



Who is on the Gorilla’s Payroll? Claims on Tourist Revenue From a Ugandan National Park

WILLIAM M. ADAMS

University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

and

MARK INFIELD *

Fauna and Flora International, Hanoi, Vietnam

Summary. — This paper discusses the competing interests in revenues derived from visitor wildlife tourism based on viewing the mountain gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla beringei*) in Mgahinga National Park, Uganda. Financial flows to local communities do reduce their sense of grievance at the park’s creation, but do not compensate them for the costs of park creation. Different interests within and outside Uganda compete for wildlife tourism revenue and limit its capacity to fund the direct and indirect costs of gorilla conservation. The creation of multiscale multistakeholder partnerships for conservation built on revenue-sharing is a daunting institutional challenge.

© 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

Key words — Africa, Uganda, national parks, community conservation, conservation and development

1. INTRODUCTION

A central element in the “new conservation” thinking of the 1990s (Hulme & Murphree, 1999, 2001) is the linkage between conservation and human needs. The limitations of conventional protectionist approaches to biodiversity conservation (often referred to as “fences and fines” or “fortress conservation”) have been recognized (e.g., Inamdar, de Jode, Lindsay, & Cobb, 1999). These limitations relate to economic factors (e.g., Emerton, 2001; Leader-Williams & Albon, 1988; Norton-Griffiths & Southey, 1995), and concerns about political opposition, human rights or justice (Neumann, 1997). It is widely argued within the wildlife conservation policy community that wildlife needs to “pay its way” (Eltringham, 1994). This principle is currently taken to be true generally, but particularly in poorer and less industrialized countries (Emerton, 2001; Wilkie & Carpenter, 1999a).

The revenue stream that wildlife is now being expected to yield serves several distinct purposes. The first, and the most central to the “community” ethic that dominates much in-

ternational thinking about conservation, and practice in developing countries, is that revenues from wildlife should contribute to poverty reduction in communities adjacent to protected areas or wildlife populations, to meeting the needs of rural people, and to compensating for benefits foregone due to conservation policy (e.g., establishment of an exclusive protected area) and the costs of living next to a protected area (e.g., crop-raiding wild animals, Naughton-Treves, 1997; Sekhar, 1998). Community-based natural resource management schemes

* This paper arises from work funded by the Global Environmental Change Program of the UK Economic and Social Research Council entitled “Community Conservation in Africa: principles and comparative practice” (L 320 25321). We would like to thank David Nkuriyongoma, who guided us through the fieldwork, the staff of the Mgahinga Gorilla National Park and all those people who agreed to be interviewed. We have gained many insights from conversations with colleagues, especially David Hulme, Marshall Murphree, Ed Barrow and Lee Risby. Final revision accepted: 23 July 2002.

such as CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe (e.g., Hasler, 1996; Metcalfe, 1995; Murombedzi, 1999), and schemes involving people living adjacent to protected areas, from which they have been evicted, or which prevent colonization (e.g., Hulme & Infield, 2001; Infield & Namara, 2001; Wells, Brandon, & Hannah, 1992; Western & Wright, 1994) represent opposite ends of a continuum of "community conservation" activity that emphasises the need for wildlife-based revenue generation (Barrow & Murphree, 2001).

The second reason why conservation policymakers wish wildlife to "pay its way" is to offset the costs of state-funded conservation. Protected areas typically generate low economic returns compared to alternative land uses (Norton-Griffiths & Southey, 1995; Norton-Griffiths, 1995). Conservation can therefore involve considerable economic costs to governments both in terms of revenues foregone as well as the direct costs of their management. Demonstrable economic gains from wildlife conservation at national level can be important factors in the enthusiasm for governments to pursue conservation strategies (Emerton, 2001). Protected areas are costly to establish, police and maintain: the costs of protected area systems globally are large, even if not impossibly large (James, Gaston, & Balmford, 1999). In developing countries, heavy government expenditure on conservation can be politically and economically problematic, given the competing demands for investment, many of them with potentially direct effects in reducing poverty and human suffering. Expenditure on conservation is also criticized by conservative economists (particularly the World Bank and International Monetary Fund) convinced of the need to reduce economically unproductive state expenditure.

Most less industrialized countries do not spend enough per hectare of protected area to ensure that biodiversity conservation is effective (James *et al.*, 1999; Leader-Williams & Albon, 1988), so even where the burden of state expenditure is high, it may be less than is needed. Wilkie and Carpenter (1999a), for example, suggest that the total of government and donor investment in central Africa meets only 30% of the recurrent costs of the protected area network. Under these circumstances the possibility of deriving revenues from wildlife has obvious attractions. Unless protected areas and wild species are able to yield streams of revenue, conservation efforts are likely to be ineffective

through underfunding, governments may give preference to other forms of land use (e.g., mining or agriculture), and the financial incentives for illegal use may drive degradation of the wildlife resources in poorly-protected "paper parks" (Brown, 1998; Wilkie & Carpenter, 1999a).

Wildlife can yield revenue streams through consumptive use (harvesting for consumption or sale, or sport hunting), or nonconsumptive use (various forms of wildlife or nature viewing tourism, including "ecotourism"). Successful and sustained revenue generation from wildlife based tourism requires a relatively high level of physical infrastructure including access to international airports, suitable hotels and lodges (luxuriously rugged for hunters, safely luxurious for wildlife viewers), a good road network and vehicle fleet, a good record on security, law and order, and above all the presence of suitable wildlife species for visitors to watch or kill. Revenues from wildlife viewing or hunting are greatest where there is rare and attractive wildlife available to be seen (or shot) with appropriate facilities to ensure a quality holiday experience. Safari hunting follows a fairly straightforward formula, with certain large mammals (in Africa notably elephant, buffalo and lion) forming the bedrock of the industry. For wildlife viewing, while the importance of bird-spotting holidays is growing, as is interest in traditional peoples and their culture, it is the presence of large, identifiable charismatic species that is most important. Wildlife-based revenue is thus commonly dependent on a small fraction of total biodiversity, that represented by a few large species of mammal.

The current policy assumption is that tourism, particularly so-called "ecotourism" has significant potential to support wildlife conservation (Honey, 1999; Walpole & Goodwin, 2001). There are both benefits and costs to nature tourism, but its potential to contribute to both conservation and development goals together is a major attraction (Sherman & Dixon, 1991). It is widely celebrated as a contribution to conservation options in the Third World on the basis of local success and informal review, often over short timeframes (e.g., Langoya & Long, 1998). But appraisals of the economics of community benefits and costs from wildlife, suggest more caution (Emerton, 2001). Recent studies in the Democratic Republic of Congo suggest that safari hunting has a greater potential than wildlife viewing to support the costs of conservation but even so

متن کامل مقاله

دریافت فوری ←

ISIArticles

مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات