

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Nebraska Anthropologist

Anthropology, Department of

2006

Transboundary Protected Areas as a Solution to Border Issues

Catherine Pool

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nebanthro>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#)

Pool, Catherine, "Transboundary Protected Areas as a Solution to Border Issues" (2006). *Nebraska Anthropologist*. 23.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nebanthro/23>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Anthropology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Anthropologist by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Transboundary Protected Areas as a Solution to Border Issues

Catherine Pool

Abstract: Transboundary Protected areas (TBPAs) and peace parks are possible solutions to conflict and environmental problems that can occur along the borders separating countries. Though there are many possible benefits to the parks creation, they can cause problems for those that live along the borders. A series of case studies are examined to determine what factors can help or hinder the success of the parks. Without communication at all levels, from government to locals, the parks are unsuccessful. If the people at the border are not part of the decisions made regarding the parks they are much more likely to fail. If created and maintained in a correct manner, it is possible they can solve problems successfully.

I dream of an Africa which is in peace with itself. I dream of the realization of the unity of Africa, whereby its leaders combine in their efforts to solve the problems of this continent. I dream of our vast deserts, of our forests, of all our great wildernesses. We must never forget that it is our duty to protect this environment. Transfrontier parks are a way we can do just that (Nelson Mandela quoted in Godwin 2001).

Introduction

Today there are many different types of relationships between countries and Transboundary Protected Areas (TBPA) and peace parks can exist on any type of border. In the past eight or nine years TBPAs have come to the forefront as a possible solution to serious problems that can arise at a border. In all cases the parks are involved in helping the environment and, in some cases, they are used as a possible alternative to violence. An important question that needs to be asked of these parks, however, is whether they are always beneficial. If there is differential success for parks, then what factors need to be present for there to be a positive outcome? This paper will examine the general purpose or objectives of both TBPAs and peace parks and what separates the two by definition. I will describe a few different cases of TBPAs and peace parks to determine if they are a solution that is beneficial for all involved. Some of these cases are parks that have as

of yet only been proposed. It is important to investigate examples that have been unsuccessful to see what possible downsides they may have. I will also examine what traits and methods are important for the success of TBPAs and peace parks. I am providing a general overview of this issue in order to draw attention to its importance. Some details will need to be overlooked so that the larger issues can be fully addressed. This is a starting point for further research on this matter.

Definitions

Often TBPAs are also referred to as peace parks, but by definition they are not the same thing. A TBPA is:

An area of land and/or sea that straddles one or more boundaries between states, sub-national units such as provinces and regions, autonomous areas and/or areas beyond the limits of national sovereignty or jurisdiction, whose constituent parts are especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed co-operatively through legal or other effective means (Phillips et al. 2001: 3).

Peace parks, as defined by the same source, are similar except that they have another purpose, to promote peace and cooperation. This means that peace parks are a special type of TBPA. Also, for an area to be considered a TBPA it first has to be defined as a protected area of the state to which it belongs after which it can then be connected to a like area on the other side of a border. These definitions become a problem when parks are both supporting the environment and supporting peace. There is not a clear definition of “supporting peace”; this could be anywhere between two countries cooperating for a park to countries resolving past issues for a park. Each case study will be defined as is referred to in the literature.

Peace parks can support peace in many different ways, resulting in many different advantages. They can solve immediate issues involving border location that defy other possible solutions, or they can place a buffer area between two countries to help alleviate tension. Groups of people who reside in adjacent countries are often forced to find reasonable solutions when they begin working together. The issue of the environment is a good place to start communication because environmental degradation is something that affects all humans. Most governments find this an easier topic to resolve than

political differences. Once communication starts, there is the possibility both countries will work together on other issues as well.

Sometimes the environment needs help even when there is no border dispute. Borders are rarely drawn as lines based on natural features. They more often reflect the political and cultural past of the area which has the potential to disrupt the environment (Cornelius 2000). Ecological systems pay no attention to these lines and an unnatural block between these countries can disrupt migration patterns of animals. If one country is degrading the environment while the other is protecting it, political problems can arise. In TBPA's where the ecological landscape is the primary focus, conservation can be referred to as Transboundary Natural Resource Management (TBNRM) which is a "process for reducing or minimizing conflicting resource-use policies and practices within ecosystems that are divided by international frontiers or by national property or land-use zoning boundaries" (Wilke et al. 2001: 5). Policies of all countries involved are an important part of resource management. TBNRM can help to allow different countries to share in natural landscapes and resources. According to Wilke et al. (2001), when two countries do not have any impediments to the natural flow of the ecosystem, whether it is the flow of water or the movement of wildlife, a *de facto* system of TBNRM is occurring even if they are not communicating about the area.

The last purpose of TBPA's is to preserve and enhance cultural values. The parks may help with communication between political officials and indigenous peoples who may not abide by the boundaries of countries. They can help give indigenous people their right to live according to their cultural heritage. There can also be problems that arise in these parks in regards to land rights. Examples of this issue will be given later. Because of the large impact the parks can have on local people, their involvement in the parks is important and an essential part of their success.

Today there are approximately 169 peace parks which involve at least 110 countries (Fuller 2004). According to many sources there are at least five times this number of parks which have potential but they have not become recognized officially. TBPA's cover at least 1.1 million km², which is about 10% of the total protected areas in the world (McNeely 2003). There are different levels of cooperation for each of these parks. They are ranked on a scale from zero to five, reflecting how much the governments of the countries work together. Level zero has no cooperation or communication. Groups at level one have some limited communication and will cooperate on occasion. A park has to be at level one before it goes from being considered an internationally adjoining protected area to a TBPA (Phillips et al.

2001). Level two is marked by consultation, and once they get to this level progression to level five moves much more quickly. By level five they are almost completely jointly managed. Countries may feel that by consulting another country they could be left open to criticisms of weakness or instability, so they will hesitate. Cisneros and Naylor (1999) state that out of 176 pairs of countries who adjoin protected areas only 8% demonstrate full cooperation. The highest numbers of protected areas, 38%, fall into level one, and moving past this can be difficult. Unfortunately, it was shown in this study that 18% of the pairs had no cooperation.

An important part of communication involving the parks does not occur at the government level but at the local level. The parks are set up in legislation through the communication of government officials, but communication among people that live at the border is equally important in the success or failure of the proposed park. The locals have to be in support the endeavor, whether if it is for political or environmental reasons.

Case Studies

The following case studies display a variety of contexts and outcomes based on an abundance of available information. It seems as though the parks that get more attention and study are the ones that have the most excitement or violence involved with them, but these are also the factors that can make a park successful or create a failure. Hopefully lessons from the parks that had difficult times will benefit other parks and ensure a successful future.

Africa

Africa seems to have found that peace parks and TBPAs are a successful solution to fighting and a form of mediation to ethnic differences. In the late 1990's these parks started showing up, especially in South Africa, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, and Namibia. Southern Africa has faced great obstacles to peace in the past and since the end of apartheid the countries have looked to different options for people to work together. Peace parks have had some success in this area of Africa. They are helping the borders to open up and are improving communication.

The Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park was the first in this area of Southern Africa. It was successful and this led to the formation of more parks involving these countries. There are now at least six parks in these countries that are officially TBPAs or they are in the process of

becoming so (Beech & van Reit 2004). In many parks fences still mark the borders which limited movement across them. The fences had protected ecosystems in the past but are now stopping the ecosystem from being an entire unit. Between South Africa and Mozambique there has been a fence up, and when Mozambique was going through their civil war it protected the wildlife on the South African side from going over the border and getting killed. Today there is an overabundance of elephants in South Africa and Mozambique is almost without. These countries also have an opposite problem involving land: Mozambique has a large amount which is uninhabited and without much wild life while South Africa which is overcrowded with animals (Godwin 2001). These elephant and land problems have pushed for the opening of a park in the area. A problem which has been faced is moving the elephants over into the uninhabited area in Mozambique. Elephant females stay together in family units and they have territory, remaining within the boundaries. At first it would be likely that only a few bulls would move over on their own and people would have to, by the truck, translocate thousands of female and immature elephants within their family units. The estimated cost is \$1,000 to \$2,500 per elephant. To keep the elephants from migrating back to their territory, workers will have to keep them within electric fences for a few days. Poachers are still a problem in Mozambique, so the move will be very slow to make sure there are few problems (Godwin 2001). Other animals will be transported into Mozambique, and hopefully all animals will resume the migratory paths they had before the fence went up. It is foreseen that once all of this is completed the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park will be the world's largest animal kingdom (Vesely 2003).

Another issue these counties face continued tensions involving illegal immigration and smuggling. More than 100 Zimbabweans are returned from South Africa every day (Ford 2002). The parks are being used as easy access to multiple countries, and they are not safe places. The African parks are known for their dangerous wildlife. According to park officials immigrants are being eaten by lions, and this problem is getting worse. This causes the lions to fear humans less and this makes the park, tourists, and immigrants more susceptible to attacks (Ford 2002). Fires started by immigrants also harm the vegetation. Some governments are not allowing the fences to come down because these problems are impeding the progress of the parks.

Money is something that, for the most part, is not an issue in these African peace parks. There are many countries throughout the world that are investing in these areas. The contributors in Africa include the World Bank, Conservation International, USAID, and the

German development bank Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (Ford 2002). The most talked about, and probably the biggest financier of the parks, is the World Bank. The World Bank finances peace parks all over the world, but seems to be particularly interested in Africa. These peace parks and TBPAs have a higher profile than other parks around the world. This is possibly because of the appeal the landscape has to many people all over the world. They also have a wide variety of wildlife that exists nowhere else and people feel it needs to be protected. One can only hope that the money Europe and the U.S. give is used to help support the peace process in an area that they changed via colonialism and Westernization.

The parks in Africa are an example of what may happen when the government and the attention the parks receive from around the world can create a success. On the surface the parks are successful, in that they are established and have extensive monetary resources; however the lack of support the parks receive from the local communities causes many problems. The establishment of the parks has pushed people out of their traditional homelands and into poverty or a non-traditional workforce. In the governments search for peace they may be causing further turmoil within their own countries.

United States and Canada

The Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park was the first peace park in the world (Cisneros & Naylor 1999; Fuller 2004; Long 2003). It was founded in 1932, combining Glacier National Park in the United States and Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada. It covers 1,500 square miles and is on both sides of the Continental Divide. It is considered to be one of the most intact ecosystems on earth. It seems to be the definition of what a peace park should be, yet it has many problems with wildlife management and the changing political climate of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. Here, there are animals living that have a home range as large as the park, such as grizzly bears and wolves. The U.S. and Canada have not agreed on how to treat these animals. While there are groups that try to protect animals in the U.S., these animals continue to be killed in Canada (Long 2003). For example, in the U.S., a wolf is considered an endangered species, but if one travels into British Columbia it becomes a “game animal” during its hunting season. If a wolf is in Alberta it becomes a pest and can be shot at anytime on private property. Another issue is an area on the North Fork of the Flathead River that has “wild and scenic” protection from the U.S. Congress, but whose headwaters are open to development on the Canadian side. Moreover, there are fisheries in

Montana that have damaged fish populations in Canada by introducing exotic fish (Long 2003). This is a sign of a lack of communication or the dwindling importance of this subject for the governments of these countries. Those who live in these areas are not to blame for their actions; they are however, according to the law they live under, doing nothing wrong. This case shows that peace park status does not necessarily mean that the two countries will work together well or regularly. These two countries are protecting their respective halves of the ecosystem in different ways. The park has existed for so long that the officials in the U.S. and Canada may have forgotten that it needs to be maintained along with their relationship.

United States and Mexico

A large portion of the border between the United States and Mexico is an ecologically diverse area. The Chihuahuan desert is located roughly in the center of the continent, and is a place where the ecosystems of the east and the west overlap, and where the north and south overlap. It covers 200,000 square miles, existing in seven states in Mexico and in parts of Texas, New Mexico and Arizona in the United States. It covers a wide range of elevations causing many different microclimates which support a variety of species (Cisneros & Naylor 1999).

The political climate in this area varies. Many people on both sides of the border feel they are not part of a distinctly Mexican or American culture, but it is a borderland area where they belong on both sides of the border. The area has also faced a long history of conflict with wars in the past and currently with the issues of drug trafficking and illegal immigration. A peace park was proposed in 1934, only two years after the establishment of the Waterton-Glacier Park, but today there is still no official park in this area. Whenever a decision seemed imminent, there would be some kind of distraction, like World War II. It was not until 1994 that the President of Mexico established protected areas adjacent to the existing Big Bend national park in the U.S., the first step towards a TBPA (Cisneros & Naylor 1999). They not only want to do this in the Chihuahuan desert, but also in the Sonoran desert and in Baja California where there are also corresponding protected areas. In the Big Bend area there is some cooperation between the two countries, showing their dedication to this project, but no parks are official peace parks according to the government.

In the decision to make the area a peace park, problems with immigration and drugs are the primary concerns of both the U.S. and Mexico. The countries are in disagreement over the solutions to these

problems, causing additional conflict in the area. With both countries fighting hard to maintain the integrity of their border they are closing themselves off to negotiations. The U.S. is putting millions of dollars into closing the border to illegal immigrants and to combat drug trafficking. Why then would a country do something that opens the border to these same problems? The United States' answer is to do nothing, based on the idea that an international park would make it easier for these illegal actions to occur. The local populations, it seems, are mostly in favor of the park. However, illegal actions on the local level may be keeping the U.S. from supporting the idea.

Russia and Mongolia

The case for a peace park between Russia and Mongolia is an example of a parks ability to help the indigenous people of the area and protect their way of life. The Totem people of this area are animal herders and their ability to continue on this way has been threatened in the past. They have existed in both Russia and Mongolia, traveling seasonally across the border. Daniel Plumley started The Totem Peoples Preservation Project of Siberia and Mongolia "to ensure the survival and sustainability of traditional, indigenous, and nomadic cultures whose lifestyle and spirituality are inextricably linked with totem animals" (Chang 1999).

This project not only helps preserve the basic human rights of these people, it also helped in repairing the reindeer numbers which had been low. This problem with the reindeer numbers was caused when many of these people had stopped herding. The project re-teaches them how to care for the herds with veterinary training and supplies them with a small herd to get started. They are then able to return to the nomadic and semi-nomadic lifestyle that is a part of their cultural heritage. This project also allowed these people to have improved communication with their government, giving them a chance to be more vocal in their interests (Plumley 2003). An official peace park has not yet been established, however there is cooperation between the two countries involving these people. By definition this would be a TBPA because of their communication, but there have been difficulties because of oil and natural gas corporations wanting to put pipelines through the area. These corporations are not working with the indigenous people of the area, thus causing a host of problems. Poor funding has also been a drawback to putting a peace park in this area.

Poland and Belarus

The country of Belarus once belonged to the Soviet Union during which time they placed a fence between the countries as a “barrier to stop the dangerous ideas of Polish dissident and democracy” from coming in (Sochaczewski 1999). It stopped people and also bison from moving freely between the countries. Even though the Cold War is over, there is still a mutual distrust and this fence has yet to come down. The borderlands that had once separated the Soviet Union from the rest of the world is an ideal spot to have peace parks, though it seems the area is still too sensitive for the necessary cooperation. The border of Poland and Belarus splits the only remaining primeval forest, the Bialowieza National Park on the Polish side and the Belovezhskaya Pushcha National Park on Belarus' side. It covers about 385 square miles and acts as a barrier of protection between these two countries from violence that could ensue from political and ethnic differences.

According to Sochaczewski (1999) it is unlikely that the fence will come down by choice, but the financial burden it causes will probably cause it to fall within a few years. Though a peace park has not yet been declared in the area, negotiations are in progress. The two countries have been able to communicate effectively enough to move bison over the boundary, but the animals are unable to migrate without this assistance. Poland has hopes of Westernizing and becoming part of the European Union (EU) and has become part of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Part of the problem is the fact that Belarus' president Lukashenko has been barred from entering the United States, the EU, and Japan. The preservation of this forest is very important to both countries, but it is not enough to reconcile their differences. In a way it has been the historic tension in the area that has preserved this area so far. They are headed in the right direction with both countries protecting their own area of an ecosystem that covers the border between two countries, but the communication level is far from the necessary minimum (Brunner 2002).

Pakistan and India – Siachen Peace Park

The India and Pakistan border meets in the mountains in an area that is uninhabitable because of the high altitude and harsh climate. When the area was demarcated the two countries failed to make an agreement about the exact placement of the boundary between their countries high in the mountains. Demarcation for the area was described with the vague statement of “...and thence north to the glaciers” (Ali 2003). For 35 years this disregarded issue caused no

problems, but when mountaineering expeditions started occurring in the area troubles began. Both countries used the unclear boundary markers to their own benefit and fighting over the area ensued. Pakistan sent troops into the area in 1984 and India followed their example to keep their grasp on the area. Fighting has occurred since, causing devastation to the mountain environment. The environment has also caused 97% of the 15,000 casualties, via exposure and avalanches among other factors, showing that humans do not belong at altitudes of around 6700 m. People living at these heights generate massive amounts of waste “packed into metal drums and dropped into crevasses at the rate of up to 4000 drums a year” (Ali 2003). This could have terrible effects in many ways, especially for the water supply. The Himalayas supply water to much of the surrounding area and if the water is compromised there would be disastrous repercussions. Neither of the countries is willing to give in on the issue as both feel they have claims to the land. A peace park would work in this situation because it would take the land that both countries feel is theirs and make it an area they can both enjoy. It is not necessarily a productive area except for tourism, which is limited because of the altitude. The land is really only useful if it is not destroyed and so they need to find a way to restore the area. It is obvious that there is no military solution and this would allow the armies to withdraw with dignity. Many times they came close to negotiating but political climates changed and tensions escalated so they have continued to fight.

North and South Korea - The DMZ

The civil war in Korea not only split the country in two, it wreaked havoc on the environment. Before the war, the Koreans referred to the land as *Keum-Su-Kang-San*, the land of embroidered rivers and mountains (Drohan 1996). There is an area between the North and South which became the demilitarized zone (DMZ), and is now virtually uninhabited. Only a few military personnel have entered since the conflict ended in 1953. Establishing a peace park in the area is, unfortunately, something which is not occurring at this time. What is occurring in the area is a transformation from farm land, to war zone, to a place where the native species of the area have been allowed to return. In this act a TBPA has begun. These two countries have been alienated for many years and it may be a long time before they have a more open border. Until that time, greater cooperation among the countries' officials is necessary, so the process of opening and preserving the area can begin. It is because of this closed border that a peace park is impossible as of now. Ke Chung Kim, a professor at

Pennsylvania State University, has created a proposal for the two countries for a “network of wildlife preserves, international parks, and managed ecosystems in and around the DMZ” (Drohan 1996). Many rare plant and fish species have been identified in the southern half of the zone and Kim wants to create a system that can protect these species. In the proposition he wants these sensitive areas accessible only to scientists, but the other parts could be used for national parks and limited ecotourism. A peace park in the area would serve its exact purpose: help these two areas to start communicating and ease tensions while also taking steps to protect the environment. This area seems to be an ideal spot for a peace park because of its history. An area already uninhabited can now be used to benefit both countries. A possible problem with putting people into the area is that it is unknown how many land mines are still buried there. Resources would need to be put toward clearing them out. As of now, North and South Korea have been unable to come to an agreement on the topic of a peace park, probably because hostilities still run too deep.

Discussion

The previous case studies show how each peace park or TBPA is unique. They each involve different circumstances that countries must face when they share a border. This next section examines how the different peace parks and TBPAs are the same. Peace parks and TBPAs are a relatively new and interesting way to deal with many problems that can occur along borders. Yet some issues with these parks might make them not worth the trouble they may cause. Some factors that can help all parks to be more successful will also be addressed.

Tourism

Tourism is a major factor in all peace parks and TBPAs, and it can be something that either makes the park successful or causes failure. Tourism is the biggest factor in the difficulty of maintaining a peace park, whether it is the affect it has on indigenous peoples’ way of life or the money it can possibly bring them. It seriously affects the job market and can change how people in the area live their lives. Sometimes the park is created in the hopes that it will create better lives for those living in the area. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss all aspects of tourism; I will go into detail on the some of the most important positive and negative issues tourism brings.

Jobs that can be created in the tourism industry include gamekeepers, hotel staff, and guides for wildlife and landscape. The local people's knowledge can be useful for some of these jobs. However, money is needed to create this industry. Peace parks and TBPAs will often occur in relatively poor countries. Because they are less economically developed they tend to have a more natural landscape that the citizens and the government may want to preserve. Tourism and the ecotourism industry can help reduce poverty, a primary cause of conflict. Also, when there is widespread poverty there can be a greater degradation of the environment (Godwin 2002). One opinion of tourism holds that it helps peace by leaving visitors "wiser and more tolerant," (David de Villiers in Godwin 2002). De Villiers also notes that if tourism is not watched and guided it can result in exploitation of child labor and prostitution, degrading local value systems. Also, tourism can amplify the difference between rich and poor, urban and rural. For all these reasons it is clear why tourism is considered controversial.

In the peace parks in southern Africa, tourism will financially support the parks ability to continue. Vacations to these parks are very popular for affluent travelers because of these unique and exotic lands. Establishing an infrastructure to support this tourism has been very costly and has impeded the process of some parks. In the Great Limpopo Park there was a great difference in tourism infrastructure between South Africa and Mozambique, since the Kruger National Park in South Africa had been established 100 years prior to its connection to the protected area on the Mozambique side. In order to get tourists to visit both sides, Mozambique has to catch up with Kruger Park. This has caused some tension between the two countries. Some South Africans refer to the creation of this TBPA as the "Kruger expansion", and those in Mozambique call this ecological imperialism (Godwin 2001).

Poaching has been a major problem for Africa, and it is hoped that peace parks will make it less profitable. If there is money coming in from tourists who want to see wildlife it becomes more economical to help protect the animals rather than kill them. Among conservationists there is a concept of wildlife paying its way in hopes that animals will be more useful alive than dead (Relly 2001). Many who were once poachers are becoming gamekeepers (Godwin 2001). Hunting is an issue with these parks because there are people who live off of hunting and there are benefits in keeping the number of animals in control. In the Gaza-Kruger-Gonarezhou Park there will be three separated areas: a tourist zone, a wilderness zone and a resource utilization zone (hunting area). There is concern that this will cause

hunters to sit at the line in the hunting zone and wait for the large animals to cross over, as this has happened in Mozambique in the past. Park officials say that this will not be a problem, but there is skepticism as to the validity of this opinion.

Because there are many parks in Africa, tourist movement is an issue. This is the case for all TBPA's because of their international status, however Africa has gone to the extreme to cater to the tourists. There is talk of making international airports within parks and creating multinational visas for the parks. Officials want to have agreements between the countries so that travelers can move freely between countries without problems and fees (Godwin 2002). Even with these proposed benefits, tourists will always have to exit the parks from the same country that they entered, go through customs, and pay park fees to each country (Ford 2002).

There have been many problems between the government and park officials with the indigenous people in southern African countries. Native people are included in the parks through jobs. These jobs can allow them to teach tourists about their way of life (Vesely 2003). The parks sometimes allow indigenous people to live within park boundaries. Yet, there are some people who think that tourism is propagating the very ideas of discrimination that the areas are trying to overcome. The upper-employment in the tourism sectors often still belongs to white males (Archer 2004). Commercialization of the parks in southern Africa is not helping this issue. Locals are usually not hired by these large companies because they want their management to be more like those that will be visiting the area. In addition, when the tourists go through a large company to book their whole trip with one price, the locals lose out on this money. In Africa the local people have been left out in the decisions that were made regarding their future. The government made the choice for the parks to exist, which they have good reasons for, but the people involved were not thought of in this choice. Though the parks are providing some jobs, the people in the area are often unwillingly changing their way of life.

The two parks that involve the United States, with both Canada and Mexico, demonstrate interesting differences that reflect the economies in these countries. The park between Canada and the U.S. has been established for a long time. There are tourism infrastructures on both sides of the border that have existed for years and people are able to go to both countries easily. Mexico and the U.S. however do not have equality in this area. It is one of the factors that keeps them from officially becoming a TBPA. There are many places on the U.S. side of the border for people to stay, but Mexico has few (Cisneros & Naylor 1999). The two countries also cannot agree on how to deal with

those who pass from one country to the other wanting to re-enter, and customs regulations have not been determined. This differential success reflects both the history of the borderlands and the continuing issues these countries face.

In the other case studies there is little infrastructure for tourism, but these are also areas that have yet to be established as peace parks. On the Poland/Belarus border there could be a great draw for tourists since it is the last remaining forest of its kind, but the locals are not ready to give up using the forest and depend on tourism for their income. They do not believe that the tourists will come, and at this point only 3-5% of people in the area live off the tourism industry. On the Pakistan/India border there has not been any kind of established tourism since the fighting began. There had been mountaineering in the area, since the area has the longest glacier in existence, but the continued instability of the area discourages any visitation. Even if the fighting over the area were to stop today, there has been substantial damage to the environment. A great amount of time would need to be given to the area for recovery before visitors could arrive. In Korea there is hope to create tourism, it is part of the proposals for the area. A portion of the area would remain off limits to tourists, though, because of the large number of endangered species in the area (Drohan 1996).

Tourism is a major factor for these parks and is also very controversial. It needs to be an important factor in the decision to create these parks because peoples' ways of life are at stake. They may be loosing their land to the park, but they need to in turn get a job or income that equals what they lost. There are few ways to prevent some of the negative aspects of tourism such as prostitution and the degradation of the local people's value systems. One can only hope that the benefits of tourism and the help it gives to the environment are worth what people may lose.

How to Make Parks Work

The quality of relationships involved in creating and sustaining a peace park or TBPA are the most important part of the success of the endeavor. When parks start at the local level they tend to have more long term success. Borderlanders must be willing participants in the process (Gasana 2003). The people need to have a stake in its success so that when there are difficult times, they will work hard to make the park work. If they do not, they will let it go or they will let the cross-border relationships decay. Peace in the border areas is dependent on the day-to-day interactions of local people. Border areas are often neglected and isolated from the government and from

core areas, allowing increased illegal trading and environmental actions that can lead to added tensions on the border. If these parks can bring more attention to the border, then they can help solve these issues (Gasana 2003).

On top of this local infrastructure there also needs to be governmental support. Without legislation there is little hope of success. In some of the cases discussed it is this problem that has kept parks from forming officially. If the government cannot create a more open border and have more communication it does not matter how much the local area people work together. Parks should “have strong political backing in the design and implementation phases, and the signals for such backing should be given by the highest political authorities of cooperating countries...Such a high-level gesture can change public opinion” (Gasana 2003). The government can have great influence on the path of success or failure of a park. There also has to be monetary support, because without the money the government and non-government organizations (NGO) are able to give there is little ability to protect the environment (Cornelius 2000).

It is often the NGOs that work as mediators between the indigenous or local people on issues like “contested boundaries, tribal rights, established resource utilization protocols or lack thereof” (Relly 2001). The local people need to be considered when parks are being created. There are instances where they were taken advantage of and committees or governments did not consult with them about the parks creation. If the creation of the parks could be a democratic choice, it would better reflect what is wanted and needed in the area. Often the indigenous people are not given rights to the land that was taken for park use, so they need to have a part in the decision for the parks creation. The ?Khonami San in Africa are one group that was removed from their ancestral land for park use, and though, after a long battle, they were compensated, it did not make up for their losses. They are no longer able to live on the land the way they had been previously. This case has helped more recent parks in the area work better with the indigenous people living on the land. When the local people are kept informed and part of the decisions for the creation of parks in their area they can become part of the system of conservation and tourism, giving the park more opportunities for success. They can also integrate the indigenous knowledge of the land and resources to make the park better (Archer 2004).

An issue that peace parks face is the fact that peace may not last in the area. When parks have a better relationship with the local area they have a better chance of recovery. With conflict comes a change in priorities for the people and therefore the priorities for the

park should change as well. They may need to use the usually off limit resources of the park in order to survive, but this may create a better long term result (McNeely 2003).

Conclusions

TBPAs and peace parks have the capacity to solve problems that can exist on any border, and if done correctly the parks may be the most cost effective way to solve conflicts. However, are peace parks and TBPAs worth the problems they may cause? It depends on the way that the situation is created and maintained. Without good relationships between countries there are going to be problems; “the biggest challenge is to overcome the dominant political culture, which in many cases is characterized by a rigid concept of sovereignty” (Gasana 2003). When there is no respect for the sovereignty of another country there will not be trust, but at the same time, countries will need to see their land in more borderless way and trust the other country involved, in order for the parks to work. Government officials need to look at the border in a way they have not before: *as an area which needs protection and preservation with bona fide cooperation with another country.*

If the lives of the local people are not taken into account they will not support the park and it will most likely fail. If created and maintained correctly the parks can avoid some of the problems that can arise from tourism and illegal activities like smuggling and poaching. Each area has to be seen as a unique situation, and it has to be decided if the environment is worth it, or if the loss of land will hurt the people living there. If the park is not going to be created in a way that supports all parties involved then it should not be done. The park is not worth the effort if people living there are going to have their lives altered without their consent. Those harmed will not care if the park fails, so they will not do their part to help its success. In any park there will be problems that arise but if all people are part of the choices being made this is a success.

References

- Ali, A. (2003) “A Siachen Peace Park: The Solution to a Half-Century of International Conflict?” *Mountain Research and Development* 22(4):316-319
- Archer, F. (2004) “Transfrontier Parks in South Africa”. *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 28(1):57.

- Beech, C and van Riet, W. (2004) "Peace Parks of South Africa". *Map Book Gallery* (Volume 18). Accessed 3/13/2006.
http://www.esri.com/mapmuseum/mapbook_gallery/volume18/conservation5.htm.
- Brunner, R. (2002) *Identification of the Most Important Transboundary Protected Areas in Central and Eastern Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Chang, E. (1999) "The Totem Peoples Preservation Project of Siberia and Mongolia". *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. 23(3):20.
- Cisneros, JA and Naylor, V.J. (1999) "Uniting La Frontera: The Ongoing Efforts to Establish a Transboundary Park". *Environment* 41(3):12.
- Cornelius, S. (2000) "Transborder Conservation Areas: An Option for the Sonoran Desert?" *Borderlines* 8(6):1-4, 15-16.
- Drohan, J. (1996) "Sustainably Developing the DMZ". *Technology Review*. 99(6):17-18.
- Ford, N. (2002) "Building Bridges across Borders". *New African* February:32-33.
- Fuller, S. (2004) "Parks for Peace". *Alternatives Journal* 30:27.
- Gasana, JK. (2003) "On War and Peace, People and Parks". *Tropical Forest Update* 13(2).
- Godwin, N. (2002) "Planned Transborder Nature Park Draws Praise; at African Peace through Tourism Conference". *Travel Weekly* 61(15):36.
- Godwin, P. (2001) "Without Borders: Uniting Africa's Wildlife Reserves". *National Geographic* 200(3): 2(26).
- Long, B. (2003) "Beyond Boundaries: Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park". *National Parks* 77(7-8):22-26.
- McNeely, JA. (2003) "Conserving Biodiversity in Times of Conflict". *Onyx* 37(2):142-152.
- Phillips, A, Sandwith, T, Shene, C, Hamilton, L, and Sheppard, D. (2001) *Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Cooperation*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, and Cambridge, UK.
- Plumley, D. (2003) "Aiding and Empowering Reindeer Herders; Totem Peoples' Preservation Project". *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 27(2):62.
- Relly, P. (2001) "No Boundaries for Wildlife: Peace Parks in Southern Africa". *Global Insight* 8:1-5.
- Sochaczewski, PS. (1999) "Across a Divide" *International Wildlife*. July/August: 1-6.
- Vesely, M. (2003) "The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park" *African Business* February: 58-59.

- Beech, C and van Riet, W. (2004) "Peace Parks of South Africa". *Map Book Gallery* (Volume 18). Accessed 3/13/2006.
http://www.esri.com/mapmuseum/mapbook_gallery/volume18/conservation5.htm.
- Brunner, R. (2002) *Identification of the Most Important Transboundary Protected Areas in Central and Eastern Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Chang, E. (1999) "The Totem Peoples Preservation Project of Siberia and Mongolia". *Cultural Survival Quarterly*. 23(3):20.
- Cisneros, JA and Naylor, V.J. (1999) "Uniting La Frontera: The Ongoing Efforts to Establish a Transboundary Park". *Environment* 41(3):12.
- Cornelius, S. (2000) "Transborder Conservation Areas: An Option for the Sonoran Desert?" *Borderlines* 8(6):1-4, 15-16.
- Drohan, J. (1996) "Sustainably Developing the DMZ". *Technology Review*. 99(6):17-18.
- Ford, N. (2002) "Building Bridges across Borders". *New African* February:32-33.
- Fuller, S. (2004) "Parks for Peace". *Alternatives Journal* 30:27.
- Gasana, JK. (2003) "On War and Peace, People and Parks". *Tropical Forest Update* 13(2).
- Godwin, N. (2002) "Planned Transborder Nature Park Draws Praise; at African Peace through Tourism Conference". *Travel Weekly* 61(15):36.
- Godwin, P. (2001) "Without Borders: Uniting Africa's Wildlife Reserves". *National Geographic* 200(3): 2(26).
- Long, B. (2003) "Beyond Boundaries: Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park". *National Parks* 77(7-8):22-26.
- McNeely, JA. (2003) "Conserving Biodiversity in Times of Conflict". *Onyx* 37(2):142-152.
- Phillips, A, Sandwith, T, Shene, C, Hamilton, L, and Sheppard, D. (2001) *Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Cooperation*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, and Cambridge, UK.
- Plumley, D. (2003) "Aiding and Empowering Reindeer Herders; Totem Peoples' Preservation Project". *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 27(2):62.
- Relly, P. (2001) "No Boundaries for Wildlife: Peace Parks in Southern Africa". *Global Insight* 8:1-5.
- Sochaczewski, PS. (1999) "Across a Divide" *International Wildlife*. July/August: 1-6.
- Vesely, M. (2003) "The Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park" *African Business* February: 58-59.