CONSERVATION AND THE DAY AFTER TOMORROW: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF GUYANA'S CONSERVATION EFFORTS

Delon Alain Omrow
Environmental Studies
York University
delonominfo@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Global conservationists exercise geographic domination through the imposition of hegemonic and neocolonial modes of conservation through the reliance on market-oriented, fortress style, and command and control management. Situating conservation within an abyssal framework forces students of conservation to ruminate on how cognitive injustice is linked to social and environmental injustice. This article explores the discourses surrounding the creation of Guyana's very first community-owned conservation area (C.O.C.A.), unmasking the abyssal dimensions of conservation efforts.

Keywords: Guyana, Cognitive Injustice, Critical Discourse Analysis, Conservation, Abyssal Thinking.

INTRODUCTION

This article serves as an instalment in a comparative and critical analysis of the discursive representation of Guyana's indigenous population. Analyzing how both the government of Guyana and Conservation International utilize textual and linguistic resources available to them, I reveal that representations of the Amerindians conform to a legacy of Santosian abyssal ideology and cognitive injustice, reinforcing their civilizational and cultural inferiority. I begin this article by explaining the significance of exploring abyssal thinking in conservation projects; I proceed by presenting a brief, and succinct, literature review on the problematics of conservation; finally, I explore the creation of the country's first community-owned conservation area and its abyssal dimensions, invoking critical discourse analysis (CDA) in order to tease apart Conservation International's institutional discourses surrounding the implementation of the project.

Abyssal Thinking and Conservation

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2006; 2014) argues that modern Western thinking constitutes abyssal thinking through an intricate system of visible and invisible distinctions, with the latter serving as a foundation for the former. Invisible distinctions are composed of radical lines which divide social reality into two distinct realms: the realm of "this side of the line" and the realm of "the other side of the line" (Santos 2014). It bears emphasizing that through this division of social reality, "the other side of the line" runs the risk of vanishing because it is produced as nonexistent by those on "this side of the line". Santos (2014) reminds us that an important feature of abyssal thinking is the impossibility of co-presence between the two sides of the line. It is this impossibility of co-presence which captures my attention – especially the constellation of invisible distinctions which have drawn upon (and continue to draw upon) colonial and post-colonial discourses regarding the "backwardness" and cultural inferiority of the Amerindians. The indigenous peoples of Guyana have been discursively

consigned to "the other side of the line". Drawing upon the works of Michel Foucault (1970; 1972; 1977; 1980), Norman Fairclough (1989; 1992; 1995; 2000; 2001) and Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2006; 2014), I explore the power of discourse- its capacity to create myriad social realities, creating and sustaining unequal social orders. Human beings interpret the world based upon the social and cultural categories available to them. Thus, this project endeavors a thoughtful examination of the colonial, and post-colonial, discourses surrounding Guyana's indigenous peoples.

My exploration of the discourses surrounding the creation of Guyana's very first community-owned conservation area (C.O.C.A.) seeks to unmask the abyssal dimensions of conservation efforts. Couched within the rhetoric of Conservation International's institutional discourses is a visible distinction: Market-Oriented Conservation/Indigenous Conservation. Such a distinction, however, is buttressed by a collection of invisible distinctions: Modern/Customary, Formalized Knowledge/Folk Knowledge, Stakeholders/Rights-Holders, Unilinear and Commodified/Fractal and Recursive Environments and Positivistic/Cosmographic.

One-Sided Conservation?

Research on the social impacts of conservation initiatives in Guyana is still in its infancy; there is, nevertheless, a robust literature on conservation-induced displacement across the globe (Brockington et al., 2003; Sanderson et al. 2002; Igoe 2010; Duffy 2003; Agrawal and Redford 2009; Ferguson 2006; Garland 2008). From consumption pressures, which accelerate the decline of flora and fauna, to the failure of conservation projects to alleviate poverty, eradicate disease and promote social equity (Sanderson et al. 2002), many scholars argue that conservation, like development, is inherently spatial and that the conservation of ecosystems implies the governance of human interaction with landscapes (Agrawal and Redford, 2009). The asymmetrical power relations inherent in conservation projects have been critiqued, leading scholars to the conclusion that international organizations cannot impose transboundary cooperation along/across the boundaries of protected areas, but must encourage and foster "day-to-day involvement and efforts of those on the local level" (Zbicz 2003: 22).

This literature also addresses the problematics of contemporary conservation models. For example, drawing upon the conservation work of the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), Igoe (2010) suggests that the representation of conservation in the media facilitates transformations of landscapes consistent with a 'conservationist mode of production' (Garland 2008) in which conservation lays claims to 'natural capital', securing resources for interventions which maintain dominant worldviews. Such worldviews entail the idea that people residing in conservation landscapes can easily transition from land-based livelihoods to market-based ones. This logic legitimizes massive conservation efforts worldwide (Adamson 2006; West and Carrier 2004). While Igoe (2010) comments on the media productions of conservation interventions, asserting that such presentations elide the socio-economic complexities of the displacement and impoverishment of people, Brockington (2003:25) laments that current and future conflicts over protected areas contain a "myriad of marginalizations and inequalities enforced on smaller and smaller scales".

The politics of conservation, Agrawal and Redford (2009) suggest, are shrouded in mystery; there is a lack of systematic data regarding what transpires in 'protected areas', leading to questions of how management objectives of conservation efforts are implemented. What is

more, there is a glaring absence of data regarding the social impacts of displacement and what role the government of certain countries is poised to play in addressing the rights of those who have been evicted from their territories (Agrawal and Redford 2009). Despite such gaps in the literature, numerous studies have recorded some of the consequences of conservation-led displacement: impoverishment, social disarticulation, political disempowerment and losses to livelihoods and agricultural incomes, (Ghimire & Pimbert 1997; Adams and Hutton 2007; McLean & Straede 2003; Rao et al. 2002).

Guyana's Community-Owned Conservation Area

The Konashen community-owned conservation area is the first of its kind in Guyana. It is located within the Konashen Indigenous District in the deep southern region of Guyana (1°11 to 2°2'N and 58°18 to 59°39'W). It is revered as one of the last intact and pristine forested areas in the country, encompassing the watershed of the Essequibo River and the tributaries of the Kassikaityu, Kamoa, Sipu and Chodikar rivers. The region also boasts awe-inspiring mountains: the Wassarai, Yashore, Kamoa, and Kaiawakua with elevations reaching approximately 1200 meters above the sea level (Alonso et al. 2008). The untouched pristine landscape is attributed to the area's low population density (about 0.032 humans/km2). The village of Masakenari is located within the Konashen C.O.C.A. This village is inhabited by the Wai Wai. No more than 250 people reside in the village; they rely upon the area for their sustenance, utilizing the resources at their disposal. At the turn of the 21st century, the Smithsonian Institution identified nearly 2,700 species of plants (239 distinct families) from the area (Alonso et al. 2008).

With mounting fears that the utilization of the region's resources were not being used sustainably, the Wai Wai, upon receiving formal title to their lands in 2004, demonstrated interest in collaborating with Conservation International to embark on an expansive inventory of the region's natural resources, in conjunction with the development of community-based regulations and the implementation of systems of governance. The Government of Guyana, Conservation International-Guyana (CIG) and the Wai Wai signed a Memorandum of Cooperation (MOC) outlining a plan for the sustainable use of the Konashen's biological resources. Here are the terms of the MOC, as cited in a Rapid Assessment Program by Alonso et al. (2008: 13):

> -to jointly evaluate the ongoing resource needs of the Wai Wai and the impact of traditional land uses on biodiversity and ecosystems.
> -to jointly conduct surveys and other activities necessary to collect data for an adequate evaluation.
> -to work together to increase local, national and global awareness of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystems on the Wai Wai land.
> -to jointly develop land-use practices that satisfy Wai Wai needs while also preserving ecosystems and biodiversity.
> -to develop an appropriate strategy for managing resource use and for identifying and addressing threats to the integrity of the area.
> -to identify and formulate income-generating projects and potential sources of funding of the same.
> -to work together to establish the Wai Wai lands as a Wai Wai owned and managed conservation area for future recognition

and incorporation by the national protected area system.
-to work together to identify and secure adequate funds to finance the implementation of this collaborative process.
-to regularly collaborate to update the GOG, through the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs, regarding the implementation of the process, in order to benefit from its insight and contribution.

The C.O.C.A. plays a vital role in the creation of a southern biodiversity corridor along the Essequibo River which links it to the North Rupununi Wetlands, the Kanuku Mountains Protected Area, the Iwokrama Rainforest Reserve and the Kaieteur National Park. Such an endeavor dovetails with Conservation International's long-term vision of linking the Southern Guyana corridor with other protected areas, establishing a mega-Guyana Shield Tropical Wilderness Corridor (Alonso et al. 2008).

Abyssal Ideology and Discourse

Critical discourse analysis explores the manner in which power and language intersect, perpetuating asymmetrical power relations. When exploring the discourses of an institution such as Conservation International, it behooves analysts to adopt Dennis Mumby and Robin Clair's (1997) approach to examining organizational discourse. The authors maintain that all organizations are discursive sites which enable the production, maintenance and reproduction of domination via ideology. Before we explore the discourses surrounding the initiative in the Konashen district, let us perform a critical analysis of Conservation International's discourses surrounding other conservation projects, gaining a deeper understanding of how abyssal ideology is produced and maintained through this organization. Consider this brief description of tourism in the Rupununi, which relies on what Valene Smith (1996) refers to as the four Hs of tourism (heritage, history, habitat and handicraft):

> "*The Rupununi already has a good base of excellent birding, nature and culture tourism experiences, but to attract the special interest traveler segment…work must be done to polish existing experiences and create dynamic new ones that deliver a unique sense of place and make travelers feel the true essence of Guyana*"
> (Conservation International 2010: 71).

Here, the visible distinction between Market-Oriented Conservation/Indigenous Conservation is captured and sustained by an ideology of "collaboration" between the international NGO and the indigenous groups of the Rupununi. The latter are positioned on a unilinear trajectory of both Western-based development and conservation. This trajectory, therefore, encourages conformity to Western ideals and portrays the Amerindians' traditional way of life as highly dependent upon the work of international NGOs: the so-called collaboration between these two parties portrays Guyana's indigenous peoples as "catching up" with the Western world, lest their customs and livelihoods disappear in our modern, globalized world. In the text above, the visible distinction between Market-Oriented Conservation/Indigenous Conservation is buttressed by invisible distinctions- namely, Modern/Customary and Positivistic/Cosmographic. For example, Conservation International declares that the Rupununi already has "*a good base of excellent birding, nature and culture tourism experiences",* but proceeds by stating that the communities can do more in order to attract more tourists. This is followed by suggestions that the current tourism experience must be

"polished" to "*create dynamic new ones that deliver a unique sense of place",* making travelers *"feel the true essence of Guyana".*

This suggests that there is something "*passive*", "*stagnant*" and "*untrue*" about the current experiences delivered by this Amerindian community. Moreover, they require Conservation International's help to foster tourism in their villages. The irony here is the Rupununi already features a unique sense of place and does, in fact, embody the true essence of Guyana. What Conservation International is referring to then is a Western-based ideal of the commodification of the Amerindian ethnosphere and its integration into the mainstream market economy. In other words, tourists such as the "*special interest traveler segment"* will gain more of an "experience" from a commodified interpretation of Guyana.

We can advance a critical analysis of Conservation International's discourses surrounding the community-owned conservation area. Their website features a section on what they refer to as "community-based" management:

> "*The Wai Wai community is now moving forward with conservation and development planning for the community conserved area. With the technical advice of Conservation International, the community leadership group has completed their long term Management Plan, and is in the process of completing their first two-year Operating Plan.*
>
> *Six community members recently completed training as qualified rangers and para-biologists, and a community-led training program has revitalized their traditional craft enterprise. Under the new operating plan, a management training program will be implemented for the community leadership and opportunities are being developed to create partnerships for research and eco-tourism development.*"

This passage embodies Santosian distinctions- both visible and invisible. The visible distinction between Market-Oriented Conservation/Indigenous Conservation is foregrounded, again, by invisible distinctions between Modern/Customary and Positivistic/Cosmographic. The ideology of collaboration, and cooperation, positions the Wai Wai as entirely dependent upon modern, scientific and positivistic epistemologies in order to move "*forward with conservation and development planning".* This impetus to move forward, undoubtedly, is attributed to the *"technical advice"* of Conservation International via "capacity building".

The text proceeds to boast the quality of its "capacity building", stating that "*six community members recently completed training as qualified rangers and para-biologists"* and that these training programs have "*revitalized their traditional craft enterprise".* The Wai Wai are framed as completely dependent upon external actors such as Conservation International in order to perform sustainable use of their resources and proper conservation of their lands. Nowhere in the text do we see evidence of "joint cooperation" (as clearly outlined in the MOC). Instead, abyssal lines are drawn between Modern/Customary epistemologies and practices, as the description outlined above adopts a very narrow-minded and unilinear approach to conservation, obfuscating the holistic and cosmographic relationship the Wai Wai have with their lands. It is almost as if the management of the area's resources are entirely top-down, ignoring opportunities for local governance, self-determination and leadership- in other words, "conservation *by* the people". Nowhere is this more evident than

near the end of the text where Conservation International reveals its plans to "*create partnerships for research and eco-tourism development",* an attempt to commodify Wai Wai landscapes and lifestyles, integrating the C.O.C.A. into the global market economy.

We see this positivistic and market-oriented *rationality* in various articles released by Conservation International. Consider the following quotes from CI President Dr. Russell A. Mittermeier and Executive Director Dr. David Singh:

> "*These irreplaceable forests are under threat from increasing demand from a resource-hungry world. The fact that the carbon market is finally beginning to look at the critical importance of forest carbon provides a unique new opportunity to compensate tropical countries for protecting these forests at a scale far beyond anything that has been done to date and in a way that is truly sustainable both ecologically and economically. Guyana's enlightened approach to this issue could serve as a model for many other forest-rich countries around the world*"
> (Stabroek News 2007: 9).

> "*The carbon stock in our intact forests provides a global public good around which we must develop financial mechanisms for conservation and sustainable use…The people, the place and biodiversity come together to make this area a centre for tourism in Guyana. We look forward to continue working with communities and like-minded organizations in its development*"
> (Stabroek News 2008: 12).

In both texts, collaboration is framed as very one-sided and market-oriented. The visible distinction between Market-Oriented Conservation/Indigenous Conservation is propped up by invisible distinctions between Stakeholders/Rights-Holders and Formalized Knowledge/Folk Knowledge. This is most evident in Dr. Mittermeier's statement that "*the fact that the carbon market is finally beginning to look at the critical importance of forest carbon provides a unique new opportunity to compensate tropical countries for protecting these forests".* This reveals that conservation among the Wai Wai does not occur due to either customary and holistic relations between the indigenous peoples and their lands, but due to the carbon market's recognition of their lands as potential sites of carbon sequestration. Cosmographic conceptions of the environment, therefore, are replaced with strictly positivistic and market-oriented conceptions of the value of indigenous land, transforming the Wai Wai (among other communities) into stakeholders and not rights-holders with cosmological and spiritual connections to their land.

After presenting this "market" mentality, Dr. Mittermeier proceeds by saying that "*Guyana's enlightened approach to this issue could serve as a model for many other forest-rich countries around the world".* The implication in the subtext is that a market-oriented approach to conservation is an "*enlightened"* one and that alternative reasons for conservation are "*unenlightened".* Such a statement advances the integration of indigenous land into the global market for commodification and privatization by international actors.

The final text which will be presented truly exemplifies abyssal ideology vis-à-vis conservation. During the celebration of Biodiversity Day, observed March 22, Prime Minister

Samuel Hinds delivered a succinct speech on the importance of protecting the nation's resources. 2010 marked the international year of biodiversity and the theme of the commemoration was "Many Species, One Planet, One Future", but it was Hinds' speech which warrants a closer analysis. He clearly placed more emphasis on certain actors in the field of conservation, ignoring the contributions of many others- namely, the country's indigenous population:

> "*Today, mankind has to develop a new way of living which allows all of earth's people to be secure. We can no longer live in a way where we essentially pillage the environment. This poses new questions for engineers and scientists and all, and is a cause for all to show greater consideration for our surroundings*" (Guyana Chronicle 2010: 23).

CDA explores the lexical devices present in a given text, but it also explores what is rendered invisible or absent. In Hinds' declaration that "*mankind has to develop a new way of living which allows all of earth's people to be secure",* he merely illumines the invisible distinctions of abyssal ideology which values certain epistemologies over others. In this particular example, when Hinds explores the solutions to the decline of biodiversity and the pillaging of the environment, he states that "*this poses new questions for engineers and scientists".* This statement reveals the purported supremacy of technocratic and positivistic methodologies of conservation over other methodologies. Thus, invisible distinctions between Formalized/Folk Knowledge and Modern/Customary are referenced here and it is only the practitioners in the fields of engineering and science who are portrayed as capable of enacting conservation. This is entirely false, given the research on Amerindian epistemological and methodological bases for conservation (Chung Tiam Fook 2011). It is the deliberate exclusion of indigenous methodologies of conservation in Hinds' speech which should be critically analyzed, especially after the MOC's emphasis on cooperation between Amerindian communities and global conservation actors. Again, the Amerindians are discursively portrayed as needing the guidance of Western-based paradigms to achieve their goals.

CONCLUSION

The above excerpts reveal that discourses surrounding conservation and LCDS are hardly apolitical, but rather reinforce powerful, epistemological regimes. Whether it is through the marketization of conservation, or the commodification of indigenous lands, power imbalances inhere in national, and international, discourses. To recapitulate, this article explains the significance of exploring abyssal thinking in conservation projects; I proceed by presenting a brief, and succinct, literature review on the problematics of conservation; this is followed by an analysis of international-led conservation initiatives in Guyana; finally, I explore the creation of the country's first community-owned conservation area and its abyssal dimensions, invoking critical discourse analysis (CDA) in order to tease apart Conservation International's institutional discourses surrounding the implementation of the project.

REFERENCES

Adams, W.M. & J. Hutton. (2007). "People, parks and poverty: political ecology and biodiversity conservation". *Conservation and Society* 5(2): 147-183.

Adamson, R. (2006). Conservation and indigenous peoples: Peeling away the misconceptions (interview with Rebecca Adamson). *Alliance Magazine Online*

http://www.allavida.org/alliance/axnov04a.html.

Agrawal, A. & K. Redford. (2009). "Conservation and Displacement: An Overview". *Conservation & Society*. 7(1): 1-10.

Allicock, S. (2003). *Developing partnerships between the North Rupununi District Development Board (NRDDB) and the Iwokrama International Centre Programme for Rain Forest Conservation & Development*. Paper presented at Indigenous Rights in the Commonwealth Caribbean and Americas Regional Expert meeting. Georgetown, Guyana.

Alonso, L.E., McCullough, J., Naskrecki, P., Alexander, E. & Wright, H.E. (2008). *A rapid biological assessment of the Konashen Community Owned Conservation Area, Southern Guyana. RAP Bulletin of Biological Assessment 51*. Arlington, VA: Conservation International.

Amerindian Peoples Association. (2000a). Newsletter No.3, April. Georgetown: Amerindian Peoples Association. Amerindian Peoples Association, Upper Mazaruni Amerindian District Council.

Brockington, D. (2003). "Injustice and Conservation- is 'Local Support' Necessary for Sustainable Protected Areas?". *Policy Matters*. 12(1).

Bulkan, J. (2010). "Review of Butt Colson, A. J. (2009). Land. Its occupation, management, use and conceptualization: the case of the Akawaio and Arekuna of the Upper Mazaruni District, Guyana"**.** *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America*. 8(1): 4.

Chapin, M. (2004). *A Challenge to Conservationists*. Washington, D.C.: WorldWatch Institute.

Choudry, A. (2003). Beware the Wolf at the Door: Conservation International. *Seedling: GRAIN Magazine.*

Choudry, A. (2003, October 3). *Conservation International: privatizing nature, plundering biodiversity.* Retrived from https://www.grain.org/article/entries/406-conservation-international-privatizing-nature-plundering-biodiversity

Chung Tiam Fook, T.A. (2009). "Articulating Decolonized Collaborative Conservation through Indigenous Knowledges in Guyana". In Davis, L. (Ed.) *Re/Envisioning Relationships: Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal Alliances and Coalitions for Indigenous Rights, Social and Environmental Justice.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Chung Tiam Fook, T.A. (2011). *Sustaining Indigenous Lifeways Through Collaborative and Community-led Wildlife Conservation In The North Rupununi, Guyana*. (Doctoral Dissertation). York University: Toronto.

Colchester, M., La Rose, J., & James, K. (2002). Mining and Amerindians in Guyana, Report of the APA/NSI project on Exploring Indigenous Perspectives on Consultation and Engagement within the Mining Sector in Latin America and the Caribbean. Retrieved from http://www.nsiins.ca/english/pdf/guyana/guyana_final_report.pdf.

Conservation International. (2010). *Demonstrating Community Action Towards Implementation of Guyana's Low Carbon Development Strategy.* Georgetown: CI Guyana.

Deetz, S.A. (1990). "Reclaiming the subject matter as a guide to mutual understanding: Effectiveness and ethics in interpersonal interaction". *Communication Quarterly*. 38(1): 226-243.

Duffy, J.E. (2003). "Biodiversity loss, trophic skew and ecosystem functioning". *Ecology Letters*. 6(8): 680-687.

Edley, N. (2001). 'Analyzing masculinity: interpretative repertoires, ideological

dilemmas and subject positions'. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. Yates (Eds.). *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.
Errington, F. & D. Gewertz (2001). "On the Generification of Culture: from blow Fish to Melanesian". *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 7(3): 509-25.
Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (2000). 'Discourse, social theory and social research: the discourse of welfare reform'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 1(4): 163-195.
Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). 'Critical discourse analysis'. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 2. Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 258-84). London: Sage.
Ferguson, J. (2006). *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Foucault, M. (1969). *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard
Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things*. (Les Mots et les choses Trans.) New York: Random House, Inc.
Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* (A. Sheridan Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish*. (A. Sheridan Trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). (C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham & K. Soper, Trans.) New York: Pantheon Books.
Garland, E. (2008). "The elephant in the room: confronting the colonial character of wildlife conservation in Africa. *African Studies Review*. 51(3): 51-74.
Geisler, C. (2003). "A New Kind of Trouble: Evictions in Eden". *International Social Science Journal*. 55(175): 69-78.
Ghimire, K.B. & M.P. Pimbert, (1997). Social Change and Conservation. Environmental Politics and Impacts of National Parks and Protected Areas. London: Earthscan and UNRISD.
Guhu, R. (1989). "Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique". *Environmental Ethics*. 11(1): 71-83.
Guyana Chronicle. (2010). "LCDS not being forced upon Amerindians – Pearson". May 27. Georgetown.
Guyana Chronicle. (2010). "Persaud assures mining, forestry as Guyana signs US$700,000 climate change deal with CI". January 12. Georgetown.
Guyana Chronicle. (2010). "We can no longer live in a way where we essentially pillage the environment". May 31. Georgetown.
Hayward, M. L. A. & Boeker, W. (1998) "Power and Conflicts of Interest in Professional Firms: Evidence from Investment Banking", *Administrative Science Quarterly* 43(1): 22.
Hennessy, L. (2005). *Fission and Fusion: Economic Transformations and Indigenous Resistancein Guyana.* Berkeley: University of California.
Hill, R. (2006). "The effectiveness of agreements and protocols to bridge between indigenous and non-indigenous tool-boxes for protected area management: a case study from the wet tropics of Queensland". *Society and Natural Resources* 19:577-590.
Hill, R., Grant, C., George, M., Robinson, C.J., Jackson, S. & Abel, N. (2012). "A Typology of Indigenous engagement in Australian environmental management:

implications for knowledge integration and social-ecological system sustainability". *Ecology and Society*. 17(1): 1-17.

Vaughan Howard, C. (2001). *Wrought Identities: the Waiwai Expedition in Search of the "Unseen Tribes" of Northern Amazonia*. Phd Thesis. Chicago, Illinois: Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago.

Igoe, J. (2010). "The spectacle of nature in the global economy of appearances: Anthropological engagements with the spectacular mediations of transnational conservation". *Critique of Anthropology*. 30(4): 375-397.

La Rose, J. (2004). Indigenous Lands or National Park? *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. 28:1.

LaRose, J. (2004). In Guyana, Indigenous Peoples Fight to Join Conservation Efforts. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. 28(1).

Markham, A. (1996). "Potential impacts of climate change on ecosystems: A review of implications for policymakers and conservation biologists". *Climate Research*. 6(2): 179-191.

Maud, H. (2003). The Iwokrama story- A Commonwealth cliff-hanger. *The Round Table*. 371(1): 477-485.

McLean J, & S. Straede. (2003). "Conservation, relocation and the paradigms of park and people management—a case study of Padampur Villages and the Royal Chitwan National Park, Nepal". *Soc. Nat. Res.* 16(1): 509–26.

Muller, S. (2003). "Towards decolonisation of Australia's protected area management: the Nantawarrina Indigenous Protected Area Experience". *Geographical Research* 41:29-43.

Mumby, D. (1996). "Feminism, Postmodernism, Organizational Communication Studies: A Critical Reading*". Management Communication Quarterly*. 9(3): 259-295.

Mumby, D.K. & Clair, R.P. (1997). "Organizational Discourse". In Teun A. van Dijk, (Ed). *Discourse as Social Action: Discourse Studies, vol 2: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 181-206). Newbury, CA: Sage.

Mentore, L. (2011). "Waiwai fractality and the arboreal bias of PES schemes in Guyana: what to make of the multiplicity of Amazonian cosmographies?". *Journal of Cultural Geography*. 28(1): 21-43.

Nelson, J. & Hossack, L. (Eds.) (2003). *From Principles to Practice: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas in Africa*. Moreton-in-Marsh: Forest Peoples Programme.

Nursey-Bray, M. (2009). "A Guugu Yimmithir Bam Wii: Ngawiya and Girrbithi: hunting, planning and management along the Great Barrier Reef, Australia". *Geoforum* 40:442-453.

Rao, G.Y., Andersson, S. and Widen, B. (2002). "Flower and cotyledon asymmetry in Brassica cretica: genetic variation and relationships with fitness*". Evolution*. 5(1): 690-698.

Roughley A. & Williams S. (2007). *The engagement of Indigenous Australians in natural resource management: Key findings and out- comes from Land & Water Australia funded research and the broader literature*. Land & Water Australia, Canberra, ACT.

Ross, H., C. Grant, C. J. Robinson, A. Izurieta, D. Smyth, & P.Rist. (2009). "Co-management and indigenous protected areas in Australia: achievements and ways forward". *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management* 16(1): 51-61.

Sanderson, E., Jaiteh, M., Levy, M., Redford, K., Wannebo, A. & Wollmer, G. (2002). "The Human Footprint and the Last of the Wild". *Bioscience*. 52(10): 891-904.

Santos, B. (2006). *The Rise of the Global Left. The World Social Forum and Beyond*. London: Zed Books.

Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.

Schroeder, R. (1997). "Re-claiming Land in The Gambia: Gendered Property Rights and Environmental Intervention". *Annals of the Association of American Geographers.* 87(3): 487-508.

Shiva, V. (1999). *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. New York: South End Press.

Smith, V. (1996). Indigenous Tourism: the Four H's. In R. Butler and Thomas Hinch (Eds). Tourism and Indigenous Peoples. London: International Thomson Business Press.

Stabroek News. (2001b). "Region 8 touchaus criticize Iwokrama, support protected areas", November 4. Georgetown.

Stabroek News. (2007). "Ford, Jagdeo and CI Call for Forest Protection to Fight Climate Change". May 20. Georgetown.

Stabroek News. (2008). "David Singh appointed local Conservation International head". January 8. Georgetown.

Stabroek News. (2011). "Heritage Village celebrations highlight contributions of Parliamentarian Stephen Campbell". Septmber 13. Georgetown.

Stabroek News. (2012). "Gov't stance on river mining, mercury exposes 'ineffective' environment community, says GHRA -urges review of mining regulations". August 25. Georgetown.

Stabroek News. (2012). "Masakenari pins future on 'green' development- seeking to join protected areas system". September 1. Georgetown.

West, P. (2006). *Conservation Is Our Government Now: The Politics of Ecology in Papua New Guinea*. Durham (NC): Duke University Press.

West, P. & Carrier, J. (2004). "Ecotourism and Authenticity: Getting Away from it All?". *Current Anthropology*. 45(4): 483-498.

Smith, E.A. & M. Wishnie. (2000). Conservation and subsistence in small-scale societies. *Annual Review Anthropology* 29:493-524.

Zerner, C.A. (2003). "Introduction- moving translations: poetics, performance and property in Indonesian and Malaysia". In Zerner, C.A. (Ed.) *Culture and the question of rights: forests, coasts and seas in Southeast Asia (*pp. 1-23). Durham (NC): Duke University Press.

Zbicz, D. (2003). "Imposing Transboundary Conservation: Cooperation Between Internationally Adjoining Protected Areas". *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*. 17(1): 21-37.