



Towards a Global History of National Parks

Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler and Patrick Kupper

National parks and related forms of protected areas have been the most important tool of nature conservation since the late nineteenth century. Ever since the United States invented the label of a 'national park' to preserve the natural wonders of Yellowstone in 1872, the idea of confining 'nature' to a 'park' and assigning it the status of a national heritage has been transferred to a wide and diverse range of political, social and ecological settings. At the moment of this writing, national governments have officially assigned some degree of protection to around 130,000 areas, i.e. almost 13 per cent of the global land mass in 2010.¹ The increase of protected areas in both number and geographical extent has been nothing but staggering over the last few decades, and there is no end foreseeable to this boom.

Judged merely by their impressive extension in size and number, parks and protected areas appear to have been a phenomenal success. However, the past performance of protected areas casts doubt on such an optimistic outlook. Bill Adams, one of the foremost experts in conservation history, states that the '20th century saw conservation's creation but nature's decline'.² Although the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) hails protected areas as 'the world's most cost effective tool for biodiversity conservation',³ they have apparently been unable to bring a halt to the rampant loss of biodiversity. According to the same organization, the current species extinction rate is estimated 'between 1,000 and 10,000 times higher than it would naturally be'.⁴ Conservation biologists routinely blame the apparent failure of protected areas to safeguard global biodiversity on their fragmented geography and lack of coherence. Today's protected areas would neither encompass all biodiversity 'hotspots' nor even the most representative biomes of each continent. Parks and protected areas are more akin to thousands of isolated islands of conservation in a global sea of continuing transformation and degradation of land, nature and ecosystems. As it seems, the efforts to harness ever-changing dynamic ecological systems within rigid boundaries have turned out to be as futile as nailing the infamous jelly to the wall.⁵

This volume is premised upon the assumption that the blatant discord between the enthusiastic appraisal of protected areas as the most successful instrument of nature conservation on the one hand, and their questionable ecological performance on the other, is a result of the history and *political* ecology of the worldwide proliferation of protected areas. The contributions assembled here take the national park, in many respects the most important conservation trade mark in history, as a vantage point to navigate through the bewildering variety of past and present conservation categories and concepts. They study the transfer, implementation and adaptation of the national park, both as idea and as label, in a variety of political, social and ecological settings. Altogether, they show that the much-deplored lack of ecological interconnectivity in today's global landscape of conservation is a consequence of the peculiar political, cultural and social conditions and connections that moulded the national park idea since the late nineteenth century. The patchy global geography of conservation is a consequence of the very malleability and adaptability that characterized and actually enabled the global spread of the national park idea.

National parks are, of course, a well-established theme in environmental history. This volume adopts a fresh perspective in that it confronts parks with the perspectives and sensibilities of recent debates in transnational and global history. Environmental historians' understanding of park making, we believe, could greatly benefit from the conceptual repertoire offered by global history. Vice versa, environmental history offers a promising field of study for historians interested in the emergence of global connectivities. National parks are more adequately understood as 'transnational parks': globalized localities that owe their establishment to transnational processes of learning, pressure, support and exchange. Interpreting national parks in global historical perspective, while undeniably part of the 'urgent intellectual project' of a 'closer integration of world history and environmental history',⁶ should by no means be equated with an encyclopaedic world history of national parks or protected areas.⁷ The contributions assembled here are exemplary rather than comprehensive. Major areas and biomes of the globe are not or only cursorily covered. By adopting a global perspective on exemplary cases and localities this volume seeks to identify as concretely as possible the mechanics, actors and institutions that fostered the transfer of an environmental idea that, by its very name and nature, was characterized by territorial and conceptual closure.

In order to understand the emergence of a global regime of compartmentalized conservation territories, and as a conceptual framework for the chapters that follow, we will outline the expediency of national parks to *civilize*, *territorialize* and *categorize* nature. Arguably, these were the main principles and forces that facilitated their worldwide proliferation. National parks emerged in an era in which the properties of territory were instrumental for national,

imperial and international policies, and in which distinct demarcations and boundaries became the hallmark of the modern nation-state. The discourse of civilization rested upon the assumption of a temporal and spatial divide between Western development and allegedly more primitive states, and it took social relationships with nature as a yardstick of progress: parks to shield nature from the encroachments of industrialization, agricultural modernization and capitalist land grabbing became a benchmark of a society's civility, and they were impressed upon the world with missionary zeal as expression of a peculiarly modern valuation of nature. Understanding parks as both agents and instruments of *civilizing* nature draws attention to their ambivalent role in conservation as a civilizing mission and alternative project of modernity. It also highlights the role of parks to exert an educative, 'civilizing' function through the recourse to nature they provided for modern societies. Both of these functions were predicated upon the fundamental separation of nature, usually understood as wilderness, from society and culture that in turn endorsed the specific *territoriality* of parks and facilitated their implementation in national and imperial regimes of statehood. Finally, the national park provided an appealing conceptual blueprint to *categorize* nature and mobilize conservation efforts, which facilitated its transfer and implementation into diverse polities and ecologies.

Explaining the Globalization of the National Park

The protection of nature in national parks and related protected areas has developed into a significant form of land use worldwide. The polar regions, the seas and virtually every state around the globe feature protected areas in one form or another. Renowned 'environmental states' like Tanzania or Costa Rica have even set aside around a third of their territory for nature conservation and figure as globally influential laboratories of wildlife and tropical conservation.⁸ These developments have not escaped the attention of the scholarly community and innumerable case studies analyze the conflicting establishment of parks throughout the continents, adopting the perspectives of park management, indigenous residents, conservation biology, geography, political (and apolitical) ecology as well as environmental history.⁹ While an authoritative global history of protected areas is still missing,¹⁰ conservationists as well as scholars from various disciplinary backgrounds have explained the globalization of national parks with varying refinement and complexity. At the risk of gross simplification, four types of explanations can be distinguished.

First, explanations operating within a declensionist paradigm postulate a direct and inevitable causal link between the spread of nature reserves and environmental degradation caused by industrialization, the rationalization of

forests, population growth, plantation monocultures and the application of technology and chemistry to agricultural production. Such explanations have been widespread among nature lovers and conservationists, whose rhetoric has been rife with scathing indictments of the rampant destruction of nature on the one hand, and demands for the last-minute preservation of the remaining patches of 'virgin nature' and 'last wildernesses' on the other. In that logic, national parks flourished in direct response to the destruction and spoliation of nature on a historically unprecedented scale over the twentieth century.¹¹

A second type of explanation looks for answers on the level of world polity and could be characterized as institutionalist. Sociologist John W. Meyer and his research group, for example, have argued that the global diffusion of national parks can be explained neither by degradation, nor the concomitant rise of environmentalism, nor by an approach that analyzes the establishment of parks merely within the framework of compartmentalized nation-states. Rather, the mechanics of world polity have been responsible for the worldwide proliferation of national parks. Institutions and regimes of 'world society' – international governmental and nongovernmental organizations, treaties or associations of scientific experts – create and promote standardized blueprints of institutions and practices that become implemented into national policies through scientific advocacy, the activities of interested pressure groups and intergovernmental exchange. In this logic, the spread of parks has been tied to various emanations of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century internationalism. Parks owe their existence to the actors and institutions that produced and framed 'global environmentalism' and advocated national parks as a science-based instrument of environmental policy.¹²

A third strand of interpretations could be termed progressive, respectively modernist and has understood the spread of national parks as the worldwide diffusion of environmental sensibilities and practices that first emerged in the United States.¹³ According to environmental historian Roderick Nash, the United States was the first society to combine a democratic culture, unique experience with wilderness, the availability of allegedly empty, undeveloped land and the material affluence to afford the nonutilization of territory. This resulted in the setting aside of public land in the first national park in Yellowstone in 1872. Other advanced, industrialized and urbanized societies also developed a heightened valuation and love for unspoiled nature as an increasingly scarce commodity so that the marginal value of nature increased. A cosmopolitan 'social and economic class of nature lovers' in advanced countries, so the argument runs, either pressed for the establishment of national parks in their own countries, or tried to 'import' unspoiled nature from undeveloped areas where it was still abundant. Therefore, not always the most industrialized or urbanized societies were the first to establish national parks, for their demand could also be satisfied, for example, by wilderness tourism abroad. For Nash, parks

essentially functioned as the ‘institutional “containers”’ provided by developed nations to underdeveloped ones for the purpose of “packaging” a fragile resource.¹⁴ National parks were the epitome of a preservationist modernization, in which unused, wild nature came to be commodified by states and societies of the global South to satisfy the developed world’s desire for wilderness.

Finally, scholars have drawn attention to the astonishing compatibility of conservation and neoliberal capitalism in order to explain why the number of protected areas doubled since 1980. Such an interpretation may appear counterintuitive, for the vast majority of conservation advocates since the late nineteenth century has regarded capitalist-driven economic development as the foremost opponent of nature preservation as an idealist, moral campaign. However, as Dan Brockington, Rosaleen Duffy and Jim Igoe show, several processes and developments combined to make this opposition collapse since the 1980s. Among these was a general proclivity of international funding agencies, but also of transnational conservation NGOs, for market-based solutions in conservation, for example by privatizing the management of protected areas or implementing them in carbon offset schemes. Sustainable development as the overarching paradigm to integrate economic development and conservation replaced ‘no touch’ and ‘fences and fines’ approaches to park management and promoted a less rigid and more managerial approach to conservation that encouraged the establishment of protected areas and their utilization for ecotourism. Additionally, the new paradigm of biodiversity conservation re-framed wild nature as a massive treasure of hitherto unknown and unused genetic resources that attracted new stakeholders, such as transnational business corporations, to the field. As a consequence, wild nature and its conservation became more valuable and expedient for capitalist enterprise, which provided an enormous boost to the extension of protected areas.¹⁵

Undeniably, the inventions of biodiversity, sustainable development and green capitalism go a considerable way to explain recent developments in international conservation. Arguably, the compatibility of parks and capitalism has an even longer prehistory in the intertwined histories of parks and nature consumption through tourism that already started with the designation of Yellowstone as a ‘pleasuring ground’ for the American people. Still, the mechanics of capitalism alone hardly do justice to the multiplicity of actors, motivations and cultural orientations that were involved in park making over the past one and a half centuries. For the majority of these years the relationship between capitalism and conservation was marked by conflict and accommodation rather than cooperation. The declensionist interpretation is right to emphasize the unprecedented and measurable processes of environmental degradation and species loss during the twentieth century,¹⁶ as well as the degree to which industrialization and urbanization have been accompanied by changes in environmental attitudes, above all in Western societies. While these devel-

opments cannot be overestimated as a motivation for nature protection, a sole focus on degradation falls short of explaining how and where conservation enclosures were established. Moreover, 'degradation' must be critically examined since in many instances, it was less a verifiable ecological reality than a rhetorical construct that served as a powerful tool to excise previous forms of land utilization and the presence of indigenous residents.¹⁷

The institutional approach is to be credited for the importance assigned to the actors, institutions and regimes of global environmental governance as the motors of park making worldwide. Pressure exerted by well-connected elite lobbyists such as the British Society for the Preservation of the (Wild) Fauna of the Empire (SPFE) were instrumental in framing 'global environmental problems' and instigating conservationist policies across empires and nation-states since 1900. So were 'conservation entrepreneurs' and the epistemic communities they formed, from the hunter-naturalists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to the ecologists and conservation biologists who followed them and whose activism and expertise formed part of the science-based approach of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the IUCN after 1945.¹⁸ The epistemic community of preservation (often also referred to as the 'parks movement') helped to bring parks on the agenda of international environmental diplomacy and trigger a series of regional and continental conventions that promoted parks as the foremost tool of preservation.¹⁹ However, the institutional approach, particularly in the guise of world polity, has shown little interest in analyzing the actual practice and performance of parks and suffers from too homogenizing an assumption of their global diffusion. Parks are treated as part and parcel of an emerging world environmental regime that is largely Western in its origin, and there is little sensitivity for the political asymmetries, conflicting interactions and the contestations surrounding the adaptation of the park concept to diverse political and cultural settings.

This criticism equally pertains to the progressive reading championed by Roderick Nash. His interpretation overstates American exceptionalism and environmental leadership and operates firmly within a teleological paradigm of modernization:²⁰ parks and the concomitant sensibilities towards the preservation of nature are wedded to the uniform march of Western civilization. His idea of an exchange of 'wild nature' between equals neglects the unequal power relations and responsibilities between 'importers' in the West and 'exporters' in the developing world.²¹ It denies the value of non-Western sensibilities towards nature and obscures significant differences in the way parks were incorporated into non-Western societies. In Africa, Asia and Latin America the top-down imposition of parks made nature conservation for tourism an important instrument in policies of modernization and development, whereas

the social disruptions evoked by the establishment of parks often inhibited the very attitude of detached care that Nash postulated as a prerequisite of parks. Nonetheless, the notion of national parks as explicitly modern containers for packaging nature as a resource provides a thought-provoking basis for further reflections on the peculiar territorial regimes of parks.

The global historical perspective proposed in this volume goes beyond the vague and agency-denying metaphors of diffusion or circulation of a seemingly uniform concept. While acknowledging the dynamics of 'virtualism' and the world-making capacity of conceptual visions and virtual blueprints, it is sensitive to the adaptations, modifications and translations that accompanied the transfer of the concept from one cultural context to another, and to the political asymmetries in which these transfers were embedded.²² It is aware of the insights of recent globalization research that emphasizes the imbrication and mutual production of the 'global' and the 'local' and the interplay of deterritorialization and reterritorialization. A global historical perspective as we understand it is also sensitive to the fact that globalizing processes do not necessarily erase the national but remain essentially shaped, enacted and enabled on the scale of the nation-state.²³ Emphasizing the local diversity and uniqueness of individual national parks cannot release global historians from identifying general principles, common forces and shared properties that made parks such an expedient tool of conservation around the world. What commended the national park as an almost universally applicable format for framing wild nature?

Civilizing Nature

Separating nature from everyday human use has been a long-established cultural practice in human societies across the globe. In African societies, sacred groves not only were sites of spiritual and social importance to communities but also fulfilled ecological functions such as the preservation of plants and wildlife. Forests set aside for the conservation of elephants (especially to use them in warfare) were known in India from the fourth and third centuries BC.²⁴ Also the enclosure of nature for individual or social delectation has a long tradition in societies worldwide, the ancient game reserves of the Middle East and the feudal game parks or royal forests of the European tradition representing only two examples out of many. Often these enclosures were undertaken by the highest authority of the respective political entity, and there were undeniable continuities, for example, between the designation of 'Crown Land' in medieval and early modern Britain and the establishment of game reserves and national parks within the British Empire.²⁵ When the Congress of

the United States officially 'set apart a certain Tract of Land near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a public Park' in March 1872, it was in many respects but a 'novel twist on an old idea'.²⁶

Still, the creation of national parks in the decades before and after 1900 was effected by a sea-change in both the predominant attitudes towards nature and the related social practices. It is no coincidence that the first national parks were established when national and imperial projects of colonization and exploration erased the remaining blanks on the physical and mental maps of Europeans and North Americans: the 'unending frontier' (John F. Richards) of wild nature as the opposite of human expansion and conquest drew to a close. Thereafter, wild nature could no longer be conceptualized as an unlimited mental and practical resource *beyond*, but became a finite resource *within* the boundaries drawn by civilization. No matter for what purpose wild nature came to be protected, its enclosure was employed not to exclude nature from civilization but rather to incorporate certain forms of valued nature into schemes of national or imperial development.

'Civilizing nature' is a fitting metaphor to describe this function of parks, both in its suggestive transitive and intransitive meanings. The *Oxford English Dictionary*, for example, lists under 'to civilize' the entries 'To bring (a person, place, group of people, etc.) to a stage of social development considered to be more advanced, esp. by bringing to conformity with the social norms of a developed society'; 'to tame or domesticate'; 'to conduct oneself in a manner appropriate to the norms of civilized society' and 'to subject to civil order, to subdue, pacify'.²⁷ All of these semantic aspects appear in one form or another in the terminology of conservationists who demanded and justified the establishment of parks in the language of civilization. A commentator of the *New York Times*, for example, hailed the Yellowstone National Park in 1872 as a 'place which we can proudly show to the benighted European as a proof of what nature – under a republican form of government – can accomplish in the great West'.²⁸ Three decades later, the American wilderness sage John Muir opened his book on *Our National Parks* with the famous line, 'Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wildness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but as fountains of life'.²⁹ When in 1962, U.S. President John F. Kennedy hailed national parks as 'places where we can find release from the tensions of an increasingly industrialized civilization', he not only proved a late disciple of Muir but rehearsed a by-then classic trope of the Western park movement.³⁰

Another dimension of parks' civilizing nature is addressed by Canadian entomologist Charles Gordon Hewitt, who claimed in 1921 that the mission of conservationists was 'to prove that the advance of civilization into the more

remote sections of Canada does not imply the total destruction of the wild life, but that civilization in its true sense signifies the elimination of the spirit of barbarism and the introduction of an enlightened attitude.³¹ Advocates of national parks in Europe as well as within Europe's colonial empires routinely couched their appeals in a language of national or imperial duty and an obligation arising out of one's own civilized status. International conservationists like the founding director of UNESCO, Julian Huxley, used it as a moral yardstick to remind the colonies recently released into independence that 'in the modern world, a country without a national park can hardly be recognized as civilized'. Postcolonial leaders reciprocated this obligation, most famously perhaps in the Arusha Manifesto of Tanzania's Prime Minister Julius Nyerere in 1961.³² And as late as 2002, geographers Paul Jepson and Roger Whitaker, with a view to the impending degazetting of national parks in Indonesia, framed the preservation of nature in parks as a moral responsibility and part of the 'international values to which civilised nations and societies aspire'.³³

These assessments from various decades illustrate that parks and civilization were closely entwined, yet stood in a paradoxical and thoroughly ambivalent relationship. Although often inseparable in concrete historical situations, it is useful to distinguish at least four dimensions of civilizing nature. First, the notion of civilizing nature draws attention to the fact that nature protection (and parks as its foremost instrument) became elements of an alternative vision of the future course of (Western) civilization. In the eyes of early nature conservationists, it had been exactly the 'advance of civilization' that necessitated the establishment of parks to preserve the last pieces of intact nature from economic spoliation. This established notion of civilization as human progress through growth-oriented development at the cost of nature was countered by a conservationist vision of civilization as an idealist endeavour that respected the aesthetic, ecological and social value of wild nature. Protecting and valuing nature in its raw, untransformed state became a property of being civilized.

Second, understanding parks as a form of civilizing nature highlights the degree to which conservation became an integral part of 'civilizing missions' within nation-states and empires, but also through international or nongovernmental organizations and postcolonial elites. In its propensity to export and universalize an essentially Western organization of social relationships with nature, the rhetoric of conservationists and park advocates shared many characteristics with other forms of civilizing missions that emanated from Western societies.³⁴ Conservationist discourse operated through the asymmetrical counterconcepts of civilization vs. savagery that had organized Europe's relationship with the colonial world. These dichotomies helped to legitimize the conservationist agenda and territorial claims of imperial states, but they also justified nongovernmental organizations' participation in park making and global environmental governance. While nature protection was never un-

contested or high on the imperial agenda, central governments used parks to excise land-use practices deemed as backward or wasteful, particularly in colonial settings. Nomadic pastoralists were often victims of such policies, and parks complemented policies geared at rendering rural populations controllable or at forcing them onto the labour market. Park management also became a field of scientific governance in which understandings of nature in terms of ecosystems, keystone species or biodiversity marginalized alternative readings of the same landscape. Conservation as a civilizing project assured the ongoing political influence of the former imperial powers in the decolonizing world: the apparatus of conservation and park management remained often dominated by expatriate scientific experts and advisors, while financing conservation was taken over by Western donor agencies and NGOs. However, it needs emphasis that conservation as a civilizing mission was never just a one-way imposition. Several essays in this volume show that conservation was also a self-civilizing mission that reflected back upon environmentally detrimental practices in colony and metropole. And even more significantly, local actors as well as state authorities in non-Western societies adopted and appropriated conservation's language and practices to criticize conservationist policies, to get access to political and financial resources, but also because they came to share its mission and values.

Third, civilizing nature includes the expectation of conservationists that the encounter with wild nature itself exerted a civilizing influence. National parks became the sites where urbanized and industrialized societies should relax and find recourse to wild nature as an antidote to 'overcivilization' and taxing modern lifestyles. The aesthetic qualities of the nature preserved in national parks, as well as the embodied or visual practices of consuming nature in a park, fulfilled a recreational function that only attained importance with the advent of wage labour and leisure as a mass phenomenon in modern, capitalist societies. But parks should do more than cater for recreation. They were sites of learning and education that provided visitors not only with knowledge about the nature in the park through signs and visitor centres. Even more important was the education of sentiment through respect and awe in the presence of wonders that have existed before and independent from human ingenuity – a benign purpose that could gain an exclusive, elitist and often racist edge in colonial settings. Civilizing nature in this third sense thus throws up the fundamental question of what role parks played in the shaping of social attitudes towards nature and conservation, or the making of what has been termed 'environmentality' – 'the knowledges, politics, institutions, and subjectivities that come to be linked together with the emergence of the environment as a domain that requires regulation and protection'.³⁵

Finally, as much as nature should civilize, parks must also be regarded as the institutionalized form of civilizing nature in the sense of 'disciplining' na-

ture and assigning it its controllable and consumable place in modern societies. This last aspect of civilizing nature draws attention to the technologies of statehood and science employed in the making of parks: the map, the expedition, the fieldwork, the research station, but also law making, bureaucracy and armed surveillance. Furthermore, park establishment necessarily involved the designation, classification and allocation of space, in other words, the territorialization of nature.

Territorializing Nature

The worldwide spread of the national park makes a powerful case for the globalization of territorialized and nationalized space. As historians have pointed out, globalizing processes in the past did by no means result in the erosion of space, territoriality and the 'national', but often produced new regimes and constellations of territorially bounded space that went hand in hand with nationalist ambitions.³⁶ The historian Charles S. Maier even proposed to acknowledge territoriality as the defining principle of the century between roughly 1860 and 1970, which he consequently classified as the 'Age of Territoriality'.³⁷ Following Maier, territoriality, understood as the first and foremost political resource derived from the control of bounded space, is not a timeless property of space but a principle of spatial organization that itself has a history: territoriality experienced a worldwide rise in the second half of the nineteenth century when multiple powers (political as well as economic) scrambled for the remaining uncharted regions on a finite globe. Territoriality involved the enclosure, mapping, survey and control of space 'not just as an acquisition or as a security buffer but as a decisive means of power and rule'.³⁸

Although Maier catalogues the principles of territoriality with little recourse to natural spaces, the geopolitical strategies and rewards of territorial control, the practices of mapping and ordering, the importance of the idea of finite space and the territorial merging of power and knowledge make plausible why national parks were so attractive and often so contested.³⁹ Territoriality was the mindset of the era of foreseeably limited space on earth, in which formerly 'boundless nature' was perceived as a finite resource and contained in defined spaces. Understanding national parks as the key instrument of territorializing nature draws attention to the political, social and cultural prerequisites essential to their spread. They are unthinkable without the existence of a centralized state with the capacity or at least the determination to rationalize, order and control its territory. They were a product of the rational procedures that characterized modern governmental bureaucracies and administrative infrastructures. Although the nationalization of nature was by no means characteristic of every national park, the rise of the nation as the prime social entity to com-

mand allegiance and legitimize political and social action proved a great spur for park making. Infusing physical terrain with national meaning helped to 'naturalize' the nation and promote notions of a peculiar rootedness of nations in their landscape.

Maier has identified the 1960s as the period in which the demise of territoriality began. However, the meteoric rise of protected areas over the last few decades casts doubt on this claim and suggests a differentiated interpretation. Networks did not displace territoriality, as Maier proposes. Rather, they were instrumental in its reconfiguration. The 1960s appear not as a decade of disintegrating territoriality but as the beginning of a transformative period in which territorial structures were rearranged and rescaled in a variety of ways. After decolonization, national elites and conservationists appropriated a global blueprint to strengthen authority on a national scale, while trans- and supra-national conservationist institutions also worked through the instruments and mechanisms of the nation-state. This transformation of imperial structures and networks into inter- and transnational ones did not result in a weakening of territoriality on a national level. Postcolonial states in the global South appropriated the economic and coercive potential of national parks, while international organizations and transnational NGOs continued to promote 'civility' as a property to be realized from parks. More importantly, they strengthened their maintenance through external funding and expertise.

However, both the legitimacy and adequacy of territorialized 'fortress conservation' through central state agencies have been challenged by at least three developments, each of which involved different sets of actors and forms of governance in the emerging politics of sustainable development. First, in a variety of cases, rigidly bounded parks proved incapable of providing adequate protection, which contributed to the displacement of natural equilibrium theories by more dynamic conceptualizations of ecosystems and impressed the need for more flexible management practices upon park managers. Second, conservationists' frustration with the often poor performance of states in adequately managing and funding protected areas has fuelled hopes that corporate capitalism and market mechanisms could serve as a panacea against the failure, unwillingness or incapacity of states in matters of nature conservation. This neoliberal turn in conservation resulted in the strengthening of the private sector in protected area management. Third, the forced removal and economic displacement of original residents – the regular accompaniment and dark underside of park making in the global South⁴⁰ – uprooted established human relations with the land, evoked tensions over access and use, and significantly diminished the local acceptance and thus the performance of parks. Grassroots initiatives emerged to protest against their exclusion from parks and demanded local autonomy, or at least benefit sharing and participation in decision-making processes concerning the park.⁴¹ Starting with the

Arctic Peoples Conference in Copenhagen in 1973 indigenous groups affected by park making themselves forged transnational coalitions and contested the territoriality of parks from below.⁴² All these developments did not erase but transform territoriality. Similarly, they weakened the role of the state and increased the number of actors participating in the multilevel yet still territorially based global conservation regime we presently witness.⁴³

Categorizing Nature

It has been one of the core insights of recent analyses of cultural transfers that translation, transformation and reinterpretation are keys for the success of travelling concepts. The national park is a prime example for a globally mobilized environmental concept that originated in Western ideological and institutional contexts to be transferred to other places, experiencing a variety of transformations, adaptations and contestations in the process.⁴⁴ Nothing testifies more to its successful mobilization than countless frustrated efforts at its standardization, including the desperate attempt of Swiss conservationist Jean Baer in 1949 to introduce a systematic Latin nomenclature in which the enigmatic national park would feature, for example, as *territorium reservatum conservandi aut delectandi causa*.⁴⁵ From the 1960s onwards, the IUCN developed an ever-more-refined and totalizing system of categories for protected areas (see Table 0.1 for the latest version of the IUCN classification system from 2008). Within this system national parks became relegated to Category II, consisting by definition of 'large natural or near natural areas set aside to protect large-scale ecological processes, along with the complement of species and ecosystems characteristic of the area, which also provide a foundation for environmentally and culturally compatible spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and visitor opportunities'.⁴⁶ Designed to overcome national peculiarities, the IUCN scheme actually created further confusion, as areas with the national denomination of a 'national park' became distributed over all IUCN categories (see Table 0.2), whereas areas that met the criteria were included in Category II although they do not bear the name 'national park' (see Table 0.3). As the organization has few instruments to enforce its categories, the reform still stands to prove if it can enhance the concept's worldwide coherence and further a universally shared meaning of the national park, or if it will ultimately reduce its transnational purchase and just add to conceptual confusion.⁴⁷

When the term 'national park' was first used in the United States in the 1870s, its meaning was fuzzy and therefore open to change and appropriation. Although broadly used to denote Yellowstone, the term did not appear in federal legislation in 1872, but only three years later when Mackinac Island was set aside 'as a national park'. Later on, this designation was regarded hardly

Table 0.1. IUCN Protected Area Management Categories (2008).⁴⁸

Category Ia	Strict nature reserve
Category Ib	Wilderness area
Category II	National park
Category III	Natural monument or feature
Category IV	Habitat/species management area
Category V	Protected landscape/seascape
Category VI	Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources

Table 0.2. Examples of ‘national parks’ in the various IUCN categories.⁴⁹

<i>IUCN</i>				
<i>Category</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Size (ha)</i>	<i>Date</i>
Ia	Swiss National Park	Switzerland	16,887	1914
Ib	Nanda Devi National Park	India	62,460	1982
II	Guanacaste National Park	Costa Rica	32,512	1991
III	Yozgat Camligi National Park	Turkey	264	1988
IV	Pallas Ounastunturi National Park	Finland	49,600	1938
V	Snowdonia National Park	Wales, UK	214,200	1954
VI	Expedition National Park	Australia	2,930	1994

Table 0.3. Examples of IUCN Category II ‘national parks’ with different national designations.⁵⁰

<i>National Designation</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Size (ha)</i>	<i>Date</i>
Provincial nature reserve	De Hoop	South Africa	32,160	1956
State park	Denali	United States	130,845	1970
National wildlife special protected area	Utonaiko	Japan	510	1982
Heritage river	Genoa River	Australia	1,300	1992

suitable for the small island in Lake Huron, and the title was removed in 1895. The first American protected area that was named a ‘national park’ in legislation and kept this designation to the present was Mount Rainier in 1899. In the twentieth century, extensive discussions about the proper use of the term accompanied the approval or rejection of new parks and thereby continuously shifted the common meaning of the U.S. national park.⁵¹

The globalization of the term further complicated its meaning.⁵² While ‘national park’ became a kind of global brand long before Coca-Cola or McDonald’s, there was no international institution or legal framework regulating its use. A bewildering variety of nature protection schemes adopted the label within a few decades, so that a need for an international definition of the national park was increasingly felt. In 1933, the third conference held by

the European colonial powers on the preservation of the flora and fauna on the African continent in London agreed upon a definition that emphasized control by the highest legislative authority and the area's double purpose. Parks were to be set aside for 'the propagation, protection and preservation of wild animal life and wild vegetation and for the preservation of objects of aesthetic, geological, prehistoric, historical, archaeological, or other scientific interest for the benefit, advantage, and enjoyment of the general public'. If a concern with wildlife was pivotal in the case of Africa, an American 'Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere' signed by twelve states from Latin and North America in Washington, DC, in 1940 echoed the monumentalism of Yellowstone and Yosemite. It assigned to national parks the 'protection and preservation of superlative scenery' and of 'flora and fauna of national significance'.

The cofounder of the Swiss National Park, Carl Schröter, presumed in 1924 that the term was so widely used because of its rhetorical suggestiveness. Three elements associated with the concept were particularly appealing to proponents of national parks worldwide. First, in an age of rampant nationalism and nation building in full swing, the 'national' was an attractive tag to bestow relevance upon any cause. Framing a landscape as meaningful to the nation was a means to approach governments for funding and protection, mobilize shame and fears of national backwardness, bid for public appreciation and raise patriotic sentiments. Second, the 'park' label associated the respective landscapes with public accessibility and recreation. Finally, the association of the term with the United States gave the conservationist agenda a peculiarly modern image.

But all these elements served as reasons to reject the term as well. The prefix 'national' was hardly applicable to all political settings. In subnational contexts as well as within the framework of empires, the national denomination could be a contested issue.⁵³ Then there were many instances where the reference to the United States turned out to be double edged: While for some, the United States served as a model of how an advanced industrial society managed to domesticate the dynamic of capitalist exploitation and integrate the preservation of nature into its idea of progress, others rejected the national park label as an alien import and signifier of American materialism, capitalism or imperialism. Finally, the term 'park' was criticized for not appropriately describing what were held to be essentially 'wild spaces'. The governor of Tanganyika, for example, regretted in the late 1930s that the term 'has become accepted currency' for he deemed it not 'particularly suitable to describe the area to be protected on account of its suggestion of artificiality'. And discussing the applicability of the park concept to conservation in Britain after the Second World War, one conservationist associated with the word 'park' 'an artificially laid out and maintained piece of land or a site for assembling vehicles, for example, ar-

tillery or automobiles'. However, he regarded it 'useless at this late date to think of changing it, especially as an alternative, short of coining a new word, would be difficult, if not impossible, to suggest'.⁵⁴

Defining and categorizing to render the world legible and governable has been a standard feature of institutions operating through bureaucratic rationality.⁵⁵ Such categories not only represented the world in a specific way but also constructed it by generating universal standards. The clarity and comparability provided by such instruments came at a price. On the one hand, categorizations created their own incentive structures, inviting superficial compliance rather than effective preservation. On the other hand, categorizations hardly captured the complexity of the phenomenon at hand and created their own blind spots. For decades, this was the case with the social aspects of parks and their impact on local livelihoods.⁵⁶

This brief problematization of the national park category has pertained only to the definitions and meanings ascribed to it by 'parks people' and official documents. Tourists, scientists, wardens, displaced residents, shopkeepers or hoteliers inscribed a multiplicity of further meanings into parks. The oscillating character of the category as well as the politics of categorization has important ramifications for an analysis of the global proliferation of national parks. Any past or present definition of the national park would be inappropriate for guiding research. On the contrary, attempts to internationally classify and standardize national parks must be part of a global history analysis. If national parks have been fluid in their meanings and subject to intercultural translation and adaptation, then historians must follow the label through time and space and include all kinds of areas that have, for various reasons, been dubbed 'national park', regardless of their present categorization by IUCN. This does not mean to neglect that some concepts were of higher importance for the development of the national park idea than others. However, a global history of the national park must not lose sight of alternative developments, routes not taken and transfers denied or modified to a degree that the original blueprint is hardly discernible anymore. Therefore, also places where the term national park was rejected or dropped have been included in this volume.

National Parks between Imperialism, Internationalism and Nationalism

Imperialism, internationalism and nationalism all provided frameworks and opportunity structures for the global transfer and local appropriation of the national park idea. Empire, internationalism and nation are, therefore, the categories that structure our investigations into the global history of national parks, and this volume is accordingly organized into three sections entitled

Parks and Empires, Organizations and Networks, and Nations and Natures. The case studies in the first part, *Parks and Empires*, examine how national parks were established in 'frontier' settings and resulted from imperial encounters with wild nature. They analyze the varying ways nature was made meaningful in the form of national parks to white European settler communities not only in the United States but all over the globe. Imperialism, the case studies show, enabled hunters, conservationists, naturalists and nature lovers – often in transimperial dialogue and exchange – to frame the setting aside of wild nature as part of Europe's civilizing mission.

Karen Jones deals with Yosemite and Yellowstone as the first protected areas established as national parks in the United States in the 1860s and 1870s. Her contribution decentres the received interpretation of national parks as a genuinely American 'invention' by situating them in a larger history of Euro-American colonial expansionism and transatlantic debates on nature, nation and identity. This partial revision of American exceptionalism notwithstanding, Jones rejects allegations that "the United States provided no model for global diffusion of the idea"⁵⁷ by emphasizing both the eminent exportability of the general principles enshrined in US-American national parks, as well as the powerful allure 'Yellowstone' exerted as a mythical point of reference in conservationist discourse abroad.

The second chapter of the section by *Melissa Harper* and *Richard White* continues the theme of Yellowstone's impact upon conservationist discourse and practice abroad. However, the authors question and qualify its 'model' character by emphasizing both the varied experiences with nature and wilderness in the 'Greater Britain' of the English-speaking settler societies as well as the importance of alternative concepts and examples provided by the international concern over nature protection in the decades around 1900. While at first glance there seems to be a common thread in the ways 'nature' was implemented into the national understandings of the English-speaking settler societies, a careful comparison of the siting of parks in Canada, New Zealand and Australia unveils the enormous differences with respect to the purposes of 'national parks', the treatment of indigenous populations and the traditions of spatial conservation and land use that proved influential in the designation of national parks.

Caroline Ford's contribution challenges diffusionist assumptions of a Yellowstone model from another vantage point as she charts the establishment of protected areas in France and her overseas possessions. Ford's analysis reveals a remarkable fluidity of conservation concepts, oscillating broadly between conservation and preservation. She shows how name, nature and purpose of protected areas in the French colonies were negotiated in a complex constellation of factors, including the presence or absence of a French settler population, local resistance and the degree to which state authorities and scientific,

conservationist and tourist institutions and advocacy groups managed to bring their ideas about landscape protection to bear. The only 'national parks' in the French colonial empire were established in Algeria, where the preservation of the colony's depleted forests was of 'national' significance because they served as imperial mnemotopes that harked back to a golden past of natural plenty in North Africa during Roman times. In other parts of the empire national parks were rejected as concerned with the spectacular and tourism. Instead, so-called *réserves naturelles intégrales*, or strict nature reserves, were established, which served scientific and biological interests to the exclusion of human access and became the French contribution to international conservation legislation.

Existing analyses of game preservation in Africa and forest conservation in India have established the role of the British Empire as a key promoter of globalized environmental governance. *Jeyamalar Kathiritamby-Wells's* essay on the history of Malaysia's Taman Negara Park shows that British imperial environmentalism was not only more pervasive still but was itself part of trans-imperial processes of exchange and competition in colonial Asia. Established as King George V National Park in 1939 after years of effective lobbying by big game hunters and conservationist organizations, the park was renamed Taman Negara after independence and transformed from an imperial imposition into an emblem of postcolonial Malaysia. In a society marked by discriminatory land rights and nuanced curbs on political expression, the management of Taman Negara as a public space theoretically accessible to all citizens became an important vehicle for the country's growing middle class's claims on government accountability, environmental stewardship and political participation. The fate of the Batek hunter-gatherers is, however, a case in point for the structural legacies of imperial conservation. The fact that the Batek were allowed to remain in the park only as long as their lifestyle remained low impact, 'primitive' and 'authentic' shows that the dichotomies about 'civilized' and 'natural' produced in colonial times continued to motivate park management after independence.

Bernhard Gissibl's concluding chapter of the first section focuses on the entanglements of game conservation between East Africa and Germany. German colonial rule not only was instrumental in laying the foundation of Tanzania's environmental conservation complex before the First World War but also left a deep imprint on German conservationist thinking by conflating space, species and identity in a political geography of the characteristic animal. The ideology of a wilderness essentially animated by the presence of large, 'primeval' game not only motivated the top-down imposition of game reserves in the East African colony, but also resulted in a quest to render the German landscape primeval through the reintroduction of its 'original' big game. The projection of a racialized, masculine national identity onto the bodies of 'characteristic' species linked the spatialities of conservation in Germany's African colonies

with conservation at Germany's Eastern frontier in both World Wars and the reestablishment of a primeval fauna that inspired the creation of the country's first national park in the Bavarian Forest in 1970.

The contributions gathered in the section *Organizations and Networks* investigate how trans- and international movements, networks and organizations adopted and adapted the concept of the national park for multiple social and political motifs. Throughout the twentieth century Western conservationists worked hard to turn the national park into a universal conservation tool, and the forging of transnational structures for nature conservation had ramifications far beyond the stated goal of organized nature protection. INGOs as well as NGOs at times assumed parastatal functions in the governance of national parks, which became a laboratory for ecological and social experiments on various scales. The universalism of conservation provided a lever not only to shift, but also to affirm, and often to replace, existing global power relations, while the transfer and application of Western science and technology to park management in colonial and postcolonial settings reshaped the meanings of nature. Networking across borders remained, however, no privilege of conservationists and scientists. Also indigenous communities affected by the establishment of parks formed transnational alliances and adopted the language of human rights to resist and modify the structures of supranational environmental governance.

The section is opened by *Patrick Kupper* who investigates how the national park idea was decisively transformed by its transfer into the cultural landscapes of Europe at the beginning of the twentieth century. His chapter highlights the establishment of the Swiss National Park, the most prominent case of early European park building. Promoting the park as a laboratory for ecological sciences, the Swiss park deviated significantly from the American model with its emphasis on tourist recreation. Kupper also questions the importance of Yellowstone as an international model by tracing the significant role of the Swiss park as the bedrock of early attempts to establish a global network of protected areas. Arguably, conservationists in many countries were first familiarized with the national park concept through the relentless propaganda for *Weltnaturschutz* by the Swiss conservation entrepreneur Paul Sarasin before the First World War.

Anna-Katharina Wöbse takes up from where Sarasin left to delineate the importance of international organizations like the League of Nations and the United Nations as norm- and agenda-setting institutions for the preservation of nature worldwide. As early as the 1920s, the League of Nations embraced the concept of national parks as an appropriate 'container' and institution for the preservation of nature threatened with destruction. Wöbse demonstrates how a small network of white male Western scientists and lobbyists adopted the universalist language of a 'common world heritage' to enforce the claim to the

global spread and institutionalization of national parks. These efforts culminated in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention in 1972, which promoted an approach that clearly separated nature from culture and postulated collective human ownership of the nature protected in individual national parks.

Brad Martin investigates the contested power relations behind the benign label of global nature conservation. His essay attends to the clash of globally endorsed ideas of wilderness preservation and local traditions. The ongoing struggles between American and Canadian park planners and indigenous populations in arctic and subarctic regions unfolded in the Yukon-Alaska borderlands in the 1960s and 1970s when large areas were set aside for national parks without adequate participation of affected communities. As indigenous populations contested the boundaries of the planned parks and the ensuing restrictions imposed on their livelihoods, they formed networks that gained increasing strength and influence on determining the design and the use of the prospective parks. Thus, Martin's contribution reveals how the formation of a transnational indigenous movement was able to discredit the original approach of the national park as empty space devoid of humans in favour of more participatory concepts of national park management sensitive to local traditions and cultures.

Etienne Benson concludes the section, showing that the global spread of the national park not only consisted of the transfer of ideas and concepts but of conservationist practices, too. His chapter uses the science and technology of wildlife management in national parks to explore how changes in conservationists' scientific practices fundamentally shaped the management, territory and control of wild nature since the 1960s and 1970s. Benson investigates the appropriation of remote-sensing technologies developed at the peak of the Cold War in the 1960s by conservation biologists and follows a small academic network of wildlife scientists who applied radio tracking technology to grizzly bears in Yellowstone and later to tigers in the Nepalese Chitwan National Park. While it can be argued that the devices for disciplining nature were exported successfully from the United States to other regions of the world, Benson reveals that scientific and technological management strategies neither went uncontested, nor did they entail the straightforward 'modernization' of wildlife management. Park managers in Yellowstone objected to radio-collaring in the late 1960s as a visible violation of wilderness aesthetics. They also feared that the new systematic data on animal territoriality might jeopardize the independent management of the park. In Chitwan, the radio tracking of tigers proved instrumental in the significant extension of the park while incorporating key elements of local aristocratic traditions of tiger hunting. The chapter thus illustrates how a Western practice of park management was culturally adapted and localized. It also introduces animals as influential agents in the transition of national parks from spatially bounded wilderness towards an ecosys-

tem whose boundaries were determined scientifically through examining the functional relations of its parts.

The third part of the book, *Nations and Natures*, explores the close association of national parks with notions of territoriality and processes of nation building throughout the twentieth century. The contributions highlight the expediency of the national park idea for different political and socioeconomic regimes. They show, from an environmental history perspective, that globalized environmentalism and international environmental regimes did anything but weaken the governing capacities of the nation-state. Tracing the transfer of national parks to the latest wave of nation-building processes in Europe after 1990, the volume also questions some received assumptions of current globalization studies and reveals the ongoing importance of territoriality and the enduring allure of nationalized nature well into the twenty-first century.

Emily Wakild focuses on revolutionary Mexico under the presidency of Lázaro Cárdenas in the second half of the 1930s to show how national parks became a core expression of the governments' agenda of social reform, national integration and regeneration of natural resources. Altogether forty national parks were created on Mexican territory trying to serve the aims of making nature accessible to the people and conserving forests for rational exploitation. The chapter highlights the role of scientific foresters as a driving force behind the national park agenda, which proved astonishingly successful in reconciling multiple use and encouraging local support, although conflicts arising from the competing claims of urban regeneration, scientific forest management and land use by local communities were by no means missing. Stressing the degree to which an internationally recognized model of conservation served to foster local participation at the same time it federalised natural resources, Wakild makes a powerful case for the political versatility of an internationally recognized blueprint for conservation. The Mexicanized version of the national park, she argues, "etched a radical and inclusive meaning into the international concept".

The essay by *Henny van der Windt* pursues the transfer of the national park concept into one of the most densely populated countries in the world, the Netherlands. From the outset the small state territory disallowed the usual notions of wilderness as a value for preserving nature in parks. Instead, van der Windt contends, programmes of preserving cultural landscapes reigned supreme, introducing a completely different idea of nature and nature management compared to the park idea as it evolved in the United States. Many conservation projects were privately initiated, resisted the emphasis on the nation, and discarded any notion of pristine nature. Balancing the interests of humans and nature was an essential feature of the Netherlands' parks and shows how institutions that allowed for political participation spawned an understanding of 'nature' markedly different to the politics of conservation

exposed by European colonial powers – including the Netherlands – in their overseas empires.

The contribution by *Michael Lewis* focuses on the creation of national parks, tiger reserves and biosphere reserves in postcolonial India in the 1970s. He confronts the official Indian rhetoric of a Third World, anticolonial conservationism sensitive to issues of social justice with the actual performance of the protected areas that were established as a response to the promotion of national parks and biosphere reserves by a series of international environmental conferences since the early 1960s. This science-based assortment of protected areas as offered by the IUCN extended earlier Indian and British imperial traditions of conservation. As Lewis shows, it was impressive in numbers, but comparatively poor in performance. The Indian reception of the Man and Biosphere programme of the UNESCO resulted in the creation of fourteen biosphere reserves, which remained, however, merely a further title without concrete management consequences. They were marked by insufficient implementation and often exerted a detrimental impact upon local livelihoods. A similar ambivalence characterized India's Project Tiger, initiated in 1973. The programme was met with international acclaim and elevated the tiger into the rank of an emotionally integrating symbol of the Indian nation, but privileged tigers over the livelihoods of the poor. Therefore, Lewis qualifies the conservationist policies of India as those of an uncertain state honestly committed to both conservation and relief of rural poverty, yet unable to translate this commitment into viable politics.

Finally, *Carolyn Firouzeh Roeder* takes the example of the Julian Alps to demonstrate how nature conservation has continuously been reinterpreted and symbolically harnessed to different political systems throughout the twentieth century. From the times of the Habsburg Empire the idea of a national park developed both a surprising persistence and adaptive ability to survive imperial dissolution, two world wars, and multiple political upheavals and border changes. Imperial and national politics of conservation became repeatedly enmeshed with transnational transfers of concepts and ideas, which became encapsulated in today's Slovenian Triglav National Park. Today, the Triglav mountain provides not only a mental habitat for a new nationalist identity but also a powerful ethnoscape by which Slovenia, like other postsocialist societies, claims its belonging to Europe as a community of shared values that include nature conservation.

In her epilogue *Jane Carruthers* addresses the challenges and the potentials that a global history perspective poses to the environmental historiography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The history of the national park, she argues, by its very 'nature' transgresses the traditional focal point of the nation-state, demanding emphasis on international networks and transnational nature protection schemes. A global history approach also questions

long-standing concepts and values of a 'universal', timeless and ubiquitous nature dear to environmentalists and environmental historians alike. Finally, a global historical perspective points to the diverse scales of 'global' environmentalist structures as they intersect with local networks and form the 'web of globalization.' Thus Carruthers corroborates the central idea of this volume, that the history of national parks and their agency in 'civilizing nature' offers a distinguished approach to scrutinize the structures of global environmental governance as they have emerged in the twentieth century, particularly since the 1970s.

Notes

1. World Database on Protected Areas, <http://www.wdpa.org> (accessed 16 October 2012). Designations below nation-state level, private reserves and international protected areas are not even included in these numbers.
2. William M. Adams, *Against Extinction. The Story of Conservation* (London, 2004), 231.
3. http://www.cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/powpa_pp_sbsta14_final.pdf (accessed 16 October 2012).
4. <http://www.iucn.org/what/tpas/biodiversity/> (accessed 3 April 2011).
5. Consequently, the 2008 World Conservation Congress in Barcelona explicitly encouraged states to step up their efforts in establishing 'national ecological networks and connectivity conservation areas to strengthen the protection of biodiversity.' See also Graeme L. Worboys, Wendy L. Francis and Michael Lockwood, eds., *Connectivity Conservation Management. A Global Guide* (London, 2010).
6. Kenneth Pomeranz, 'Introduction: World History and Environmental History,' in *The Environment and World History*, ed. Edmund Burke III and Kenneth Pomeranz (Berkeley, 2009), 3.
7. The debate on how far world and global history in fact constitute different approaches remains as yet unresolved and has resulted in significant terminological overlap in practice; see Bruce Mazlish, 'Global History and World History,' in *The Global History Reader*, ed. Bruce Mazlish and Akira Iriye (New York, 2005), 16–20; Marnie Hughes-Warrington, 'World and Global History,' *Historical Journal* 51 (2008): 753–61.
8. Sterling Evans, *The Green Republic: A Conservation History of Costa Rica* (Austin, 1999); Elizabeth Garland, 'State of Nature: Colonial Power, Neoliberal Capital, and Wildlife Management in Tanzania.' PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 2006.
9. Important studies include David Anderson and Richard Grove, eds., *Conservation in Africa: People, Policies and Practice* (Cambridge, 1987); John M. MacKenzie, *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism* (Manchester, 1988); Patrick C. West and Steven R. Brechin, *Resident Peoples and National Parks: Social Dilemmas and Strategies in International Conservation* (Tucson, 1991); Jane Carruthers, *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History* (Pietermaritzburg, 1995); Krishna B. Ghimire and Michel P. Pimbert, eds., *Social Change and Conservation: Environmental Politics and Impacts of National Parks and Protected Areas* (Lon-

- don, 1997); Roderick P. Neumann, *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa* (Berkeley, 1998); Dawn Chatty and Marcus Colchester, eds., *Conservation and Mobile Indigenous Peoples: Displacement, Forced Settlement and Sustainable Development* (New York, 2002); Dan Brockington, *Fortress Conservation: The Preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve in Tanzania* (Oxford, 2002); William M. Adams and Martin Mulligan, eds., *Decolonizing Nature: Strategies for Conservation in a Post-colonial Era* (London, 2003); Jim Igoe, *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota* (Belmont, 2004).
10. For the early decades, see John Sheail, *Nature's spectacle. The World's First National Parks and Protected Areas* (London, 2010).
11. See e.g. Bernhard Grzimek, *Serengeti Shall Not Die* (London, 1960); Robert M. Poole, ed., *Nature's Wonderlands: National Parks of the World* (Washington, DC, 1989); Laura and William Riley, *Nature's Strongholds: The World's Great Wildlife Reserves* (Princeton, 2005).
12. David John Frank, Ann Hironaka and Evan Schofer, 'The Nation-State and the Natural Environment over the Twentieth Century', *American Sociological Review* 65 (2000): 99; John W. Meyer et al., 'The Structuring of a World Environmental Regime 1870–1990', *International Organization* 51 (1997): 623–51. This research is, however, not interested in explaining the globalization of parks as such. Rather, it takes the proliferation of parks as an indicator for the making and functioning of a world environmental regime.
13. Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind* (New Haven, 2001; 1st ed. 1967); Roderick Nash, 'The American Invention of National Parks', *American Quarterly* 22 (1970): 734.
14. Nash, *Wilderness*, 344. On tourism as a motor for park establishment see Warwick Frost and C. Michael Hall, eds., *Tourism and National Parks. International Perspectives on Development, Histories and Change* (London, 2009).
15. Dan Brockington, Rosaleen Duffy and Jim Igoe, *Nature Unbound. Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas* (London, 2008). See also Karl S. Zimmerer, ed., *Globalization and New Geographies of Conservation* (Chicago, 2006).
16. For a survey, see John R. McNeill, *Something New under the Sun. An Environmental History of the Twentieth Century* (London, 2000), esp. ch. 8.
17. See the contribution of Ford in this volume; Melissa Leach and Robin Mearns, *The Lie of the Land. Challenging Received Wisdom on the African Environment* (Oxford, 1996); Paul Robbins, *Political Ecology. A Critical Introduction* (Malden, 2004); Roderick P. Neumann, *Making Political Ecology* (London, 2005).
18. Martin W. Holdgate, *The Green Web: A Union for World Conservation* (London, 1999); Barbara J. Lausche, *Weaving a Web of Environmental Law: Contributions of the IUCN Environmental Law Programme* (Bonn, 2008).
19. Particularly the 1900 and 1933 London Conventions relating to wildlife preservation in colonial Africa were critical in promoting and defining conservation enclosures, which served as a blueprint for park making well beyond the African continent. Mark Cioc, *The Game of Conservation: International Treaties to Protect the World's Migratory Animals* (Athens, OH, 2009).

20. For a recent critique, see Ian Tyrrell, 'America's National Parks: The Transnational Creation of National Space in the Progressive Era,' *Journal of American Studies* 46, no. 1 (2012): 1–21.
21. See the critique of Ramachandra Guha, 'Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation. A Third World Critique,' *Environmental Ethics*, 11 (1989): 71–83.
22. James G. Carrier and Paige West, eds., *Virtualism, Governance and Practice: Vision and Execution in Environmental Conservation* (New York, 2009); Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton, 2004).
23. Saskia Sassen, *Territory, Authority, Rights. From Medieval to Global Assemblages* (Princeton, 2006); Roland Robertson, 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', in *Global Modernities*, eds. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson (London, 1994), 23–44; Antony G. Hopkins, ed., *Global History: Interactions between the Universal and the Local* (New York, 2006).
24. Michael J. Sheridan and Celia Nyamweru, eds., *African Sacred Groves: Ecological Dynamics and Social Change* (Athens, OH, 2007); Mahesh Rangarajan, *India's Wildlife History, An Introduction* (Delhi, 2006); Thomas T. Allsen, *The Royal Hunt in Eurasian History* (Philadelphia, 2006).
25. Roderick P. Neumann, 'Dukes, Earls and Ersatz Edens. Aristocratic Nature Preservationists in Colonial Africa,' *Environment and Planning D. Society and Space* 14 (1996): 79–98.
26. Harriet Ritvo, *The Animal Estate. The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age* (London, 1990), 209.
27. Civilize, v., in: Oxford English Dictionary, 3rd ed., November 2010, online version March 2011 (<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/33587>; accessed 16 October 2012).
28. 'The Impending Doom of Yosemite,' *New York Times*, 13 February 1872, 4.
29. John Muir, *Our National Parks* (Boston, 1903), 1.
30. 'Letter by John F. Kennedy. June 23 1962', as printed in *First World Conference on National Parks*, ed. Alexander B. Adams (Washington, DC, 1964).
31. Charles Gordon Hewitt, *The Conservation of Wild Life in Canada* (New York, 1921), 1f.
32. Julian Huxley, *The conservation of wild life and natural habitats in Central and East Africa. Report on a mission accomplished for UNESCO in July-September 1960* (Paris, 1961), 94; Raymond Bonner, *At the Hands of Man. Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife* (New York, 1993), 64–67.
33. Paul Jepson and Robert J. Whittaker, 'Histories of Protected Areas: Internationalisation of Conservationist Values and Their Adoption in the Netherlands Indies (Indonesia),' *Environment and History* 8 (2002): 130.
34. See Jürgen Osterhammel, *Europe, the 'West' and the Civilizing Mission. The 2005 Annual Lecture* (London, German Historical Institute, 2006); Immanuel Wallerstein, *European Universalism. The Rhetoric of Power* (New York, 2006); Boris Barth and Jürgen Osterhammel, eds., *Zivilisierungsmissionen. Imperiale Weltverbesserung seit dem 18. Jahrhundert* (Konstanz, 2005).
35. Arun Agrawal, *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects* (Oxford, 2005), 226.

36. See Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question* (Berkeley, 2005), 91–112; Sebastian Conrad, 'Globalization Effects. Mobility and Nation in Imperial Germany 1880–1914', *Journal of Global History* 3 (2008): 43–66.
37. Charles S. Maier, 'Consigning the Twentieth Century to History: Alternative Narratives for the Modern Era', *American Historical Review* 105 (2000): 807–31.
38. *Ibid.*, 818.
39. Questions on the evidence of space and place have long been domains of poststructuralist social sciences, cultural studies, postcolonial studies and critical geography; see, for example, Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis, 1996); David Harvey, *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference* (Oxford, 1996); Doreen Massey, *For Space* (London, 2005); Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London, 1999); David Turnbull, *Masons, Tricksters and Cartographers: Comparative Studies in the Sociology of Scientific and Indigenous Knowledge* (Amsterdam, 2000).
40. See Mark Dowie, *Conservation Refugees: The One Hundred Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples* (Cambridge, MA, 2009); Daniel Brockington, James Igoe, 'Eviction for Conservation: A Global Overview', *Conservation and Society* 4, no. 3 (2006): 424–70.
41. Examples of a comparatively early involvement of local communities into park management are provided by Reuben M. Matheka, 'Decolonisation and Wildlife Conservation in Kenya, 1958–68', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 36 (2008): 615–39; Reuben Matheka, 'Antecedents to the Community Wildlife Conservation Programme in Kenya, 1946–1964', *Environment and History* 11 (2005): 239–67.
42. See Martin in this volume, Jim Igoe, 'Global Indigenism and Spaceship Earth. Convergence, Space and Re-entry Fiction', *Globalizations* 2 (2005): 377–90; Alison Brysk, *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford, 2000).
43. The politics of transfrontier parks are a recent example of how efforts of nature conservation as well as network and capacity building have been intricately intertwined with the leverage of transnationally mobile capital and exclusive global political, financial and business networks.
44. Michael R. Dove et al., 'The Global Mobilization of Environmental Concepts: Re-Thinking the Western/Non-Western Divide', in *Nature across Cultures: Views of Nature and the Environment in Non-Western Cultures*, ed. Helaine Selin and Arne Kalland (Dordrecht, 2003), 19–46; Anna Tsing, 'The Global Situation', *Cultural Anthropology* 15 (2000): 327–60.
45. Jean G. Baer, 'A Contribution to Securing a Unified Nomenclature in the Field of the Protection of Nature', Paris, 12 January 1949, UNESCO Archives Paris NS/UIPN/8, Annex IVA.
46. Nigel Dudley, ed., *Guidelines for Applying Protected Areas Management Categories* (Gland, 2008), 16. For the history of the IUCN categories system see *ibid.*, 3–5; Adrian Phillips, 'The History of the International System of Protected Area Management Categories', *Parks* 14 (3/2004): 4–14.
47. The IUCN categories apply to nationally designated protected areas. In addition to and often overlapping with these national designations, there are sites recognized on the international level. Since the 1970s, several thousand World Heritage Sites, Bio-

sphere Reserves and Ramsar Reserves have been created. For the politics and consequences of international categorization see the contributions of Woebse and Lewis in this volume.

48. For the definition of the categories see Dudley, *Guidelines*.
49. World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), <http://www.wdpa.org> (accessed 16 October 2012), Kevin Bishop et al., *Speaking a Common Language: The Uses and Performance of the IUCN System of Management Categories for Protected Areas* (Cardiff, 2004), 16.
50. WDPA (accessed 16 October 2012). It seems that mainly developed countries with a long conservation tradition stick to their own national categories.
51. See Roderick Nash, 'The Confusing Birth of National Parks', *Michigan Quarterly Review* 19 (1980): 216–26; Alfred Runte, *National Parks: The American Experience* (Lincoln, 1987); Harpers Ferry Center, ed., *The National Parks: Shaping the System* (Washington, DC, 2005).
52. See the contributions of Harper/White, Gissibl and Kupper in this volume.
53. Cf. the contribution of van der Windt in this volume.
54. Public Record Office London CO 323/1516/16, Harold MacMichael to Colonial Office, 22 November 1937; G.F. Herbert Smith in *Nature*, 4 October 1947.
55. James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, 1998).
56. These problems are now acknowledged by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre. See UNEP-WCMC, ed., *Annual Report on Protected Areas: A Review of Global Conservation Progress in 2007* (Cambridge, 2008), 29ff. On the impacts on livelihoods see especially the contributions of Kathirithamby-Wells, Martin and Wakild in this volume.
57. This is the argument forwarded by Tyrrell, 'America's National Parks', 4.