

Regarding the primary goal of the national park—wildlife and forest conservation—deforestation and mining have proven the two greatest threats to achieving this goal. While logging limits were greater during the Suharto administration, less illegal logging was undertaken due to the strict penalty for illegal logging and the highly centralized nature of the

⁹² Ibid, 7.

⁹³ Conservation International. “Final Project Completion Report”. Workshop on Indonesia’s Biosphere Reserves: A Reassessment of Current National Strategy, including Leuser and Suberut Final Project Completion Report, December 2002-February 2003.

⁹⁴ The substantive outcomes of this workshop included recommendations for tighter national conservation legislation for biosphere reserves and greater collaboration between national conservation authorities in Indonesia and international organizations, NGOs, and researchers.

logging industry (most of which was controlled by Suharto's family and close allies)⁹⁵.

Beginning in 1998, illegal logging around and in Tanjung Puting dramatically increased; in the province of Central Kalimantan as a whole, the ratio of legal to illegal logging stood at approximately 10:1 from 2000-2005—meaning that loggers (many of them working with small-scale operations) removed 10% more trees every year than they are legally allowed⁹⁶. At this ratio, logging around Tanjung Puting is highly unsustainable and in the early 2000s led villagers to seek out continually more tree resources from inside the national park as logging penalties and employment in manufacturing and government work both disappeared.

Since 2006, deforestation for logging inside the park has dramatically decreased as regulation and policing have increased, though this has served to additionally decrease the economic welfare of the local population, who depended upon logging jobs for substantial monetary income. Moreover, this decline has paralleled an increase in clearing for palm oil plantations around the edges of and even within the park⁹⁷. Since at least 2007 corrupt local politicians have handed out permits to build palm oil plantations within the bounds of the park, despite the permits' direct contravention of national policy; the Borneo Orangutan Survival Foundation estimates that if palm oil plantations expand at their current rate, the orangutan will be extinct by 2012 as a result of habitat destruction⁹⁸. As it stands, by 2004 approximately 40% the park was stripped of its native vegetation and that percentage is even higher today⁹⁹.

⁹⁵ Casson, Anne and Krystof Obidzinski. "From New Order to Regional Autonomy: Shifting Dynamics of "Illegal" Logging in Kalimantan, Indonesia". *World Development*, 30(12), 2002: 2133-2151.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 2140.

⁹⁷ Knudson, Tom. "Logging, largely stopped, but clearing for palm oil plantations has risen". *Sacramento Bee*, 21 January 2008.

⁹⁸ Rainforest Action Network. "The Last Haven for Orangutans Threatened by ADM's Palm Oil Expansion". Rainforest Agribusiness Case Studies, http://ran.org/campaigns/rainforest_agribusiness/spotlight/case_studies/tanjung_puting_national_park/.

⁹⁹ Butler, Rhett. "Saving Orangutans in Borneo". Mongabay.com, 24 May 2006. <http://news.mongabay.com/2006/0524-orangutans.html>.

From 1998 to 1999, fifteen illegal gold mining operations sprang up along the length of the Sekonyer River, which runs through Tanjung Putting. These mining operations not only threatened the water quality of the naturally brackish river but also led to substantial riverside deforestation and habitat destruction. And while the gold mines were shut down by park guards and the police within a few years, in October 2005 the mining camps were reopened for quartz sand mining (a valuable export commodity) and by the end of the year active quartz operations were documented in all fifteen former gold mining sites¹⁰⁰. The renewed quartz mining will both continue to threaten biodiversity within the park and thus the conservation goal of the park, and place new economic pressures upon the local communities as migrants move into villages near the Sekonyer River in order to take advantage of jobs in the informal mining industry. In order to curtail illegal mining, Orangutan Foundation International is working with park personnel to increase patrols and crack down on the provincial authorities who illegally authorize mining permits¹⁰¹.

Upon creation of the park in 1982, several villages within the park were resettled to just outside the park, but were given neither resettlement aid nor job training or development assistance to wean their dependence upon forest resources, which includes fuelwood, rattan, and food sources. This situation led to feelings of disenfranchisement, which finally peaked in 2002 when the local community took over two park visitors' centers as well as Orangutan Foundation International's orangutan breeding center at Camp Leakey. Once in control of the breeding center, villagers took the orangutans hostage, but no humans or animals were harmed. This nonviolent protest served to first, express community dissatisfaction over their resettlement and

¹⁰⁰ Yappi, Robert et. al. "Sand Mining in Tanjung Putting National Park, Indonesia". ESCI, 2006.

<http://gis.esri.com/library/userconf/proc06/papers/abstracts/a2099.html>.

Interestingly, the demand for silica sand has risen along with high-tech applications and increased solar energy use as this excellent source of pure silica is used to create high quality superconductors and photovoltaic cells for solar panels.

¹⁰¹ Butler.

to second, protest the obvious international preference for the orangutan's survival over that of the Kalimantan people. While community aid had been minimal up to this point, the WWF, CI, the World Bank, and USAID spend millions of dollars funding orangutan conservation.

As an example of this type of project, in a current \$11.5 million USAID project grant for orangutan conservation, 74% of the money will go toward orangutan conservation and planning, with the remaining 26% spent on three projects, of which community support forms only one component¹⁰². While the project does have the goal of promoting "community learning in agricultural development", thereby increasing crop yield and diversity, the effort expended toward this is minimal compared to that spent on orangutan conservation and the concept does not involve locals in the park. Much like the government sponsored "pay to stay out" program at Kerinci Seblat, this project fails to link the conservation work within the park and community development, a necessary component to local support of the park.

Prior to 2004, while international donors focused on the endangered primates, the park provided few benefits to the local human population. With gate fees of only \$5, fees barely cover operations costs within the park and unlike at Komodo, fees are not given to the surrounding communities as compensation for the loss of their use of park's resources. Moreover, the park did not hire any locals to work in the park and the tourist sector was relatively undeveloped, with the orangutan rehabilitation center being the only substantial tourism draw.

Following the 2002 takeover, a clear community-park relations low point, a small group of local and international actors have begun projects in Tanjung Puting that aim to increase conservation, economically develop the local community, and legitimize the park by substantively involving the community stakeholders in park management and planning. Though

¹⁰² "Protecting the Endangered Orangutan". USAID (Bali: December 2007).

the ecological impact of these programs will take years to determine, initial reporting on economic welfare, community involvement in the park, and power relation transitions indicate that these programs are highly successful. Participation is breeding legitimacy, which in turn is improving the community's willingness to conserve the park's resources.

One such program, run by Biruté Mary Galdika's Orangutan Conservation International (OCI), seeks to directly link habitat conservation, long-term orangutan survival, and community welfare. In part, this connection results from the link this conservation NGO experiences between all three factors. The primary goal of OCI is to conserve the habitat of orangutans and to reintroduce orangutans into the wild in order to increase population numbers. However, habitat loss from logging and palm oil threatens the orangutans. In addition, many of the orphaned baby orangutans OCI rehabilitates were orphaned due to the policy of palm oil plantations to kill all adult orangutans that enter their plantation as the animals eat the palm oil fruit. And these same palm oil plantations that are so detrimental to orangutan survival provide virtually the only wage-based employment in Kalimantan aside from informal mining. In order to save the orangutans the number of palm oil plantations must be decreased, but to simply eliminate palm oil plantations would devastate the regional economy.

In an effort to combat this cycle, OCI created a program that hires local employees to run rehabilitation and protection efforts, while encouraging conservation-minded village leaders to actively involve themselves in the local and provincial government decision-making processes. Specifically, OCI now employs 200 personnel and after some initial training, has handed over management of all park reforestation and guarding efforts to team leaders¹⁰³. The NGO staff and the local team leaders meet regularly to discuss progress and areas in which protection can be improved, staffing shortages, and other park management data. Thus, through this

¹⁰³ Butler.

measure the local community develops an active interest in the park as the conservation of the park and its resources equates to economic stability and improved environmental conditions in the areas around the village. And since part of the reforestation efforts have been aimed at near-park deforested lands on the edges of the villages, the ecological benefits of *in-situ* jungle conservation are readily apparent to villagers and local NGOs. To improve the economic stability of those not employed within the park, OCI undertook a USAID-funded small grant project to diversify agriculture, eliminating the danger of rice crop failure to village health and the national park. Finally, OFI hosted a meeting of village leaders, specifically from villages on the west side of the park whose villages or customary village land was incorporated into the park during its 1996 expansion¹⁰⁴. These village and community leaders have formed a committee with the Department of Forestry and OFI to redraw park boundaries together. GIS and GPS training sessions bringing together park and government officials, local NGOs members, and OFI staff to work toward better real-time park monitoring furthered collaborative efforts.

The success of this initiative lies in its time-scale, comprehensiveness, and the proactive leadership roles of community members. OFI has been located in Tanjung Puting since the 1970s and acts as a more stable, long-term presence than many project-based, short-term initiatives. Alone, none of the individual projects would succeed in improving park-community relations or decreasing community-based threats to conservation. But through a comprehensive and multi-faceted approach, the many initiatives have resulted in involving the community in park management, providing substantive benefits to the community that are directly linked to

¹⁰⁴ Galdika, Biruté Mary. "OFI 2005: The Year in Review". Orangutan Foundation International, 2006. <http://www.orangutan.org/fieldnews2005.php>.

park conservation, and improving the economic situation of villages as well as community interest in the park¹⁰⁵.

Conclusion

The Role of the Core in Developing National Parks

The goal of the core in creating and funding national parks in the semi-periphery and periphery is to further bring these states into the international order and promote its norms and values. The two primary mechanisms through which this goal is developed are institution building and norm building. Regarding the former, funding countries and international bodies create government organizations, set up mechanisms, and host workshops and trainings that link together government officials in the target state with one another and with those in the international community. This ideally builds meaningful links between government officials that encourage cooperation, information sharing, and the involvement of diverse stakeholders in the park creation and development process. International meetings, collaborations, etc., acquaint target park and government officials with the bureaucratic norms of the international order and its many bodies, while introducing them to the language used by the international community.

In an ideological level, funding national parks on the American park model provides an opportunity to entrench the norms and values of the international order in the target country. For this reason, funding agencies demand that parks be created and managed by multiple stakeholders, be accountable to both the funding agency and the central government, be pluralist in its decision-making, and practice open reporting. Yes, conservation of wild natural spaces is a secondary goal of park creation, but the parks serve as a training ground for the target nation's

¹⁰⁵ Though community interest in the park may be hard to quantify, the rush of local school children reported to visit the park on school holidays attests to an interest in the park's resources and conservation, at least among young community members.

civil service and non-governmental leaders on how to act in good faith as a part of the international order.

In its objective to bring a state and its officials into line with the international order, core actors have experienced varying degrees of success. Highly successful aspects of park implementation have been those of building international interactions and building familiarity with international organizations (IOs). Though the international interactions have not always been as long-term as one would desire, park implementation in Indonesia has undoubtedly brought together national and international park and government officials that would otherwise never have collaborated. As an example of a successful interaction-building project, workshops such as the biosphere workshop hosted by Conservation International improve national level communications, allowing representatives of different branches of government to work together to solve conservation problems. Though focused at a national level, this project reenacts the procedures and collaborations required at international conventions. In addition, funding national parks provides semi-periphery stakeholders with small-scale exposure to IOs such as the World Bank, international conservation NGOs, or UNESCO through economic measures such as loan repayments or grants and political measures such as conservation planning and cooperation. Through supporting these various types of cooperation, IOs have been effective in normalizing the procedures and expectations of the international order.

However, the tools of national park creation and development have largely failed to promote pluralist representation and build long-term relationships between stakeholders. At Komodo, Kerinci Seblat, and Tanjung Puting, as well as the rest of Indonesia's national parks, the multi-stakeholder model fundamentally fails to include necessary local stakeholders. While the original national parks in the United States left out some marginal populations from the

decision-making process, it had a strongly supportive local constituency to advocate for the park and protect it from political machinations, something lacking in most cases in Indonesia. Very seldom is it the local population supporting a park's creation and development. This lack of support is manifested in an all too frequent disconnect between the government, tourism, park officials, and the local community, which inhibits truly pluralist and open decision-making.

The failure to build long-term relationships is a critique not just of national park funding, but also of development and conservation funding as a whole. Most conservation is carried out via "projects", wherein a specific activity or group of related activities will be carried out with a set amount of money and in a set time period (generally ranging from one month to five years). Once the project is finished at the end of its allotted time all incentives to participate dry up and, much to the detriment of all involved parties, the collaborations forged during the project tend to break off. The earlier discussed time-specific project between park officials in Komodo and the Galapagos exemplifies the detriment to participating parties of focusing effort on short-term relationships.

And finally every park, being a member of the national park family rather than a group of absolutely identical parks, has slightly different problems that lead to the failure of its conservation and development goals. However, the case studies in Indonesia have shown that these failures occur in large when the local community exercises its muscles as the veto player. While the local community continues to play this role due to their perception of marginalization from the park-related decisions made by the government, donor agencies, park officials, and non-local tourist agencies, achieving the conservation goals of the park will be nearly impossible.

Donor Roles in Achieving National Park Success

National Park success, as previously discussed, requires a multitude of components that, when combined, result in a cohesive set of relationships, interactions, and programs. This first requires a realization that pluralist systems must have support amongst those who will be most affected, especially in cases where the governing authority is weak or highly decentralized. In the United States, the dissenting opinions of one local community toward the creation of a national park can be overridden as the government is powerful, has high levels of local legitimacy, and can afford to pay people for their resettlement. For example, when Shenandoah National Park in Virginia was created during the 1930s, hundreds of people had to be resettled against their will, which has led to substantial community-park tensions in the subsequent seventy years¹⁰⁶. However, these people still respect park boundaries and do not use park resources. The fear of law enforcement, the fair market compensation for their property, continued financial support through welfare programs, and general respect for the state and federal government ensure that the conservation goals of the park continue to be met. But in cases such as Indonesia where the government lacks this power, legitimacy, and capacity to monetarily assist individuals, the legitimacy of the park must be independently established irrelevant of government perception or capacity.

To assist parks in achieving legitimacy, funding of national parks must take into account and assist in not only the conservation goals of the national park, but also the economic and political needs of the park. Each year hundreds of national park visitors from dozens of countries visit United States parks in order to learn about how parks in America are run, how tourism is managed, and how the parks manage their relationships with the community. The

¹⁰⁶ Beck-Herzog, Karen. Interview at Shenandoah National Park. 4 April 2008.

three specific needs these visiting park representatives repeatedly express are: to improve local relations, to develop concessions, and to increase the quantity and quality of tourist services¹⁰⁷.

Local relations as previously discussed, are essential to the conservation goals of the park. In addition, positive local relations are mutually beneficial to all parties involved, as visitors are more likely to visit and spend substantial periods of time at parks that have a variety of appealing characteristics. Especially within the ecotourism demographic, tourists are more likely to visit a slightly environmentally inferior park with locally run ecolodge facilities and cultural events than a slightly superior park with limited cultural facilities. Local involvement within the park may be especially important to destinations such as Indonesia where 57% of ecotourists self-report as coming primarily for cultural reasons, with their national parks visit being secondary to culture tourism¹⁰⁸. Recognizing this, park managers are beginning to seek to bring tourism revenue into their parks by combining ecotourism with cultural tourism and funding agencies must take this need into account when allotting funding dollars toward park development.

Concessions and tourist services both provide additional means of making parks economically profitable. Concessions as run in the United States National Park System consist of large-scale contracts given to one company in order to provide all tourist services within the park, including lodging, restaurants, and gift shops¹⁰⁹. The purpose of the long-term, noncompetitive contracts within parks is to reduce competition-based expansion and fingerprint of tourist services on the park, thereby protecting the park's primary goals of conservation. However, in the United States the majority of near-park communities live well above the poverty level and large, non-local concessionaires do not form tourist enclaves and are not seen to be

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Goodwin, "Local Community Involvement", 346.

¹⁰⁹ Albright and Cahn.

taking tourist dollars from the local population to the degree that they are in parks such as Komodo.

While the existing park model recommends concessions and while national park managers in the semi-periphery often desire concessionary park services as they are stable, large-scale enterprises, this component of the model limits local tourist enterprise and may work against the goal of positive community relations. As such, either the contracts should be split into several, smaller contracts that community businesses, business cooperatives, or NGOs can compete for or the contracts should be created so that one company coordinates the services of several local service providers. If the service industry is not yet sufficiently developed to manage any park concessions, a possible measure includes a mixture of local employment in park concessions and the provision of a training program to develop local skills into viable tourism-based companies that can compete for concessions in the future. And Even where local tourism is undeveloped, the selling of local crafts or artwork in park gift shops, as is done in the United States model, can provide immediate economic benefit to skilled individuals in the region.

The third need stated by foreign park officials is to improve their in-park tourist services. Service improvements include measures such as: installing informative and interesting interpretive exhibits or holding interpretive programs, training park rangers in guiding tours, advertising the park and its unique features to national and international audiences, and collaborating with tourist providers including airlines, cruise companies, tour companies, and local guest service businesses. International donors can assist parks in achieving their specific tourist service goals through a variety of means. These means include, but are not limited to: paying for trainings for park rangers and interested community members (the earlier-discussed

tourist-services education program in the Galapagos, for example), bringing in experts in interpretation to assist community leaders and park officials in identifying and explaining important park features, funding local enterprises through small and micro-enterprise (SME) loans, and using the agency's convening power to bring together tourism, conservation, community, and park stakeholders to create a tourism development and funding plan.

But while funding must reflect the needs and desires of the national park, funding patterns must also be transformed to better reflect the needs of the community. Most importantly, all development projects or programs must contain some component that directly links community to the park. Each must furthermore provide the community with the capability to carry out proactive, self-managed, and self-determined conservation. Parks with strong tourist potential possess a unique opportunity for park-based economic growth. In these cases, the goal of those managing, planning, and funding parks the parks needs to follow the newly-adopted attitude of the Shenandoah National Park management team in the United States, which is that “when we [the park] bring people in, we will bring them through your community” and integrate the park into the economic and tourist fabric of the region and of the neighboring communities¹¹⁰. In cases where in-park resource extraction has become commercialized, donors can further meet the community and park needs by supporting the local and provincial government in strongly enforcing existing pro-park, anti-industry legislation and in rooting out corrupt officials who allow in-park extraction.

As the Indonesian case studies show, national park development needs to focus on strengthening and legitimizing the relationship between the local community and the park. The failure to do so is detrimental not only to the individuals who have been impacted by the park, but to the conservation goals of the park itself. Thus, in seeking to promote conservation,

¹¹⁰ Beck-Herzog.

development, and normalization of the international order, international funding bodies must focus on building and sustaining multiparty, stakeholder-driven park planning and management.

Research Limitations

Though the case studies were able to explain general relations between the community and the park as well as the conditions of both, direct comparison between cases is difficult as not all parks, international bodies, and researchers use the same language. Further complicating comparison is the difficulty in quantifying certain factors such as conservation. Conservation most commonly refers to either the protection of a certain keystone species or to habitat conservation and sometimes to both; however, success in conserving a habitat does not directly relate to conserving a species as the conservation methods are not necessarily compatible and attempting to compare requires drawing value judgments about the worth of a particular resource or animal.

Comparison is further made difficult by the scale of multi-park comparison studies. It is necessary to assume that each near park community is homogeneous for the sake of benefits and perceptions comparison. However, in many cases villages and local stakeholders have heterogeneous and even divergent interests, which a park-scale study cannot account for.

And finally, community perception studies in Indonesia have been highly limited and while relations between the park and community can be inferred by economic data to a degree, further studies and stories of community perceptions of parks, park benefits, and their role in relation to the park would greatly strengthen the explanatory capability of these case studies.

Further Directions for Research

While this research shows promising results for local community veto power as the primary explanatory factor for park success in semi-periphery countries, this research needs to be expanded in order to yield widely applicable results.

Turning the lens away from Indonesia, reports from park officials in South Korea, Nepal, Kenya and India indicate that local park officials are beginning to recognize the necessity of local community legitimacy¹¹¹. Also, in the past ten years cases exist where international funding agencies have undertaken specific projects that recognized and the local community's value in conservation and promoted building this relationship in their design.

USAID, for example funded a project in 2001 in Croatia to create visual media and park-related literature and undertake a visitors survey at two national parks. The project hired fifteen interns and a project manager—half Croatian and half Serbian—to create the interpretive and literature sources and to write, administer, and analyze survey results. These young individuals were assisted by a technical team of three US NPS rangers, but were primarily responsible for all outputs. The project sought to help “rebuild tourism” in the wake of an urban brain drain, 24% national unemployment, and a major drop off in tourism due to the civil war that lasted from 1991-1995¹¹². In order to do so the project provided specific tourist services and served as a rebuilding and democracy promotion measure that involved multiple ethnicities and employed rural youth. In addition, the project consulted local businessmen throughout, holding bi-weekly community meetings and bringing in local partners to consult on service capacity and needs. The initial pilot was so successful that the project has now been implemented in six national parks and the recommendations been integrated into the official policy of the parks service.

¹¹¹ Comer, Claire. Interview at Shenandoah National Park. 4 April 2008. Morris.

¹¹² Comer.

The reports of international park officials and the presence of community-oriented park conservation projects and programs in Indonesia and Croatia indicate that the phenomenon of community veto power is widespread. However, further field research must be carried out in order to test both the veto power hypothesis and the broad applicability of this paper's park funding and management recommendations.

Appendix A

Statement of the Logic of the Central Problem [in National Parks where the local population exploits the park's resources]

Shah, 13-14.

1. Assume that a given national park is valuable.
2. Further, to begin with, assume that the value of the national park exceeds its opportunity cost of alternative land use.
3. In particular, it is the long-term value of the park which exceeds its long-term opportunity cost. In the short run, the value may be less than the short-run opportunity cost.
4. Therefore, such a national park is worth having in the long run but it happens to be threatened.
5. The various threats arise from human activity in and around the park.
6. Since these activities are largely economic in nature, the threats have a large economic element.
7. The activities are threatening because they appear to be out of control.
8. The reason for activities being out of control is that the current values of such activities are very high, e.g. survival grazing.
9. If the activities are left unregulated then their cumulative consequences could even annihilate the park.
10. So the problem is one of regulation of human activity.
11. In order that the regulations can be made to work, their design should be such that they are not worth challenging. This means that they should either have incentives built in to discourage challenges or be backed by effective enforcement.
12. The latter approach of the park versus the people does not appear to work. So the solution lies with the former—cooperation between the park and the people.
13. Since the long-term value of the park exceeds its opportunity cost, it may be possible to devise regulations to make everyone better off.
14. Hence the task is that of designing regulations with incentives for the people to cooperate with the park management so that the park is conserved and everyone's welfare increases.

Appendix B—Success Variables

To note, the three success variables are essentially positivist. To fulfill the requirements of the variable is to be successful in this area of park management and the failure (in whole or part) to do so is to be increasingly unsuccessful. Though the goal of the national park is conservation, success in this case will be defined as the ability to meet both the primary goal of conservation while achieving successes in population integration and economic impact as well.

Conservation

Conservation is herein defined as “The management of human use of nature so that it may yield the greatest sustainable benefit to current generations while maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of future generations”¹¹³. As applied to a national park, the conservation level refers to the sustainability of the park's living and nonliving resources over time¹¹⁴.

¹¹³ All of the environment definitions included in this paper will be based on those defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as these represent the meanings generally accepted by the international community of politicians and scientists. “Biodiversity Glossary”. *CEPA Toolkit*. Ed. Jeff McNeely. Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat. 2004. pp. 2.

¹¹⁴ Sustainable use refers to “The use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity, thereby maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations.” McNeely, Jeff. “Biodiversity Glossary”. *CEPA Toolkit*. Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat. 2004: 10.

Sustainability herein contains two elements: quality and quantity. Biologically, a park possessing a strong conservation level will exhibit stability or growth in both the quantity of species and the population within each species. Simultaneously, to possess a strong conservation level the park must maintain a stable amount of intact inorganic resources (i.e. minerals) and suffer little or no habitat degradation as a result of incursions by the local population, industry, or tourism.

Population Integration

The local population's integration into the park will be measured in relative terms as accounting data across parks differs greatly. As such the integration will be loosely based on the presence of the most separate categories or instances of involvement and the quality of that involvement or interaction.

Possible factors or categories considered in population integration will be:

1. Number and percentage of persons directly employed by the park
2. Number and percentage of persons working in the park and in gateway towns connected to the park, but not directly employed by the park
3. Public sentiment toward the park
4. Legal community access to the park for non-extractive activities (none, little, moderate, relatively high, uninhibited)
5. Legal community access to the park for extractive activities (none, little, moderate, relatively high, uninhibited)

Economic Impact of Park

This success variable is a measure of the direct and indirect economic impact of the park on the local community. Direct economic impact refers to the money given to the local community by the park, park administration, or any government compensation measures that have been enacted to offset the loss of natural resources access. Indirect economic impact is divided into two general categories: foreign aid and park-related economic growth. Foreign aid includes infrastructure or community development projects directly related to the park and projects not tied to the park, but which began after the creation of the park. Park-related economic growth includes park-related tourism, outsourcing of park duties to the local population, wages derived from working in, for, and relating to the park, the worth of facilities and services provided by the park, and the economic impact (if any) of park-related corporate investment in the local region.

Works Cited

Albright, Horace M. and Robert Cahn. *The Birth of the National Park Service The Founding Years, 1913-1933*, Howe Protehrs (Salt Lake City, 1985).

- Augelli, Enrico and Craig Murphy. "Gramsci and International Relations". *Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations*. Cambridge University Press (Cambridge, MA: 1993).
- Aumeeruddy, Yildiz. *Local representation and management of agroforests on the periphery of Kerinci Seblat National Park, Sumatra, Indonesia*. UNESCO (Paris: 1994): 2.
- Barnett, Thomas P. *The Pentagon's New Map: War and Peace in the Twenty-First Century*. G.P. Putnam's Sons (New York: 2004).
- Barret, CB and Arzose, P. "Are Integrated Conservation Development Projects (ICDPs) Sustainable?" On the Conservation of Large mammals in Sub-Saharan Africa". *World Development*, 32(7), 1995: 1073-1084.
- Beck-Herzog, Karen. Interview at Shenandoah National Park. 4 April 2008.
- Beehler, Bruce. Interview at Conservation International Office. 13 March 2008.
- Butler, Rhett. "Saving Orangutans in Borneo". Mongabay.com, 24 May 2006.
<http://news.mongabay.com/2006/0524-orangutans.html>.
- Casson, Anne and Krystof Obidzinski. "From New Order to Regional Autonomy: Shifting Dynamics of "Illegal" Logging in Kalimantan, Indonesia". *World Development*, 30(12), 2002: 2133-2151.
- CIA. "Indonesia." *The World Factbook*. 15 April 2008.
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/id.html>.
- Comer, Claire. Interview at Shenandoah National Park. 4 April 2008.
- Conservation International. "Final Project Completion Report". Workshop on Indonesia's Biosphere Reserves: A Reassessment of Current National Strategy, including Leuser and Suberut Final Project Completion Report, December 2002-February 2003.
- Cooper, Marilyn. "Environmental Rhetoric in the Age of Hegemonic Politics: Earth First! and the Nature Conservancy". *Green Culture*. Eds. Carl G. Herndl and Stuart C. Brown. The University of Wisconsin Press (Madison, WI: 1996).
- D'Andrea, Claudia. *Field Report on World Bank/GEF Integrated Conservation Development Project in Sumatra' Kerinci Seblat National Park*. The Sustainable Development Institute, March 1996, http://www.susdev.org/kerinci_seblat.html.
- Ehrlich, Paul R. "The Loss of Biodiversity: Causes and Consequences". *Biodiversity*. Ed. E.O. Wilson and Francis M. Peter. National Academy of Press (Washington DC: 1988): 21-27.

- Etzioni, Amitai. *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society*. Basic Books (New York: 1996).
- Foresta, Ronald A. *America's National Parks and Their Keepers*. Resources for the Future, Inc. (Washington, DC: 1984).
- Forgacs, David. *An Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings, 1916-1935*. Lawrence & Wishart (London: 1988).
- Galdika, Biruté Mary. "OFI 2005: The Year in Review". Orangutan Foundation International, 2006. <http://www.orangutan.org/fieldnews2005.php>.
- Giplin, Robert. "The Theory of Hegemonic War". *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 8(4). Spring 1988. pp. 591-613.
- Goodwin, Harold. "Local Community Involvement in Tourism around National Parks: Opportunities and Constraints." *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(3&4), 2002: 338-360.
- Goodwin, Harold J., et. al. *Tourism, Conservation & Sustainable Development: Volume III, Komodo National Park, Indonesia*. Unpublished, 1997.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Eds. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. International Publishers (New York: 1971).
- Gülz, Sümer. "Effect of Public Opinion on National Park Planning in Turkey: A Case Study". *Environmental Management*, 16(3), 1992: 355-362.
- Harmon, David. "The Source and Significant of Values in Protected Areas." *The Full Value of Parks: From Economics to the Intangible*. Eds. David Harmon and Allen D. Putney. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Lanham, MD: 2003): 13-26.
- Helms, Ludger. "Working Paper No. 03.2 Executive Leadership and the Role of "Veto Players" in the United States and Germany". 2003. London School of Economics and Political Science, London.
- Hoyt, Erich. "Case Study: A place for cetaceans in Komodo National Park, proposed for expansion." *Marine Protected Areas for Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoise: A worldwide handbook for cetacean habitat conservation*. Earthscan (London: 2005).
- Ikenberry, G. John. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ: 2001).
- Jepson, Paul et. al. "The End for Indonesia's Lowland Forests?" *Science*, New Series, 292 (5518), 4 May 2001: 859-861.
- Knudson, Tom. "Logging, largely stopped, but clearing for palm oil plantations has risen". *Sacramento Bee*, 21 January 2008.

- Lake, David A. "Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy", *International Studies Quarterly*, 37(4), December 1993: 459-189.
- Latham, Robert. *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order*. Columbia University Press (New York: 1997).
- McNeely, Jeff. "Biodiversity Glossary". *CEPA Toolkit*. Convention on Biological Diversity Secretariat. 2004.
- Montaperto, Ronald. M. et. al. "Indonesian Democratic Transition: Implications for United States Foreign Policy". *Strategic Forum* 171, April 2000.
<http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/sf171/forum171.html>.
- Morris, Douglas. Phone Interview. 22 April 2008.
- Murnaiti, et. al. "The contribution of agroforestry systems to reducing farmers' dependence on the resources of adjacent national parks: a case study from Sumatra, Indonesia". *Agroforestry Systems*, 52, 2001: 171-184.
- Murphy, Craig. *Global Institutions, Marginalization, and Development*. Routledge (New York: 2005).
- Nash, Roderick. "The American Invention of National Parks". *American Quarterly* 22(3). 1970: 730. (726-735)
- Nye, Joseph S. "Soft Power and American Foreign Policy", *Political Science Quarterly*, 119(2), 2004: 255-270.
- Posen, Barry. "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of US Hegemony". *International Security* 28(1). Summer 2003: 5-46.
- "Protecting the Endangered Orangutan". USAID (Bali: December 2007).
- PT Putri Naga Komodo. "Contributing to the Future of Komodo National Park". Komodo Collaborative Management Initiative, 2006. <http://www.komodonationalpark.org/>.
- Purnomo, A. "Overcapacity in Forestry Sector". *The Jakarta Post*, 27 January 2000: 4.
- Rainforest Action Network. "The Last Haven for Orangutans Threatened by ADM's Palm Oil Expansion". Rainforest Agribusiness Case Studies,
http://ran.org/campaigns/rainforest_agribusiness/spotlight/case_studies/tanjung_puting_national_park/.
- Ruggie, John Gerald. "International Regimes, Transactions and Change". *International Organization*, 36(2), Spring 1982.

- Sellers, Richard West. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History*. Yale University Press (New Haven, CN: 1997).
- Scott, James. *Weapons of the Weak*. Yale University Press (New Haven, CT: 1985).
- Secretariat of the Convention Biological Diversity. "List of Parties". *The Convention*. 2007. <http://www.cbd.int/convention/parties/list.shtml>.
- Shah, Anup. *The Economics of Third World National Parks: Issues of Tourism and Environmental Management*. Edward Elgar Publishing Company (Brookfield, VE: 1995).
- So, Alvin Y. *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-System Theories* (178). Sage Publications (Newberry Park, CA: 1990).
- Sumardja, Effendy A. *Public Sector Support and Management of Protected Areas in Indonesia*. Vth World Parks Congress: Sustainable Development Stream, Institutions Session, Panel A: Government structures for financing protected area systems. (Durban, South Africa: September 2003).
- Susilo, Harry Djoko. "The Tanjung Puting National Park and Biosphere Reserve, Indonesia". *Working Papers*, 22. South-South Cooperation Programme for Environmentally Sound Socio-Economic Development in the Humid Tropics (Paris: 1997). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001092/109214eb.pdf>.
- The Nature Conservancy. *Komodo National Park: Effective Marine Protected Area Management*. The Nature Conservancy Southeast Asia Center for Marine Studies. http://www.nature.org/wherewework/asiapacific/indonesia/files/komodo_summary.pdf.
- "Tourism Lessons: Komodo National Park (Indonesian) & Galapagos Marine Reserve (Ecuador)". *MPA News*, 7(2), August 2005.
- Tsebelis, George. *Veto Players. How Political Institutions Work*. Princeton University Press. (Princeton: 2002).
- Ulman, H. Lewis. "Chapter 2", *Green Culture: Environmental Rhetoric in Contemporary America*, eds. Carl G. Herndl and Stuart C. Brown, University of Wisconsin Press (Madison: 1996).
- UNDP. "Human Development Index rankings". UN Development Report. 2008. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>.
- UNESCO Office, Jakarta. "Tanjung Puting Biosphere Reserve". Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Project, 2008. http://www.unesco.or.id/Sci_ECO_MABTPuting.html.

- Vaughan, David. "Tourism and Biodiversity: A Convergence of Interests?" *International Affairs*, 76(2), April 2000: 283-297.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. "World-System Analysis". *Social Theory Today*. Eds. Anthony Giddons and Jonathan H. Turner. Stanford University Press (Stanford, CA: 1987): 309-324.
- Walpole, Matthew J. and Harold J. Goodwin. "Local Economic Impacts of Dragon Tourism in Indonesia." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 2000: 559-576.
- Werner, Sylvia. *Environmental Knowledge and Resource Management: Sumatra's Kerinci-Seblat National Park*. Dissertation. University of Berlin, (Berlin: 2001).
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophical Investigations*. Tr. G.E.M. Abscombe. The Macmillan Company (New York: 1953).
- Wohlforth, William C. "The Stability of a Unipolar World". *International Affairs*, 24(1), Summer 1999: 5-41.
- Yappi, Robert et. al. "Sand Mining in Tanjung Putting National Park, Indonesia". ESCI, 2006. <http://gis.esri.com/library/userconf/proc06/papers/abstracts/a2099.html>.