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This dissertation examines the start of a new era in the history of biodiversity conservation. While new parks, nature reserves, and other conservation areas are being created all over the world, many older parks have lost funds for continued management. Waza National Park in northern Cameroon, is one such site. I analyze the effects of a crumbling fortress conservation area and demonstrate that the absence of authority within it has been devastating to both the surrounding populations and the animals previously protected by the park. Farmers and pastoralists in the region are exposed to physical violence and food insecurity on a par with those faced by those evicted in the early years of park establishment and an open access situation has taken hold. I locate these problems of park management in the region's history, tracing the articulations of territory, access, governance, and subjectivity from the precolonial period. The creation of the Waza protected area was an act of enclosure as well as a form of state territorialization. Before the creation of this reserve, the territory that became Waza was governed by sedentarized village leaders under a larger system of indirect rule by German and French colonials. Before German colonialism, local people had managed the space for farming, pastoralism, fishing, and other subsistence activities. With the French colonial government’s creation of the reserve in the 1930s, the space was violently transformed, becoming a strictly governed protected area. Local people’s access to and control over land and natural resources were lost and they were evicted from the Waza Protected Area. The reserve was both a symbol of colonial power in the region, and an economic resource for the French administration. Subsistence users and former residents were legally relegated outsiders as squatters, poachers, and thieves within protected area limits. The maintenance of this enclosure was continued by the independent Cameroonian government until the 1990s. The lines between those the government administrators construed as insiders and outsiders were not as circumscribed in everyday practice as they were in French and Cameroonian law. Though local residents had no formal rights to their former village territories, they maintained access. Locals deployed gender, ethnic, spatial, and political subjectivities to achieve an insider status that afforded them access to park resources. Outsiders, generally users from areas distant to the protected area, were less able to negotiate access and were targets of enforcement and often subjected to violence if they transgressed the park’s limits. Alliances were formed, however informally, between locals and park guards, with the effect of protecting the park’s resources from certain subjects and not others. Due to economic crisis, changed presidential priorities, and structural adjustment projects, state-led park management began to wane in the 1990s and NGOs took on park
management responsibilities. In the early 2000s as global conservation discourses shifted their focus from biodiversity to global warming, these NGOs left the park and management declined.

Waza National Park became an open access space with all the attendant wildness associated with such a status. Local leaders were unable and unwilling to defend this space and the animals within. Waza National Park’s empty and ungoverned territory has also created an ideal spot for criminals to use as a base of operations for kidnapping, murder, and theft causing local people to fear for their physical security.

The case of Waza National Park illustrates the problems that arise when conservation is imposed from the outside without real participation by local people. The promoters of protected areas profess extensive commitment to control of the boundaries, legal and physical, created by the initial enclosures. Without either the institutionalization of more viable long term management structures, or local engagement in and benefit from the process from the start, the goals of both biodiversity preservation and community well-being cannot be guaranteed.
“We must have the stubbornness to accept our gladness in the ruthless furnace of this world. To make injustice the only measure of our attention is to praise the Devil.”

--Jack Gilbert, A Brief for the Defense
Dedicated to my Sister, Sophie and my parents, Ann and Henry, for always answering the phone, no matter what time it was.
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Introduction

**Demanding Wilderness?**

It was October and the rains were just ending, lending the hot air humidity that made it almost unbearable. Moving out of the bright, dusty courtyard and ducking into the cool darkness of the mud house felt like heaven. The ladies who invited us in clustered around, some holding infants, some braiding young children’s hair, one shaping a mat with quick, precise flicks of her fingers. The smell of wood smoke was pervasive and mixed with the scent of fresh cow dung outside to make the air smell spicy. I had come to talk about Waza National Park, directly adjacent to these women’s homes. I settled in to record complaints about the evils of this protected area which had banned the use of natural resources within its limits, displaced a good number of villages and doubtless harbored wildlife whose appetites led to the destruction of crops in the field and the predation of livestock. Instead, one of these women looked me in the eye and said, “The biggest problem that we have is that the park is not guarded.” I looked at my research assistant who was translating for me with bewilderment. “I think you translated that wrong. Please ask her again what she said” I said. She asked again and told me that, no, that is what the woman had said. Seeing my confusion, the woman we were interviewing went on to say, “They [bandits] come into the park and hide there, then they steal cattle and other things, they run and hide in the park. They live inside of it. We are afraid for our children and our husbands. We are afraid that they will be killed. Even in our homes we are afraid. When Badjoda was here, we felt safe.” Her words hung in the air. I had come to Waza National Park to record a story of displacement, dispossession and oppression but here was this woman (and the other women behind her nodding or clicking their throats in agreement) calling for the return of the park manager (Badjoda) who was known for the most brutal tactics of enforcement and the most frequent patrols in the parks’ history.

Introduction

Meant to be fortresses on a changing landscape, national parks are often touted to be symbolic of civilization, national unity, peace and natural beauty. National parks and fortress conservation areas of this kind are relatively new phenomena in the world, but since their inception their popularity and prevalence has grown at a rapid rate. Between 1900 and 1950

---

1 There are over 10 local languages in this region and though I can passably speak two, this was not enough to communicate with everyone—particularly women who often only spoke their local language and were not even fluent in some of the trade languages of the area.
around 600 protected areas were created. By 1955 there were 10,000 protected areas covering five percent of the earth’s surface. In 1977 there were 30,000 protected areas. By 2003 this number had risen to over 100,000 covering over eleven percent of the land surface of the earth (Oliver-Smith 2005; WDPA 2005; Schmidt-Soltau 2006). In 2011 there were almost 160,000 protected areas covering over sixteen million square kilometers of land and over 7,500,000 square kilometers of water (IUCN and UNEP-WCMC 2012).

The exponential rise of protected areas has not occurred without heavy criticism. Starting in the mid-1990s, scholars critical of fortress conservation shattered idyllic notions of national parks as the last bastions of pure “nature” (e.g. Peluso 1993; Neumann 1998; Duffy 2000; Brockington 2002). Their writings show that national parks had been inhabited places from which resident populations had been ripped, their livelihoods and cultural traditions greatly impaired. Activities like wood cutting, vegetable harvest and hunting were criminalized as theft and poaching. The act of residing within these protected areas became squatting. People who continued to use the areas and resources that they had formerly held rights to became criminals, terrorists bandits, vagabonds and thieves (e.g. Thompson 1975; Peluso 1992; Cronon 1996; Neumann 1998; 2001; Brockington 2002; Jacoby 2003).

In many cases, extreme violence has been used against local people in the name of establishing fortress conservation areas or their management in colonial and post-colonial eras (Peluso 1993; Duffy 2000; 2010). This violence has taken its form in deaths, injuries, lost access to food and sacred places. Scholars critical of conservation have also examined what happens to those whose livelihoods are criminalized, showing that many former residents of protected areas become what they call conservation refugees and are flung into poverty and destitution by the creation of exclusionary protected areas (e.g. Geisler and De Sousa 2001; Chapin 2004; Chatty and Colchester 2002; Cernea and Schmidt-Soltau 2006; Büscher 2009; Dowie 2009). Further detailing the risks faced by those evicted from protected areas, scholars such as Cernea and Schmidt-Soltau (2006) show how displaced people face economic hardships, homelessness, social and economic marginalization, food insecurity, disease, and death. In these studies, local people’s voices are heard railing against injustices caused by international conservation efforts and park managers, calling for a return of their land or a reduction of park guard numbers.

Local people who live adjacent to Northern Cameroon’s 1700km² Waza National Park by all rights should have expressed similar sentiments. Hundreds, if not thousands of sedentary, nomadic, and semi-nomadic people were displaced from its rich floodplains, savannas and dry forests by its creation with no compensation. These people lost their rights to manage the abundant and diverse mammal, bird, and fish populations that are drawn to the area by the annually flooded Logone and Chari Rivers’ floodplain. Park managers were known for shooting people, mutilating their corpses and burying them in unmarked graves inside the park.

---

2 See Schmidt-Soltau and Brockington 2007 for an extensive list of all the studies that have shown this to be true.
3 Though these are not fixed or “natural” categories, these groups of people are locally called Logone Mbororo Fulbe, Fulbe, Jina, Majera, Musgum, Kotoko, Kanuri, Shuwa Arabs (Kuseri, Maltam, Afade) and the Oodah (Bauer 2003; Seignobos and Iyebi-Mandjek 2000)
4 Aside from the floodplain, the rest of the park is covered by a woodland zone which is dominated by Marula, Bambara and Lannea trees (Sclerocarya birrea, Anogeissus leiocarpus, Lannea humilis), and a woody-savanna zone dominated by more sparsely distributed Acacia seyal trees (Tchamba 1995, 186).
5 At one point Waza boasted large populations of giraffe, elephants, lions and many different types of ungulates (Wesseling et al. 1994; Scholte 2005). The floodplain is known for its diverse avifauna. It has been declared a Ramsar wetland5 site important for migratory and non-migratory birds (Tchamba & Elkan 1995; Scholte et al. 1999; Bauer 2003a).
Imprisonment, fines, property confiscation, and execution of cattle were also common punishments for infractions of park laws. Despite such atrocities, I found that many of the people I interviewed called for more park management. The story I will tell in this dissertation is why displaced villagers whose ancestors had been displaced on the park’s account, or who had suffered themselves from its strict management were calling for more guards and continued conservation in 2010.

The Waza case exposes a new era in the global history of fortress conservation areas. The critical conservation studies literature has done an excellent job raising awareness about the immediate impacts of exclusionary conservation. Through their efforts these scholars have had some effect on the ways in which conservation managers, NGOs and states go about creating these areas. There has been little to no systematic discussion about the long term effects of protected areas in the critical conservation literature, however. While conservationists attempt to measure long term protected area effectiveness by analyzing biophysical metrics, most of their critics make the assumption that protected areas will remain protected for the foreseeable future. Critical conservation researchers have not considered what might happen if these areas are no longer brutally exclusive or well patrolled.

This dissertation is a detailed unpacking of what happens long after national parks have been established. Here I analyze the effects of a crumbling fortress conservation area on its neighboring populations. I show that the effects of park abandonment can be equally, if not more damaging to local populations than the initial creation of these protected areas. As a result of state and NGO abandonment of Waza National Park, villagers and pastoralists in the Waza region are exposed to food and physical insecurity that they perceive as worse than the insecurities they faced under strict park management.

Three key components to understanding the long-term social relations of conservation are territory, access and governance. Each of these concepts contributes to an understanding of subjectivity. Subjectivities are the product of the on-going the objectification of humans by other humans (Foucault 1982, 777). For example, a person can be produced as a subject by others through scientific analysis, called “dividing practices,” wherein certain people are categorized in certain ways (e.g. racially, ethnically, politically, legally, sexually). One also turns oneself into a subject as one recognizes oneself in certain ways. The ability to define categories and have them used to order thinking, social relations, and society is a way that knowledge can be seen as an accretion of power (Foucault 1980; 1982, 778).

The formation of subjects is intimately related to power relations. According to Foucault (1980) powerful actors are able to produce knowledge, creating categories defining particular subjects’ positions related to who and what they are, for example. Contained within these categories are prescriptions of how these subjects should act, and how they should be treated (e.g. persecuted or protected). These knowledges, categorizations, or subjectivities serve to order and influence people’s daily lives and how they think about and categorize themselves in comparison to other people, the state, and their environments; they are productive of power and power relations (Foucault 1982, 781). An individual generally recognizes and claims multiple subjectivities, as, for example, a pastoralist, a citizen, or a merchant. These subjectivities shape the means and mechanisms of deriving benefits from resources (access), the physical and economic security of subjects in space (territoriality), and the ways in which laws, codes and social norms protect and rule behavior (governance).

Subjectivities are historically and contextually contingent. For example, a law-abiding subject under one regime of rule may be deemed a criminal subject in another. As I refer in this
dissertation to various categorizations of people based on their ethnic identities, spatial locations, religions, and livelihood strategies. I am using these terms in historically, politically and geographically contingent ways. They are not pre-determined, natural categories into which certain people are born or become, but are, rather, continually produced and re-produced identities and classifications. I examine state and local categorizations of sometimes vaguely construed ideas of "insiders," "outsiders" and "bandits." Insider/outsider subjectivities are contingent on who is producing them (what are the power relations and how are they positioned), the sites being referenced, and the contextual political economic circumstances of a historical period.

Bandits are the quintessential outsiders; they are outlaws, outside the order imposed by states, outside regimes of law and accepted practice. However, they are not always criminals or murderers, as the term is often interpreted to mean. States can produce populations they deem recalcitrant as bandits and outsiders by defining their livelihood activities as crimes (Hobsbawm 1960; Thompson 1975; Peluso 1992; 1993; Neumann 1998; 2001; Brockington 2002). Thus banditry and bandits are defined differently by different regimes of rule and of truth—those categories of knowledge production that are productive of power (Foucault 1980). For example, in the Waza region, state definitions of bandits and banditry have gone through multiple iterations since the pre-colonial period. At different moments in the region’s history, kidnapping, wildlife hunting and wood collecting were either sanctioned or criminalized by the state or by other local/regional authorities. In the cases of hunting and wood collecting, it mattered where people performed these activities; laws were spatialized and productive of territory: in whose territory a particular subject (an insider or outsider) collected wood rendered them criminal subjects or law abiding citizens.

State productions of subjects as bandits, outlaws or outsiders, serve to legitimate repression and violence against them (Hobsbawm 1960; Thompson 1975; Peluso 1992; 1993; Duffy 2001; 2010; Neumann 1998; 2001; Brockington 2002). The criminalization of customary claims, territories, and livelihood activities has been well explored in scholarly work that critiques fortress conservation schemes (e.g. Thompson 1975; Peluso 1992; 1993; Neumann 1998; Duffy 2001; 2010; 2001; Brockington 2002). These analyses show how very particular kinds of insiders (e.g. tourists, hunters and government officials) are sanctioned within these new enclosures and territories of rule while peasants and pastoralists are excluded. Conservation and other kinds of state resource enclosures are strategies for state actors to control those of their subjects they see as ungovernable (Peluso 1993; Watts 2003; Peluso and Vandegeest 2010; Duffy 2001; 2010).

Using the analytical frameworks of territory, access, and governance, I examine how insider, outsider and/or bandit subjectivities have been created in and around Waza under various historical regimes of rule. The productions of these subjectivities influence state-making, accumulation strategies, and the production of property regimes. By demonstrating the ever changing productions of new subjects and territories, and changing patterns of rights to and control over land and resources within and around Waza National Park, I show why Waza’s resources are in rapid decline, while local populations are threatened with severe physical and food insecurity.

**Territory**

Territory is a geographical notion, used to describe land or space. The root of the word is *terra*, or land in Latin (Elden 2010). More than a geographical concept, however, territory is a
juridico-political one, an area that is controlled through power relations at local, national and international scales (Foucault 1980: 68; Moore 2005). Territory is both formed by and productive of modern nation states. These states, according to Max Weber (1947: 78) are those institutions that claim a monopoly on force within a territory. Scholars continue to identify states as central to the process of territorialization (Nevins and Peluso 2008; Peluso and Vandergeest 2011; Corson 2011). In this conception, territories are areas to be secured and defended (Cowen and Gilbert 2008, 16). By Vandergeest and Peluso’s (1995) definition, territorialization is undertaken by creating boundaries and mapping them, making their boundaries visible to others. Territorialization is rarely a straightforward process.

Scholars have recognized that the production of territory, asserting and demarcating control over a particular geographic space, entails the control of the people, natural resources, and relationships between them within that area (Sack 1986; Vandergeest and Peluso 1995; Sivaramakrishnan 1997; Peluso and Vandergeest 2001; Sikor 2001; Wadley 2003; Peluso 2005; Moore 2005; Roth 2008; Corson 2011). Territorialization is about creating insiders and outsiders within particular geographic boundaries and controlling what they do within those areas (Vandergeest and Peluso 1995, 388). The act of delimiting that includes or excludes certain groups of people as insiders on a piece of land is a violent act and its maintenance requires the threat of further violence as well as constant vigilance (Elden 2010: 807). As such, territorialization is intimately connected with violence and fear. Its root (*terra*) is also linked with *terrere*, Latin for terror (Elden 2010, 807). Territory is constantly contested, resisted, and fervently negotiated amongst and between state and civil society actors at different spatial and historical scales (Vandergeest and Peluso 1995; Corson 2011). The enforcement of territory can vary widely across space and time and can be contingent on the area’s history and ecological characteristics (Sivaramakrishnan 1997, Wadley 2003, Roth 2004; Corson 2011).

Simply put, territory is important to understanding who gains access to what where, and under what circumstances. As such, territory is also important in creating subjects and asserting control over them. Depending on how land and resources have been allocated and where territorial boundaries have been drawn, a person could be a hunter or a poacher, a citizen or a foreigner, a squatter or a resident. Conversely, gaining access to territorialized land and resources can be contingent on identity. One may gain insider status through negotiations and relationships based on ethnicity, race, gender and citizenship.

Though the above definition of territory could also be applied to property, territory is different from property in important ways. Unlike property, territory is inherently linked with land or abstract space that represents land. *Pieces* of this territory can become property that can be transferred, bought or sold (Soja 1971, 9; Elden 2010, 805). *Landed* property rights are also territorial claims, but they are not the only form of territorial claims (Peluso 2005). Rights over and/or access to landed property are often predicated on how and in what ways it was territorialized. For example, property rights can be re-zoned according to changing territorializing agents or agendas such as resettlement or colonization (Peluso and Vandergeest 2011). Property does not necessarily have to be landed. For example, I can own the cup of coffee I just bought without owning the coffee shop I bought it in. Territorialization is most often a collective claim to a space or specialized resource and implies the control of that space by

---

6 This does not mean that all territories are created by nation states. Neighborhoods in urban settings can be territorialized by guerillas, for example (McColl 1967; Flint 2005; Peluso and Vandergeest 2010). Sacred spaces can also be territorialized (Flint 2005; Peluso and Vandergeest 2010).
some authority, usually in connection with the state (Vandergeest and Peluso 2001). Property can be individually or collectively owned.

Territory and its entanglements with access, governance and subjectivity are essential to understanding Waza National Park’s trajectory as a protected area and the security issues that have resulted from its lost management. I look at the production and reproduction of territory as a process and product of political, economic and cultural practices that are historically situated between the pre-colonial era and 2010 in the Waza region. I examine the production of territory over time to explain three things. First, I use the production of territory to establish how and by whom land, resources and people were controlled in the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial periods. In particular, I analyze the ways in which pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial state actors used territorialization, frontier establishment and acts of enclosure in the Waza region to accumulate wealth and resources.

Second, I use territory to understand how, in what ways and by whom insider/outside subjectivities were produced over time. In this way I am able to reveal that who was counted as an insider or an outsider was contextually contingent, changing as this region was territorialized and re-territorialized over time. I show that with these changes in territory and subjectivity, the advantages and disadvantages of being an insider or an outsider changed as well. Third, examining territorialization as an uneven process I explain the variation of its imposition across the Waza region and within the national park. This process is not just spatially uneven, but also temporally uneven as national and regional boundaries in this area were claimed and enforced by different actors in different ways over time.

In the Waza Region, pre-colonial acts of territorialization and their concomitant governance were wiped away by the French colonial territorialization of this space, and particularly in their creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve. As the Zinah-Waza reserve was re-territorialized by the independent Cameroonian government as Waza National Park in the 1960s, similar modes of exclusion and inclusion were put in place in this protected area. The extended territorialization of the Waza protected area by state actors has had dramatic effects since park management began to fail in the mid-2000s and by 2010, for all intents and purposes, had been de-territorialized. With the loss of state territorialization, and in the absence of local territories and governance that had long been excluded from this space, Waza National Park has become an open access space.

Access

Access is the ability to benefit from material objects, people, institutions and symbols (Ribot and Peluso 2003, 153). Unlike ownership, having access to something does not necessarily mean one has rights to it. Access incorporates all of the possible ways that a person can benefit from things. Thus, access can be achieved by licit and illicit means (Ribot and Peluso 2003, 158). Rights-based access, attributed by law, custom, or convention, is often called property (MacPherson 1978; Ribot and Peluso 2003; 162). Legal access can be achieved by holding state-issued deeds, titles, permits and licenses (Tawney 1978, 141; Nelson 1986, 1995; Ribot and Peluso 2003, 162). Those who hold legal rights to land or natural resources thus have the enforceable right to control access to these things (Ribot and Peluso 2003, 162). Having an enforceable right to something does not always mean that one has access to it, however. Also, legal rights to access can be ambiguous and contradictory. Overlapping systems of authority and legitimacy can lead to “forum shopping,” wherein people make specific claims to the authorities they believe are the most likely to grant them legal control over the access to a resource (von
Benda-Beckmann 1981; Lund 1994, 14; Ribot and Peluso 2003; Sikor and Lund 2009). Illegal access involves benefiting from things in ways that society or the state do not sanction. This category can include theft (violent or stealthy), using government sanctioned power for personal gain (corruption), and coercion (Ribot and Peluso 2003, 163).

In the Waza case I draw on two intertwined access mechanisms described by Ribot and Peluso (2003): access to authority and access through social identity. Though other means of gaining access are part of the Waza story, these two access mechanisms play the most important role in explaining how and in what ways local people were able to gain access to land and natural resources within the region over time. I show that in the pre-colonial Waza region, access to natural resources, land and security was achieved through access to authority. For example, pastoralists would often pay tribute to local chiefs in order to use seasonal grazing areas unmolested. Villagers were able to request land or gain access to fish in village ponds from the chief based on their membership in the village community.

The creation and maintenance of the Waza fortress conservation area severely curtailed villager and pastoralist access to land and resources within the protected area. At the same time, however, local access to protected area resources was not lost entirely. Operating in a gray area between the legal and illegal, local people were sometimes able to gain “authorizations” from park authorities to harvest fish, grass, wood and other necessary items within the protected area. Others entered the park secretly, counting on their relationships with park authorities to allow them to negotiate lower fines or less brutal punishments if they were caught.

In these acts of negotiation and stealthy access social identity mattered enormously. Some villagers gained insider access through long-term relationships with park authorities. Others drew upon their gendered, religious, ethnic, or spatial identities to gain favor from park guards or park managers. In this way, local people were able to gain relative advantages over outsiders (usually people from areas distant to the park) who did not have the ability to negotiate with park authorities. As opposed to village and pastoralist insiders, it was these outsiders who were the targets of park management’s most brutal violence. As park management faded away in the mid-2000s, local people lost their relatively exclusive access to park resources as rapacious outsiders began flooding the region in search of natural resources. Unable to negotiate with these outsiders, in 2010 local people felt as though the natural resources they depended on for their livelihoods or in times of emergency are being stripped away at a rapid rate.

**Governability**

As I trace the articulations between territory, subjectivity, and access in the Waza protected area over time, I also trace the governability of this space and the effects of governance on local people’s access to resources as well as their physical security. Governable space is a concept conceived of by state governments or international organizations as spaces under the control of the nation state, where laws are followed, taxes are paid, and subjects are fixed and countable. These same groups define ungovernable space where there is an absence of state control (Clunan and Trinkunas 2010, 17). State actors describe such territories as areas that offer safe havens to terrorists and other criminal actors (e.g. Lamb 2006, 6). They are also seen as disorderly, unmanageable, and lawless (Clunan and Trinkunas 2010, 26). These are frontiers to be conquered, controlled and subsumed under state power. In reality, this type of ungoverned space is very often governed, just not by state actors. For example, non-state institutions like

---

7 See Shipton and Goheen. 1992; Berry 1993; Peluso and Vandergeest 2001 for more on negotiation and identity.
tribal or clan-based governments, or insurgents may have rules, laws, and subjects as well as the ability to maintain order. NGOs and terrorist organizations also fall under this large “non-state” category (Clunan and Trinkunas 2010, 17). Taking a slightly broader view, other theorists see governable spaces as places where governmental thought is explicitly linked with territory. It is the spatialization of government (Rose 1999, 39; Watts 2003).

A second, truly ungovernable space is also described in the literature. In these truly ungoverned spaces, no cohesive group has power to enforce rules or law. These truly ungoverned spaces represent the gaps between other governed spaces. They can be internal frontiers that represent the spaces between well ordered social spaces like towns and markets (see Roitman 2005), but are often found on the actual physical borders of state territories where sovereignty and order are constantly being undermined and in flux (Williams 2010; Eilenberg 2012). Places where state rule is “fractured” create ungovernable subjects whose activities are unaffected by state law or enforcement mechanisms (Moore 2005, 208). These places are lawless and uncontrolled, often subject to unchecked violence and crime (Watts 2008; Williams 2010). In some cases, ungovernable spaces may be created with the complicity of government officials seeking to profit from crime or illicit trade (Felbab-Brown 2010).

Both definitions of ungovernable space are useful in considering the Waza protected area. Using the state-centric definition, it is easy to see how French colonial officers experienced Northern Cameroon as an ungovernable space with its near-constant conflict and highly mobile population. Under these circumstances, the French creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve can be understood as one attempt of many to assert and maintain governance in this area. Cameroon’s first president, Ahmadou Ahidjo maintained similarly strict central-state governance of the Waza protected area throughout his presidency. This governance waned and finally collapsed under Cameroon’s second president, Paul Biya in the mid-2000s. Because Waza had been governed so strictly for an extended period of time and because its residents had been removed from its limits for the sake of conservation, local governance in this place is long gone. Thus, as of 2010 Waza National Park has become a truly ungovernable space, one that is not only outside of state control, but is also outside of any control, local, international or otherwise.

Outline of the Dissertation:

Tracing the history of Waza National Park allows me to make three progressive claims about territory, subjectivity, access and governance in the context of biodiversity conservation. First, the production of territory in the Waza Region in pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial eras was visible in its physical and socially-constructed frontiers. As I explain in chapter one, beginning with slave-raiders in the pre-colonial era, being an insider to “the land of Islam” was vital to resisting enslavement and oppression by Muslim leaders and slave raiders. While being an insider was often ideological in that Muslims could not enslave other Muslims, belonging was also very much predicated on spatially demarcated territories. The frontier of the “land of Islam” was a constantly shifting site in this period (Roitman 2005). Living beyond this frontier meant being an outsider and a potential slave (Roitman 2005). German colonial rulers re-enforced and reproduced these subjectivities as they sought to rule colonial territory through Muslim rulers. The more people under the control of these rulers meant more people under German control.

In chapters one and two I show that in the French colonial period, subjectivity as an insider or an outsider to the protected area territory was based on racialized identities. With the

8 Dar al-Islam (the land of Islam) as opposed to Dar al-Harb (the land of unbelief) (Roitman 2005)
creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve, Europeans were the only legally recognized insiders in this protected area and thereby allowed to travel and hunt within its borders. Meanwhile, Africans were deemed outsiders to be repelled and controlled, by force if necessary. In chapter two, I explain that despite legal designations of insiders and outsiders, the practical realities of protected area management in the French colonial and independent Cameroonian era made different kinds of subjects. Those living adjacent to the colonial Zinah-Waza Reserve and later Waza National Park developed insider subjectivities for whom laws were more flexible and use of the park more possible. Outsiders from distant villages or countries seeking natural resources inside of the protected area’s boundaries were those who were the most severely punished by park management for infractions of park law.

The second claim I make is that, neoliberal conservation policies caused the lines between park insider and outsider subjectivities to slip. In chapter three I show that as the independent Cameroonian state’s enforcement of laws within this protected area’s territory began to deteriorate due to economic crisis, structural adjustment policies and changing national political priorities in the 1990s, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) gained state-sanctioned access and control over this territory. Thinking that participatory management was a tool which could help boost the diminished surveillance over this territory’s natural resources, these NGOs implemented a co-management project that promised use of some natural resources in the park in return for protecting other natural resources. By loosening the strict territorial governance of the park, these NGOs effectively lessened the advantages of being an insider. As a result of lost territorial enforcement, outsiders began using park resources during this time, mainly unchecked by park guards.

The third claim I make is that Waza National Park’s territory became an open access space in the mid 2000s. The NGOs who had governed the park when the Cameroonian government became financially unable and politically unwilling to do so essentially abandoned Waza’s savannas in favor of Cameroon’s southern rainforests, driven by conservation agendas shifting from biodiversity protection to carbon sequestration. In this open access space, being an insider or an outsider had become meaningless except to those who were threatened by outsiders. Stealth, negotiation and cunning had become unnecessary for gaining use of Waza National Park’s natural resources.

In chapters four and five I show that in the absence of consistent governance in this protected area, Waza’s neighbors’ lives have become insecure. Local people who once considered themselves to be insiders in this area, benefiting from the forceful exclusion of outsiders are furious that the state is not protecting their food security or their physical wellbeing. In chapter four I show that the park’s neighbors attest to feeling afraid for their livelihoods and emergency stores of food inside of the national park now that they are being harvested at a rapid rate by outsiders. In chapter five I show that this ungoverned space has also become a prime location for criminals to use as a base of operations for kidnapping, theft and violence.

Conclusion

Understanding how access, territory, governance and subjectivity have historically articulated in the Waza protected area helps us understand why the women I quote above, and many other agriculturalists, pastoralists and fishermen that I spoke to over the course of my twelve months in the Waza region called for a return of brutal park management. However bitterly this has happened, villagers became dependent on park authorities to keep them safe. Often the only armed representatives of the government in their villages, these park guards
protected villagers and local pastoralists against hunger as well as crime. Facing the loss of these governing agents, unarmed local people are exposed to food insecurity and banditry today. I demonstrate why local people saw more guards and better park management as far better than their present alternative.

The consideration of Waza National Park’s long-term trajectory serves as a warning for other protected areas that have been created more recently as well as those yet to be created. I argue that we must think about the injustices, violence and social disarticulations these places cause in the moments of their creation as well as when they fade from the public eye, lose funding and management. Further, if we care about nature conservation itself, the long-term view of fortress conservation areas is vital. One of the main reasons local people’s livelihoods have been so threatened by the dissolution of park management is that the park’s natural resources, which include diverse animal and plant populations have been severely diminished by rapacious and opportunistic natural resource harvesters seeking subsistence and/or a quick profit. Thus, critical thinking about the historical trajectories of protected areas is important both to those interested in human rights and welfare as well as to those concerned with biodiversity and ecosystem services.
Figure 3: Map of Waza National Park available at park’s entrance. Here you can see the gray-blue area on the left of the park is wooded savannah, the orange-pink area in the center is *Acacia seyal* forest and the light yellow area on the left is floodplain. Gobe, the village I describe below is in the floodplain.
Chapter One

Frontiers, Territories and Subjectivities in the Waza Region

It was mid-day and the heat was closing in. We were all hungry, grumpy, and tired. Seeing an island of trees in the vast sea of high grass, Adamou steered toward it and stopped the truck with a kick of dust. Suddenly we could hear the throb of crickets everywhere, the monotonous warbles of a laughing dove, the hiss of the wind pushing its way through the landscape. The old guide, the aging park guard, Adamou and I sat under the sparse shade of Balanities and Acacia trees on our plastic mat eating our sardines and bread. As we ate, we stared over a shallow pond named Gobe toward a thicket of vines and umbrella-shaped Tamarind trees. After eating my fill I began examining this terrain more closely. The ground was littered with triangular pieces of clay which I first mistook for rocks. Seeing me hold one in my palm and rub it with my thumb, the old guide nodded and said, “Yes, those are the remains of pots.” Furrowing my brow, I asked the guard why there were so many here—we were far from any village on the edge of the park. He told me that this had been a village site once—that human hands had dug this pond, planted those Tamarind trees, and shaped those pots from the clay beneath our feet. He told me that many of the waterholes in the park—now vital to the survival of its wildlife—had once been village territory. Gesturing with his papery, dry hand toward the park’s distant limit he told me they had moved from this place a long time ago. Though he did not tell me why they had moved, I knew. It was in the name of conservation that the human history of this place had been polished off the park’s maps—only the village’s name clung to this site.

Introduction

Maps of Cameroon’s Waza National Park are dotted with water holes like Gobe, each bearing very particular names – Zeila, Mourgouma, Darlele (see Figure 3). The elephants, giraffe, antelopes associated with these holes are drawn next to them, making it seem as though “wild nature” alone defines the space. This impression is false; the names of these waterholes belie such a belief. At the time of its establishment in 1934, the 170,000ha of land that now make up Waza National Park had been long territorialized, inhabited, used and fought over by pastoralists, fishermen and agriculturalists (Mbenkum 1997, 22). Many of the names of the water holes covering the map were those of former villages. As in the case Gobe, names are not all that remain. These former village territories can be located by trees that indicate past human settlement (Tamarindus indica, Adansonia digitata, Acacia sieberiana, and various Ficus spp.) (Wit, 1975; de longh et al. 2010, 107). In addition, huge mud mounds that marked territory for fishing communities still remain (Mbenkum 1997, 22; Sholte 2005). Gobe is not the only waterhole where thousands of sherds of clay pots made for holding and carrying water to homes cover the ground. The history of this park is anything but “wild.”

As we try to understand the current socio-natural space of Waza National Park and its environs, simply studying what is currently happening is not enough. Instead, we must understand how the present pivots on past productions of this place by multiple actors through
various struggles. How did those productions shape contemporary violence and environmental problems in the park? Here I show that the Waza landscape is not simply a stack of historical strata—each layer sedimenting atop the previous one. Instead, I tease out the ongoing interactions between local, regional and international actors with each other, their histories, and the changing environment over time. This chapter is not an exhaustive accounting of three-hundred years of history in the Waza region. Rather, it is an examination of the articulation of frontiers, territory, subjectivity and governance in this place that draws on historical events and processes.

Starting in pre-colonial era, I show that the Waza region has long been affected by international political economics, power and desire. I will first explain why leaders in the pre-colonial period desired territory and slaves. I then briefly show how these leaders defined and governed territory. Finally, I will explore how the articulations of territory and frontier in the pre-colonial context created the conditions for leaders of this era to accumulate wealth. As early rulers, raiders and jihadists created territories in this region, they also created insiders and outsiders with distinct privileges and disadvantages. These territories both produced and were produced by frontiers. Territories allowed Muslim leaders to control land, natural resources, and the populations within these areas. The spaces beyond the frontiers of these territories were equally, if not more important to these leaders as they created the means by which wealth accumulation was possible. Consciously creating, recognizing or designating areas beyond their administrative or religious control, Muslim leaders of the pre-colonial period were able to create spaces in which capture of outsiders as slaves was sanctioned (Roitman 2005). This was an extremely profitable venture as slaves were units of wealth and exchange, a resource for labor and protection as well as power.

Mapping out these pre-colonial articulations is vital to understanding early colonial struggles to govern these constantly shifting territories, frontiers and subjects while simultaneously trying to impose their own, more regimented, versions of these things. In the early colonial context, pre-colonial productions of insiders/outside, territory and frontiers were recreated through German colonial military action and law. German colonial administrators tried to govern indirectly through Muslim leadership. This indirect rule increased the benefits of being an insider to Muslim held territories as colonial administrators joined forces with Muslim leaders to defeat and subjugate non-Muslim populations. At the same time the Germans did little to stop the domestic slave trade, making frontier production as important for wealth creation through slavery as it was in pre-colonial times. These continued productions of frontiers, territory, and enslaveable subjects caused the population of the Far North to remain highly mobile well into the early twentieth century.

As French administrators took over much of Cameroon after WWI, they found the Far North Province an ungovernable space in the sense that it was seemingly beyond state control. The area was roiling with conflict, contained a highly mobile population and was rife with unchecked trade across national borders. Here I show that along with other acts of control and surveillance, the French worked to make territory distinct and governable. One example of this territorial demarcation and governance is the Zinah-Waza Reserve (which later became Waza National Park). This reserve was useful to the French for controlling recalcitrant populations, limiting illegal trade as well as nature preservation. I show that the surveillance and governance of this space was strict and sustained throughout the colonial period. This chapter lays the
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9 This chapter is informed by Donald Moore’s (2005) work in Zimbabwe, as is the idea that the past “pivots” on the present.
foundation for understanding of the Zinah-Waza Reserve as a fortress of governance in a sea of ungovernable space and people up until the 2000s. It also presents Waza as a new kind of territory in this region, creating its own categories of insiders and outsiders.

**Frontiers, Territory and Subjectivity**

Considering frontiers both as limits as well as ungoverned territories is helpful in our understanding of the context in which the Zinah-Waza Reserve arose. By some definitions frontiers are simply the lines delimiting the edges of politically or culturally defined territories, and nation states. This type of frontier can have ecological or political significance and is often fixed by law (scientific, moral and jural) (Kristof 1959, 274). These boundary lines are often sites of contestation, violence and military action (Mbembe and Rendall 2000). The frontier cum boundary line is a separating, limiting factor. In this sense, the frontier is the periphery, the space beyond the outer edge of a nation’s reach. By these two definitions, frontiers are things and places to be policed, pushed back, crossed, expanded, exploited, and conquered. As we will see, the creation of frontiers as limits was vital to the economic expansion of Muslim leaders in the Waza region as they created outsiders who were raidable or enslaveable subjects. The frontiers these leaders defined were the boundary between free and unfree, belief and unbelief (Roitman 2005). Colonial Europeans’ alliances with Muslim leaders in their attempts to maintain their grasp on their newly defined colonial territories reinforced these Muslim leaders’ practices.

Some scholars take the concept of the frontier further by thinking about these spaces as not simply lines demarcating the limits of states or regions, but as discontinuous, incomplete, interstitial, lacunary spaces within existing territories (Kopytoff 1987, 25; Bennafa 2002; Roitman 2005). These frontiers are not necessarily on the borders of nation states, but are the in-between places of the world, far from population centers, markets, corridors of transport and exchange (Kopytoff 1987, 25; Bennafa 2002; Roitman 2005). The frontier in this sense is a politically open, morally ambiguous area lying between organized spaces or societies. These are institutional vacuums where the rules of the metropole and society do not apply (Kopytoff 1987, 25). Here, socio-political and cultural structures are more loosely defined, fuzzier and can merge with, and be penetrated by, those of other regions or groups (Kristof 1959, 273). These are unsettled or under-populated areas that may hold unexploited and abundant natural resources that can lead to social and economic gain (e.g. Billington 1966; di Tella 1982; Barbier 2012). Thus, these are spaces of potential danger, as well as sites of potential abundance (Kristof 1959, 271). In northern Cameroon these internal frontiers are often referred to as “the bush.”

Today, as in earlier times, the bush is a place where one can get away with things, hide oneself, or is the opposite of populated city or village spaces. As I will show below, these internal frontiers were the ungoverned and ungovernable spaces the French sought to control through military action, surveillance and the creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve.

Frontiers are both constitutive of and created by territory and territorialization. Territory is not just land or space, it is a claim to these things (Peluso and Vandegeest 2011; Peluso and Lund 2011). It is more precisely defined as “land or space that has had something done to it—it has been acted upon. Territory is land that has been identified and claimed by a person or group...It is a bounded space which there is a compulsion to defend and secure” (Cowen and Gilbert 2008: 16, emphasis original). Thus, territorialization is “an attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena and relationships by delimiting and
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10 Roitman (2005) makes this observation as well.
asserting control over a geographic area” (Sack 1986, 19). Internal territorialization, occurring within a broader national territory, involves the creation of land boundaries which allow that individual or group to take control over natural resources and the people who use them (Vandervegeest and Peluso 1995). Like frontiers, territories are not ahistorical, asocial entities. They are constructed and defined through constant negotiation and contestation over time (Vandervegeest and Peluso 1995; Corson 2011). Though territorialized spaces are highly dynamic and control over them is often incomplete, they represent defined, mappable, spaces wherein rights and specific resource uses are allocated to state and private actors by a governing body.

Frontiers and territory are each important to creating different kinds of subjects (Vandervegeest and Peluso 2001, Moore 2005). Residing within a territory or beyond a frontier makes one an insider, citizen, subject, ally or an outsider, foreigner, enemy, threat. These subjectivities carry with them certain privileges and disadvantages. In this chapter I show that those who attained insider status in the pre-colonial and early colonial era were able to evade capture and enslavement while state-identified outsiders, infidels, or non-Muslims were considered enslaveable human beings. These identities had as much to do with territory as they did with religion. Insider/outsider status changed with the creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve and Waza National Park. In this new type of territory, frontiers defined the categorical difference between criminals and law-abiding citizens.

Pre-Colonial Period

By the fifteenth century, control over natural resources and slave raiding were integral to the accumulation of wealth and power of the leaders of the Waza region. Due to the Waza region’s constant flooding, it was considered to be rich farming country where people cultivated yams, cotton, fruit, wheat and sorghum (Rudin 1936; 105). This area also represented prized dryland pasture for cattle and other livestock (Moritz et al. 2002). Controlling an area with great agricultural potential, and containing ivory, salt and natron11 resources, as well as areas that allowed for fish and cattle production, leaders of the region’s various empires were able to link up with east-west trade routes to their great economic benefit (Connah 1981: 190-96; Roitman 2005). Territorializing this important pastureland and fertile agricultural floodplain meant symbolic and material wealth for pre-colonial rulers.

More than any natural resource, however, slaves were sources of enormous prosperity and power. Slave trading and raiding were vital wealth generating activities for traditional rulers and their subjects at this time. Slaves were an important unit of exchange during this period, often used to pay tribute to local leaders (Stenning 1959, 17). They were also a form of everyday exchange and payment. For example, slaves were often used to pay brideprice during this period (Geschiere 1982; Nicod 1927). Slaves were also traded with distant states in North Africa and beyond for enormous profit. As the Atlantic slave trade intensified after the seventeenth century, the importance of slaving rose in the Waza Region in order to meet international and local demand (Austen 1990, 321-28; Roitman 2005, 111).

Before the 18th century agricultural12 chiefs controlled the vast and rich floodplains of the Waza region. To gain access to these lands, and protection while on them, Fulbe pastoralists13
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11 Natron is a naturally occurring mineral (looks white and chalky) that can be used as a cleaning product (like soap), antiseptic, and flavoring for local dishes especially at the time of Ramadan. To me, it tastes kind of like baking soda and sulfur mixed together…yum!
12 Often referred to as Zumaya, Massa, Musgum, Guiziga, Mundang and Tupuri ethnic groups (Moritz et al. 2002)
13 A primarily Muslim ethnic group
were obliged to pay tribute and grazing dues to these sedentary leaders and were expected to help herd local cattle and follow local customs (Moritz et al. 2002). Those who broke with custom or were unable to negotiate access successfully were sometimes violently expelled from local leaders’ village territories (Mohammadou 1988, 173; Moritz et al. 2002). Without sanctioned access and promised protection, these pastoralist groups were exposed to potential theft and violence (Abubakar 1977; Moritz et al. 2002, 130). Gaining temporary insider access was an important part of these nomadic pastoralist groups’ successful use of the floodplain.

By the beginning of the 19th century Muslim Fulbe leaders overthrew these agriculturalist chiefs through religiously legitimated warfare (Smith 1966; Moritz et al. 2002). After this jihad, Muslim Fulbe leaders sedentarized and predominantly controlled the Waza region. Under Fulbe control administrative centers, called Lamidates, controlled by a Lamido14 were linked in a centrally regulated federation15 (Last 1985, 27; Roitman 2005). This hierarchical and centralized administrative structuring was based on medieval Muslim caliphates (Kintz 1985; Njeuma 1989; Moritz et al. 2002). To maintain the continued support of the Fulbe groups that remained nomadic, sedentarized leaders gave them access to grazing land and did not enslave non-Muslim Fulbe (Awogbade 1983; Stenning 1959, Moritz et al. 2002). These leaders also used their control over access to naturally occurring salt-licks16 to gain political capital and income from their subjects (Rudin 1938; 275).

 Territories at this time were not rigidly defined, but instead represented those areas which were settled by insiders of the Muslim faith as opposed to potentially raided so-called pagan areas. Settled, active areas were marked by physical symbols of occupation, use or control. For example, towns and cities were often encircled by tall mud walls and trees/shrubs planted by their inhabitants—traditions that continue in many parts of the Waza landscape today (Clapperton 1823; Lockhart 1996; Lange 2008). Such symbols were recorded by early Italian explorer d’Anania in 1582 who describes the broader Waza region as populated with “mound sites and walled cities” (d’Anania 1582 cited in Holl 2001; 168). These walled cities persisted into the 19th century when German explorer Henrich Barth recorded large walled towns as well as extensive fishing, agricultural and cattle operations in the immediate Waza region (Barth 1857; 350-426). Hugh Clapperton, a British explorer in this region in the 1820s also recorded these walled towns as well as cotton plantations and trees planted for shade and other uses (Clapperton 1823; Lockhart 1996). Man-made ponds and canals for fishing were also clear symbols of territory in the dry Sahelian landscape. A prominent village adjacent to Waza National Park, Andeni, bears the name of one of these ancient watering holes (Mbouche 1995, 37).

 At this time leaders would invade territories in order to seize, govern and exploit the natural resource wealth within these territories. Though the natural resources within these territories were important to wealth accumulation, these territories’ productions of frontiers was of primary importance to their conquerors. For example, Fulbe leaders of the Sokoto Caliphate abided by Shari’a law which forbids the enslavement of Muslims by other Muslims. For Fulbe Sokoto leaders and raiders, the accumulation of wealth (slaves) was predicated on creating a
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14 plural is lamiibe
15 This hierarchy has remained embedded in the socio-natural landscape—the strict hierarchy of lamidat territory which is then divided into village and neighborhood territories, each controlled by a chief or sub-chief, remains in place today.
16 Salt licks are important to maintaining the appetite and weight of cattle.
frontier between belief and unbelief\textsuperscript{17} (Burnham and Last 1994, 322; Roitman 2005, 121). Here, territory and the subjectivities it created were essential to continued wealth production. Beyond the limits of Muslim territories lay non-Muslim frontier areas, places that had neither institutional nor moral restrictions (see Kopytoff 1987, 25). Those who were insiders and belonged within the “land of Islam” were safe from slave raiding, while outsiders, those who resided within the “land of unbelief” were targeted to become slaves (Roitman 2005, 111). In this frontier space outsiders composed of Muslim and non-Muslim bodies could be enslaved, sold and exploited for production, domestic labor, and man-power for local and international armies (Roitman 2005, 111). The sale of these slaves was far more profitable than the sale of any natural resources the region had to offer.

Conversion to Islam was not an assurance of freedom. Territory defined one’s status as an insider or an outsider and thus, one’s capacity to be enslaved. Flight from the non-Muslim territory to the Muslim territory was the only means by which one could assure one’s freedom (Willis 1985, 21; Roitman 2005, 122). Even within defined or claimed territories, frontiers between Muslim and non-Muslim populations and spaces were created or identified for the purpose of accumulating more slaves. For example, the Mandara Kingdom was able to maintain peace with its neighbors by allowing them to perform slave raids in its southern pagan districts (Abubakar 1983; Lockhart 1996, 20). Property in the “land of unbelievers” could also be seized, even if its owner was Muslim (Tabiu 1989, 386; Roitman 2005).

In the pre-colonial period, people in the Waza landscape were highly mobile. The constant desire to spread Islam, gain control over territory and natural resources, as well as the desire to produce new bodies to enslave led to the continued creation of frontiers on the landscape through jihad. These frontiers were produced and maintained by jihadis who were highly mobile because of their frequent invasion of new regions (Burnham and Last 1994, 322; Roitman 2005, 120). At the same time, populations deemed to be in the “land of unbelief,” beyond the frontiers created by Muslim leaders, often fled to escape enslavement either into the “land of Islam,” where they would have to participate in the jihad themselves, or into remote areas like mountains and swampy floodplains where they could hide from their aggressors (Weiss 2000a).

**German Colonial Period**

German territorialization of Cameroon\textsuperscript{18} began in 1884. Because the Germans began colonizing Cameroon from its southern coast and met with resistance from Muslim Fulbe and other aggressors in Cameroon’s northern regions, they did not immediately territorialize northern Cameroon. It was only after German forces subdued Fulbe emirates through military action in 1902 that they were able to establish a colonial administration in this region (Weiss 2000a, 145). The Germans, in conjunction with the United Kingdom and France inscribed new forms of territories on the Waza region, dividing it into colonial territories which were defined in part by geographical landmarks like the Logone and Chari Rivers and the Mandara Mountains (see Figure 4).

Upon their arrival, German administrators were plunged into a seemingly ungovernable space, one whose governance was outside of the control of the state. The Waza Region was a site of frequent conflict and struggle. The many empires\textsuperscript{19} that converged in this area at this time

\textsuperscript{17} Dar al-Harb (the land of unbelief) and dar al-Islam (the land of Islam) (Roitman 2005)

\textsuperscript{18} Kemerun in German

\textsuperscript{19} Among them, the Kanem, Mandara, Bagrimi, Borno and Sokoto Empires.
Figure 4: General Map of Africa 1898-1904 Augé. German Territory is in Green, French territory is in Pink and British Territory is in Yellow. Portugese territory is in purple.
were constantly fighting over territory, creating new frontiers beyond which they were raiding slaves, and were allying themselves with or defending themselves from North African armies from Tripoli and Fezzan (Lovejoy 1978, 345; Seignobos and Iyébi-Mandjek 2000, 71; Lockhart 1996, 18). German colonial officers trying to take control of their new territory also had to contend with the extremely powerful invading Rabah army that swept through the Lake Chad Basin and reached the immediate Waza region in 1893 (Sholte 2005; 73).

German colonial officers had to deal with what they called banditry in this region as well. Bandits during this period were men who would raid colonial trade caravans or steal goods and livestock. One criminal in particular, a bandit named Zigla, caused them an enormous amount of trouble. Zigla took advantage of Rabah’s destabilization of the region’s ethnic boundaries (Issa 2010). He formed professional gangs of law-breakers without regard for village, family or ethnic affinities (Issa 2010, 25-28). Refusing to submit to German colonial powers, Zigla and his band terrorized the communities in northern Cameroon for four years, attacking caravans and stealing goods and livestock until he was captured by German authorities in 1906 (Issa 2010, 33; Egughi 1978, 595). The Waza region’s physical characteristics helped repel this banditry. While Zigla’s attacks were widespread in northern Cameroon, the wet floodplain of the Waza region acted as a natural barrier to him and prevented him from attacking those who lived in and above the plain (Eguchi 1978, 600).

After research expeditions in 1902 and 1903, the German administration realized that the northern part of Cameroon was not the promised land they had imagined (Weiss 2000a). This was a place that had little immediate economic value. It had no apparent mineral deposits and no goods that could be easily integrated into the colonial economy. If anything, this was a territory that held strategic value and was a site of potential labor, livestock and agricultural development for future needs (Weiss 2000a). Thus, the Germans sought the most efficient way to territorialize this region with limited personnel, military supplies and funds. To do this, the German colonial administration pursued a course of indirect rule in Cameroon’s north, in which they used existing Muslim Fulbe lamidat rulers (laamiibe) to control local populations (Moritz et al. 2002). The Germans believed that Fulbe Muslims were culturally superior to non-Muslim “pagans” who were seen as lacking organizational capacity (Residentur Adamaua, Jahresbericht 1904-05, cited in Weiss 2000a, 162).

Selecting this already dominant group through which to rule, the German administration reinforced the insider/outsider dynamics that existed before the colonial period. Based on their alliance with the Muslim Fulbe, the German administration understood their new territory in three categories: areas under Fulbe Muslim rule, non-Muslim areas subdued by Muslim rulers, and areas not subdued by Muslim rulers. One exception to this rule was ivory. Due to the prevalence of elephants in the Waza region (noted by Barth 1857), the Germans were drawn to this area by a desire for ivory to ship back to Europe for profit. This interest in ivory led to new acts of territorialization as the Germans, worried about depletion in this precious resource, attempted to regulate the amount of ivory harvested in Cameroon issuing decrees in 1906 and 1907 (Rudin 1938; 257). Ivory harvesting seems to have continued unabated despite German attempts at regulation, however. By 1912 reports on the Waza region’s animal population were devoid of elephants (Mecklenburg 1912 cited in Sholte 2005).

20 Rabih az-Zubayr was a Sudanese warlord and looting slave-trader who established a powerful empire west of Lake Chad between 1879 and 1900 when he was finally defeated by the French. (Babikir 1954).
21 Myths and legends around Zigla lend him a kind of Robin Hood quality, painting him as a man would was opposed to the colonial subjugation of his people, a man of responsible and consistent character, and a proud warrior (Issa 2009, 43; de Lame 2009, 18). Though Zigla was captured, his bands of bandits persisted. The Sonngoobe, a celebrated group of bandit descendants of Zigla’s group continued to roam northern Cameroon’s pasture lands challenging European and (later) independent Cameroonien police until they were rounded up and executed in the early 1970s (Issa 2009, 48).
22 One exception to this rule was ivory. Due to the prevalence of elephants in the Waza region (noted by Barth 1857), the Germans were drawn to this area by a desire for ivory to ship back to Europe for profit. This interest in ivory led to new acts of territorialization as the Germans, worried about depletion in this precious resource, attempted to regulate the amount of ivory harvested in Cameroon issuing decrees in 1906 and 1907 (Rudin 1938; 257). Ivory harvesting seems to have continued unabated despite German attempts at regulation, however. By 1912 reports on the Waza region’s animal population were devoid of elephants (Mecklenburg 1912 cited in Sholte 2005).
and non-Muslim communities living in remote and unreachable mountain areas or swamps who were not subject to Muslim rule (Weiss 2000a). Thus, within German territory, Fulbe, or those under Fulbe control were subject to German rule and regarded as insiders while those who had eluded subjugation were deemed outsiders and therefore outlaws or threats. Seeking to gain control over the whole population of northern Cameroon through Muslim Fulbe leadership, the Germans encouraged and supported these leaders in subduing recalcitrant pagans (Residentur Adamaua-Bornu 1905/6; Weiss 2000a). These dynamics benefited state sanctioned insiders as they were able to gain protection under colonial law while outsiders were criminalized and persecuted. For example, Muslim leaders were able to attain German military support to continue raiding populations beyond the frontiers of their territories telling the Germans that these pagan groups were criminals—thieves, kidnappers, highway robbers, marauders and dangerous elements (Weiss 2000a, 162, 189).

The pre-colonial dynamics of subjectivity, territory and frontiers were reproduced and reinforced by German rule. Favoring the Muslim Fulbe over pagan populations, the German administration tacitly allowed the Fulbe to continue creating frontiers and thereby slaves. Though abolishing slavery from their colonial territory was supposed to be one of the main missions of German officials, they never abolished slavery in northern Cameroon. Germans understood that their ability to govern and control this unruly region was predicated on the continued power of the Muslim Fulbe elite and recognized that this elite gained much of the power and wealth from the slave trade (Weiss 2000a, 152). As other European powers took hold of much of North and Central Africa, abolishing slavery along the way, the price for slaves continued to rise making them ever more valuable to these leaders in the early 20th century (Stieber 1904 cited in Weiss 2000a). Also, allowing the slave trade to continue despite the fact that it was technically illegal in German Cameroon gave administrators leverage over Fulbe elites as they could threaten to enforce the law (Weiss 2000a, 152).

Despite their (at times) violent territorialization of northern Cameroon, German administrators never gained full control over this region. For example, they were unable to stop Muslim Hausa traders from undercutting colonial prices by using slaves as labor (Weiss 2000a, 182). Certificates to tax and control trade within this area were also ineffectual (Weiss 2000a). Continued regional wars, uprisings and conflicts also made German administration in northern Cameroon quite difficult and patchy. The continuous tumult in the region and the eventual collapse of German administration in Cameroon’s north in 1915 caused by the First World War created political chaos that allowed Muslim leaders to continue to create of frontiers and thereby profit from raiding, slavery and territorial expansion into the 20th century (Goodridge 1997 cited in Weiss 2000a). This turmoil also caused Muslim slave traders to rush into the area from other colonial territories which had been more serious about abolishing slavery seeking children to take for slaves (Eckert 1999, 143). The frontier regions between Cameroon and other colonial territories were the areas that were most frequently raided (Eckert 1999). It was into this roiling space outside of European state control that the colonial French plunged after World War One (WWI).

---

23 Gaston Thierry, a colonial administrator was an exception to this rule. He wanted to give non-Muslim communities that had not been subdued by Muslim Lamidos political autonomy. This was a highly unpopular position which was called unrealistic and “stupid” by his fellow administrators (Wirz, Vom Sklavenhandel, 178-179. See also Midel, Fulbe und Deutsche, z22; Weiss 2000a 162-3).

24 The Germans also used heavy military presence and the forced consolidation of villages to govern this seemingly ungovernable space (see Weiss 2000a, 198; Burnham 1996, 33)

25 An ethnic group different from Fulbe and who were frequently in conflict with Fulbe leaders
Figure 5: Map of Africa (Bacon & Co., Ltd., ca. 1925). Cameroon is marked here under “French Equatorial Africa”
French Colonial Period

After WWI, German Cameroonian territory was split between two European powers. Called “the Cameroons,” the French took the majority of the country while the British took control of two provinces (the Northwest and the Southwest) which they administered from Nigeria (see Figure 5). When the French first arrived in northern Cameroon in the early 20th Century, they viewed it’s highly varied, highly mobile population as being in an extreme state of disorder (Roitman 2005). They sought to make this region a governable space, one characterized by fixed, countable populations grouped by ethnicities in stable villages for the purposes of taxation²⁶, control and production (Burnham 1975, 585). To achieve this goal, the French instituted a mix of direct and indirect rule that they called la politique indigene in which they used local authorities as a part of their colonial administration.

The French also instituted distinct territories in this region, as opposed to the loose conceptions of territory present in the pre-colonial and German colonial eras. Under this form of administration, the French established administrative subdivisions to maintain order (Roupsard 1987, 24). Within these subdivisions, some lower-ranked traditional leaders were placed under the control of a French officer (Moritz et al. 2002). Though in some circumstances these new management systems bypassed the powerful Fulbe chiefs (laamiibe) in the Far North Province, for the most part it had little effect on their elite positions (Van den Berg 1997; Moritz et al. 2002). The French put other forms of surveillance of space and people in place as well. They conducted a census, ran military implemented vaccination campaigns for smallpox and sleeping sickness, policed roads, established military bases in the region and patrolled the area with gendarmes (Farinaud 1945:3, 113; LeVine and Nye 1974:50-60; Feldman-Savelsberg et al. 200; Seignobos and Iyebi-Mandjek 2000, 112; Roitman 2005).

Complete surveillance and fixing populations to specific villages proved impossible, but the French attempted to reach these goals by classifying, identifying and enumerating distinct ethnic groups and their territories. They also tried to settle or re-settle groups of people in village configurations that were recognizable to them through what they called regroupement (Roitman 2005, 132). French reports during this time stress the traditional Muslim authorities’ hostility or deafness to colonial actions (Roupsard 1987, 32). Many nomadic Fulbe people did not respond well to the French attempts at regroupement, and remained highly mobile (Lembezat 1947 cited in Roitman 2005, 135). Even populations with sedentary livelihood activities were highly mobile, individuals moving between many villages over the courses of their lives. This mobility was a product of constant alliance and frontier formations, enslavement, war, segmentation of groups, and displacement of entire villages due to raiding, war or exploitation by laamiibe as well as drought, epidemics, marriage, pilgrimages, the need to find funds to pay the French Head Tax, and long distance trade (Beauvilain 1989, 553; Roitman 2005, 135, 8).

Northern Cameroon’s mobile population expanded rapidly as the French instituted French coinage as the primary source of wealth and exchange in the region in place of slaves. This shift in units of exchange from slaves to coins combined with French decrees to abolish slavery in 1916 led to the release of large numbers of enslaved people from servitude (Seignobos and Iyebi-Mandjek 2000; Roitman 2005). French enforcement of anti-slavery laws through their surveillance of roads, villages and towns allowed non-Muslim populations that had formerly hidden in mountains and swamps in order to escape enslavement to move to the more fertile plains which previously were Muslim territory (Hilaire 1991; Beauvilain 1989; Gubry 1988; Iyebi-Mandjeck 1993; van Andel 1992; Roitman 2005). This newly freed population caused the

²⁶ L’impot (Head Tax)
French colonial administration an inordinate amount of stress as they took part in rebellions, uprisings, agitation, thievery and murder for over twenty years at the beginning of the 20th century (Beauvilain 1989, Roitman 2005).

Territory and subjectivity once again were linked as those populations who were territorially-fixed became insiders, seen as law-abiding citizens under French rule. People categorized in this way escaped being the targets of regulation and subjugation. Conversely, the French strategically criminalized the highly mobile “floating population” (la population flottante), calling this group “anti-social” or referring to them as bandits (Monographie Departementale, Departement Diamare 1965, 12, ANY/1AA229 cited in Roitman 2005). Mobility (criminalized by the French as “vagabondage”) became illegal. By 1924 colonial law required every Cameroonian to be able to identify a permanent home and occupation upon pain of imprisonment (Arrêt promulguant au Cameroun du 6 Mai 1924 portant repression du vagabondage au Cameroun, Journal Officiel, August 15, 1924, 357-58 cited in Roitman 2005). Those subjects outside of the control of the French government were the outsiders of this period.

Despite these new colonial laws and their attempts to fix local societies to specific territories, state defined bandits often left their ascribed lamidats in order to trade cattle between Chad and Nigeria (crossing across the slender Far North Province along the way). Smugglers of cloth and kola nuts, as well as pilgrims and armed robbers also moved between Chad and Nigeria, across Cameroon, to the great displeasure of the colonial administration (Roitman 2005). These mobile populations were seen as a threat to colonial control over French territory, French colonial citizens and traders. These outsiders or bandits were also fiscally disobedient as they evaded the Head Tax both and taxes on trade (Roitman 2005).

French frontiers, territories and subjects did not always work to their advantage as they tried to gain control over these mobile populations. For example, bandit movements across nation-state borders flummoxed the French as their police and regulations were territorially bound. Colonial administrators and police were unable to pursue bandits across their colonial frontiers, a fact that bandits exploited frequently (Note sur le banditisme dans le Region le Nord-Cameroun, (Logone et Chari), 11 July 1952, 2, ANY/1AC 1752/4 cited in Roitman 2005). Further, village chiefs (officially intermediaries between the French and local Cameroonian populations) often sanctioned, financed and encouraged the actions of bandits in order to gain funds to maintain social standing and power in their communities (e.g. wearing beautiful gowns, having horses, ministers, guards and the like) (Rapport Annuel 1948, Region du Nord Cameroun, 13, ANY/APA 11618 cited in Roitman 2005; Issa 1998; Issa 2001; Moritz 2005). Sometimes village chiefs were also the leaders of bands of bandits at the same time (Roitman 2005). Like Zigla, such bandits were often not seen as such through the eyes of local people. Though defined as criminals by the colonial state, locally these men were often highly celebrated—having songs written and sung about them in praise of their work. They were seen by the local population as re-distributing wealth and spoils (Issa 2001). These well-connected, geographically savvy bandits were often better liked, or were more powerful and/or terrifying than the French gendarmes and thus were rarely brought to justice by local populations (Roitman 2005).

The French used various military operations and surveillance through policing and medical interventions in their attempts to govern the Far North Province of Cameroon. Aside from these activities, French colonial officers also used the establishment of the Zinah-Waza Reserve in the 1930s as a means to take control of this province and, in particular, a space
whose swamps were historically used to hide from authority and subjugation. The explicit goals of establishing the Zinah-Waza reserve were to a.) Control the illegal traffic of cattle into Nigeria; b.) Stop the installation of camps along the wetlands inside of the limits of the reserve; c.) Provide a barrier between the irregularly vaccinated cattle herds from the Far North and the regularly vaccinated herds from the South; d.) Ensure the regeneration of trees as well as aforestation in this area; e.) Promote tourism to this region by allowing for the multiplication and security of large mammals (Arrêté n° 71, 24 March 1934; Arrêté n° 264 9 September 1935; Arrêté n° 297 30 July 1938; Mbenkum 1997). By working toward these goals, the French were trying to preserve and produce the means for capitalist accumulation by being better able to tax trade, and fix local populations to specific territories, as well as to protect their investments in cattle herds in the Southern Regions of the country. Beyond protecting the means for colonial capital accumulation through tourism, cattle and taxation, this reserve also worked to stop bandits from moving unchecked across the landscape using the region’s wetlands and water sources as a means of survival (for both cattle and man).

State territoriality in the Zinah-Waza Reserve was distinct and sustained, inscribed on the landscape with guard posts, roads, signs and cement markers, delimiting park borders (see Figure 6). Creating this hunting reserve also gave the French colonial administration a monopoly on legitimate force in this volatile region. Claiming that this reserve was put in place to ensure the survival of megafauna such as elephants, buffalo and waterbuck, gave the French colonial government a compelling discourse to ban hunting (and arms-bearing) by non-Europeans within the reserve’s limits. Though in many parts of the world, the state is unable to achieve a

![Figure 6: Colonial-era cement Marker delimiting Zinah-Waza Reserve Boundaries outside of the village of Tchede. (Author photo)](image)

1932 by the order of the High Commissioner, Djarma (2002) states that the “Zinah-Waza Reserve” was formed the 24th of March, 1934, as does the Cameroonian Ministry of Tourism, while Sholte (2005; 75), citing the Commission for Technical Co-operation in Africa south of the Sahara (1953) states the “Waza-Zina Hunting Reserve” was formed in 1935, and Drijver (1991; 132) states the “Waza Hunting Forest Reserve” was formed in 1936. These different dates and names may be due to patchy record keeping, or may be due to the fact that after its initial inception, the reserve was expanded upon and changed function several times before it became a national park in 1968 (a date everyone can agree upon).
monopoly on the use of physical coercion (Vandergeest and Peluso 1995, 389), guns in this region were relatively rare during this period of Cameroonian history, giving reserve staff and French colonists hunting in the Waza-Logone Region a major advantage over the local population. In my interviews with village elders and retired administrators, they stated that only Europeans were allowed to carry guns and hunt within the Zinah-Waza Reserve. This racialized privilege was taken as a symbolic act of colonial state territorialization and control over Cameroonian land and people.

Creating new, violently enforced territory, the French also created new frontiers and subjectivities. In the reserve, insiders were not Fulbe Muslims or spatially-fixed populations, but Europeans benefiting from the enforcement of this territory through sport hunting and tourism. Fixed populations in the villages under the control of the Lamido of Logone Birni and the Lamido of Pete became outsiders as they were pushed to the park’s periphery (Sholte 2005, 75-6; interviews 2010). As many as sixty villages were displaced from the park for the creation of this reserve. Now, it was not simply vagabonds or mobile people who were criminals, but also those who entered the park seeking natural resources for their livelihoods. Fishing, hunting, wood, grass and vegetable gathering and pasturing livestock within the park’s limits were now crimes. Though most people alive today are too young to remember the creation of the reserve in the 1930s, quite a few remember that their great grandparents were displaced by its creation. Some of the oldest still remember the colonial management of this space. One such villager remembered, “he [Flizot--colonial manager] suspended everything, the fish, grass cutting, no one, no one could go into the park and do this kind of work…Rene [another park manager] was harsh too.”

Outsiders whose status as such existed before the creation of the protected area like mobile cattle traders seeking to move cows within Cameroon, Chad and Nigeria were also excluded from this strictly governed reserve. French control over this territory was important because this area was one of the easiest places in Cameroon to cross from Nigeria to Chad with cattle or other contraband. The protected area is located in one of the narrowest parts of Cameroon, where the distance between Chad and Nigeria measures only around fifty kilometers (see Figure 2). Lost access to Waza’s landscape was significant to travelers as well. Because of its seasonal flooding and permanent water sources, this area offers travelers and their livestock places replenish their water supplies and find palatable food (green grass for cattle, fish and wildlife for humans) while crossing this otherwise deadly-dry stretch of land which lacks surface water for most of the year. Regular surveillance of the reserve’s interior allowed French colonials to further control and repress recalcitrant populations in this distant province,

---

28 Guns were not entirely absent, however. Even in the pre-colonial era, they were traded for in the northern provinces of Cameroon. These guns were used to maintain the territories of people living in this region (MacEachern 1993). These guns allowed cattle and slave raiders of this period military superiority (van Beek and Avontuur 2005). Under colonialism, ‘pacification’ work meant that the colonizers lent their military might to aiding sedentarized indigenous rulers (laamiibe) (van Beek and Avontuur 2005).
29 The manager was a man named Flizot. Flizot worked with a Cameroonian man named Rene. Both are said to have ruled the reserve very strictly.
30 A few villages were allowed to remain within the reserve’s limits during the colonial period—namely Zeila, Baram and Garle.
31 Colonial efforts to limit illegal cattle transfers and smuggling across Northern Cameroon did not stop these activities entirely. For example, in 1950 1,503 cattle exports were declared in northern Cameroon while an estimated 12,000-15,000 were exchanged unregulated and untaxed by the French administration (Rapport Annuel 1950, Partie Economique. North Cameroon, n.p. ANY/APA 116168 cited in Roitman 2005).
furthering their goals of pacification, nation building and economic development (Burnham 1996, 33).\textsuperscript{32}

The sustained maintenance of this reserve had an effect on wildlife in this territory. Legally, wild animals were more welcomed as insiders than Cameroonian nationals were. French governance as well as their exclusion of local populations and cattle from this site made it an attractive and secure area for wildlife to graze. In the first twenty years of its existence, the numbers of antelope in the Zinah-Waza Reserve rose dramatically (Sholte 2005; 74, 77). The sustained security that this space offered wildlife eventually drew in large numbers of elephants from Chad who fled the effects of war and lost wildlife management in the Mandelia Faunal Reserve (Fry 1970; Tchamba 1996; Sholte 2005). The Zinah-Waza reserve which in 1947 had no elephant population had a population of over 600 by the end of the colonial period in 1960 (Fry 1970; Tchamba 1996; Sholte 2005).

**Conclusion**

This brief review of the Waza protected area before its constitution as a park has allowed me to emphasize two things. First, that the space that is now taken up by Waza National Park was by no means uninhabited before it became a protected area. It carries with it a long and fraught history of human occupation, use, and conflict. The evidence of human actions in and on the landscape remain visible today. Second, territorial expansion, frontier creation and maintenance, flight from enslavement, and adaptation to a highly variable ecological system (nomadic cattle herding, e.g.) made the Waza region a place that seemed disorderly and unruly to the French colonial administration.

This chapter has established how the Waza protected area became a fortress of governability in a space that seemed ungovernable to European colonizers. The protected area became a territory that was highly governed through strict guarding. The establishment of the Zinah-Waza Reserve located this territory outside of the control of Cameroonian rights and control entirely. This shift in territorial control also created new subjectivities, making subsistence users and former residents of this territory into outsiders. These subjectivities, along with state governance of this territory were maintained into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.

---

\textsuperscript{32} Conceptually, Peluso 1993 and Duffy 2000, 2010 are useful here.
We sat with our backs against the smooth mud wall. Though we were now in shade of a woven mat supported by what looked like four ancient tree trunks, the wall held the heat of the day deep within it. A young man brought sweet, spicy tea to us on the intricate carpet where we had been invited to sit. Behind the wall we could hear a donkey braying incessantly and a young woman yelling (ineffectively) to calm it. Chickens strolled through the enclosed courtyard and somewhere out of sight a roster crowed. After we drank the steaming, syrupy tea, the old man whose home we were visiting began to tell us about the memories of the colonial period that had been passed down to him by his grandparents. Looking away, out over the wall toward the dense mass of trees at the village’s edge, he shook his head and described how their land was taken, and more importantly, how their fishing areas were enclosed within the park. Surveillance in European days was tight, he said, with two guards living in the village. “We are agriculturalists and fishermen,” he said, “without land or water we were blocked from our work.” Looking back to me and my research assistant, this old man then half-smiled and went on to explain to me where inside the park he and his family had continued to fish for generations.

Introduction

The creation of insiders and outsiders and their mechanisms of access to natural resources within the Waza protected area under colonial rule become clearer if we think of the Zinah-Waza Reserve’s creation as an act of enclosure. Enclosure can be defined as the act of closing off commonly held property or commonable land (e.g. swamps, wastes, fields) for private use (Blomley 2007, 2; Vasudevan et al. 2008, 1642). Though in classic descriptions of enclosures, land and resources are usually walled, hedged or fenced off from others (e.g. Marx 1906; Thompson 1975), enclosures do not necessarily have to have physical markers of their boundaries. They can be created and maintained through laws and policies, discursive strategies, and maps, which are upheld by policing and surveillance.

Enclosures have become increasingly prevalent as capitalism has spread across the world in many different forms (Blomley 2007; Harvey 2011). Representing a specific set of social relations, enclosure creation and maintenance are intimately linked with unequal power relations, violence, or the threat of violence. Their history, according to Marx (1906), is one “written in letters of blood and fire.” In this violent act the enclosing party usually benefits economically and/or politically from the enclosure while those whose land and resources have been enclosed lose out. Enclosures often result in the dispossession of people from long-held common property resources, home sites and sacred places (Marx 1906; Thompson 1975). Because property relations are sets of social relations, dramatic shifts in rights to, and management of, land and other natural resources also change how dispossessed people interact with each other and their environments.

The creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve was an act of enclosure as well as a form of state territorialization. Before the creation of this reserve, the Waza region was largely ungoverned by the German and early French colonial state, but was managed intensively by sedentarized chiefs, under a larger system of indirect rule. With the French colonial
government’s creation of the reserve in the 1930s, this space was violently transformed into a strictly governed and delimited protected area. Local people’s rights to and control over land and natural resources were lost as they were excluded from the Waza protected area. Under French law, only Europeans and their African hunting guides were deemed insiders to the reserve. Not only was the creation of this reserve a symbolic assertion of colonial power in the region, it also allowed the French administration to benefit economically from tourism, taxes and the protection of cattle investments. Meanwhile, Waza’s subsistence users and former residents were legally relegated outsiders as squatters, poachers, and thieves. The maintenance of this enclosure was continued by the independent Cameroonian government until the 1990s.

The state’s enclosure of the Waza region to create a protected area was violent, but not all people were excluded from this protected area in the same way. The lines between those the government's park managers construed as insiders and outsiders were not as circumscribed in everyday practice as they were in French and Cameroonian law. Though local residents may have lost their rights to and control over their former village territories, they had not completely lost their access to the natural resources within the protected area’s limits. This ability to gain access to natural resources was gained via complex mechanisms of negotiation. Using studies done by scholars such as Goheen (1992), Berry (1993), and Juul and Lund (2002) on negotiated rights to natural resources, I examine the role of negotiation in struggles over resources in Waza National Park. Local natural resource users mobilized gender, ethnic, spatial, and political identities to achieve insider status that afforded them access to resources (though not land) within park limits.

Waza's insiders negotiated with park managers to gain resource access despite having lost de jure control over them. Outsiders, generally prospective users from areas distant to the protected area, were less able to negotiate access. Many became targets of park guard law enforcement and subjected to brutal violence if they transgressed the park’s limits. The key point here is that insiders, after initially losing control of the territory that constituted the protected area, began to perceive park guards as necessary to protect the resources of the park—to which they could gain access—from overuse by outsiders.

This chapter does not seek to minimize the violent, unfair and socially disruptive qualities of conservation enclosures, nor does it claim that violence here stopped after the initial enclosure of this area. The creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve and the maintenance of this enclosure as Waza National Park tore people away from land and resources vital to their economic, social and cultural activities. Rather, the story of Waza demonstrates that after expulsion from the park, new alliances were forged between local people and park guards, shifting the violence to would-be park users who sought to gain access to the park from afar. Negotiated access may have given local people physical access to the protected area, but the informal negotiations did not challenge either the state's territorial authority or the legal boundaries of the enclosure. The alleged fortress was not impervious to all subjects.

**Zinah-Waza as Enclosure**

The territorialization of the Zinah-Waza Reserve was carried out through the violent enclosure of land. With the creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve the French colonial government physically removed villagers from their commonly held land and resources. One old man, remembering a story told to him by his grandparents said, “They [grandparents] lived there, inside of the park. They were given three days to leave. If they [government] came and found people still inside of the park they [the villages] were burned. All the villages were chased out.”
Former reserve residents were put in dire straits. Their livelihoods which were based on the agricultural lands, livestock pastures and fish ponds in this area were now, according to the French colonial state, criminal acts within the reserve’s boundaries. In similar fashion, local people lost their rights to the wood, vegetables, grasses and wildlife within the protected area (see Sholte 2005, 75-6).

Spatially-fixed villagers were not the only group to be torn from their means of production by the enclosure of this protected area. Non-fixed members of Cameroonian society were also denied use of the reserve area. This “floating population,” made up of former slaves who had become itinerant traders, highway robbers, and vagabonds as well as nomadic herdsmen was a group particularly targeted by the French colonial government in their creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve. The laws that set the park aside explicitly aimed to stop “the installation of camps along wetlands inside the limits of the reserves.” Nomadic pastoralists and transhumance users of the regions in particular were put in peril by the enclosure of this reserve and its exceptional water sources.

The colonial French’s change in rights to and control over natural resources in the Zinah-Waza reserve had serious social implications for local people. Before the creation of the reserve, village land was generally controlled by a village leader (Lamido) or sub-leader (Lawan) who was responsible for meting out land to those who needed it, mediating use of fishponds and canals, and responsible for excluding outsiders from damaging or using these resources. Further, while the French saw what they called the “floating population” as ungovernable, some members of this population were closely governed by village leaders. Village chiefs often sanctioned, financed and encouraged the actions of state-identified bandits in order to gain funds to maintain social standing and power in their communities (Rapport Annuel 1948, Region du Nord Cameroun, 13, ANY/APA 11618 cited in Roitman 2005; Issa 1998; Issa 2001; Moritz 2005). Sedentary leaders also negotiated contracts with nomadic pastoralists. Village leaders would agree to offer security and access to rangeland to pastoralists in exchange for tax and tributes (Moritz et al. 2002). Village leaders also acted as mediators, resolving conflicts among and between pastoralist groups (Moritz et al. 2002). Though many of these social relations continued after the creation of Zinah-Waza outside of protected area limits, these intricate and complex forms of governance no longer had meaning within the reserve itself.

Human-nature relations were drastically altered by the establishment of this protected area enclosure as well. In the pre-colonial era, the Sao (whose later descendants are locally called the Kotoko and Musgum people) had extensively manipulated the Waza environment to suit their livelihood needs. They had constructed large canal and pond systems to making fishing in the floodplain more efficient. Creating concentrated water points in parts of the Waza region attracted wildlife in huge numbers (Mboouche 1995; 87; Mbenkum 1997, 22; and Sholte 2005). Indeed, early visitors to the region also record the space as teeming with animals. Barth (1857) observes rhinoceros, giraffe, large numbers of water birds and falcons in the immediate Waza region.44 Ironically, as the French ripped fisher villages from the land in the Waza reserve, they

---

33 (Arrêté n° 71, 24 March 1934; Arrêté n° 264 9 September 1935; Arrêté n° 297 30 July 1938; Mbenkum 1997)
34 Human-nature interactions are still inscribed in place names in the Waza Region. Elephants, known to frequent the region were such an important source of food that one of the villages of the regions still bears the name Niwadiji meaning “place of a dead elephant” Sholte (2005) or “troupe of elephants” (Mboouche 1995, 36). Tchede’s elders told me that the village’s name derives from that of a lizard-like animal that only lives in its vicinity. Badadaye’s name comes from the Kanuri name for a type of plant (Hibiscus canabinus) (Mboouche 1995).
were removing the people who had constructed the landscape so attractive to European hunters in the first place.

As I have shown, violently removing the occupants and users of reserve land, creating an enclosure and maintaining its borders helped the French accumulate wealth. First, by enclosing land for the Zinah-Waza Reserve, French colonists used the protected area as a kind of barrier to protect cattle investments in the southern half of country from disease by controlling the unauthorized movement of unvaccinated herds of cows from the north to the south (see Mbenkum 1997). Second, the creation of the Zinah-Waza reserve allowed the French to more effectively collect taxes by territorializing one of the easiest places to both hide and cross between Chad and Nigeria with livestock or other goods. Third, forming a distinct, well governed territory helped the French to push the Far North’s recalcitrant “floating population” into villages where they could be counted and taxed.

Colonial powers used hunting to finance colonization in central Africa during this time as well (Mackenzie 1987, 40-42). In Zinah-Waza this use of hunting was apparent particularly after WWII when French Central and West African safari tourism entered its “golden age” (Roulet 2013). As transportation options modernized and safari tourism became more organized and professional, Western elites began visiting Francophone Africa for hunting expeditions in droves (Roulet 2013). Cameroon’s stable geopolitical situation, its higher level of development, as opposed to other Francophone Central African countries, the diversity and beauty of its landscape, and the abundance of wildlife there brought more foreign tourists to Cameroon than neighboring Chad or Central African Republic (Roulet 2013). Tourism in northern Cameroonian reserves particularly benefited from the construction of an airstrip the French colonial period. Air France offered flights from Paris to near-by Fort-Lamy four times a week in the 1950s—marketed as only a weekend away from Paris (Freed 2011). The Zinah-Waza reserve drew in Europeans from places like Italy, Spain, Belgium, Germany and France padding the pockets of hunting guides and tour operators as well as the colonial state.

Hunting in Cameroon’s reserves also served to supplement the pay of colonial administrators in northern Cameroon after WWII. Many foreign residents were known to leave the northern cities of Ngoundéré, Garoua and Maroua to enter the bush to hunt on the weekends. Villagers in towns surrounding Waza National Park today remember that some white hunters only took their trophies and left the meat of their kills for the townspeople. These more “altruistic” people aside, many Europeans used these hunts to stock up on meat for the week (Roulet 2013). This practice was prevalent enough that it was a subject of public debate between those who hunted for meat and those who were “sport” hunters within Cameroon at the time (Roulet 2013).

Maintaining the Enclosure

Beyond the initial violence of enclosing the Zinah-Waza Reserve, the maintenance of this protected area was achieved through continued violence. For example, as the independent

---

35 “As the hunter (in good standing with the local legislation and must remember that some species are protected in "reserves"), it is always possible for one to find oneself in the bush face to face with buffalo or antelope….he may find a troop of giraffes in the north, or a bunch of elephants in the south.” (French Hunter 1951, cited in Roulet 2013 118-9).

36 There are few data to confirm the revenues from the tourist industry in Maroua, the Provincial Capital (perhaps because many records were recently destroyed in a flood) or in Garoua, the colonial capital of northern Cameroon.

37 This second group looked down upon hunting for meat as something that was disrespectful, unsportsmanlike and simple butchery (Roulet 2013).
Cameroonian government changed the reserve’s status to become a national park in 1968, Cameroon’s first president, Ahidjo, had several stalwart villages within the protected area burned to the ground. One man remembers that the independent Cameroonian government “made a road and chased everyone out [who was living within the park borders]…we could not cross it [the road/park border].” The protected area boundaries, reinscribed by the independent Cameroonian government, produced similar subjectivities as existed in the colonial period. Cameroonian who crossed into the park for subsistence purposes and were caught faced arrest, imprisonment, loss of livestock (cows found in the park were shot or confiscated), fines or violence from park guards.

Park managers Flizot—a Frenchman (1957-1968), Rene (1968-1975), Loubou Pierre (1975-1979), Abakoura (1978-1980), and especially Badjoda (1981-1994) were known for their strict maintenance of park boundaries and regular patrols. These managers’ physical presence—often doing patrols themselves, as opposed to just sending their guards to do their work—and the presence of their guards were so pervasive that almost every person I spoke to during my fieldwork referred to at least Badjoda, if not the other previous managers, by name. Many could describe what these managers looked like. The reason I make a point of noting that the people I interviewed were able to recall the names and faces of park managers from the (sometimes distant) past is that in my line of questioning many could not recall the names of the more recent (or current) managers. The constant and long-lasting maintenance of this enclosure is apparent in Bauer’s (2003, 177) survey of residents adjacent to the park that showed that 73% of respondents knew where the boundary of the park was and could describe its location accurately.

38 This will be discussed further in Chapter Three.  
39 Probably earlier—records are sketchy  
40 Killed by poachers while on patrol in 1980  
41 Even when I would mention the names of the most recent managers people would shake their heads and declare that they had not heard these names. People would often comment that they might know the names of the new managers, but they did not know them physically meaning that they had never actually seen them in their village or in the field.
In the early to mid-1990s the violent enforcement of the park enclosure reached its apex under park manager Badjoda. Former park guards describe this time in military terms, one park guard saying that under Badjoda’s administration they “fought a war with Nigerian poachers” (see Figure 7). At one point in Badjoda’s tenure, he instructed his guards to bring the heads of poachers to him in order to prove their victory over these outsiders. Admitting to carrying out these heinous orders, one guard remarked, “…their heads were too heavy to carry so we took their ears.” The mutilated bodies of these hunters are still buried in unmarked graves inside the park. Badjoda was also known for searching homes adjacent to the park for evidence of hunting, fishing or gathering within the protected area’s limits. The jokes, rumors and myths about the stringency of the well-known past managers were numerous. For example, one woman told me “if a chicken stuck its beak into the park, Badjoda would know, and that chicken would have to apologize.”

Waza National Park, was an important means of facilitating economic gains in the post-colonial era. After independence in 1961 up until the mid-1990s, the large numbers of charismatic elephants, lions, antelope and bird species concentrated in Waza National Park, as well as the country’s relative national security,42 attracted thousands of tourists to the region (Djarma 2002, 62). An administrator currently in the employ of the Ministry of Tourism fondly remembered that President Ahidjo developed tourism en masse in Waza during this era by funding and facilitating infrastructure to draw tourists in to the area. A grand hotel was constructed next to the park which included a swimming pool and forty-two rooms (see Figure 8; Djarma 2002, 77). International and national tourism industries profited from the ecological conditions of the park. Tour operators who were working in the park between the late 1960s and mid 1990s remember this as an extremely profitable period.

The sixty years of strict state governance of the Zinah-Waza Reserve/Waza National Park were not without serious social consequences. Social property relations changed as people’s traditional livelihood strategies were made unavailable to them and their presence in the park criminalized. As we have seen, prior to the park’s establishment, village territories in this space were guarded and outsiders excluded or controlled by village leaders in the area. With the creation of the park, surveillance and enforcement of the laws in this territory were jobs left to park guards and managers. The institutional base of exclusion from this territory had shifted from a local level to a national level in the colonial period and remained that way into the 1990s.

Because of this enduring, exclusionary state governance, local people’s understanding today (however bitter) that the park’s land and resources are state property has become
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42 As opposed to the neighboring countries of Chad, Central African, Congo, Equatorial Guinea who have been rife with civil war, military coups, genocides and other forms of violence almost non-stop for much of the last century. Of these neighbors, Gabon has the most peaceful history, but Cameroon is not called “an island of peace” without cause.
widespread. Many residents now think themselves intruders when they enter the park. During my interviews with many of these people, park users often called themselves thieves and their taking from the park stealing, ascribing territorial control to the state. For example one woman, representative of many others, said bluntly, “that area [the park] is for the state. We don’t go in there.” People in different villages all around the park used almost identical phrasing—“over there? That is for the state.” In these off-the-cuff statements, it is possible to see that local people recognize that their right to govern reserve land and resources has long since been lost.

The removal of villages from the park and strict enforcement of park boundaries for many years also dramatically altered local people’s interactions with the protected landscape. The government’s forced removal of villages from Waza changed the spatial relations of people and the environment. By moving villages to the park’s periphery, an interior empty of human habitation was created. Historically adjacent to each other, fishing communities and fish ponds are now distant from one another as these communities have been moved beyond park’s borders. Even if local natural resource users do enter the park, hindered by distance and rough terrain they generally only seek out resources at its periphery. These patterns of resource use are different from the pre-protected area era wherein villages were more evenly scattered the whole landscape. This new set of property relations and the alteration of human/environment interactions played a large role in setting the scene for the creation of the current open access situation that has led to environmental degradation as well as heightened food and physical insecurity for the populations adjacent to Waza National Park.

A Permeable Fortress: Negotiated Access to Natural Resources

The fortress conservation area, built and maintained by the colonial and post-colonial Cameroonian governments, was not airtight. The use of the park was drastically altered but, according to one woman, “…people were not stopped from doing their work in the park.” The work this woman refers to includes traditional livelihood activities like gathering legumes, gum arabic, wood and leafy greens, as well as hunting and fishing within the park’s limits. Indeed, though resource users may have lost their rights and control over the land and resources within Waza National Park’s boundaries—through forced removals, threats of violence, fines and imprisonment, this did not mean that they had lost access to these things. Those who were able to breach the boundaries of the Waza protected area and gain access to its resources were not strictly white Europeans. Instead, local people negotiated access to natural resources within the protected area through long-standing relationships with park administrators as well as through identity-based negotiations. These people also mobilized the access mechanisms of stealth and cunning.

As we have seen, before the Zinah-Waza reserve existed, both outsiders (e.g. nomads) and insiders to village communities were required to negotiate access to land, pasture, security and fish with each other as well as with local leaders. Maintaining avenues for negotiation was a means by which people were able to avert risk in the face of unpredictable rains, politics and violence in the region. As conservation of wildlife for hunting became the primary objective in this area with the creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve, acts of bargaining and struggle were not just over how to gain access to natural resources through a single, standard set of rules, but over the rules themselves (see Benjaminsen and Lund 2001, 12-13). Who was allowed to benefit from the reserve’s resources and under what circumstances was not as distinct in practice as it was in French legal documents.

43 Other than the village of Baram which was able to remain inside of the park’s limits.
With the enclosure of their former village sites and natural resources by the protected area, local people’s use of the resources within its borders did not stop entirely. For example, Bauer’s (2003b, 177) survey of Waza residents found that many local people still used resources in Waza National Park, particularly water and grasses for cattle, and fish and game for subsistence. Sholte (2009, 16) points out that “were the park really closed for exploitation, villages would not be able to stay where they were.” Similarly, villagers frequently commented on the continued importance of this territory even after its enclosure by the state. For example, one woman told me, “If there were no advantages we would not stay here [next to the park]. We live because of the park.”

Waza National Park’s neighbors most frequently maintained access to its natural resources by buying extra-legal “authorizations” or paying extra-legal “taxes” to park guards. Payments were sometimes made in cash and favors as well as through simple benefit sharing. Describing one such scenario, a villager told me, “when there are guards we sometimes share fish with them.” Similarly, “taxes” bought the ability to fish or graze cattle within park limits in the early 2000s (see Sholte 2009, 16). In other cases, villagers were able to simply negotiate their way out of punishments if they were caught without an “authorization” within protected area limits.

The ability to negotiate for access in this way was often predicated on personal and longstanding relationships between villagers and park guards. Being an insider mattered. For example, one man told me, “yes, the park was well guarded, [but] it was possible to get a few things…you had to know guards to get authorization.” These interpersonal relationships were forged over long periods of time in remote areas. For example, during park manager Badjoda’s administration, park guards were stationed in each village around the park. Some stayed only two or three years in a single village, but others stayed for much longer periods of time. While some of these villages were easily accessible by road to larger markets or towns, many were very isolated. Because several of these villages were located in the floodplain, they were only accessible by canoe for several months of the year. Due to the remoteness of some of these villages a feeling of careful mutual dependence and obligation formed between some park guards and villagers. Some park guards formed close personal connections with the villages they stayed in. For example, one retired park guard, originally from one of Cameroon’s southern provinces decided to move back to the village he had been posted in during Badjoda’s administration for his retirement years rather than returning to his extended family in his home village.

The long-standing relationships that villagers built with park guards enabled them to make claims to access resources within protected area limits based on needs for survival or subsistence. Local resource users would comment that guards or park officials would recognize when they were in urgent need and help them. For example, one man told me the park manager “would see that you had nothing and let you use the grasses in the park.” Hinting at the lines along which they negotiated with park guards, villagers I spoke to were quick to make distinctions between subsistence and commercial uses of park resources. For example, one
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44 I am speaking about the National Park because information on this sort of thing was nearly impossible to find for the colonial period.
45 Authorizations to enter the park were extra-legal with the exception of a short period of time in the late 1990s and early 2000s when a co-management regime was attempted and it was proposed that certain communities could enter the park for certain natural resources.
46 Being able to gain these authorizations was a point that was often brought up proudly by village leaders. One leader told me, “park management would stop someone from going inside [the park] unless they had an authorization. This is something we are proud of. Because of this we are OK with animals making trouble.”
woman described her use of the park (having received a 1-day a week authorization by park guards during one period of the park’s history) by saying “We also fish. For the fish we only take a little bit to eat. It is not for commercialization, if we did that we would be stopped. Also the wood, we gather just enough to cook.” These findings align with research that focuses on poaching and illegal natural resource harvest in Europe and the United States which has shown that wardens and conservationists may treat those who illegally harvest natural resources for subsistence more leniently than those who harvest for large scale profits (Hampshire et al. 2004, 307; Forsyth et al. 1998; Pendleton 1998; Forsyth and Marckese1993; Eliason 2003).

Gender played a role in who was allowed into the park and who was not. Women were not deemed to be as large threats to the natural resources in the park as men because guards did not think they would go as far into the park’s interior or do as much damage to the natural environment. For example, one woman told me, “At our level here, we always get authorization. Women only. Men don’t get the authorization because they can actually ruin the things there [the park]. But us, the women, we get the authorization because they know we won’t go far. We are afraid.” Some women believed that they were favored by park officials over men because men traditionally hunt and fish while women traditionally used the park to seek out plants to use for thatch, brooms, food and fodder for small livestock.

Ethnicity also played a role in who was able to negotiate access to park’s natural resources and who was not. Ethnicity’s utility for negotiating access to resources within protected area limits was less static than that of gender, however. Who was able to access natural resources within the park changed as new park managers of different ethnicities were hired or replaced. Some villagers made the claim that those people who were of the same ethnic group as the park manger of the moment benefited the most from the park. According to non-Fulbe people I spoke to, the Fulbe (the same ethnic group as Badjoda) were treated more leniently than other people violating park law during his tenure as park manager. This sentiment was confirmed by Fulbe herders themselves, one telling me “We would sometimes pasture our cattle with his cattle. We liked the time of [Badjoda] ten times how we like now. Things were good. The cows were favored by [Badjoda].”

Similarly, one park guard described catching some Kotoko fishermen in the park but being forced by the Kotoko park manager to return confiscated fishing gear to these people because they were of the same ethnic group as the park manager. This man’s replacement was also Kotoko. This second Kotoko park manager was accused by many people of allowing Kotoko fishermen to use park ponds for their livelihoods. A Muzgum man (another group of fisher-people) told me that because both of these park managers were Kotoko, “the Kotoko thought the whole park was for them so people from Tchede [a Kotoko village] went up to the Tchikam Pond [used by the Muzgum people] and began fishing there.”

Political identity (aside from the ethnic politics discussed above) played an important role in local people’s maintenance of access to the park’s natural resources as well. For example, the residents of Baram (in particular their chief) supported Ahidjo in his bid to be the first president of Cameroon as the countrytransitioned from colonial rule. When Ahidjo was elected president Baram’s recalcitrant neighbors were burned to the ground and their inhabitants forced to move.

---

47 People blame this favoritism for starting an ethnic war between the Kotoko and the Muzgum people, resulting in the deaths of over 300 people.
Baram, on the other hand, was able to remain in place and continue to take advantage of the park’s natural resources from within (Scholte 2005, 77; Drijver 1991, 133). Spatial identity also made a difference in how villagers were treated by park managers and guards. For example, Badjoda married a woman from one of the villages on the park’s boundary. Due to this marital connection, people from other villages and ethnic groups claimed that the people of that particular village were able to benefit more readily from park resources than they were. Though some of these reports may be exaggerated and spoken out of jealousy, there is physical evidence of Badjoda’s leniency with the natal village of one of his wives. According to villagers, Badjoda built the mosque which still rests within the park limits. This favoritism is also apparent in the testimony of a woman from this village who told me that the park guards favored the people in her village over others. She said, “they knew us, they knew we were from Irimi and we wouldn’t go deeply into the park, we wouldn’t go far. We would just go right here next to us. They would catch the strangers.”

Stealth, a different means of gaining access, was another key element in villager use of park resources (see Ribot and Peluso 2003, 164). Drawing on gendered, ethnic, political and village affiliations was not possible or useful for all of the natural resource users living in and around Waza National Park. Some resource users were the wrong gender or ethnicity to garner sway with park staff. Also, some people may not have been able to gain “authorizations” for certain park resources they may have wanted or needed from this area. For example, while some park staff readily claimed to give people authorizations for collecting grasses, they would never admit to allowing people to pasture their cattle in the park, hunt or fish. In other cases local people may not have wanted to negotiate (and/or pay) for authorizations to use natural resources within the park’s boundaries.

These cases of unauthorized use of the park were not the exception. In fact many people living around the park admitted to “stealing” from the park by gathering wood and other plant products, fishing and pasturing cattle. For example, one man told me that “a person could make the decision to go steal, and he would go steal unless he was seen, it was a possibility.” Many people described entering the park at night or hiding themselves if they saw park guards. Other local resource users noted that they were able to predict when park guards would come and thus, could plan their secret forays into the park accordingly. These people stole from the park with the understanding that if they were caught they could negotiate their way out of severe penalties, an advantage that outsiders to the region did not have.

Interestingly, though these people were not able to/did not negotiate their uses of the park with park guards, many still made the point of remarking that what they were taking was for their personal use rather than commercial use. For example, one woman discussing the theft of wood from the park said, “That is just for cooking wood. We do not sell the wood.” These protestations of “small theft” are a form of negotiation at a different level—amongst peers in a village or nomadic group. Stressing that their theft was necessary to their survival was a way local resource users were able to reinforce their insider status in the village community. For example, some people I spoke to implied that large-scale harvest or harvest of the wrong kind (poaching of certain species, e.g.) in the park would not be tolerated by the village or the chief. Claims of “small theft” may have also been driven by a fear of being associated with outsiders.

---

48 Why Baram has been allowed to remain inside of the park, even post-Ahidjo, is up for debate. Some villagers I spoke to said that Baram had a magical power which made park managers forget about it and not come after them.
49 He has several
50 A pseudonym.
who came for large-scale harvest of natural resources within the park’s limits because park guards targeted these outsiders for arrest and violent punishment.

Though some park guards developed close and personal relationships with the people they were supposed to police, and others were willing to enter into negotiations with various groups of local people in the Waza region, they were not always on friendly terms with villagers and pastoralists. Scholte’s 1995 survey shows that local communities cited “intimidation by the Waza NP authorities” as among the ten main problems they faced (Scholte 2009, 15). Pastoralists in particular complained that park guards had shot or confiscated their cattle. Pastoralists were also the people that most frequently complained about being intimidated by park guards. Pastoralists may have faced more harassment from park guards because they were wealthier than the average villager and could therefore pay higher fines or taxes. Further, because of their mobile lifestyles, these pastoralists may have held a lesser insider status than villagers with whom park guards lived and interacted with on a daily basis.

Risk, Use and the Benefits of being an Insider

Neighboring villagers and pastoralists alike understood themselves as outsiders to the park under state law because of colonial and post-colonial maintenance of the protected area enclosure. These people understood that if they were caught in the park they faced harassment, fines, loss of property (particularly shot/confiscated cattle or confiscated axes), or imprisonment. Further, resource users who entered the park invested their time and energy in pasturing their cattle, gathering, fishing and hunting—time and energy that could be lost if caught by park guards and the fruits of their labors (or cattle) confiscated. As we have seen, however, despite this legal outsider status and the potential risks of using the park’s resources, local people accessed resources in the protected area frequently. In the eyes of park guards and fellow community members, these resource users were insiders who were able to negotiate access or reduce punishment if caught in the protected area without an authorization. Often these people were able to talk their way out of prison by paying a small fine. For example, the chief of one village, referring to people of his village said, “Bajjoda might send people to prison, but mainly he would just fine them.” Though occasionally villagers or local herdsmen I spoke with described the park guards being violent with them, this was quite rare and capital punishment was out of the question.

Having insider status in the eyes of the community and park guards not only meant the ability to access natural resources within the park, but the ability to have relatively exclusive access to these things. Having lost the ability and right to exclude others from natural resource use within the park, local resource users came to depend on park guards to do this for them. Thus, outsiders, or people frequently described as being from far away or as foreigners by the park’s neighbors, were excluded from using park resources while insiders were still able to negotiate use. For example, when I asked a woman if there were any advantages in living next to Waza National Park she said yes, “they cannot stop us from collecting gum arabic [as opposed to] those people who live further from the park. That is our advantage.” It became apparent in my conversations with fishermen, plant gatherers and pastoralists that strict park management had played an important role in maintaining the resources these people depended on inside of the park. These people often noted that with strict guarding fish, pasture and vegetables in the park were abundant, a bounty that was for insiders to access as opposed to outsiders. One man put this particularly well saying, “when the park was well protected we alone could steal from the park.”
While local resource users frequently and angrily referred to outsiders, foreigners or people from far away coming to the park to collect resources for their subsistence or profit in 2010, very few local people mentioned the presence of these groups of outsiders during the period of strict park management. Instead, those who did come from far away during this period were engaged in commercial, large-scale harvesting operations (especially of wildlife carcasses, skins and tusks). Perhaps these foreigners, faced with longer distances to travel, less intimate knowledge of the park’s landscape, and outsider status (i.e. inability to negotiate in the same ways as local resource users), came only when the rewards would be high enough to be worth the risk. In Waza these “big operators”\(^5\) drew the focus (and violence) of guards and park managers more than villagers and local users. The findings of scholars like Bell et al. (2004), Forsyth et al. (1998) and Pendleton (1998) show that park management tends to punish commercially oriented poachers and illegal harvesters more harshly than subsistence harvesters. This pattern was apparent in Waza as it was commercially oriented outsiders who were fought, shot, mutilated, beheaded and buried in mass unmarked graves within the park’s boundaries by Badjoda’s guards in Waza National Park. Thus, the maintenance of Waza National Park involved violent acts, but this violence was structured by identity, belonging and negotiation.

**Conclusion**

The French enclosure of the Waza region in the form of the Zinah-Waza Reserve caused local people to lose access to land and resources, changing power and social relations in this area as well as human/nature interactions. Local people’s perceptions of their rights to and control over this natural resource changed as they eventually came to see the state, rather than village leaders, as the governing institution inside of the reserve. The fortress created by the conservation scheme still allowed local people some access to its natural resources through negotiation, stealth and cunning. Critically, while park staff-villager relationships cannot be said to have been friendly, they served the purpose of excluding outsiders defined here as using resources on which villagers depended. Understanding local people’s long-standing dependence on government officials makes it clearer why these people call for increased park management today. Without park staff with whom they could negotiate, local people lost the relative advantages of being insiders that they had attained through negotiation and personal relationships with park guards.

\(^5\) A local appellation of large-scale poachers/natural resource harvesters
Chapter Three

The Crumbling Fortress: Institutional Failure in Waza National Park

After some negotiation, the guard agreed to take me up to see the ex-president’s palace. We walked up the winding road to the place lined with flamboyant trees (Delonix regia) which had just begun their ostentatious bloom. The wind of the early morning had died and now the air felt close and stifling. Everything was quiet except for the occasional, panicked slither of a lizard through the dried leaves cluttering our path. Finally, we emerged at the palace—actually a group of boukarous set into the hillside just within the park’s limits. Vines and weeds grew around these dusty buildings. The walks that connected them were covered with rubble and sand—a result of villagers’ attempts to scavenge stones, lights, and posts for home construction or sale. The place felt desolate, forgotten, almost haunted. The boukarous’ boarded up windows stared blindly over the expanse of Waza National Park stretching out below. From this eerie vantage you could see the traces of the pitted, sometimes-impassable road that traversed the park. Aside from the sheep and goats clustered at the park’s border, no animals were visible. I closed my eyes for a moment and tried to imagine the park as it once was—its road system well maintained and patrolled, its landscape filled with wildlife that attracted thousands of tourists each year. What had happened here? How had this vacant, dilapidated version of the park emerged from something that was once so famous, so prized as the “Serengeti of the West?”

Introduction

To understand the collapse in management of Waza National Park, we must first acknowledge that its downward turn is not the result of a single cause. It is not simply national dynamics of neopatrimonial rule or the availability of extra-legal avenues of capital accumulation that influence state conservation practice in this protected area (see Bayart 1993). Nor have global, neoliberal economic and political forces bearing down upon this protected area caused a decline in management. Rather, the articulation of national and global processes and discourses on Waza National Park have affected this area’s management and funding. This protected area’s property rights, subjects and natural resources have been affected by economic and political processes at work at a regional, national and international level.

I begin this chapter with a brief review of ethnic politics in Cameroon. Building on my previous discussions of subjectivity and territory in the Waza region in the pre-colonial and early
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52 Boukarous are round structures with metal or thatched roofs that imitate the construction style of some of the groups who live in the Northern provinces of Cameroon.
colonial era, here I take a geographically broader view of subjectivity and territory within Cameroon. At a national level, territory constitutes ethnic subjectivity and shapes political processes. Analyzing ethnic and regional politics in Cameroon, I demonstrate the significance of the change from a Fulbe president from Cameroon’s north to a southern Beti president for the funding and government interest in Waza National Park, located in Cameroon’s Far North Province.

Four historical moments mark critical changes in national and international priorities concerning Waza National Park. First is the transfer of power from the French colonial government to independent Cameroonians under President Ahidjo. Waza played an important role in Cameroonian nation building and the solidification of political power. Ahidjo’s change of Waza’s status as a hunting reserve to that of a national park, closed to any extraction, was a symbolic rejection of the prior colonial state. President Ahidjo also used specific management strategies such as violent action against recalcitrant villages in the Waza protected area to assert and obtain personal and national power. The rocky transfer of presidential power from Ahidjo to his successor, Paul Biya is the second historical moment of interest. With this change in presidents we also see a change in the locus of power in Cameroon. Ahidjo’s power base was in Cameroon’s northern provinces, where Waza National Park is located, however, Biya’s power base is located in Cameroon’s southern regions. When Biya came to power, the importance of Waza National Park as national symbol began to decline.

The third moment comes in the late 1980s just after economic crisis first hit Cameroon. The Biya government’s changed priorities toward park management were exacerbated by this economic crisis. Pressured by international organizations like the IMF and World Bank to enact structural adjustment policies, Biya “rolled back” the state, significantly reducing government jobs, activities and pay. Among the ministries hardest hit were the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife, the Ministry of the Environment and Protection of Nature, and the Ministry of Tourism. Park management shifted from Cameroonian state agencies to state-sanctioned non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Waza National Park was re-territorialized by international NGOs that re-ordered the ways the park could be used and by whom. In this historical moment the strict fortress conservation model of the colonial and Ahidjo governments was exchanged for participatory co-management of Waza’s natural resources. This was when Waza National Park as a well governed territory began to crumble.

The fourth moment I consider was in the mid-2000s when NGOs and the Cameroonian state essentially abandoned management in Waza National Park. This was also the point when global agendas around conservation started to change from biodiversity conservation to global warming. Waza was a global diversity hotspot and not as important to carbon sequestration as Cameroon’s southern tropical forests. NGOs subsequently withdrew funding from this protected area.

A key theme in each of these historical moments was the drive for capital accumulation by forces outside the physical territory of Waza. In some cases, profits were gleaned in the form of tourist dollars—through park fees, car rentals, guiding services, restaurants, and hotels. Less legitimate forms of profit stemmed from the extra-legal sale by park guards and managers of grazing or fishing permits inside Waza National Park, the diversion of maintenance funds into personal accounts, or the sale of equipment for personal profit. International organizations involved in park management were not immune from a drive for capital accumulation. Waza’s management was abandoned by these groups as they pursued different sources of funding.
A Brief History of Cameroon’s Ethnic and Regional Politics

Both German and French colonial powers allied themselves with Muslim Fulbe groups in ruling Cameroon’s northern provinces. As a result, Fulbe tended to be better educated and politically connected than other ethnic groups in the region. After WWII, Northern Cameroonians (mostly Fulbe), many of whom had been educated in Cameroon’s capital, Yaoundé, began to form political associations such as the Association Amicale de la Dimaré or the Association Amicale de la Benoue (Joseph 1978, 49). At first the colonial French saw these budding political organizations as a threat to their rule, fearing them to be Arab-Muslim nationalists.

As unrest increased among other ethnic groups, and rebellious political groups gathered in Cameroon’s south, the French recognized the northern Fulbe Muslims as potential allies. By allying themselves with these northern groups, the French once again reinforced Fulbe dominance. Southern politicians, such as members of the Union des Populations Camerounais (UPC), were vocal in their calls for independence and re-unification of British and French territories of Cameroon (Fah 1997; Golaszewski 2008, Atangana 2010, 17). Southern politicians’ connections with the communist African Democratic Rally, their guerilla warfare against the French colonial government, and their petitions to the United Nations to end French Rule in Cameroon drove the French colonial government to permit and/or support northern political parties in an attempt to create domestic opposition to the UPC (Cooper 2002; Mbaku 2005). The Fulbe laamibe worked together with the young, educated Cameroonian political elites of the northern provinces and French colonial government officials to maintain political control over Cameroon throughout the 1950s (Joseph 1978, 52-3). As a result, the primarily northern Fulbe Muslim Union Camerounais (UC) was created in 1958 (Shilder 1993, 54). Though party leaders allowed people who were not Fulbe to be a part of the group, everyone in the UC was expected to adhere to Fulbe cultural norms (Shilder 1993, 55).

In 1958 the political power of northern Fulbe Muslim power in French colonial Cameroon was solidified when Fulbe Muslim Ahmadou Ahidjo was elected as Prime Minister. Ahidjo faced little opposition from the UPC which had been outlawed and excluded from the territorial Assembly in 1955 (Atangana 1997; Roberts 1960). Ahidjo, supported by the French, may have also been aided by the French institution of a dual electoral system that gave disproportionate representation to the European community in Cameroon in the 1950s (Atangana 1997). Once elected, Ahidjo worked to solidify his power base both in the north and south of the country, even before independence. He particularly focused on suppressing and harnessing the power of southern Bamilike elites who strongly opposed his rise to power (Joseph 1978, 57; Konings 1996, 249). To gain their support and control over this group, Ahidjo promised the Bamilike ample room for capital accumulation, particularly the expansion and facilitation of trade (Stark 1976; Konings 1996, 249). Ultimately, however, Ahidjo used police and military suppression to maintain the stability of his growing regime (Konings 1996, 249; Atangana 1997).

Ahidjo won Cameroon’s first national presidential election in May 1960 by using the power base he had built during the colonial period, relying heavily on the support of northern elites and the French government. The resentment that southern Cameroonians felt at the

53 Burnham 1996, 48
54 Founded by future president Ahmadou Ahidjo
55 Though traditional leaders did not entirely trust Ahidjo because of his youth and lack of nobility, they believed that Ahidjo’s allegiance with them would protect them from democratization which would threaten their domination of non-Fulbe people (Joseph 1978, 54).
dominance of the northern elite and their allegiance with the French cannot be underestimated (Atangana 1997). The southern UPC’s guerilla warfare continued up until Cameroon’s independence in 1960 when they were repressed by Ahidjo’s newly independent military which was supported by five French battalions, as well as tanks and bombers (Atangana 1997, 103). Ethnic and regional divisions between north and south still persist in Cameroon today. Due to different colonial histories, citizens of French and English Cameroon also rarely saw eye to eye. Linguistically, economically and politically distinct from the Francophone provinces of Cameroon, the Anglophone provinces continue to seek more power and influence in the nation’s government.

Building a Nation: From French Colonial Cameroon to Ahidjo

When he became the first independent president of Cameroon, Ahidjo had to work hard to ensure support from all parts of his country which, even aside from the UPC guerrilla fighting, was divided along highly varied ethnic, religious and ideological lines (Gabriel 1999). To do this, Ahidjo adopted a different style of rule than the highly bureaucratic French. Ahidjo’s regime was personal, driven by regional and ethnic ties and patron-client relationships (Jackson and Rosberg 1982; Bayart 1993; Gabriel 1999). His presidency has been compared structurally to the highly centralized court of a northern Lamido (Bayart 1979; Le Vine 1982). Ahidjo consolidated his power through the creation of a broad clientelistic network that reached into even the most remote parts of the nation—people obtained jobs, licenses, contracts, and projects through their relationships with him and his closest advisors (Van de Walle 1994; Gabriel 1999).

Although Ahidjo tried to attain and maintain peace in the nation by publicly offering positions in government to many different ethnic groups, he continued to favor his home province and Muslim Fulbe. To consolidate and solidify his power base in the north, Ahidjo combined the three northern provinces created by the French into a single Northern Province. He then allowed special privileges and opportunities for capital accumulation for the Muslim Fulbe of this province, a group that came to be known as the “Garoua Barons” (Konings 2011, 27; Gabriel 1999; Vubo 2003, 597). For example, these Fulbe elites benefited from land grabbing sponsored by the government, thereby acquiring large amounts of land for absentee cattle ownership and investments (Burnham 1996, 131; Boutrais 1983, 129-30). Ahidjo also brought large-scale projects to Cameroon’s Northern Province, building bridges, airstrips and hospitals using state funds and as well as establishing partnerships with foreign nations (Konings 2011). These projects both created the conditions for further capitalist expansion in the north (providing transport and power) as well as directly benefited those who were able to obtain employment and contracts to build these structures.

As another means of favoring the North in terms of infrastructure and investment, Ahidjo established national parks throughout the region. These parks brought money to the Northern Province through hotels, restaurants and other service industries. During his two decades as president, Ahidjo created six national parks in the North Province (Martin 2011). 57 While four of these parks had been colonial hunting reserves, transformed into national parks in 1968, two others—Kalamaloue and Faro National Parks—were gazetted well into his period of rule (1972
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56 Cameroon has been estimated to have 230-282 different linguistic groups (Neba 1999) and had been further divided by French interventions in Cameroonian politics.
57 Ahidjo did create 2 faunal reserves in the south of the country (Kimbi and Lac Ossa). In terms of development it has been documented that Ahidjo favored the north while letting provinces like the North West and South West stagnate (see Nkwi 1997).
and 1980, respectively). In the early post-colonial period, these parks were popular among the still large (and relatively wealthy) expatriate population in the country and French tourists (Burnham pers. communication 2013). Waza in particular drew in thousands of tourists each year, noted for its large and visible wildlife populations. For this reason it was called “the Serengeti of the West” by tour operators at the time.

The establishment of these northern parks was not just Ahidjo’s way of gaining regional support for his regime in his home province by benefiting members of his ethnic group. He also used these parks (Waza in particular) as a means of nation building and asserting his power in the province furthest from the national capital. Ahidjo achieved these goals in several ways. First, accused of being a puppet for the French by some of his citizens, Ahidjo sought ways to distinguish his administration from that of the colonial French (Konings 1996; 247). To do this, Ahidjo’s government produced a narrative that set him in opposition to the French colonial government despite the fact that Ahidjo’s entry into politics had been heavily supported by the French (Bayart 1978, 45). For example, allying himself with John F. Kennedy, Ahidjo condemned France for its continued divisive influence in Africa, and asked Kennedy for U.S. involvement in Cameroon to help break their dependence on France (Mbaku and Takougang 2004, 164). Changing policies within wildlife reserves was another means of creating distance between the newly independent Cameroonian government and the French colonial administration. For example, one retired government administrator told me “national parks made hunting illegal to show people that these were our resources. Before, Europeans were the only ones that hunted so the [national] parks made hunting illegal.” Waza National Park was one such site of defiance against colonial rule where hunting of all kinds was outlawed.

Ahidjo’s transformation of the French colonial Zinah-Waza Reserve to Waza National Park was a display of his repressive force and demand for absolute loyalty from Cameroon’s northern population. Zinah, one of the two villages for which the French colonial reserve was named (adjacent to the reserve itself), was burned to the ground by Ahidjo for supporting a different candidate for president (interviews 2010; Drijver 1991; 133). Later, as he formally changed Waza’s status from reserve to national park in 1968, Ahidjo had Zeila, Garle and other Kotoko villages which had remained on the interior of the reserve burned to the ground for the same reason (interviews 2010; Drijver 1991; 133; 2005, 77). Baram, a village which, like Zeila, had remained on the interior of the reserve is now the only village that remains on the inside of Waza National Park. Baram’s population supported Ahidjo’s bid for the presidency. The erasure of recalcitrant villages both from the name of the reserve and the landscape was a clear assertion of the new president’s power and of the presence of the state even in this remote area.

Throughout his presidency, Ahidjo used the Waza protected area as a symbolic locus of his government in the Northern Province. Having built a presidential palace (Figure 9) within the park’s limits, Ahidjo visited the park frequently. It was at this palace that Ahidjo convened with heads of state from Asian, Arab, and other Central African countries to sign agreements and treaties (Djarma 2002, 77). In this way Ahidjo was able to link the Northern Province of his

---

58 I should note that part of the reason Ahidjo established no parks in the southern parts of the country may also have been due to: a.) the fact that rainforest conservation and/or tourism was not popular at the time, b.) game viewing was better in the north, and c.) the road network in the forest zone was in a poor state which deterred tourism.
59 Between 3600 and 6700 each year (Djarma 2002, 64).
60 See chapter one for more details on this reserve.
61 Zinah was subsequently re-built, but its name remains off of the national park’s title.
62 An ethnic group different from Ahidjo’s Fulbe group.
birth with important national events that would have normally only occurred in Cameroon’s southern capital, Yaoundé.

Because of Ahidjo’s personal interest in wildlife conservation and Waza in particular, the number of guards for this area increased steadily during this period (Scholte 2005, 79). Ahidjo helped establish the Garoua Wildlife College to train Cameroonians as park guards and to carry out ecological studies (Scholte 2005, 78). The number of park guards in Waza National Park rose from around ten in 1962 to over thirty in 1982 (Scholte 2005, 77, Fig. 2.4). The U.S. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) also collaborated with the Cameroonian government to conduct base-line ecological studies in the 1970s (Vanpraet 1977; Scholte 2005). With Waza’s thriving tourism industry, the number of guides for the park increased from four to over twenty between 1970 and 1979 (Scholte 2005, 79).

**Changing Priorities for Funding and Focus: Transfer of Power from Ahidjo to Biya**

In 1982 Ahidjo retired from the presidency, handing power to his Prime Minister Paul Biya, a Beti from Cameroon’s southern region. While this initial transition was peaceful, fewer than six months later Ahidjo changed his mind about giving leadership over to Biya and a power struggle ensued (Konde 2012). Playing on Cameroonian fears of a single ethnic group dominating the country, Biya vilified Ahidjo. Following an assassination attempt of Biya which was linked to Ahidjo, Biya condemned him to death (Konde 2012, 29). Biya then pardoned Ahidjo and forced him into exile in France and then Senegal where he died in 1989 (Bandolo 1985 cited in Konings 1996, 250; Mbembe and Roitman 1995, 333). Ahidjo’s body has never been repatriated to Cameroon and remains in Senegal even today.

Upon Biya’s ascension to power the locus of political power shifted from north to south and from Fulbe to Beti ethnic groups. Biya replaced the Northern and Bamileke businessmen favored by Ahidjo with southern Beti businessmen. Biya’s “Beti Mafia” replaced Ahidjo’s “Garoua Barrons” (Konings 1996, 251). As with the Fulbe in the Ahidjo period, the Beti ethnic group soon came to dominate pivotal positions in Biya’s government and security institutions. For example, by 1991 thirty-seven of forty-seven heads of administrative divisions were Beti, three-fourths of directors and general managers of the parastatal organizations in Cameroon were Beti, and twenty-two of thirty-eight high-ranking bureaucrats in the office of the Prime Minister were Beti (Takougang 1993, 95-6; Konings 1996, 251). Determined to distance his government from Ahidjo’s legacy, Biya set about erasing Ahidjo’s name, face, power and legitimacy from the public sphere. Ahidjo’s name was wiped from city streets, stadiums, money and clothing (Eboua 1996, 112-113). Biya’s government also divided up Ahidjo’s consolidated home province (the North Province) into three separate provinces in order to undermine the power of its Fulbe Muslim leaders (Dicklitch 2002, 164).

While Ahidjo placed almost all of the protected areas he established in the Northern Province to favor his Fulbe compatriots with access to tourism dollars and infrastructure, Biya did the opposite. In Biya’s thirty years as president over nineteen new national parks have been added to the nation’s roster. Of those, only two are located in the three Northern provinces,
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63 Biya’s establishment of some of these parks may have been linked with neoliberal focus on environmental services in the form of natural areas and a desire to help out an ailing economy. For example, In exchange for France’s Debt Development Contract (C2D) providing relief for Cameroon’s $4.6 billion debt, Cameroon’s national government agreed to “secure some 40 protected areas and increase the present protected area network from 14 to 17 percent of the national land area in 2006” (Global Envision 2008).
and both remain mainly paper parks, lacking funding and infrastructure (Martin 2011). Physically demonstrating his disregard for Cameroon’s northern provinces, Biya voted with his feet. Unlike Ahidjo who visited frequently, Biya has only visited the Far North Province (where Waza is located) three times over the three decades of his presidency. Upon Biya’s rise to the presidency in 1982, Ahidjo’s palace in Waza National Park was closed, never to be re-opened. In his thirty years as president Biya has never visited Waza.

Biya’s distancing of his government from Ahidjo’s regime is visible in Waza National Park. A government official involved in tourism told me that, “Biya doesn’t care about the park [Waza].” Similarly, a representative of an international NGO who had worked in Cameroon for an extended period of time stated, “There is a political aspect to Waza and the Extreme North. After the first president of Cameroon left, there was no support for this park.” A person closely associated with the park explains the difference between these two presidents, saying, “Ahidjo built his presidential camp in the park…Biya didn’t like the park. He got rid of all of the people who worked in the park.” This particular interviewee went on to imply that to try to protect the park or to invest in it is a symbolic affront to Biya’s political will. A frustrated government official further described the Biya period by saying, “We have tried to make watering holes, cattle corridors but that dialogue to try to manage the park is non-existent.”

Evidence of the Biya government’s disinterest in Waza National Park does not exist only on the tongues of disgruntled government officials and conservationists. There is physical evidence of the state’s shift in interest as well. During the Biya administration recruitment and funding for the park all but stopped. By 2001 there were fewer than ten guards for Waza National Park (Saleh, pers. comm. cited in Bauer et al. 2003a, 114). Due to a lack of funds (or misdirection of funds), park managers have been unable to maintain adequate roads, surveillance and infrastructure maintenance over Biya’s thirty years as president (Bauer et al. 2003a).

Government responses to threats to Waza National Park are no longer as rapid as they were during the Ahidjo period. For example, as scientific researchers began seeing a serious decline in park wildlife as well as a rise in the amount of large-scale hunting, grazing, and fish harvest occurring in the park they began reporting these problems to park management in 2006. Finding that these calls for increased patrols of the park were meeting deaf ears at the local level, these researchers began sending weekly “poachers reports” to regional and national natural resource management officials. These reports consisted of pictures of large-scale hunting and fishing operations with motorbikes, dead and butchered animals, permanent fish and meat smoking structures, and cows within park limits along with detailed descriptions of where these activities were occurring (see Figure 10).

Despite these weekly reports, television broadcasts about the dismal state of park management, and lobbying of the government by foreign ambassadors on behalf of these researchers and the park, the Biya government took no action in Waza between 2006 and 2010. Repeated calls for better guarding and infrastructural maintenance in the park went unanswered. The park manager, against whom these researchers and local village officials had collected significant evidence of corruption (including signed “authorizations” for large-scale fish and cattle grazing in the park), was not replaced. Only when the Lamido of Pete, a powerful Muslim Fulbe leader, put pressure on the Prime Minister (to whom he was distantly related) did the Biya government change the manager of the park.

64 The descendent of one of the powerful Fulbe traditional leaders (Lamido/Lamibe) in the north. One of the two regional leaders in charge of the Waza territory (see chapter one)
Figure 10: Photos from weekly poacher’s reports. Fig. a: Fisher camp near Gobe Waterhole; Fig. b: Antelope skinned and dismembered by hunters within park; Fig. c: Head of butchered antelope found within park limits; Fig. d: Evidence of large tree cutting within park limits; Fig. e: Permenant BBQ constructed by fishermen next to park waterhole. Photos by Barbara Croes.
Here I do not argue that Biya pointed at Waza National Park and said “destroy that.” Rather, a combination of his personal ethnic and regional politics (focused on the Southern part of the country), his desire to distance himself from anything Ahidjo was closely associated with, as well as economic impotence (see next section) contributed to the collapse of Waza National Park. A villager living next to the park put it best, saying “The government can fix these problems if they wanted, but they have not.”

**Economic Crisis and the Rise of NGO management of Waza National Park**

Ethnic and presidential politics alone did not dictate how and in what ways Waza National Park was managed and funded. Nor is the collapse of this park entirely a story of the impact of global development and structural adjustment plans on local landscape of Waza National Park (see Hart 2002, 13-14). Rather, national and regional ethno-political maneuverings articulated with the collapse of the Cameroonian economy and the subsequent roll-back of the state pushed by International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank structural adjustment projects leading to collapse. In this section, I briefly trace the roots of Cameroon’s economic crisis and the results of the neoliberal policies of decentralization, austerity, and privatization promoted by the IMF and World Bank. I then show how this retraction of state funding and intervention was concurrent with the rise of NGOs throughout the country and in Waza in particular. This section shows how this change of management institutions and strategies further weakened Waza’s condition.

**Economic Crisis**

During Ahidjo’s presidency, economic experts considered Cameroon to be one of Africa’s economic success stories. Due to this success, Ahidjo’s government paid its employees well. The government supplied many of its officials with subsidized or free housing, generous pensions and vehicles. The government’s healthy pocketbook benefited Waza National Park as well. Guards, directed by the managers Flizot, Abokura, and Badjoda, patrolled the area frequently. Though park guards and managers made small deals with villagers and pastoralists to enrich themselves through extra-legal taxes, and skimmed from funds for the park for personal gain, the generous, regular pay, visits from Ahidjo, and government support reduced the attractiveness of selling permits to fish or graze cattle in the park.

Shortly after Paul Biya came into power in the early 1980s, Cameroon was plunged into an economic crisis. On the surface, Cameroon’s recession was primarily caused by an over-dependence on exported goods (oil, cocoa, coffee, and cotton), a lack of liquidity, and overvalued currency which was exposed when world market prices for these exported goods dropped significantly (Blane et al. 1991). Government officials’ mismanagement of national finances, embezzlement and capital flight contributed to this lack of liquidity as 150 billion CFA (around three hundred million US dollars—one quarter of the annual national budget) were either declared lost or had left the country (Konings 1995, 525).

The roots of this crisis went back to the colonial period. They grew out of economic development projects such as such as *Le Fonds d’Investissement pour le Developpement Economique et Social des Territoires d’Outre Mer* (FIDES) and the Cameroon Development Corporation conceived by France and Britain to protect their colonial empires after World War
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65 Flizot was a French colonial who worked to create and maintain many of the original reserves in Cameroon. He stayed on after independence.
66 Investment Funds for the Economic and Social Development of Overseas Territories.
II. In 1946, the French established FIDES as a program for the long-term development of France’s colonies and territories around the world (Atangana 1997, 91). Funded by the French Central Overseas Treasury, FIDES injected 96 million CFA Francs into Cameroonian economic and social development between 1947 and 1957 (Atangana 2009, 19; Ndongko, 1986, 89).

However, this spending was not focused on building up the local Cameroonian economy, but rather that of the French. As an economic project the FIDES scheme meant an increase in the development of infrastructure, placing great emphasis (85% of French spending) on creating a network for the transportation of goods into and out of the country (Kemo-Kiembou 2005, 145; Ndongko 1986, 89). FIDES helped increase European imports in Cameroon by 700 percent by 1959 (Rubin, 1971 58). France’s economic development projects were, in the words of Andre Gunder Frank (1966, 2-6), sanctioning resources and wealth from the “satellite” (Cameroon) to the “metropole” (Europe), developing underdevelopment by concentrating the wealth of Cameroon in France while creating scarcity (and the need for imports) within Cameroon. Not only did the colonial infrastructure in Cameroon siphon resources from Cameroon for the enrichment of the French, but nearly fifty-percent of the bill for this economic expansion was footed by the Cameroonian's through higher taxes (Manning 1990, 145).

Opportunities for Cameroonian businessmen to industrialize independently and accumulate capital were not provided by the colonial government, leaving Cameroon largely dependent on foreign aid at independence (Ndongko 1986, 94). The Cameroonian government used this aid, provided mainly by France in the first five years of independence, for direct financial assistance for the government, capital projects, and technical support (Kofele Kale 1981, 203). Cameroon also remained heavily dependent on Europe for manufacturing needs, as well as for some staple food supplies (Rubin 1971, 182). The weakness of Cameroon’s economy and its dependence on foreign markets was exposed when the global economy declined, causing prices for export goods to crash in the 1980s. This economic crisis made the government even more dependent on foreign aid and re-opened the door for international intervention into the country’s affairs.

Though at first Biya refused structural adjustment policies, the worsening economic situation in the country forced his government to come to an agreement with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in 1988 and World Bank in 1989 (Konings 1996, 253). Rather than remediying the dire economic situation in Cameroon, structural adjustment policies actually increased poverty in Cameroon. Policies led to cuts in state expenditures and called for the privatization or elimination of most of the state’s parastatal institutions (Konings 1996, 253). This rolling back of the state resulted in mass lay-offs (Kofele Kale 1981, 203). The economic crisis and subsequent austerity measures also led to the rising prices of goods and services, and the devaluation of Cameroonian money. Poverty rates rose from 14% to 22% in urban areas and from 43% to 62% in rural areas between 1984 and 1996 (Mberu and Pongou 2012; Baye 2004; Amin and Dubois 2001). Reeling from a sharply decreased budget and falling in line with structural adjustment policies, Biya’s government instituted hiring freezes, pay cuts, and slashed its budget in almost every sector during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Some estimate the cuts in civil servant wages as close to 70% and the effects of these cuts echoed through the population as a whole as service workers and merchants lost out on employment and revenue (Medard 2002, 389).
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67 Roughly estimating for inflation, this would have been equivalent to around 2 million US dollars at the time.
Natural resource sectors of the government were not immune to these deep cuts. The Biya government slashed the budget for the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife as well as the budget for the Ministry of Environment and the Protection of Nature. For example, 95% of the Ministry of the Environment and Protection of Nature’s budget went toward paying staff salaries in 1992, leaving only 5% of the budget for any other expenditure (WRI 2000, cited in Topa et al. 2009, 19). By 1994 staff salaries in this ministry had been cut by over 40% and employees were often paid late, and did not receive their former housing or vehicle allowances (WRI 2000, cited in Topa et al. 2009, 19).

The government’s deep cuts in spending, particularly in the realm of natural resource management, affected Waza National Park in several ways. First, the government’s indefinite hiring freeze halted recruitment of new guards. Thus, as guards retired or died they were not replaced. In Waza, the number of park guards dropped from nineteen in 1997 to eight in 2001 (Saleh, pers. comm. Cited in Bauer et al. 2003, 114). An employee of the Ministry of the Environment and the Protection of Nature stated bluntly, “With the economic crisis and structural adjustment programs with the World Bank and IMF, guarding [in Waza] stopped.” Scholte (2005, 83-84) notes that as park guard numbers dissipated, unarmed and informally trained village guides, local guards who were once complementary to the management of Waza National Park, increasingly became the only representatives of park authority in the area.

Second, due to the deep cuts in natural resource management driven by World Bank mandated structural adjustment policies, infrastructure all over the country began falling into states of disrepair (Mbembe and Roitman 1995, 328, 332). Waza’s infrastructure was no different. As noted above, the maintenance of the 600km of roads within the 170,000 ha park became extremely difficult to maintain (Mbenkum 1997). The lack of roads in the park made guarding it very difficult. Further, a lack of radios (walkie-talkies), vehicles able to traverse Waza’s difficult terrain and adequate camping materials made guarding even harder (Djarma, 2002; interviews 2010). Though the U.S. Ambassador and various NGOs (see below) attempted to intervene in the early-mid 1990s by supplying radios and vehicles, without constant funding and support, this equipment disappeared, and the vehicles were sold for private profit. 68

Third, as remaining government officials (Regional Delegates, Park Managers and Park Staff) faced large pay and pension cuts as well as unpredictable pay, they were driven to find new means to make ends meet through extra-legal practices. For example, one park manager, nearing the end of his career when he was assigned to the Waza’s post, drew on Waza National Park to line his pockets. Several villagers I spoke to described this park manager paying them or people they knew to go fish in the park in the 2000s. They said that he would then sell the fish they had caught in market for personal gain. Park guards and villagers also described the park manager selling poached meat he had confiscated to local populations. A guard who had worked during the time told me that this park manager was simply “preparing for his retirement—he didn’t want us to do work, [and] he didn’t want to do work.”

Both the park manager and his supervisor were active participants in the illegal use of natural resources in the national park. A disgusted conservation official told me, “regional delegates are supposed to control conservators [park managers], but they were all looking to make money and negotiate with herders.” This provincial delegate and park manager sold
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68 I use passive voice here because it is unclear as to WHO exactly got the money from these things. Outraged local people, some of the remaining park guards and government officials point their fingers in many different directions. The most frequent allegations are that guards stole the equipment, or sold it for profit, and that villagers who were leaders of a co-management project (see below) sold the vehicles. These are unsubstantiated claims, however.
signed authorizations to fishermen who established permanent camps next to certain waterholes even during the sensitive dry season inside the park in the early 2000s (CEDC document, direct observations, and interviews).

**The Rise of NGO Management in Waza National Park**

In the wake of Cameroon’s economic crisis, the IMF and World Bank, as elsewhere in the developing world, prescribed a smaller state, the promotion of private enterprise, and independent organizations (most often NGOs) to pick up the work of the state in a decentralized manner (Igoe and Brockington 2007). Prior to the late 1980s, only a small number of NGOs worked in Cameroon. International and national NGO numbers jumped after the economic crisis. By 1991 an estimated twelve to fifteen international NGOs, eight voluntary organizations, one hundred indigenous NGOs, ten rural associations and over four hundred village associations sprang up in Cameroon’s natural resources and rural management sector alone (Tanjong et al. 1991 cited in Swartzendruber and Njovens 1993, 7). Of these organizations, international NGOs such as WWF (started in 1990 in Cameroon) had far more available money and staff than local NGOs or voluntary organizations. As the ability of the state to perform its theretofore normal duties were limited, NGOs stepped in to do this work. Each of these new NGOs took over the work of the state in its own way—providing medical services, environmental management, education, and infrastructural support.

Environmental NGOs and others may either act as a part of the state or assist the state by facilitating projects of surveillance and control by bringing in money, and may also supply technological advances and new skills which are integral to modern forms of territorialization (Igoe and Brockington 2007, 440). As the Cameroonian government’s budget for conservation (among other things) dwindled along with political will to protect Waza in the 1990s, non-governmental or bi-lateral organizations stepped in to fill this void. Carrying out the work of the state in various ways, the WWF, IUCN, The Lake Chad Commission, United Nations Development Program, World Bank, the Netherlands Foreign Affairs Ministry, the US Embassy and others funded a variety of interventions in Waza National Park after Cameroon’s financial crisis.

The Project Waza-Logone (PWL) was responsible for many of the interventions in Waza National Park. This Project was a product of the combined work of several of the above mentioned organizations and was the longest running foreign intervention in the park, operating from 1992 to 2005. After PWL left, World Wildlife Fund, IUCN Netherlands and others took up some of the work of managing Waza and helped finance the park until around 2007-8. These organizations’ interventions and the eco-guards they paid seem to be the only protection the park’s resources and boundaries had after the mid-1990s.

PWL staff (a mixture of Cameroonian and European researchers/development agents) started an integrated conservation and development project reportedly in response to serious droughts, the loss of water in the floodplain due to a dam built in the 1970s, a decline in government management, and a rising number of human-wildlife conflicts (Fokou and Haller 2008, 326). In September 1997 they created a co-management plan for the park. Seeking to incorporate local people into the protection of the park, PWL staff explicitly linked territory and subjectivity. They did a baseline demographic study in fourteen villages neighboring Waza.
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69 E.g. GIS, Remote Sensing, Aerial Surveys, mapping, etc.

70 “Logone” refers to the Logone River which runs along Cameroon’s eastern limit in the Far North Province and is a major contributor to Lake Chad. Waza National Park is located within this river’s floodplain.
National Park from 1994-7 to determine who park community insiders were and who outsiders were. Project staff determined who was a part of the park community based on “i.) territory/space, ii.) activities undertaken and iii.) kinship” (Sholte 2005 197). Households were used as sampling units to determine settlement patterns and village origins (Scholte 2005, 193-7). Those deemed by the project to be local would be eligible to participate in PWL’s co-management scheme.

PWL project staff held meetings to explain how this “co-management” would work. Project staff told local people that they would get access to non-animal products from the park, such as gum arabic (resin), grasses, and dry firewood for home use in certain zones as well as a cut of the revenues from park tourist fees in exchange for helping protect park resources (Bauer 2003b, 176; Fokou and Haller 2008, 356). Local people would be incorporated into a management team that was supposed to have representatives from each village near the park, transhumance and nomadic agro-pastoralists, as well as seasonal fishermen (Scholte 2005, 200). Local people were also supposed to receive infrastructural and financial support for rice production, fish pond creation and regulation, conflict resolution and well creation projects (Oyo et al. 2001).

Though on paper this project appeared well thought-out, inclusive and manageable, its impacts on the ground proved different. Not only would the revenues from tourism compensate only 12-13% (at most) of the estimated losses incurred by wildlife predation on local people’s livestock, almost none of this money reached the hands of villagers and pastoralists (Fokou and Haller 2008, 357; Interview November 2010). One researcher who evaluated the efficacy of Project Waza Logone told me,

The villagers did not get anything. They [the villagers] didn’t understand [why]. There was also a vehicle which helped them [villagers] take the tourists into the park so they could see the animals…But even this vehicle was sold. The head of the [community park committee] …was not told. I went and asked about the vehicle he didn’t know where it was. These are people who were supposed to be managing these things and why were they not informed of what was happening? The money went to Maroua71 [the provincial capital], not around Waza.

The rice, well, and fish projects promised by the project never came to fruition. One village chief, enticed to move his village outside of the park by promises of rice and fish projects and a well, complained bitterly that the well built for him by the Project Waza Logone was cheap and had broken immediately. Staying in the village for several days, I understood his frustration—to get enough water to bathe or cook took an inordinate amount of time and the broken well handle was painful to use. Its pump handle was nothing more than a sharp fragment of plastic. The chief made sure I noticed that there was no evidence of either rice or fish projects in the area either.

Several studies have shown that the PWL co-management project was poorly implemented and actually increased pressure on the park’s resources (Bashirou 2002; Ledauphin 2006; Buij et al. 2009). It blurred the long-inscribed territorial lines between protected and
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71 There were accusations of mismanagement and corruption at multiple levels—some people blaming local representatives and others blaming IUCN officials in the capital for misusing/stealing funds and materials for the project.
unprotected areas by allowing local users to enter the park to use certain resources. While many users were local and did try to follow the protocols of the co-management project, many others were either poorly informed as to what these protocols were, or they were outsiders to the area, drawn in by the promise of access to rich natural resources. For example, Scholte (2005, 193) observes that after the Waza floodplain was re-flooded by PWL in 1994 the numbers of sedentary fishermen near the park increased by twenty-five percent, and in the first three years after flooding, the numbers of pastoral camps in the area rose from forty-seven to one hundred and six.

Because many of the guards were unclear as to the protocols of the project, they were unable to enforce the new rules appropriately. A researcher from the University of Dschang told me,

they [PWL] did too much to tell the population that they could go into the park and take certain resources. I think that this is where the project failed. You cannot tell people very early on in the project that they can go into the park. This is because the population will believe that they can go into the park for any need. They can go into the park and graze their animals, take grasses, cut wood, take gum arabic, etc. This caused big problems for the project and the park….The guards in the park did not have any power. If the people went into the park and were caught they could say “no, no, the project said we could come in here.”

The Project staff also began an initiative to train village guides to help protect the park’s resources as government salaried guard numbers dwindled. The PWL team gave these guides small salaries, bicycles, and uniforms to use for their patrols. Few of these guides did their jobs, perhaps because of poor training, or perhaps because their cut of park revenues was so small (or non-existent). This further blurred the park territorial boundaries as these guides engaged in poaching and fishing activities whilst in uniform, making government park guards uneasy or unwilling to apprehend them. A University of Dschang researcher recounted a conversation he had with an aged guard of Waza National Park, telling me,

He said that the project [PWL] had killed the park, period. He said that it let people go into the park freely. The eco-guards diminished. They did not have the power. The co-management was not well understood by the people. They thought that they could take their cows deep into the park, now they were letting everyone into the park; this is how the situation evolved.

This sentiment, that co-management had killed the park, was prevalent among villagers, conservationists and guards. Many marked this period as when the park started to really flood with people seeking natural resources and places to hide whilst performing criminal acts.

**NGO and State Abandonment of Waza National Park**

Even though environmental NGOs involved in Waza financed the salaries of park law enforcement officers, patrol equipment, and the creation of the park’s management plan in the 1990s and early 2000s, this burst of energy was temporary. Scholars have shown that big
international NGOs (BINGOS) often use their organizational agendas and conservation projects to garner enormous financial gains from donors (e.g. Chapin 2004; Dowie 2009; Brockington et al. 2008). Often the fervently touted conservation goals of BINGOS are no more than catch phrases for marketing the projects of NGOs (Chapin 2004, 23). Though individual members of NGOs may be committed to each project they engage with, scholars have shown that their organizations will often abandon projects in favor of more fundable ones (Rahman 2006; AbouaSSI 2012). In the mid/late 1990s catch phrases such as “hotspots” or “large-scale conservation” were in vogue as these BINGOs addressed world-wide threats to species and ecosystems (Chapin 2004, 22). This agenda incorporated places like Waza National Park that represented high biodiversity and species richness in migratory and wetland bird species, antelope and other megafaunal populations. NGOs flocked to the site in the mid-1990s. Worldwide, biodiversity aid peaked in 1992 (Miller et al. 2013, 15).

As better and more science revealed the gravity of climate change starting in the 1990s, scientists and environmental activists incited a global re-ordering of conservation agendas to focus on this threat (Hagerman et al. 2010, 192). Scientists, experts, and activists who believe that conservation strategies need to accommodate climate change scenarios have recommended the creation of new conservation areas to accommodate species migrations due to changing global temperatures (Hagerman et al. 2010, 192). As conservation strategies and priorities shifted from biodiversity to global warming, so did sinks for NGO funding. My research shows that Waza National Park was not immune to the phenomenon of NGOs adjusting their conservation programs to best fit current conservation discourses. As international conservation priorities changed from charismatic megafauna and “biodiversity hotspots” to climate change mitigation, NGOs and other international organizations pulled their funding away from Waza’s savanna landscape and shifted their programs towards Cameroon’s southern—more forested—regions. As the Project Waza Logone was phased out in 2005, it was replaced by smaller NGOs like CFAID (Cellule de Formation et d’Appui aux Initiatives de Developpement), AIDR (Association d'Appui aux Initiatives de Développement Rural) and ACEEN (Association Camerounaise pour l'Education Environnementale). Though these NGOs are committed to development and the conservation of natural resources, their work with Waza National Park is mainly limited to the floodplain surrounding the park, and not the park itself.

When I asked government officials, members of these NGOs and other conservationists in Cameroon why conservation NGOs had left Waza National Park, several noted this shift in regional focus. As an official at the Ministry of Tourism told me, “WWF is more interested in the south.” A representative of the IUCN told me,

The IUCN’s intervention [in Waza] was guided by financing—it [was] in cooperation with the Netherlands, the United Nations, Britain and the national government…priorities change all the time. They may have changed to concentrate on forested zones and worries about the global climate.

Data on shifts in NGO funding is incredibly difficult to find (Brockington and Scholfield 2010, 107). While Brockington and Scholfield (2010) look at the distribution of NGO funding in sub-Saharan Africa in a broad sense—finding that funding for conservation is highest in Southern Africa and lowest in West Africa—no data exist on NGO foci/funding by ecozone (e.g. savanna vs. rainforest).
Despite the fact that WWF website cited Waza as a critical haven for biological diversity in 2010 (WWF web 2010), a representative of the WWF said that today “WWF would find it hard to fund a project near Waza because 80-90% of the work we do is in the forest region—the Congo Basin and Waza is outside of the 12 groups that WWF is focusing on.” Similarly, another NGO official told me,

Waza doesn’t represent too much now, politically speaking and internationally it is not important because it is not forested. Global warming is the most important thing now. The large themes are the most important, they [NGOs] want places that have the most impact…Waza is not very important anymore.

Official in the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife relayed similar ideas to me, telling me that now, “Forested parks get a lot more money, even if they don’t get many tourists.” A researcher in the northern regions of Cameroon also observed that “There are very few funds for dry areas. Carbon has now changed the focus of funding.” This shift in funding foci is not unique to Cameroon. Michael Soule (2010, 350), commenting on global conservation efforts laments that the “siren song of funding for climate change research has spellbound funders and researchers alike, diverting attention away from the immediate challenges such as ecological cascades, habitat loss, and exotic species.”

While they lasted, these non-governmental organizations removed and/or replaced much of the state surveillance of the park territory. NGOs paid for vehicles, guard radios and a radio tower, park guard and community eco-guard training, salaries and equipment, the partial reflooding of the park, environmental education of local populations, creating management plans and ecological surveys of the park. When these funds dried up, projects ended, and staff went home, regular patrols in the park ended too. Only a few biological researchers were left working in the park. These researchers lacked the funds and the political clout to change the deteriorating management in Waza National Park, despite their best efforts.

Conclusion

With NGO and state abandonment of Waza National Park, as well as long-standing community understandings that the park was no longer under local control, Waza has become an open access space. The collapse of Waza National Park’s management was not the result of a single management decision, leadership change or NGO marketing strategy. Instead, the convergence of changing presidential power, economic crisis, and shifting conservation discourses all converged to cause management in Waza National Park to decline in the mid-2000s. In the next chapters I will explore the changes in property rights that this loss of governance brought about and their effects. In particular, I show that loss of governance in this space has led to the rise of food insecurity and physical insecurity for those living in the Waza region.
Chapter Four

Post-Enclosure

We stood on a small rise looking out over the park one warm evening. The moon was up and shone through the haze of the dust storm that had blown in during the day. Its diffuse light was ghostly. The world suddenly seemed very quiet as we stood at a distance from the village where the songs and sounds of the preparations for a wedding were still audible. Soon, distinct from this medley of noises behind us were the quiet footsteps of men and donkeys leaving the park in front of us. Their feet made muted thuds as they walked carefully along a worn dirt trail. The grasses around them crinkled and shifted as they moved making a quiet hissing noise. In the full moon these figures became more and more visible—teeth shining white in the blue-gray light, the shine of hooves, the outlines of grain sacs bulging with fish. As they came closer, the cool, wet smell of the fish was a relief from the hot dust clogging our throats. Not a word was passed as we watched these men slip into the quiet darkness at the village’s outskirts, headed east and away from our island in the night.

Introduction

Going beyond the analyses of most critics of fortress conservation (e.g. Neumann 1998; Brockington 2002; Igoe 2004) who primarily focus on what happens after the initial enclosure and dispossession of local people from a protected area, I ask what happens to property and access rights after the limits of these enclosures cease to be enforced. This chapter looks at the transformation of Waza National Park from a well governed enclosure to an open access space at a local scale, as well as the effects of this transformation on local people and the park’s once-lucrative tourist industry. Due to the lack of local governance and weapons, state or NGO governance, the Waza enclosure has broken down. With the dissolution of this park enclosure, state and locally identified insider/outsider subjectivities have become irrelevant. People once deemed by park guards, local people, and NGO staff to be outsiders—generally people from areas distant to the park, have flooded into the region from neighboring nations or other parts of Cameroon, migrating because of insecurity, war, and ecological crises. They have found the unguarded Waza National Park an attractive site to use for subsistence and other purposes. With few guards, almost no patrols and few apparent property rights claims, the park is a unique space in the densely populated Far North Province. Though some of these in-migrants have settled adjacent to the park, other natural resource users, kidnappers, thieves and smugglers use its empty land and unguarded resources opportunistically.

Local people’s initial loss of authority to manage and control protected area land and resources coupled with a new loss of ability to gain relative advantage to park resources via negotiation with park guards has left local people in dire straits. In 2010 many local people believed they faced serious food insecurity because the resources they had once exclusively used in the park were open to rapacious outsiders with no incentive to negotiate with them, to or harvest park resources sustainably. Local villager and pastoralist testimonies show that just as

73 Kidnappers, thieves and smugglers discussed in the next chapter.
the process of enclosure can be violent and disruptive; its dissolution can be violent and terrifying for local natural resource users as well.

The effects of the severely diminished management of this park have affected the park’s tourism industry as well. The landscape that was once teeming with charismatic wildlife like lions and antelopes that drew in thousands of tourists has changed dramatically. With a lack of guarding and waterhole maintenance these charismatic animals’ populations have fallen, making the park less attractive to tourists. At the same time, the park’s roads have become nearly impassable, making visits to the park uncomfortable and potentially dangerous, further diminishing tourism in this area.

The Dissolution of the Park Enclosure

As we have seen, French and Cameroonian creation and maintenance of the Waza protected area caused local institutions of exclusion (e.g. Lamiibe) to lose out to state institutions. Some property theorists have observed that in situations where the state tries to trump local governance over land and natural resources, multiple institutions compete to validate claims and enforce rights in order to affirm their authority (e.g. de Sousa Santos 2006; Lund 2011). Other scholars have found that open access can be the result of local control over land use being undermined by colonial and independent governments (e.g. Woodhouse 1997, Swift 1991). This second set of scholars make the claim that state interventions interfere enough to disrupt local land management while still being so lax they resulted in an influx of outsider and an overuse of the resources in question (Woodhouse 1997, 538). This was the case in Waza National Park.

State and NGO institutions have lost exclusive control over this territory. Village leaders are not stepping up to take back management of Waza National park now that it has been neglected by these institutions. These local leaders are not doing this work because they lack the authority to do so. Also, because of the long-held state monopoly on force, they lack the weaponry to challenge well-armed poachers and other users of the park. At the same time, the boundary roads that were once well maintained and clearly visible are gone, as are many of the park’s border signs. While long-time residents of the Waza region remember where the boundaries of the protected area are, even without these physical markers, in some cases newcomers or young people are not able to recognize that the land and resources within Waza National Park are enclosed by the state.

In when I was interviewing villagers in 2010, most people said they, or the village leader, would be able to chase unwanted people away from village territory outside of the park. When I asked the same people if they felt capable or willing to stop unwanted people from entering the park, many said no. For example, one fisherman said, “before [during strict management] it was good because people [from far away] would stay away. Now we cannot chase them away from the canals and ponds. We can chase them from the village but not from the bush.” Describing this lack of authority, people frequently told me that they could not exclude others from the park because they were thieves themselves. They would tell me, “thieves leave other thieves alone,” or “that is the state’s job.” Village leaders also feel unwilling to defend the park’s resources. Many local village leaders I spoke to cited park guards as the people who should be defending the park’s territory from outsiders rather than themselves. Villager dependence on park management to stop outsiders from entering the park is apparent in the testimony of one angry and desperate villager I spoke to. Representing many other voices, he said,
The state has the guards. We are occupied with [care about] the park, but what can we do? If we find people who are destroying the park, what can we do? We cannot stop them. Because we can’t stop them, we can tell the authorities that they should stop them. If they don’t do anything, if they don’t stop them, we don’t have the ability to do anything. If the authorities can’t do anything, how can we? If the authorities don’t have the ability, nor do we. How can we stop people and how can we do anything?

The state’s long-time monopoly on force has also made villagers and their leaders feel dependent on the government’s armed park guards to stop poachers and criminals in the park. Poachers and criminals are often well armed. For example, village chief told me, yes “if there were people who wanted to fish in our pond [inside the village], and we didn’t want them to, we could stop them. But in the park we cannot stop them…how can we stop people with guns?” A different man added to this sentiment when he said that they would be more willing to help protect the park he and his fellow villagers were armed. “Guards have guns,” he said, “but [we] only have bows and arrows. If we had guns it would be better.” Though some local residents claim that if they saw people entering the park they would stop them, one woman told me “frankly, they [villagers who say they guard the park] are just guarding their village. They cannot go into the park bare handed. They don’t have guns, they don’t have things to protect themselves with. They cannot protect things outside of the village.”

A few groups of fisher-people on the eastern side of the park continue to exclude outsiders from resources in the protected area. Though these people still describe their actions in the park as stealing—ascribing legal rights and control over the resources they take to the state—they also refer to the ponds built by their ancestors within the park’s limits as “their ponds.” Some feel the right to exclude others from the use of these ponds, at points engaging in vicious fighting to protect their resources. Still, the removal of villages from park land at its creation has made the consistent defense of these ponds difficult. Living at the park’s periphery, these villagers are hard pressed to do constant surveillance of their ancestral fishing sites in the park’s interior.

Just as the threats of violence or imprisonment dissipated with lost park management, the physical symbols of Waza’s fortress crumbled as its managing institutions left. Roads which were vital to patrols and surveillance became almost entirely impassable. Some roads, located in the floodplain, were overgrown by the region’s tall grasses and are now utterly invisible. Others, trampled on by elephants in the muddy wet season became so pitted they pop a truck’s tires (see Figure 11). The signs that were placed to demarcate the park’s boundaries fell down and were used for other purposes by villagers or disappeared into the park’s floodplain mud (see Figure 12). Without obvious frontiers, the park’s territorial boundaries have become blurry, crossed over by newcomers and/or local village and pastoralist...
children seeking good pasture for their cows, vegetables and wood to gather and even agricultural land.

Outsiders

Who are all of these new outsiders and why are they so prevalent in Waza National Park? The growth of the population around the Waza protected area from the mid-1990s to present was not simply due to an increase in the availability of natural resources caused by Waza-Logone’s (PWL) re-flooding project. The Waza region’s influx of outsiders can also be attributed to the fact that some fisher-people and pastoralists were pushed into this area by a dearth of natural resources in other regions. For example, Lake Chad, once a vital source of water for pastoralists, fishermen and agriculturalists in Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria, has shrunk considerably (25,000 km$^2$ in 1963 to 1350 km$^2$ in 2008) and no longer exists in Niger (Afifi 2011, 103 and NASA 2008). Pastoralists who formerly used this lake have moved southward in search of greener areas (Appolinaire et al. 2012). Many of the people who leave Niger to find more secure agricultural land, pasture or fishing areas go to Cameroon, Nigeria and Chad due to their similar culture and languages (Afifi 2011, 111). Nigerian pastoralists have also been driven into northern Cameroon by ecological and political issues (Appolinaire et al. 2012, 78). Cameroon’s comparatively pro-pastoralist policies have also attracted Fulbe pastoralists from Nigeria (Basset and Turner 2007). Villagers and pastoralists confirmed the population studies cited above. For example, one village leader told me, “There are many, many more nomads now. Where they come from there is nothing left. They are pulled here by the park.”

Aside from its ecological attractors, until very recently the Waza region has offered a relatively conflict free-area to people in neighboring nations. Often referred to as an island of peace, Cameroon is one of only a few countries on the continent to have avoided large-scale conflicts since its independence in the 1960s (Mberu and Pongou 2012). Being a relatively peaceful nation surrounded by countries engaged in political/civil conflicts has made Cameroon an attractive spot for refugees fleeing conflicts in Chad, Rwanda, Sudan, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Congo and Central African Republic (Mberu and Pongou 2012; Fleischer 2007). In 2005, the period in which Waza National Park’s management was declining, the majority of refugees entering Cameroon were from Chad and Nigeria, two nations that are only a few kilometers from each side of Waza National Park (Mberu and Pongou 2012). In 2008 Cameroon hosted around 41,600 from Chad due to the political strife and violence in that nation (UNHCR 2008). Common cultural practices, languages, kinship ties, ancestry and socio-political institutions further eased migration between West and Central African nations (Adeola and Oluyemi 2012; Nnoli 2007).

---

74 By 2008 CAR’s conflicts had pushed a significant number of people into Cameroon as well (about 49,300 refugees) (UNHCR 2008).
Losing the Powers of Negotiation, Losing Access to Food

Critical conservation literature shows that the establishment of national parks can threaten food security. For example, Naughton-Treves (1997) discusses the impact of crop predation due to wildlife from Kibale National Park, Uganda on food security for people living on the edges the protected area. In the same vein, Skonhoft (1998, 68) points out that protected areas threaten food security not only by denying people the ability to hunt for subsistence, but also by disallowing them to kill animals that threaten the crops upon which they depend for food. In Madagascar, Golden et al. (2011) estimate that removing access to wildlife (e.g. through fortress conservation schemes) would dramatically increase the number of children suffering from anemia in the poorest households. More generally, Neumann (1998, 43) and Dowie (2009, 229) note that denying people their access to resources via fortress conservation is a denial of their ability to subsist. In similar fashion, Brockington (2002, 141) describes the forces of impoverishment, livelihood change and marginalization which occur in the wake of conservation seizures of pastoralist lands in Tanzania.

The dissolution of national park enclosures can cause food insecurity as well. As we have seen in Waza, the dispossession and marginalization of local people through park creation was violent and had lasting social and economic effects, but these people were able to find some ways of alleviating losses they had suffered through negotiation with each other and with park guards. In this way they gained access to resources critical to their survival and food security. Even these small gains have been lost as Waza has devolved into an ungoverned space. Today, the collapse of the institutions responsible for excluding people from Waza National Park has left local people devoid of avenues of negotiation. Without park staff in villages or on patrol, villagers and pastoralists have no one to convince to let them use the natural resources of the park. The relative advantage of resource user insiders over outsiders is gone. Access to park resources is no longer exclusive. Reflecting on these changes, one man told me, “at the time of Bajjoda there were many more guards. [At that time] it was possible to ask for an authorization to get grasses and wood. There were lots of those things at the time. [Now] there is nothing left in there [the park].” Along similar lines, the chief of a different village said, “the people next to the park have advantages, but when the park is not protected there is nothing left. Now we are suffering.”

Local natural resource users were also unable to negotiate the terms of use of park resources with outsiders that have begun flooding into the area. Often arriving from distant places, these outsiders are not bound by village or state rules or laws. Because some of the new outsiders entering the park are often armed and dangerous (see next chapter), local people are afraid to approach strangers in the park. Explaining the blurry line between a poacher and a bandit, a village man told me “bandits and poachers have similar objectives. Some attack animals, some attack people.” Local people’s fear of negotiating with these people coupled with the fact that these people from far away do not seek to be incorporated into village or state governance systems makes these outsiders free agents in the park. Thus, outsiders take advantage of this internal frontier that is politically open and morally ambiguous lying between

---

75 According to the World Health Organization, food security is built on three pillars: 1.) Food availability which is defined as households or individuals “being able to have sufficient quantities of food available on a consistent basis,” 2.) Food access which consists of a household or individual “having sufficient resources to obtain appropriate foods for a nutritious diet,” and 3.) Food use: which is predicated on households’ and/or individuals’ “appropriate use based on knowledge of basic nutrition and care, as well as adequate water and sanitation” (WHO website accessed May 21, 2012: http://www.who.int/trade/glossary/story028/en/). In this section I am mainly focusing on food availability.
organized spaces and societies (see Kopytoff 1987, 25; Bennafla 2002 cited in Roitman 2005). Acting alone or in groups, local people observe these outsiders taking as much as they can get as quickly as they can. For example, one man told me, “they [outsiders] don’t know how long there will be grass [in the park], so they leave their animals to eat as much as they can…[similarly,] it is not just one poacher who is coming, it is many, so they hunt before the resource is finished.”

The creation of an open access situation in the Waza region has had a severe impact on food security for local villagers, nomads and transhumance pastoralists. Fears of losing the valuable resources in the park were pervasive. Though some of the people I interviewed were reluctant to speak about their use of the park, 76 many people were very blunt about the park’s utility to them. Reflecting the words of many others I spoke to, one man told me, “we cannot live without the park.” People were particularly willing to talk about their use of the park as a safety net in times of crisis. For example, one man told me, “If the pond over there [outside the park] has no more fish we will start working to do our little stealing [inside the park].” Others described using the park to feed their children if there was a drought. Speaking of the park more poetically, one man told me, “If you are hungry and your neighbor has some food, you will not starve.”

People from the full gamut of livelihood activities complained about threats to their food security. Women who historically used the park for vegetables to supplement their agricultural crops frequently complained to me that their gathering activities have been drastically hindered by outsider use of the park. For example, vehement about the importance of guarding the park, one woman told me, “before there were many more vegetables [in the park] than now, but they [park staff] don’t guard now and the Nigerians come here…looking for vegetables and gum.” Similarly, another woman told me, “I want the park to be like it was before. I want the park conserved well. [At this earlier time] there were a lot of vegetables. Now there are very few vegetables. They have all been eaten.” This second woman complained that the recent influx of herdsmen from Niger inside of Waza National Park had led to her lost vegetable harvest.

Fishermen are worried about food security as well. For example, one fisherman told me that he was frightened, saying that without park management “everyone will die. We cannot survive.” He said this because he felt that if the park was not well protected—“people go steal fish in the park and then there are no fish for us.” Other fishermen complained that outsiders had brought their cars into the park and damaged fish stocks by over-fishing. Reflecting the numerous complaints I heard about the loss of exclusive use of park fishing resources, an angry village leader told me,

I prefer at time when there were more park guards. Now there is nothing left. The park—no matter who can come in and take what they want. The park has been completely left alone. Now if you go and want to fish you might find another person [there]. Before the park gave us a lot. Now we have little interest.

The influx of cattle in the park was also a constant grievance. Fishermen complained that these cattle herds enter fish ponds in the park, crushing their fish traps, ripping their nets and muddying the water which makes fishing more difficult.

76 This reluctance might have stemmed from the fact that some people actually didn’t use park resources or because it was illegal and they feared the repercussions of these admissions of use.
Pastoralists also worried about their cows’ long term use of the park. Calling for better protection of park pasture lands, a herdsman said, “if I go there and graze my cows, and then other people come and stay there and use the grasses then it will become degraded. It is better to protect the park.” In a similar argument for the exclusive use of park resources, another pastoralist said, “If five [troops of cows] go into the park and four are caught, one will eat well. But if there are no guards…five troops will enter…Everything depends on the guards of the forest and the conservator.” Yet another herdsman shared with me the effects of lost park management. He said, “[before] there were many grasses, but now there is almost nothing left for our cows to eat. We used to be able to steal what we wanted from the park.” Some groups of pastoralists told me that they had changed where they usually pastured their animals because there were too many people using the area. These constant feelings of food insecurity on the part of local fishermen, agriculturalists, and pastoralists demonstrate how the violence of enclosures continues, even after their dissolution.

**Losing Animals, Losing Tourists**

One of the main reasons the Waza protected area was enclosed and maintained by the French and Cameroonian governments was for economic gain. In the colonial, Ahidjo and early Biya periods the state was able to directly accumulate from the park land and resources it had enclosed by collecting taxes and fees from visitors, tour operators and park concessionaires. Each visitor entering the park was required to pay a fee to the state. The state was able to charge each visitor for the use of a camera while inside of the park. Hotels and tour guides who were able to gain wealth from the park were also taxed by the government. Because Waza drew in a good number of international tourists, the state was also able to accumulate from charging for visitor visas to Cameroon. While Waza’s strict governance drew in thousands of tourists and their pocketbooks each year during the park’s heyday, in 2010 tourists visiting Waza were infrequent.

High rates of grazing in the park wherein cattle out-compete park antelopes has led to a serious decline in these species as well as the predators that eat them. Rapacious hunting and poisoning of waterholes by trappers has led to a serious decline in the park’s animal populations. According to Foguekem et al. (2010) and Bouché et al. (2011), though Waza National Park still has relatively high densities of wildlife like elephants, giraffe and various antelopes, all species in the park are on the decline. Species common in other protected areas in the country like hartebeest, bushbuck and buffalo are now extinct in Waza (Foguekem et al. 2010). Lions, a particularly attractive species to tourists, are also on the decline. Though Bauer et al. (2003) found that between 1962 and 2002 the number of lions dropped from around 100 individuals to 40-60—a rate of about one lion lost every year, Tumenta et al. (2010) found that there are only 14-21 lions remaining in the park—a rate of about six lions lost every year. Tumenta et al. (2010) estimate that at the current rate, lions will soon be extinct in Waza National Park. Foguekem et al. (2010) also noted a scarcity of lions, elephants, ostrich and warthog in most of the park. De Longh et al. (2010) fear that Grimm’s duiker and Bohor reedbuck may be facing extinction as well. These researchers also note that waterfowl and raptors are under threat (de Longh et al. 2010).

With fewer and fewer animals in the park, tour operators are less and less willing to take their clients there. For example, one tour operator I spoke to said “ten years ago I could promise every tourist that we would see an elephant or a lion within the park. Now I can promise nothing but birds and possibly some giraffe.” Shaking her head as she stared out over the plain near the
Vo waterhole that was occupied by a few of the park’s enormous Maribou Storks, another tour operator said to me, “here you couldn’t even see the ground, there were so many animals [in the 1980s and early 1990s], now there is nothing but a few birds.” The state of the park’s roads is also a limiting factor for tourism. Because of deteriorated roads, the ride through the park is bumpy, uncomfortable and usually accompanied by at least one flat tire. Because there were very few guard patrols in the park, tourists have been stranded in the park if they had car trouble. During my time in Waza talking with tour guides and park guards I heard several stories of stranded tourists having to walk for miles across the park to seek assistance, exposed to the dangers of large predators, snakes, heat-stroke or dehydration. Such stories are not great advertisements for the park or tourism within.

Without wildlife, good roads and/or tourists, Waza is no longer a site of economic gain. For example, the former tour guide I quote above and her husband once had a thriving tourist operation such that they had to turn down clients. Because tourism in the region has declined sharply in the last few years they have had to close the doors of their business. This woman’s husband has had to travel to Cameroon’s southern regions to find work in the capital while she remains in the Far North Province with their child, only employed a few times a year to do sanitation trainings by the Red Cross. Hotels in the Waza area remain empty for much of the year. Restaurants that once served park visitors are now so infrequently visited their larders are not stocked. Upon ordering a chicken dish at one of these restaurants, I saw the restaurant’s cook disappear over a hill and return in two trips with wood for cooking and a live chicken she had obviously bought from a neighbor down the road. Other hotels and restaurants have simply closed their doors.

The only people gaining economically from the park now are corrupt government officials who illegally sell authorizations to use the park’s pasture and fishponds to cattle herders and fishermen for profit. As we have seen, at least one corrupt state official has conducted his own for-profit harvests from the protected area’s resources. In this sense, the park is actively costing the government money as these officials steal from the meager park budget or equipment stores and destroy the resources that had once drawn tourists in large numbers to this place.

**Conclusion**

There have been extensive critiques of fortress conservation that stress the social and political marginalization of people living on land slated to be “conserved” or “preserved” (e.g. Neumann 1998, Brockington 2002; Hughes 2008). Other scholars have thought through the violence related to processes of enclosure in action (e.g. Marx 1906; Thompson 1975). Here, by looking at the dissolution of the Waza National Park enclosure, I expand the scope of both of these analyses. The shift from local institutions of exclusion to state and NGO institutions has paved the way to an open access situation in Waza National Park. Local people who were already marginalized by the creation of this park lost their relative advantages over people they and the state have historically deemed outsiders. At the same time, the park’s wildlife populations are sharply declining, making this site unattractive to tourists. As such, this enclosure is no longer profitable to the Cameroonian government. In the next chapter I continue the argument that the dissolution of enclosures can be as violent as their creation by showing how the park’s management collapse has given rise to intense and violent crime within its borders.
As I sat in the backseat of the truck I heard one park guard, mutter to the village guard in Fulfulde, “Are you afraid?” “I am afraid,” his compatriot responded. Suddenly, I was afraid too. We were driving through the southeastern part of Waza National Park, the part of the park that villagers and pastoralists refer to as “étouffant,” or “stifling.” Here the trees grow close and tall—long lianas dripping from their limbs. Strangler figs, spiky acacias and balanites scraped the car like fingernails on a chalkboard as we passed. Dusty gray termite mounds and yellow horned melons flew by as the driver sped up. The gloaming was coming on and soon the cool dark night would arrive. We still had a ways to go before we reached the spot where we would camp that evening. The usually chatty guards had stopped talking, their eyes scanning the thick brush, their callused hands clutching at their ancient guns, sweating. A cold prickle throbbed at the back of my neck as I clung to the dusty and cracking leather of the seat. As we bounced across the sandy track, my nails dug into the decaying foam to hold me steady. In this moment I realized that I felt what the men and women I had been interviewing around the park had described—a feeling of fear that was impossible to escape in this stifling place. Thieves, kidnappers, armed poachers and other people who didn’t want to be found or detected could be hiding just a few feet away and we would never see them. If they had better weapons than the guards I was traveling with (which was likely—it’s pretty easy to improve upon guns from WWI and WWII), they could shoot us, rob us, kidnap us, hold us hostage or rape me and there would be no one to stop them. There was no cell phone reception. The closest police station was over three hours away by car—far longer by foot if the car broke down. We were on our own. Each rustle in the trees frightened me, each set of footprints in the dusty soil. When we got back to camp that night, safe near the guard station and in the middle of a plain so we could see people coming for a long way, I thought about what it would be like to feel that fear every single day. I thought about what it would be like to take those risks to survive, to feed one’s cows or family or both. I thought about the fact that I was leaving this place, but for the fishermen, pastoralists and gatherers who I had spoken to over the last eight months there was no leaving. This was life.

Introduction

Scholars critical of fortress conservation often cite the violence visited upon local people through strict park management in the form of evictions or punishments for breaking park laws as one of this conservation strategies’ cardinal sins (e.g. Duffy 2000; 2010; Dowie 2009; Neumann 1998; 2001; 2002; Brockington 2002; Cernea and Schmidt-Soltau 2006; Whitehead 2007; Geisler and De Sousa 2001). What is rarely discussed, however, are the kinds of violence populations neighboring fortress conservation areas experience in the absence of strict park management. It is this second kind of violence, that I examine in-depth in this chapter. While in the last chapter I described part of this violence in the form of food insecurity, here I show how
the shifts in management and surveillance of Waza National Park have affected the physical security of those local people living within or adjacent to the protected area.

Some scholarship exists on non-resource related crime in protected areas (Greenough 2003; Dunn 2009; Gettleman, 2012). For example, in his analysis of protected area networks (PANS), Greenough (2003, 169-70) argues that,

PANS become archipelagoes of temptation—giant tracts of emptied terrain that pull in outsiders who have secret projects requiring isolation. Instead of embedding zones of tranquility into the landscape, PANS not infrequently attract the chaos of criminal gangs...tempt poachers, who strip out the most cherished species, and they give cover to insurgents and terrorists who boldly contest state authority.

What makes parks outlaw territories has not been well explained, however. While scholars have used a political ecology approach to analyzing violence (e.g. Peluso and Watts 2001), war (e.g. Le Billon 2001; Collier 2003), recoveries from armed conflict (e.g. Unruh et al. 2003), police reform (e.g. Russell 1997), extra-legal livelihood strategies (e.g. growing cannabis) (e.g. Bloomer 2009) environmental security (e.g. Liotta and Shearer 2011) and environmental crime (e.g. Thompson 1975, Neumann 1998; Jacoby 2003; Brockington 2002), there have been few political ecological analyses which have linked natural resource related crime (e.g. poaching) with non-resource related crime (e.g. theft, murder, rape, kidnapping, and assault) (Greenough 2003).

Bandits are socially constructed subjects. One is not born a criminal. Rather, these subjectivities are produced by different regimes of truth and rule (Hobsbawm 1960; Thompson 1975; Peluso 1992; 1993; Duffy 2001; 2010; Neumann 1998; 2001; Brockington 2002). As we have seen thus far, villagers who otherwise would have been law abiding subjects under the French colonial state were deemed criminals if they stayed within the newly created Zinah-Waza reserve. These spatially contingent subjectivities were internalized and re-produced by habitual users of the park as they identified themselves as thieves stealing from the Cameroonian state when inside of its limits. In this chapter I discuss a different kind of criminal, whose actions most of us would categorize as crimes: murder, kidnapping, theft (e.g. stealing cows or money), and highway robbery. While these criminals’ actions were motivated by the need to survive in the face of severe economic hardship, their actions are often far more violent than stealing food from a national park. In northern Cameroon, these kinds of criminals are called les bandits (bandits), les coupeurs de route (those who cut off the roads) and zargina.77

To understand the devolution of the Waza National Park enclosure into an outlaw territory, I employ the concepts of governable and ungovernable space. Since pre-colonial times the Waza region has lain at a crossroads of extraordinary instability, turbulence and violence. Given its war-torn, ecologically unpredictable and economically-stricken milieu, the Far North Province of Cameroon has often been by colonial and independent Cameroonian administrators as an ungovernable space in the sense that these officials have not been fully able to control, count, tax, or fix the mobile population found there. In previous chapters I have traced how the French government used Waza National Park as a fortress of governability in this province. In this chapter I first show that the state governance of this territory remained strong throughout the
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77 Zargina is a word that derives from the name of blue washing soap which was used to mark the faces of thieves caught stealing in the market. It is used to refer to masked bandits (Seignobos 2011, 40).
Ahidjo period. I note that though Waza was not left untouched by the jump in economically-motivated crime in the 1990s, highway robbery, assault, and murder were mainly focused along the paved road that delineates the park’s western boundary. The rest of the park was relatively insulated from these forms of banditry due to continued surveillance funded by non-governmental organizations at the time. Thus, not only were park guards repelling natural resource users from afar, they were also repelling thieves and murderers from the park.

In the second part of the chapter I describe the security conditions in Waza today. Here I show that the state’s regulation of its territory instilled in its neighbors and residents a sense of security that was lost when its borders were no longer regularly patrolled, its laws feebly and patchily enforced, and exclusion no longer practiced by local, state or NGO agents in the mid-2000s. As Waza has transformed into a truly ungoverned and ungovernable space, lawlessness has taken hold in the park and its environs. The loss of patrols in the protected area created an empty, open space that made it easy to hide oneself as well as stolen goods or people. Crimes like kidnapping, theft and assault are now on the rise. Thus, just as people living adjacent to Waza National Park lost the alimentary privileges of being an insider in this space, they also lost the physical security provided them as constant surveillance of the park diminished.

In the third part of this chapter I examine Waza in its regional, national and international contexts to explain how it has become an ungovernable outlaw territory. First, I show that Waza’s emptiness is no accident. As we have seen, historic exclusionary tactics made this protected area one of the only uninhabited spaces in the crowded Far North Province. Second, I explain that in concert with this isolation new members of la population flottante have arrived on the scene. This new mobile population has reacted to state attempts to govern it on major roads and in towns and cities by changing its banditry techniques and moving into rural spaces. Third, I show how biophysical, geopolitical and economic forces have made Waza seem like an attractive site for both the victims of banditry (most frequently pastoralists) as well as criminals (particularly kidnappers) themselves. Waza, a resource-rich, unguarded, empty, relatively safe site lured both the victims of banditry and their attackers to this protected area.

The final section of this chapter shows that local people have not allowed themselves to be completely immobilized by this violence. Instead, some of these resilient people have found ways to fight back against their assailants. Others have developed techniques to avoid interacting with bandits and to secure their safety in the Waza plain.

A Fortress of Governability

After the French colonial period ended, president Ahidjo maintained Waza as a fortress of governability in the Far North Province after independence. Patrols were frequent. The violent punishment of outsiders caught within the protected area’s limits also acted as a significant barrier to entry for many criminals and natural resource users who did not benefit from park insider status. Thus, while banditry in many forms continued in the Far North Province during this time, I was unable to find any mention of Waza National Park being used for smuggling, kidnapping or other types of non-resource related crimes during the Ahidjo period.

Property crime, money laundering, smuggling of goods, vehicles and petrol, and highway robbery in the Far North Province became more prevalent as financial crisis struck the
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78 Discussed in previous chapter
79 With one exception--Park Manager Abokoura was shot and killed by poachers during this time but as the story goes, it seems as though he was trying to kill them as well.
country in the 1980s (Roitman 2005, 155). Paul Biya reluctantly allowed the World Bank to put structural adjustment programs in place and devalued the franc CFA. At the same time, global industrial production was rearranged to favor labor markets in Southeast Asia, South Asia and Latin America. In this economic context, legitimate employment and purchasing power in Cameroon diminished dramatically (Roitman 2005, 155). Many people were plunged into poverty. Mirroring the actions of la population flottante of the colonial era, many “economic refugees” in Cameroon migrated towards the nation’s borders in search of jobs in the world of unregulated commerce or sought other extra-legal ways of making a living (Roitman 2005; Delancey et al. 2010, 142; interviews 2010). In the eyes of the state, this group of impoverished citizens was a new crop of bandits.

Between 1992 and 1997 many of Chad’s 27,000 demobilized soldiers, lacking livelihood alternatives, turned into small arms dealers and “‘enter[ed] the bush,” as they say, working as mercenaries or as highway bandits with organized groups of under- and unpaid soldiers as well as the unemployed from Cameroon, Nigeria, Niger, the Central African Republic and Sudan” (Roitman, 2006, 248). These were men who, upon being let go from the Chadian and Central African Republic’s military spent their severance pay on guns bought on the black market or took their weapons with them when they left (Roitman 2005; 1998; Seignobos 2011a). These men would then enter and engage in complex regional and international weapons trading, counterfeiting and money laundering, and smuggled gasoline, vehicles, elephant and rhinoceros products, gold, and drugs (Roitman 2005). Unemployed, well-armed men also formed road gangs, wherein they would set up road-blocks, brandish weapons and steal money and valuables from passing travelers (Issa, 2004; Moritz 2005; Roitman 2005; interviews 2010).

At the same time that more highway robbers, thieves, and smugglers were appearing in Cameroon, banditry was also becoming easier. As a result of Structural Adjustment Policies in the 1990s, government officials had their pay slashed or lost their jobs. Many began seeking new ways to accumulate wealth (Bayart et al. 1999; Bayart 1993; Moritz 2006). Often illicit activities like extra-legal trade (smuggling) and even highway robbery were financed and organized by military personnel, state administrators and border officials (Moritz 2005; Roitman 2005). The result of this state contraction (fewer officials) and the increased willingness of government officials to engage in extra-legal activities (be paid to look the other way, engage in or finance these activities directly e.g.) was that Cameroon’s borders became intensely active sites for banditry, smuggling and unregulated trade (Moritz 2005; Issa 2004; Burnham 1996, 160). Though there was some cattle theft in the bush during this time, most “big” bandits focused their efforts on the more lucrative ambushes of people driving on the main roads or money-holding market-goers during late 1980s and early 1990s (Seignobos 2011a; interviews 2010). By the mid-1990s roadways had become the site of an all-out “war” with coupeurs de route (Le Messager 1994; Pideu 1995; Soudan 1996; Dorce 1996 cited in Roitman 2005, 155).

Waza National Park, located very close both the Nigerian and Chadian borders as well as having one of its major borders defined by the only paved road in that part of the country, was not totally immune to increased rates of highway robbery. In the Far North Province, these new legions of bandits concentrated their efforts on the main road between Maroua and N’Djamena—particularly between Mora and Kousseri, the part of the road that passes on the Waza National
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80 “Entrez la brousse” or going into the bush means entering often roadless or remote rural areas.
81 Former public works employees were now responsible for creating desert paths and mountain roads to allow for smuggling and unregulated trade across the Chad Basin (Roitman 2005).
Figure 13: “At the Crossroads: Insecurity in northern Cameroon 1990-2010 (Seignobos 2011a). Thick dark lines on the map are those found to be most exposed to insecurity in the last twenty years.
Park boundary (See Figure 13) (Djarma 2002, 86; interviews 2010). Several Cameroonians and Europeans were killed nearby to Waza National Park in car-jackings and robberies during this period. During this time the western edge of the park (the edge defined by the paved road) was known as a place used by highway bandits as a place to hide out and find provisions (Djarma 2002, 86).\(^2\) Even Badjoda, one of the park’s most strict managers was caught and robbed by the *coupeurs de route* during this period. Due to the ungovernability of the Far North Province, replete with violence and banditry, Waza National Park was essentially closed to tourism in the early 1990s, causing its international fame to fade (Djarma 2002, 87).

Aside from the crime on the border defined by a paved road, much of Waza National Park remained a fortress of governability, relatively free of the violent crimes found elsewhere in the province in 1990s and early 2000s. During this time, violent acts of banditry were relatively rare in areas that were not close to the main road. This lack of violent crime in Waza National Park’s interior or eastern edges was due to the strict and well armed patrols of this area at the time. Though local people I interviewed often made note of Badjoda’s encounter with armed bandits on the road, few people complained of banditry affecting their pastoralist groups or villages between 1990 and 2000. This did not mean that banditry was entirely absent in the bush, however. Pastoralists continued to suffer from cattle raids, but generally felt that they were able to scare off raiders with their bows and arrows (Moritz and Sholte 2011; interviews 2010).

### Reacting to Banditry with Violence

Though crime on the road near Waza was bad, other areas like Cameroon’s Adamawa and North Provinces experienced even more crime. Kidnapping and highway robbery were happening in these areas at a rapid rate. Numerous complaints from these provinces, violent confrontations between criminals and government security forces, and lobbying\(^3\) resulted in President Biya promising to address the issue of banditry in his 1997 re-election campaign (Djotie, 2008; US State Department 1996). Selectively categorizing banditry and bandits, Paul Biya did little to suppress unregulated trade, smuggling and other extra-legal commerce in Northern Cameroon,\(^4\) but targeted kidnappers and highway robbers as the main targets of state law enforcement. His answer to kidnapping and road thieves in Cameroon’s Northern provinces was the Rapid Intervention Battalion or the *Bataillon d'Intervention Rapide* (called BIR or anti-gang units) which were deployed to the Adamawa, North and Far North Provinces in the late 1990s.

The BIR is technically a branch of the army, and is specially trained to combat high profile rural/urban banditry and terrorism (Djotie 2008; Seignobos 2011; interviews 2010). These men are unlike the police or gendarmes on the roads. They shoot to kill and often do.\(^5\) A Cameroonian NGO estimated that more than three hundred people were killed by this group in 1998, “while others were detained, most likely tortured, and held without legal process” (Amnesty International 1998, cited in Moritz and Sholte 2011, 14). In their first eight years the BIR freed three hundred hostages and put an end to serious issues of insecurity caused by
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\(^2\) Djarma (2002, 86) notes that these bandits not only used the park for food and refuge, but also hunted lions. Lion skins were used by the leaders of these groups as a symbol of power.

\(^3\) Among other lobbyists, members of the project Waza Logone of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) made recommendations to the Cameroonian government to enhance the protection of pastoralists.

\(^4\) As Roitman (2005) points out, such activities not only lend themselves to personal profit, but also respond to the insolvency of the state.

\(^5\) While I was in Cameroon this past year they had shot at least 8 people to death by the side of the road on suspicion that they were bandits.
displaced soldiers from neighboring countries in the North Province (Djotie 2008). They also killed 1,500 thieves in that time period (Djotie 2008).

When the BIR was introduced to the Far North’s capital in the 1990s, its regional leader, Colonel William Pom, was especially charged with controlling the “hot zone” between Waza and Maltam that runs along the Nigerian border (Seignobos 2011). As Issa (2004) is quick to point out, however, banditry is a malleable phenomenon, one that can adjust to the circumstances at hand rapidly. Thus, while the appearance of these BIR units calmed banditry in some parts of the country—especially along roads and near cities—it pushed banditry into other, more remote and rural places like the interior and road-less Waza National Park.

Waza Today

Today the unguarded, intermittently inhabited and used Waza National Park, has become an internal frontier, lying at the peripheries of now better protected spaces like paved roads and major towns. Robbery, kidnapping and assault have risen markedly on secondary roads and in the bush inside of and adjacent to Waza National Park (Moritz and Sholte 2011; interviews 2010). Pastoralists and livestock traders in particular have suffered (Moritz and Scholte 2011; interviews 2010). Complaints of the increased frequency of crimes were often present in my interviews with pastoralists and villagers. Most people agreed that in the last few years the problem of theft had increased. For example, a pastoralist man told me, “Anytime you have money in your pocket and you travel you are afraid. It is only recently that this problem has gotten worse.” For similar reasons, women describe being too frightened to walk between villages. Further, one woman told me, “I worry about my husband because he might meet someone on the road [on park’s border] who wanted to steal from him or kill him. I do not sleep when he doesn’t come home. I have been constantly worried for two years.”

Residents and users of the Waza region not only reported an increased frequency of crimes traditionally experienced in the area, but new types of crime as well. In particular, local people noted that incidents of kidnapping had begun occurring in the region. While kidnapping was a lucrative and frequently employed means of gaining funds in provinces to the south, this phenomenon had not occurred in the Far North Province until the mid-2000s (Issa 2006). Generally these kidnappings involve bandits taking children hostage and holding them in remote areas until their parents pay their ransom. If the ransom is not paid, the children are killed, beaten or abandoned. One man told me that though there was banditry in the 1990s, what was happening now was “incomparable. There is much more [banditry] now, and this style of coming into people’s homes never happened. We heard of the problem with kidnapping in Central African Republic but then little by little this problem came here.” Similarly describing this change another man said, “with theft, we do not have a problem with security, but...kidnapping happened here. They took children from our village into the park. They took three Peul and one Massa…this problem started in the south [of the country] and then it came up here last year.”

According to one leader of an NGO in the Far North Province that works to help pastoralists, “Pastoralists are the least protected people in the population.” Pastoralists tend to be the victims of banditry—kidnapping, hostage taking and theft—more than other parts of the population. Pastoralists are particularly vulnerable to these kinds of crime because they are less likely to contact police or gendarmes about these crimes because they are suspicious of government authorities. Government authorities are known for frequently tricking pastoralists
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86 These are ethnic groups.
into paying extra “taxes” or “fines.” Thus, frightened pastoralists usually pay off kidnappers rather than seek help from the authorities. For example, mainly reacting to kidnappings in Cameroon’s Adamawa and North Provinces in January 2004, herdsmen paid 14 million CFA rather than put their trust in Cameroonian law enforcement (Issa 2006).

Pastoralists are also more vulnerable to banditry because, as compared to the populations in the remote villages of the floodplain, they are wealthy and often have available cash. Because pastoralists often have to pay illegal taxes and fees to state officials, they are pressured into having money on hand (Moritz 2005; Issa 2006). Aside from this cash, much of pastoralist wealth is tied up in their cattle and smaller livestock of which they often have hundreds, if not thousands. Each animal can be worth hundreds of dollars which can be quickly accessed if sold in the market. As such, the amount of money that can be taken from pastoralists greatly rivals those of most subsistence agriculturalists or fishermen in the region.

Many pastoralists feel as though insecurity in the region is getting out of control, posing serious threats to their livelihoods and well-being (Moritz and Scholte 2011, interviews 2010). These herdsmen have had their children kidnapped and ransomed; they are shot at, beaten and stolen from (interviews 2010; Moritz and Scholte 2011). During the time that I was working in and around Waza more than fifteen people were kidnapped and held hostage in the park. Extending the findings of Moritz and Scholte (2011) who focus on mobile pastoralist groups, I found that villagers on the park’s northern and eastern edges were being attacked as well. Village children had been kidnapped and held for ransom. Rural market-goers had also been shot at or assaulted.

I spoke with a man whose brother had recently been seriously wounded by thieves who were trying to steal his cattle. The man I spoke to had been shot and stabbed as well. A large soiled bandage was wrapped around his forehead to cover a large wound there. He said, “we are afraid all of the time. There is nothing here [the land they were camped on relatively far from the park] but it is better to have security and live without fear than to move freely and have enough for the cows…I would give up a troop of cows to save a life.” Other pastoralists and villagers showed me where bullets were still lodged in their bodies from numerous attacks. One man I tried to interview was unable to communicate with me because he had been beaten so badly by thieves he had lost his hearing. He communicates with his fellow pastoralists through gestures now.

Though physical violence was not visited on all of the people that I spoke to during my fieldwork, feelings of fear and insecurity were pervasive amongst many of the pastoralist and village communities I visited around the park. For example, one woman said to me “I did not sleep all of last year because I was so afraid.” A young man in another camp used almost the same words to describe his past year. Aside from these two people, many others described a need for constant vigilance to avoid theft, kidnapping or violence. Even if it is not overtly violent, the constant threat of large-scale theft has left many pastoralists worried. One man put this eloquently saying, “We are people of cows. We do not do agriculture. We do not do commerce. We only have cows and if those are taken from us what will we become? We are like a tree that has been cut and dried and is being burned. In the morning there will be nothing left.”

Waza National Park is the only place in the Far North Province that is experiencing and increase in rural crime.87 Waza’s emptiness, only intermittently used or occupied by pastoralists, hunters, fishermen, and other natural resource harvesters, and it’s almost total lack of governance

87 Similar issues are occurring in a place called Mindif which is not near a protected area.
does make it a very attractive site to both the victims of banditry and bandits themselves, however. Below, I will discuss the local, regional, national and international dynamics that brought both victims and bandits to the Waza region.

Crumbling—How Waza Became an Ungovernable Space

There are several reasons Waza National Park has become an ungovernable outlaw territory. On a local scale, due to institutional neglect, Waza has become an empty, isolated open access territory, a prime location for deeds requiring solitude and seclusion. At a regional scale, in recent years there have been new additions to the “floating population.” At the same time there have also been changes in technology which have changed the way banditry is done in the Far North Province. At a national and international scale, the park’s biophysical attributes and security relative to other parts of the country, or neighboring countries, have drawn today’s banditry victims (mainly pastoralists) towards the park. Trailing along behind their victims, kidnappers and thieves have arrived as well, finding ample resources for long-term survival within the park’s limits to avoid detection as they plan their attacks.

Emptiness

In the areas adjacent to the park’s northern, eastern and southeastern borders secondary roads through the bush are just traces in the forest and grass, often flooded in the rainy season and historically rarely patrolled by police or gendarmes. Park guards were the arm of the law that local people depended on for safety. For example, one woman told me, “guards are the only form of protection we know. We don’t have other things like gendarmes here.” Village leaders felt similarly about park guards. Representing these views, a chief of a large village told me, “The park guards helped protect the village.”

As we have seen, management in Waza National Park diminished dramatically as guards were lost and those remained were further weakened as their equipment rotted away and became obsolete. Unmotivated, under-equipped, and often unpaid by the government, the remaining guards rarely did patrols. Even if they were able to do regular patrols, park guards in 2010 would have been poorly suited to defend villagers against bandits. Park guards still carry guns from WWI and WWII and move around on foot or by bicycle while bandits and large-scale poachers (sometimes the same people as bandits) often have weapons like Kalashnikovs and bazookas and often have motorcycles or trucks for transportation. Due to changes in Cameroonian law, guards have also lost their rights to kill poachers and other rule-breakers within Waza National Park. As such, their perceived threat to outsiders has diminished.

Impotence in armament and transportation as well as potential legal repercussions if a death results from law enforcement has made park guards unwilling to engage with bandits in the park. Reflecting many villagers’ feelings that park guards had become powerless in recent years, a local man told me, “The park guards don’t go where the bandits are. They are afraid.” Instead
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88 Though people from other countries were often blamed for these criminal acts, many people recognized that a good number of the acts of banditry in the region would have been impossible without a “inside man.” For example, in one case where multiple children were kidnapped and held hostage in the park, different ransoms were placed on each child’s life according to the relative wealth of their family members. Without someone who knew the villagers intimately, such a feat would not have been possible. Similarly, interviewees sometimes mentioned “agents” in the market who would observe who had sold a cow or a sheep and then communicate with bandits in the bush as to when these cash-laden people left the market. When asked why a local Cameroonian would turn against his fellow citizens, people cited economic problems, or said that these men did not want to do hard work.
of going after bandits or heavily armed poachers, villagers and pastoralists alike noted that park guards (if they patrol at all) go after easy targets like people whose cows are in the park.

Because of the state’s monopoly on force, local people do not see themselves as capable of going after the kidnappers and thieves that have begun using the area in recent years. One traditional leader put it best when he said,

The people who come here armed, we cannot stop them. They come from Chad and far away and they are well armed. We are barehanded. What can we do? They come ready for war…there are people who try to send information to the government, but the government has done nothing about this. We are barehanded. We do not have guns and cannot do anything.

Without effective governance on the part of the state, local people or NGO leadership, Waza has become a politically open space, an institutional vacuum, an internal frontier (see Kopytoff 1987, 25).

People living next to Waza National Park have noticed the effects of its lost management. Often they would refer to the protected area as empty, uninhabited, or abandoned space. For example, aware that the park is unguarded and unwatched, an old man told me, “bandits come now when they hear there are no [park] guards. They use the park.” Local people would emphasize the emptiness of this space as creating the conditions under which bandits could perform their nefarious acts. Reflecting these thoughts, one person told me, “There are no houses in the park, the bandits profit from [take advantage of] this.” Similarly, a resident of a village neighboring the park told me, “the bandits hide in the bush. They hide in nature where there is uninhabited space. The park provides them with a place where there is no one.” Yet another man who carefully traced the five shiny scars of bullet holes that had riddled his body while driving a bush taxi to the neighboring village’s weekly market over the last few years told me, “now there are a lot of them [bandits]. There was even a group that came [to the village] to ask for fish to cook. Now if they [bandits] aren’t in the park, where else would they find peace?...All these people came from the park.”

The reason that local people dwell on the fact that Waza is empty, uninhabited and abandoned so much is that areas like this are rare in the Far North Province. This province is Cameroon’s most

Figure 14: Rural population density of Cameroon circa 2000. Purple, red and orange are most dense (Seignobos 2000). Waza is the white patch in the center of the Far North Province.
The Far North boasts a population of over ninety people per square kilometer (*Recensement Cameroun* 2005). Because Waza had a long history of strict exclusion and had criminalized human habitation, this protected area represents one of the last large spaces in the Far North Province that is uninhabited. Thus, there are very few other places that bandits, often in large groups or traveling with troops of stolen cows, could hide so readily in this province. Describing first hand the utility of such isolation in practice, a man who had been held hostage by some of these bandits the previous year described what happened saying,

> We were taken into the park…the bandits chose the park because it was isolated. No one there could see them. We were there for eleven days and never saw a park guard. We were given food and it was very bad food to eat but they [the bandits] didn’t beat us. The money didn’t come so they [the bandits] chose one man to kill and shot him in front of everyone.

Because local people were fully aware that Waza National Park, now an empty frontier zone, was contributing to the violence they were experiencing, many reminisced almost fondly about the times brutal park managers were in place. After these brutal park managers left, one woman told me, “all the bandits would hide in the park. We could not sleep.” Though villagers often stated that they were afraid of park guards and the fines or imprisonment these managers could threaten if one was found breaking park rules, a good number of people also said they preferred a heavily guarded park over its current unguarded state. A simple calculus informed some of these comments. For example one man told me, “Bandits are more dangerous than park guards. Bandits can kill you.” Similarly, another man stated, “We prefer Badjoda’s harshness to what we have now. We were safe then. Now we cannot keep anything good in our homes. We live like prisoners.”

While many pastoralists have even more fraught relationships with park guards and other government officials than villagers, many of them performed a similar calculation—park guards could cause problems, but bandits could cause more. For example, while showing me a place on his leg where he was shot by armed bandits in 2009, a young pastoralist man told me,

> I think the insecurity in the region—the theft and the kidnapping—is in part because of the park. With more park guards these bandits would not be able to use the park to hide and come steal from us. With many patrols this problem would diminish…if they [park guards] were numerous, this would keep us safe. We were born with fines, we have always had to deal with this problem [fines], but this problem with security, this came only in the last 2-3 years. Security is more important. 100,000 or 50,000CFA[^2] is cheaper than losing half of your cows or all of them.

He went on to tell me that he preferred paying fines to park guards having his physical security threatened by bandits in their absence. Other pastoralists also called for a return of guard patrols and presence believing that they could help reestablish security in the region. For example,

[^2]: $200-100 USD
describing the death of a child at the hands of bandits in the park one pastoralist stated, “if the park guards were here they would be able to protect the park, this would not have happened at the time of Habibou and Badjoda.”

The idea that the park has become an empty, ungovernable refuge for bandits, is palpable not just in the everyday population living around the park, but also amongst village leaders. One of the most elite traditional leaders in the region told me, “the park has become a refuge [for bandits and poachers], inside the park there is insecurity.” Leaders of lower rank felt the same. For example, a lower level village chief told me, “Kidnapping has happened. These people [bandits] come from Chad. They use the park and the bush. They live in the bush. Less guarding of the park has allowed this to happen.” A different village chief told me the same, saying “Bandits prefer to hide themselves in the park because it is isolated. The bandits would not have been able to go into the park at the time of Badjoda [harsh park manager], this would not have happened.”

Waza’s state as an ungovernable space has also been recognized by government officials at multiple scales. A government official responsible for security at the national level acknowledged that Waza National Park was being used by bandits. He said, “Bandits used the park, they hid in the trees in the park.” An official involved in environmental protection at a national level also acknowledged that banditry was rife in Waza National Park saying, “poachers are the same as coupeurs de route, they are the same thing...these people with big guns come. There is instability in the region.” Similarly blurring the line between poachers and kidnappers, a regional government official said that it was difficult to combat people who were better armed than the government, particularly in places where there is not enough surveillance, like Waza. A former mayor of one of the larger towns near the national park observed, “Waza is used by bandits to attack people.”

New Additions to the “Floating Population” and New Forms of Banditry

In the previous chapter I showed that there has been an influx of new outsiders in the Waza region because of conflicts and ecological disasters in neighboring nations. While some of these people turned to using the natural resources within Waza National Park to survive, others turned to banditry. Quite a few local people I spoke to particularly cited the group of rebels that had tried to overthrow Chad’s President Idris Deby in 2005 as having transformed into the bandits that were attacking them in 2010. These rebels, who came from Chad, Libya and Sudan “have heavy armaments,” one pastoralist told me. Describing the transformation of these rebels into bandits he said,

[They] cannot return to their countries because their borders are closed to them and they have been chased away by the Chadian government. So now they come into Cameroon with their guns. They cannot go to town, they cannot go home and they have no money and nothing to eat so they steal from us.

The conflict in Chad was not the only thing that added to Cameroon’s new floating population. On the other side of Waza National Park is Nigeria, a place whose security situation is described by the US Department of state as “fluid and unpredictable” (Dept. of State 2013). Kidnapping is rife within this country (Watts 2009). In fact, the African Insurance Organization

91 That said, he brushed kidnapping off as a “cultural phenomenon” in the Sudano-Sahel, naturalizing this violence.
marked Nigeria as the kidnapping capital of the world in 2011 (Ogunde 2012). Economic kidnappings in Nigeria are used by impoverished people to gain wealth or to finance political struggles (Akpan 2010). Sectarian violence, in part ignited by the introduction of Shari’a law in Nigeria’s northern states, is one possible motivation for economic kidnappings in Waza National Park. Though many of these economic kidnappings are occurring in the Niger Delta, people living along the Nigerian border in Cameroon described the rising problem of kidnapping in Cameroon. Noting the porosity of the Nigerian-Cameroonian border, one man stated that bandits “can go back and forth.”

Waza National Park was recently used by Nigeria’s terrorist group Boko Haram to carry out the political kidnapping of seven French people in February 2013. This deadly terrorist group captured this family as they left Waza National Park and held them hostage for four months in Nigeria. These kidnappers were not in search of money. Rather, they called for the release of Muslim militants held in detention in Nigeria and Cameroon (Musa and Felix 2013). This incident illustrates how easy it is for bandits from Nigeria to use Waza National Park at their discretion.

Though in the 1990s many people coming from Nigeria and Chad in search of economic gains would have turned to road banditry and smuggling to make a living, with the advent of the BIR these activities have become far more risky. Rural crimes like kidnapping, theft in rural markets, and on secondary roads became a safer choice. At the same time, in the mid 2000s money-transfer institutions like Western Union and Express Union arrived in the Far North Province of Cameroon. These services allowed people to travel without large sums of money on their person. In concert with the arrival of the anti-gang units along the province’s main roads these services made road banditry more risky and less lucrative. Commenting on the changed spatiality of crime in the Far North Province, a government official in charge of public safety stationed on the western edge of the park told me that “before it was only attacks on cars. But now bandits are going into the bush to steal cows and other things.” Confirming this spatial shift in crime, a villager told me, with the advent of the BIR on the paved roads, “they [the bandits] no longer cut the road, they go into the bush and take the children of the nomads.”

**Biophysical Factors**

Waza’s biophysical attributes have also played a role in the facilitation of banditry there. An area with fewer natural resources might not have experienced the effects of a loss of governance and the development of an open access situation in the same way Waza National Park has with its rich alluvial soils, woodlands, permanent waterholes and vast, open stretches of grasslands has in recent years. The very features that made Waza attractive to conservationists in the first place are the same features that have tempted both the victims of banditry (namely pastoralists), opportunistic outsiders in search of natural resources, as well as bandits.

The abundance of natural resources, especially water, drew pastoralists to Waza National Park starting in the late 1990s. The 1994-7 Waza Logone re-flooding project more than doubled the number pastoral camps in the region and the number of cattle in the area increased from 14,000 to 39,000 in six years (Scholte 2005, 193). With this increased pressure on the larger Waza region, pastoralists seeking the best pasture for their animals were often drawn into Waza National Park itself. As Scholte (2005, 194) observed, “with the reflooding, water holes deep in
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92 The side that is bounded by a paved road.
93 A term used to denote highway banditry.
the interior of the park have become well stocked with fish and nutritious vegetation until the end of the dry season, and therefore attractive to fishermen and pastoralists.”

Waza’s open and undeveloped land were also attractive to pastoralists because land use changes in the Far North Province have made open space for grazing increasingly difficult to find. As populations in the Far North and the Waza region in particular rise, the amount of land under agricultural production has also gone up leaving less room for pastoralists. In the region around Maroua, the Far North’s provincial capital, rangelands have been almost entirely replaced by agriculture (Moritz 2008). This loss of rangeland has caused peri-urban pastoralists to entrust many of their cattle to salaried herders who take their animals into the “bush” between the floodplain adjacent to Waza national park and the Mindif region (Moritz 2008). Moritz (2003, 222) found that “because of the disappearance of pastures around the village, peri-urban pastoralists kept approximately 75% of their cattle permanently in the bush.”

Even in the “bush” cattlemen struggle to find adequate range for their animals. After the re-flooding that occurred in the 1990s, sedentary populations in the villages surrounding the park rose by 5% a year via in-migration and natural growth (Scholte 2005). With the advent of this rising population, traditional nomadic campsites, well fertilized by animal dung, have now become coveted sites for agricultural activities (Moritz et al. 2002, 135). Seeking to avoid conflict, pastoralists often move away or are forced to move because grazing is not considered a “land use” by the Cameroonian government94 (Moritz et al. 2002, 133). In the floodplain adjacent to Waza, an increasing number of fish canals also restrict the movement of pastoralists in this region. One extension agent told me, “many [pastoralists] have changed their routes because the people from the villages have destroyed all of their areas for passage.” As rangeland is lost, the fertile, water abundant land formerly preserved from development within Waza National Park becomes more and more attractive to pastoralists.

These biophysical temptations have also attracted bandits to the region. As guarding in the park diminished, Waza offered an uninhabited space with resources to survive on for long periods of time. When I asked local people why bandits used the park as a base of operations, many responded that there was available water and food there. One man told me, “the bandits use the park like their homes—they put their tents near the ponds and stay there.” Thus, the park’s natural resources may make it possible for criminals to spend long periods of time deep in the park to avoid detection by their victims or the authorities.

**Safe Haven**

Pastoralists were also pushed towards the Waza region as they fled insecurity in other areas of the Cameroon and in other countries (see Figure 15). For example, in the Central African Republic (CAR—a neighbor to Cameroon), in 2004 a representative of pastoralists said, "from January to May this year, three hundred children of herders were taken hostage and more than four hundred and ninety million in ransom was requested. And the payment was done by the herders themselves, they paid more than one hundred seventy million” (quoted in Issa 2006). According to the UNHCR, bandit attacks in north-eastern Cameroon, northern CAR, and south-western Chad between April 2005 and July 2006 caused some 20,000 to leave their villages in search of security (Issa 2006).

Meanwhile, Issa (2006) recorded only 12 children kidnapped in the Far North Province of Cameroon in 2003-4, making the region seem relatively safe to pastoralists in comparison to
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94 These lands are labeled as terres vacantes et sans maître, vacant lands without an owner (Moritz et al. 2002, 133).
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Figure 15: “Zones of Insecurity: Coupeurs de Route and Zargina” (Seignobos 2011a)
places where kidnapping, theft and violence were almost everyday occurrences. As the pastoralists traveled to the Waza region, they were followed by the same crimes that had plagued them elsewhere. Within only a few years this safe haven had been shattered. The head of a local NGO and a former resident of one of the park’s border villages told me that in 2008 and 2009 it was more dangerous to be inside of Waza National Park than outside of it.

Resistance

The local natural resource users of the Waza region have not taken this rising insecurity lying down. They have worked to resist this increasing violence in numerous ways. Resistance, broadly defined, is any action that tries to challenge, change or keep the same a certain set of social relations under circumstances of physical, psychological or symbolic domination, subjugation or exploitation (Keith and Pile 1997, 70). Resistance, can be assembled out of the available materials and practices of everyday life, may be open and confrontational or hidden, may range from individual to collective action, may operate over short or long timeframes, may be creative or self-destructive, and may be conservative or challenge the status quo (Keith and Pile 1997, 70).

Though resistance can be public and obvious, more frequently these acts of resistance are clandestine, subtle and less violent. Scott (1987) argues that it is on these undramatic, covert, and understated terms that most acts of resistance take place. He notes that powerless groups are not often able to mount grand rebellions, and thus people use smaller, “everyday forms of peasant resistance” that are generally concerned with achieving immediate gains (Scott 1987, 33). These forms of resistance generally require little or no coordination and they typically avoid direct symbolic confrontation with authority or the norms of the elite (Scott 1987). These acts of resistance usually occur “off-stage” (Scott 1987).

Resistance is not a new topic to the discussion of protected areas. In cases from east Africa to west and central Africa, local people who lost their rights to land due to conservation have continued to use the resources that they still believe they have rights to through illicit practices, protest, force or bribery (Neumann 1998; Gartlan 2004). In some cases these counter-moves have been public, sudden and violent, as in the case of mass slaughter of lions and elephants in Kenya culminating in the spearing a tourist by a Maasai frustrated with the constant and continuous losses of land and property to national parks (Western 1997). While these cases of resistance generally discuss powerless people resisting those who have dominated them in some way, in the case of Waza National Park, we must de-link geographies of resistance from geographies of domination (Kieth and Pile 1997, 30). Local residents in Waza are not resisting the domination of strict government, but the effects of the lack of government itself. Below I describe what groups are mounting resistances against violent criminals, and how they are resisting these people.

The pastoralist and village communities that live in and around Waza National Park have carved out a living from the land in a region that has highly unpredictable rains, large predators and pests. They have withstood the waves of colonists, conquerors and development agents that have swept across the landscape. It is not surprising, then, that they have found ways of resisting and adapting to the shifts in banditry in the region. This resistance has taken several forms. First, pastoralist communities have changed their patterns of movement in the area. Second, local people have mounted community-driven committees to defend themselves against banditry. Third, most of these groups have lobbied for more BIR in the region. Finally, aside from
physical and bureaucratic acts of resistance, many people have sought symbolic security—appealing to god or other spiritual practices to protect them.

Different groups of pastoralists have changed their patterns of movement in different ways. Some pastoralist groups which generally travel in groups of only two or three families and scatter themselves widely across the landscape are now traveling in larger groups. In one instance, a group of Peul herdsmen joined a group of Arab Shoa herdsmen—a rare act. A member of the Peul group who was camped within eyeshot of the Arab camp told me, “if we are together it is for the security…it is much harder to live in a group. There are more sicknesses for the cows, [but] we must keep traveling together, we are too afraid.” Some pastoralists have sedentarized while others have simply moved their routes further from the park. Noticing this change, a village woman noted that the Arab Choa and Fulbe herdsmen used to pass through their village (on the edge of the park), “but now they are afraid, they don’t come anymore. They don’t come because of the problems they had with the bandits.” Pastoralists, local government officials, and NGO extension agents confirm this information.

As early as the 1990s certain villages in the North Province formed “vigilance committees,” an established means of village protection in Cameroon which is usually organized by traditional village heads to combat banditry (Seignobos 2011b, 32). The men on these committees (also called les chasseurs—the hunters) often use charms and other occult powers to protect themselves (Seignobos 2011b, 32). These committees can have up to 60 members and were required to register with the police station or the sub-prefecture (Seignobos 2011b, 32). Fueled by the rise in banditry in the last few years, these types of vigilance committees have now formed in the Far North Province.

In 2010, fed up with banditry and coupeur de routes, villagers along the western border of the park convened and made a pact to protect themselves. They used the Koran to oblige everyone in the cooperating villages to denounce criminals in their midst and go help other villages or villagers who are in distress upon pain of death. A village man described these offensives to me saying that armed with the spears, the village defended itself and that in 2010 when another village was attacked, men from their village went to fight. When I asked why the villages had formed vigilance committees, one woman told me that “the State did not do their job. They were easy for the bandits to evade.” This method of resistance is apparently working. A man in a village further down the road told me that since this pact there have been no problems with bandits saying, we “villagers will no longer need uniformed people [like BIR, police and gendarmes], we will kill the bandits.” Other people who were not officially part of these vigilance committees use similar forms of violence to resist bandits and defend themselves. Describing a violent confrontation with bandits, one pastoralist told me, “We had to fight them. If we had not they would have kept coming to menace us. We had to show them we are strong.”

Local resource users as well as NGO representatives have also taken the problem of insecurity to local government, lobbying for different modes of protection. In one instance in 2010 a group of nomads went to Kousseri (the nearest Division Head) and lobbied to be able to carry guns. In other cases NGOs like CARPA (Centre d’Appui à la Recherche et au Pastoralism), ACEEN (Association Camerounaise pour l’Education Environnementale) and OPEN (Observatoire de Pastoralisme de l’Extreme Nord) have contacted the authorities (the governor, various international embassies, the police, gendarmes and the BIR) to rally and

95 Though the BIR are supposedly patrolling the road nearby, Moritz (2005) has found that they apply selective impunity. The wealthy and powerful were left alone or allowed to get away.
protect pastoralists in the bush around Waza national park. One of these NGOs supplied these pastoralists with cell phones in an attempt to make calling for help from these authorities more possible.⁹⁶

Using prayer and religious charms, some people (villagers and pastoralists alike) believe that they are able to defend themselves against the violence of bandits. One man, confident in the power of religion, told me that “even if they [bandits] shot bullets at us they [the bullets] would not come at us.” In some villages, chiefs have asked their populations to pray for safety and security. Most groups of pastoralists I spoke to said that they had asked God to help keep them safe. Several of the groups of pastoralists that I stayed with around the park said that they had asked Maribous (local Imams) to come and pray for their safety. A local Maribou described to me creating charms that would protect people from gunshots and stab wounds from knives and swords.

Though each of these forms of resistance is effective in its own way, it does not change the systemic problems created by the abandonment of Waza National Park’s management. Without addressing basic problems of surveillance and security, banditry in this place will continue despite the best efforts of local natural resource users.

Conclusion:

Outlaw territories and bandits themselves can arise in myriad ways under varying conditions. This chapter has shown that a lack of park management can create a space open to bandits and their criminal activities. Taking into account this newly ungoverned space as well as its ecological and political-economic context at multiple scales, I have demonstrated how this protected area became a tempting place both for violent criminals and their victims. This park acted as an easy refuge for those seeking to carry out nefarious acts like kidnapping, theft, assault and murder. Thus, the dissolution of the Waza enclosure has done more than threaten people’s livelihoods and food security, it has threatened their lives.

---

⁹⁶ A good idea in theory but a poor one in practice—finding a place to charge a cell phone is not always so easy for a nomadic pastoralist.
Conclusion

Waza as Warning: Links with Protected Areas Around the World

We were all in a doo mood as we left the herdsmen’s camp late that afternoon. One of the men there had fed us a huge pile of rice while describing the murder of his brother. His son bore fresh and serious wounds from a different attack. In the orange light of the setting sun we had shaken hands, given our condolences and headed out, trying to make it to a neighboring town before nightfall. “He’s following us,” Adamou said as we had driven only a few hundred yards from the camp. I turned and looked behind me. This thin sliver of a man was sprinting behind our truck, eyes squinting in the red dust kicked off of the tires. Adamou stopped and backed up. I rolled down my window and craned my head out, wondering if this man suddenly needed a ride somewhere. Panting, the pastoralist stood at my side. As he thrust his hand clutching a 10,000CFA note insistently through the window, one of my research assistants translated. She said, “He wants you to take this money. He wants to pay you to take his story and tell it to people who can do something.” Shaking my head and refusing his money, tears began rolling down my face. I have never in my life felt so helpless.

This dissertation has been an attempt to give this man and the hundreds of people like him a voice outside of Cameroon. Tracing the Waza protected area’s history from the pre-colonial period to present day, I have described how and in what ways this region has become an ungoverned space, exposing people like this pastoralist to fear, danger, and unimaginable sorrow. While I do not try to undermine the violence and social disarticulation that accompanied the initial creation of the Waza protected area, I have shown here that the loss of the management within this park has been equally, if not more violent.

Drawing out the articulations between subjectivity, governance, territory and access I have shown how local and regional leaders, state officials, and NGO officials have territorialized the Waza region for different purposes, each producing different kinds of socio-natural relations, forms of governance, and insider/outsider subjectivities. Pre-colonial Muslim rulers territorialized the region in order to create frontiers beyond which they were able to produce pagan or infidel subjects and enslave them. Through these territorializations these rulers were able to accumulate enormous wealth through slave trading. During this time territories were constantly shifting, and marked by human settlement. People within and beyond these territories...
were also constantly moving, either in pursuit of slaves beyond the frontier, or in pursuit of freedom within secure the territories of Islam (Roitman 2005). The productions of territories and enslaveable subjects were reproduced in the German colonial period as colonial administrators ruled through Muslim leaders. With the continuation of these territorial dynamics, high population mobility persisted in the German colonial period.

The Waza region was a space outside of colonial governance when the French colonial administration entered the region after World War One. Producing new territories, the French colonial administration created distinct divisions and subdivisions of land to be ruled by colonial administrators in conjunction with local leaders. Criminalizing slavery and mobility, the French produced new subjects as bandits and/or vagabonds to be repressed and controlled. The French creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve in the 1930s was one means by which they attempted to govern this seemingly ungovernable space. This new form of territory in the region also produced new criminal subjectivities. Former residents of the Waza protected area were legally condemned as criminals on their own land with the French creation of the Zinah-Waza Reserve. Despite the hardships this new legal status presented, local people found ways to produce insider subjectivities through personal relationships with park guards and identity-based negotiations. By producing themselves as insiders, local people were able to access natural resources within the protected area. During the most brutal periods of Waza’s park management history, local people held relative advantages over people who lacked insider status (outsiders) by gaining relatively exclusive access to this area through these negotiations. Because of their relative advantage to park outsiders and their exclusive use of the park, local people felt as though they had good food security during this period. At the same time, guarding of park territory kept park insiders safe from much of the crime that occurred in the Far North Province, particularly in the 1990s.

Due to institutional failures at regional, national and international levels Waza was territorialized by international NGOs. Here again, new and different subjectivities were produced. Through a poorly implemented co-management project, the insider status that many local people had benefited from became meaningless as people more distant from the park began using it without consequence during this time. As NGO management of Waza National Park dissipated in the early-mid 2000s, Waza’s long enforced territory began to crumble. Guarding became patchy and infrequent, and the roads and signs marking the park’s limits rotted away. Waza’s devolution to an ungoverned space has had serious consequences for local food security as well as for the physical security of its neighbors.

In this dissertation I push critical conservation scholars to look beyond the initial creation of national parks, particularly now that many national parks are old enough to be forgotten or abandoned. In this neoliberal era of conservation in which donor-driven NGOs are increasingly responsible for the placement and management of protected areas, I argue that it is extremely important to think about the long-term fate of the national parks that are created today. In the Waza case we have seen how the changing whims of the conservation community caused institutional abandonment of this protected area with serious and frightening consequences. This case study also pushes against the rising number of well-meaning activists who argue that local people should be given back the land that was taken from them through the creation of conservation areas, or that “co-management” of these spaces should occur. While this is a lovely thought, we must be incredibly careful about the ways in which this might happen. The co-management project in Waza National Park in the late 1990s and early 2000s did little more than blur the area’s territorial lines and make its management more difficult. It
was this attempt at sharing territorial authority, however well meaning, that many local people and scientists working in Waza National Park mark as the moment when the park began to decline rapidly. Further, once co-management ended and park governance dissolved completely, local people did not step in and take back their ancestors’ territories. After years of repression and lack of authority in the Waza protected area, local people were unwilling and/or unable to step up and manage this park. Though the Waza case may be exceptional in some ways, it is not an anomaly (see below). Thus, the patterns and problems I’ve highlighted here should be taken seriously by critical conservation scholars who are seeking to assist local people fight against the injustices of fortress conservation areas.

Above all, Waza is a warning. For those who are interested in protecting wildlife, biodiversity or ecosystem services, taking the long view of conservation matters as these natural resources and process can be stripped away quickly if park management is lost. For those who are interested in human rights and well being, taking a long view of conservation matters as well. People’s lives and livelihoods can be threatened by the dissolution of governance within long-held protected areas. We must recognize that Waza is not a unique case, but is representative of what is already happening in some places and what is to come in others.

**New Metrics for National Park Effectiveness**

We sat on a wide mat looking out over a mass of old car parts in front of the park. The Adjunct Chief of Waza lay on his side looking exhausted and bored. He described in a monotone how the park had taken land away from villagers with no compensation and with it food and ways of life. He told of how the co-management project they had been a part of had failed—its hotel producing no money for the community, its vehicle sold without their permission (or profit). His voice and gestures gaining vehemence, the chief described how the population had to band together to create a “community of vigilance” against bandits who had stormed the area. He noted that there was nothing for tourists to see—all the animals had gone. When he spoke of himself and his subjects, he used the word “victim.” In his estimation, the park had died and he and his population had suffered greatly.
In this adjunct chief’s and others’ views, Waza National Park is ineffective at biodiversity conservation, at preserving basic human rights and at distributing the wealth made available by tourism and research. Oddly enough, those whose job it is to assess the effectiveness of national parks disagree. For example a researcher interested in the effectiveness of parks in Cameroon noted that,

The effectiveness of management in …Waza measured with the WWF toolkit grew very significantly between 2003 and 2007. The study documenting this improvement noted progress in integrating protected areas into the overall management of adjoining public and private landscapes (Topa 2009, 80).

Thus, just as park management was declining having been essentially abandoned by both state and NGO actors, as insecurity was on the rise, and as wildlife populations were noted by all parties as dwindling, this study is claiming that Waza National Park’s effectiveness had grown significantly. This World Wildlife Fund (WWF) study used a metric with 30 indicators that “provide a comprehensive assessment of management effectiveness” which are consistent with the recommendations made by the World Commission on Protected areas and the Global Environment Facility’s monitoring and evaluation policies (Topa 2009, 110).

The wide divergence between my study and the WWF’s are an important subject of inquiry because while WWF reports are widely published and cited in places like Topa’s World Bank-financed book, information about the violence, suffering and biodiversity loss that is happening on the ground in Waza may not find the same outlets. Because similar protected area management effectiveness measurements have been used in more than 140 countries this discrepancy is no small issue (Leverington et al. 2010). If our results can be so staggeringly different, someone has got the measurements wrong.

Measuring the effectiveness of protected areas is vital. Without accurate and consistent information, it is impossible for managers and conservationists to make rational funding decisions and relevant policy amendments. That said, it is important to be sure that we are actually assessing what is happening on the ground in these protected areas. This means more than a questionnaire sent to park managers to assess the states of their parks (e.g. Bruner et al. 2001), and it also means more than reading over the park’s management plan to see if it includes community participation. Though it is more expensive and time consuming, making the effort to interview local people about the park being assessed, speaking with long-term researchers there, interviewing guards and analyzing funding and policy documents is key to getting a complete picture of how effective a park actually is, and in what ways. Widely-used protected area effectiveness tools like the WWF’s Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management (RAPPAM) Methodology explicitly state that such triangulation should happen (Ervin 2003b), but in practice this does not always seem to be the case. If it were, how could Topa reach such an opinion about Waza National Park? By taking short-cuts we are not only
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97 The WWF indicator (RAPPAM—Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management) includes looking at human settlements within park limits; commercial or other uses of park resources; agriculture, mining, transportation corridors, pollution, invasive plant species, and human intrusions within park limits; economic benefits; planning and use; staff numbers; education and awareness; local input to management issues; park legal status; and protected area boundary demarcation (see Ervin 2003a, b).
doing ourselves and others a disservice—disseminating inaccurate data—but also doing a serious disservice to those living in and around the protected areas being assessed.

Beyond examining the actual methods of protected area effectiveness assessments, we must also ask effective for *whom* and *what* exactly? The WWF model is not the only means by which conservationists have tried to measure protected area effectiveness. Many thousands of protected area management effectiveness assessments have been carried out all over the world using different metrics for “effectiveness”—some measuring size and diversity of animal/plant populations (e.g. Bruner et al. 2001; Chape et al. 2005); some looking at the ability of protected areas to protect rare species (e.g. Vellak et al. 2009); others at forest conditions (e.g. Andam et al. 2008); and still others at genetic diversity (e.g. Mech and Hallett 2002).

Though an integral part of any protected area effectiveness plan must be protected area management’s ability to maintain those natural resources it was designed to secure, many have argued that we must look beyond this simple bio-physical set of metrics. Some assessments of park effectiveness have taken vital steps toward an understanding of the effects of protected areas on local human populations. Some examine how biodiversity conservation can benefit the poor (Kaimowitz and Sheil 2007; Dudley et al. 2008; Ferraro et al. 2010), while others examine the risks of poverty and dispossession posed by protected area creation (Cernea and SchmidtSoltau 2006; Ghimire 2008). Economic indicators alone have been found to be inadequate measures of human well-being, however (Holmes and Brockington 2010; Sen 2001). Thus, some scholars have begun looking beyond these economic indicators to focus on Bebbington’s (1999) concept of ‘cultural capital’ which captures the subjective and objective dimensions of well-being (Gupta 2012).

Though I believe that cultural capital is an important concept to be included in the assessment of protected areas, the metrics for park effectiveness that currently exist are still lacking important elements. I argue that we must add metrics of physical security to the list of social and ecological characteristics incorporated into effectiveness studies. We must not just analyze threats to people’s livelihoods and cultures, but to their lives. Though livelihood security has already been studied in relation to national parks, security from kidnapping, murder, rape, theft and violence has not been looked at a consistent way at all. In Waza I found that the conditions that arose that made large-scale, unregulated natural resource use possible were same conditions that made crime of other kinds possible as well. Because Waza is a frighteningly unexceptional case in terms of the crime that is present there (see below), I believe that we must understand these issues of security if we are to preserve natural environments; the recreation within these environments; as well as preserve the livelihoods dependent on them.

**Waza as an Unexceptional Case**

*Catching up on the phone after eight months of field work in Cameroon’s national parks, I heard my friend Morgan’s voice quaver and dip as it often did when he had something sad to say. “Do you remember Tim?” he asked me. “Yeah, why?” I asked, remembering the gregarious prankster that we had occasionally skateboarded with in high-school--Tim who had become a DJ in southern Virginia after graduation. “He was murdered—shot and killed while watching the sunset on the Blue Ridge Parkway” Morgan told me. My mouth went dry. Here I had been studying murder, theft and kidnapping in Cameroonian parks and all the while I had never considered that such things could happen in the U.S. until this somber moment.*
It is very easy to think of Waza as a unique case—a remote and desolate place surrounded by countries at war, situated in an unyielding, unpredictable climate, and subject to the whims of the global market, international/national politics and mercurial NGO donors. What is frightening, however, is that though Waza is unique in many ways, the shifts in property, territory, politics and economics that have altered it in such a devastating way can—and are—happening elsewhere.

In Central and West Africa national parks that were created in colonial and post-colonial periods are now becoming magnets for criminal activity (Dunn 2009, 440; Bouche et al. 2012, 7001). As with the Waza case, it seems as though the rise of large-scale poaching and other illegal activities in these parks are not simply due to a lack of state authority in these areas. These activities are also driven by these nations’ larger geopolitical setting which have made them vulnerable to outsiders (e.g. non-citizens) entering their parks and using them for multiple purposes (Bouche et al. 2012; 7006).

Further, the lack of guarding in Central and West African parks is not solely dependent on governmental support, but also on non-governmental organizations. For example, Bouche et al. (2012, 7010) show that though the European Union will fund conservation projects in some of the Central African Republic’s national parks, “additional donors are required to secure wildlife conservation in this huge area. If not, the 25 years of funding by the European Union will collapse with the wildlife that it was supposed to secure.” As we have learned from the Waza case, it may not just be animals who are in jeopardy of losing their security. People’s lives and livelihoods may be at stake as well. Aside from crime and violence in CAR national parks, abductions in Rwanda’s protected areas, as well as guerrilla forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda and Congo’s national parks have been reported on in recent years as well (e.g. Gettleman, 2012; Webster 2012).

The effects of large spaces being emptied of their human residents and then left under- or un-guarded by national governments and NGOs are not unique to the African continent either. Protected Area Networks (PANs) all over the world may become what Greenough (2003, 169) describes as “archipelagos of temptation—giant tracts of emptied terrain that pull in outsiders who have secret projects requiring isolation.” Pointing out some of these areas, Greenough (2003, 169, 173) describes an “enormous, empty biosphere reserve” in Mexico that has provided “a perfect setting for criminals to do their dark business” and Indian forests that have created ideal hideouts for “criminal gangs, illicit loggers, smugglers, poachers, drug runners, and armed subversives.” Discussing cases of drug trafficking and kidnapping in these areas, Greenough (2003) argues that the lack of a managing presence, government or otherwise, in these emptied territories leads to these spaces becoming ungoverned and ungovernable. Linking resource and non-resource related crimes, he notes that this lack of management and/or state presence leads to ecological problems like poaching and arson as well as social problems like kidnapping, murder, theft, insurgency and terrorism.

The United States is not immune to such issues in its parks either. Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER), park rangers themselves and academics assert that crime is on the rise and/or that protected area employees are subject to increased danger while at work (ENS 2004; Tynon and Chavez 2006 and Chavez 2005). This rise of insecurity in national parks is happening in spite of the National Park Service (NPS) taking actions to address serious law enforcement problems in the 1970s and 1980s (Berkowitz 2011). Loosened gun restrictions in national parks, budget cuts for the NPS and Department of Interior (DOI), more stringent protection of the main border-crossings to the U.S. after September 11, 2001 and closures of
national forest land to timber production (due to the spotted owl) seem to be contributing to these issues of insecurity (pers. communication with NPS official 2012). Outlaw territories are forming here at home.

Due to budget cuts, many protected areas have lost rangers. For example, Lake Mead now only has seventeen rangers to protect almost 1.5 million acres. In Amistad National Recreation Area only seven rangers are expected to protect eighty-five miles of international border, and only two are on duty at any given time (20/20 2012). Devil’s Postpile National Monument (798 acres of land) no longer has rangers on site (ENS 2004). In 2005 the Government Accountability Office (GAO) stated that Department of Interior law enforcement was spread very thin, averaging “one law enforcement officer for about every 110,000 visitors and 118,000 acres of land” (qtd. Knickerbocker 2005). On average national forest law enforcement officers patrol around 378,000 acres alone (Tynon et al. 2001, cited in Tynon and Chavez 2006).

Just as we have seen in other parts of the world, the result of these open and under-guarded spaces is crime. U.S. Park rangers and naturalists have been victims of murder, drive-by shootings and assault. Organ Pipe National Monument in southern Arizona is a noted site for drug trafficking, human smuggling, and murder (ENS 2004). One ranger there was shot and killed in the line of duty in 2002 (Slagle 2012; Goodwin 2012). Lake Mead rangers have been assaulted, and must deal with rapes, murders, dumped bodies and assaults (20/20 2012). The Blue Ridge Parkway and Shenandoah National Park are sites of similar violence, as well as drug production (Repanshek 2008; Bytnar 2009). The number of methamphetamine laboratories established in Washington State’s national parks, national and state forests are increasing (National Drug Intelligence Center 2003). Property crimes (e.g. car theft or pillaging) and environmental crimes (large scale dumping of household waste or chemicals) also occur in many national parks. In 2008 alone, 136,186 criminal offenses were reported in the United States’ National Parks (Newsweek 2009).

This insecurity threatens the sustainability of protected areas not only as spaces which are vital to conserving natural spaces and ecosystem services, but also as places of recreation and learning. For example, the production of marijuana on national park lands may lead to large-scale clearing of native vegetation, terracing, diversion of natural water sources, and chemical contamination due to fertilizers, pesticides, and rodenticides (The White House 2012). Similarly, a methamphetamine production site on the Tahoma State Forest and Mount Rainier National Park border was found to have spread laboratory equipment, chemicals, and toxic waste over two acres of land in 2001 (National Drug Intelligence Center 2003). At the same time as they degrade the natural environment that parks are intended to protect, illicit activities like marijuana and methamphetamine production open up the spaces they use for production to violence. These activities draw in people associated with national and transnational criminal organizations who can be armed and dangerous, leading to incidents of intimidation and violence which may threaten the safety and enjoyment of visitors to national parks (National Drug Intelligence Center 2003; The White House 2012).

Hope for Waza’s Future?

Looking over at his friend and fellow park guard, Joseph looked at me through bleary eyes. Even through the haze of the grain alcohol he had been drinking over the course of the day, I could see the pain and fear there. “Night and day [crime and poaching] is a problem,” he said. “The state doesn’t replace people. I’m going to retire—Mibini is going to retire, and then who
will be left?” Sober, but similarly pained, Mibini shrugged and looked out over the park’s landscape. Twilight was coming on and we sat there silently, listening to the wind blow through the high grass of this still stunningly beautiful park all wondering the same question, all wondering what this place would become.

What Waza will become is up for debate. While some are convinced it will be destroyed by the oil production that has recently begun close to the park’s northern border, others are not concerned. An official at the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife told me, “Mining will not compromise conservation. It will not compromise forestry and wildlife reforms.” Some people speak about the park as if it were under no threat at all, oil or otherwise. For example, one official in the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife told me, “Waza is no worse off than any other park. We need to make sure it does not deteriorate,” while another official at UNESCO told me, “I think that Waza is OK. I think it is doing OK.” In stark contrast, many residents living adjacent to Waza National Park are seriously worried about its fate. Several people told me that “the park is dead.” At the same time, there are still a good number of people who believe it is not too late for Waza. A researcher who had worked in Waza for many years responded when I asked if Waza was past repair said, “I can say not everything is lost…the park has begun dying. [But] it is a fantastic thing that can still be saved.”

The means by which Waza might be saved are also a source of debate. A local hunting guide told me, “It is not too late for Waza. We need to have really strong management. We need a park manager. We need to stop fishing and herding…we need good roads in the park, and high penalties. Waza could regenerate.” A number of people proposed privatizing the park. For example, one official in the Ministry of Tourism told me, “To save the park we must privatize the park. That is the only way. The government cannot save the park.” Villagers frequently asked for more guards and more anti-gang units in the bush. Pastoralists asked for the same, but also wanted to better protection of their routes and grazing land outside of the park’s limits to better provide for their animals. Villagers, pastoralists and guards alike have called for a renewal of water sources inside of and adjacent to the park.

There have been some moves towards improving Waza. Waza’s lack of security, the constant and escalating harvest of natural resources within it and the frequent calls by researchers for more support and better protection were slated to be addressed as a new International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) project was supposed to begin in January 2011. To avoid attracting more people toward park borders, this project was supposed to bring money for community initiatives, and to develop villages in the whole of the Waza region, not just those next to the park. An agreement with the Ministry of Forests and Wildlife and the World Bank has also been mounted to rehabilitate Waza. Similarly, World Wildlife Fund was supposedly starting a project to develop carbon sequestration strategies in Waza in late 2011.

Finally, an unofficial memorandum of understanding was signed between Cameroon’s Minister of Defense and the Minister of Forests and Wildlife to allow the government’s Anti-gang units (BIR) to collaborate with park guards to drive bandits out of Waza National Park. BIR began some patrols of Waza just as I was leaving the area in June 2011. Such collaboration is already visible in Bouba N’Djida National Park in Cameroon’s North Province where the Cameroonian military has moved in to protect the park from large-scale poaching operations.

98 When I left the Far North Province in June 2011, no IUCN work had commenced, but an IUCN office had been opened up in Maroua, the capital of the Far North to manage the project.
99 To date, this plan is still not on their website.
originating in Sudan. The military has mobilized 600 soldiers and a Rapid Intervention Battalion (Batalion d’Intervention Rapid--BIR) helicopter (WWF 2012). As of yet, such a large-scale intervention does not seem to have reached Waza.

Though the BIR certainly have a questionable human rights record, they have an excellent reputation for reducing crime. It is unclear, however, if these brutal crime-stopping units are apprehending the right people. For example, some pastoralists have been executed for carrying guns in the bush while others have been arrested under suspicion of banditry (Moritz and Sholte 2011). It is easy to see how a militarized response to crime and large-scale poaching in protected areas can lead to violence of the kind Duffy (2001) describes in Killing for Conservation where natural resource gatherers in protected areas are hunted down and killed without due process. Environmental problems are also a concern—some people involved in park management fear that because BIR, unlike park guards, have no interest/incentive in protecting the natural environment and have guns they may end up poaching in the park for their own provisions.

How much these improvements will make a difference remains to be seen, not simply because they may be offering too little support too late in the game (or the wrong kinds of support), but also because the Far North has just endured far more dire and wide-reaching problems than a failing park. In September 2012, massive flooding that stretched from Senegal to Chad hit northern Cameroon hard. While news sources report more than forty people being killed by the floods in this area, people on the ground say the death toll is far higher, some estimates reaching to the hundreds for flood victims, the thousands for victims of disease related to flooding. The worst flood in more than sixty years, Cameroonian officials have said that these floods have displaced more than 60,000 people in the North and Far North Regions (Ngalame 2012; Tanku 2012). Thousands have been hospitalized with malaria, cholera, and respiratory infections caused by the flooding. As crops and livestock were washed away with the floodwaters, fears of hunger are rising. Villages in the Waza region, many lying in the floodplain of the Logone and Chari Rivers were seriously impacted by these floods. What will become of Waza in the aftermath of this calamity is unsure—did it wash away the bandits? Did it wipe clean the floodplain of its villages and pastoralist camps? Following this horrifying moment of destruction, can we rebuild this place better, stronger and safer than it was before?

Figure 18: Pastoralist camp adjacent to Waza National Park.
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Appendix 1: Research Approach and Methods

Between 2004 and 2006 I lived in the Far North Province of Cameroon in a small town called Mozogo as a Peace Corps Volunteer. In Mozogo, the community tasked me with helping them to open Mozogo-Gokoro National Park for tourism. Since its inception as a national park in 1968, the park had been designated for research only. Only two researchers in village history had ever visited. In Mozogo local people had not only been displaced from their former village sites for the sake of this park (formerly a colonial forest reserve), but also had to deal every day with crop and livestock predation from its wildlife. Understandably, these villagers wanted some form of revenue from this area. I worked with Mozogo-Gokoro’s park manager and representatives from all of the villages next to the park to find a means by which this could be possible. After the status of the park was changed from “research only” to “ecotourism” I helped village representatives form their own NGO which lobbied the government (successfully) for funds to build trails and train guides. It was during this period that I first visited Waza—as a tourist—and met Mr. Albert Kembou, the park manager at the time.

When I first returned to Cameroon in 2008/9, exploring Cameroon’s parks in search of a research site, I visited Waza briefly, speaking with Mr. Kembou again and walking away with the impression that if anything, he was being too harsh a park manager. He had just burned a village called Ndoudoudiem (inside the park) to the ground, calling it a “pocket full of poachers” and told me he was planning a military-style intervention to get rid of the remaining village in the park—Baram. During this time a friend and I had the unfortunate experience of running into five lions on our motorcycle at the park’s edge one night, giving me the distinct impression that wildlife in the park was doing fine (too well, perhaps). Given these brief and anecdotal experiences, I planned a research program around documenting the militarization and intensification of guarding in Waza National Park. Thus, I was surprised to return in 2010 to hear that the park was almost entirely unguarded, its natural resources and local residents threatened by people from within Cameroon and neighboring nations. My hypothesis was turned on its head.

Seeking to understand why local people called for increased park management despite a brutal conservation history, I conducted twelve months of research in northern Cameroon. This research included two two-month-long research trips to Cameroon in 2008 and 2009 and an eight-month long stint of fieldwork beginning in October of 2010 and extending to June of 2011. I also conducted research in the Far North Province’s archives, the North Province’s archives, the Cameroonian National Archives in Yaoundé, as well as research in the French Archives nationales d’outre mer in Aix en Provence.

Interviews:

After I had gained the informed consent of each of the villager and pastoralist interviewee, I tried to make it very clear that I was not with the government, not with the park staff, and not with conservation NGOs. I was explicit about these facts in an attempt to keep people from telling me what they thought I would want to hear (a common syndrome—a manner of being polite), or withhold information because they were worried about its legal repercussions. My role as an independent researcher was explained several times for most interviewees by the research/translating assistants I worked with (or by myself) and most of the folks we spoke with seemed to understand this point clearly before the interviews began.
Villages: During my fieldwork I visited twenty-nine of the villages that surrounded (and/or were inside of) Waza National Park. Because there are so many different languages spoken in this region, I would go into the field with a female translator and a male translator whom I had trained in research ethics and interview protocols. Because many of the cultures in this area have very strict taboos about women speaking to unknown men, and because women feel more comfortable and relaxed speaking only with women (if a man is present women will often turn their backs and kneel while speaking in order to show respect), having a female research assistant was invaluable. Women often liked to be interviewed in groups as did some men so we did our best to accommodate them and make sure everyone who wanted to be heard was able to speak. Further, because men often show other men more respect, having a male interpreter lent my interview questions more gravity than perhaps they would have had if I had been asking them alone.

In each village we attempted to speak with a sample of at least 10% of the village’s estimated households. These estimates were gained by speaking with the village head at the beginning of each visit. We also attempted to speak with people of all of the ethnic groups (if more than one were represented) in a village. We tried to get an even number of men and women to speak with us. In order to speak with people who were working all day, we would normally spend 1-4 nights in a village (depending on its size), interviewing village elders or doing participant observation during the day and talking with the younger, more mobile population in the evenings. Because homes in this area tend to be extremely small, we brought tents and generally slept in the compound of the village head or another willing resident.

Though I had planned to do a longer period of participant observation in one village with my female translator, we were forced to leave after three days because we were attacked in our tents during the night.

Nomadic/Transhumance Camps: I also interviewed members of thirteen different transhumance or nomadic pastoralists groups. Because these groups are often very wary of strangers or outsiders, my translator team and I were introduced by members of CARPA (Centre d'Appui à la Recherche et au Pastoralisme) a research and advocacy group focused on pastoralists in Cameroon’s northern provinces which is based in Maroua, the Far North’s Provincial Capital. Working with this group was invaluable not only for making introductions which would have

---

100 I do not pretend that this was at all close to a random stratified sample, but I did my best given the circumstances. We tried to pick homes and people as randomly as possible. We did select for older residents (above 20yrs) because they would be able to remember changes in the park’s environment and governance.

101 To maintain the safety of these folks I have not added their names here. They do, however, have my undying admiration and gratitude. They saved me from putting my foot in my mouth a thousand times over, and saved me once I had already put my foot in my mouth a thousand times more. They are friends and confidants. Over the course of this research they acted not only as translators and cultural interpreters, but also as first responders, car mechanics, and heroes as we pushed our various research vehicles out of deep mud, rivers, elephant footprints; transported the sick to hospitals; and at one point worked tirelessly to pump up the tires of a Land Rover with a plastic bicycle pump (until it melted). This research would have been utterly and completely impossible without them.

102 Nomadic pastoralists have no permanent homes. They move around the region seeking out good pasture for their cattle. On average they shift location around twenty times a year (Moritz and Sholte 2011). Men, women and children generally travel together, carrying their homes and necessary items along with them. Transhumance pastoralists usually have a home-base which they leave when pasture around these villages becomes too sparse. Often these transhumance pastoralists are only men who have left their families back in the village while they live “in the bush” with their livestock.
been impossible otherwise, but in other ways as well. For example, because the dialects of some of these pastoralist groups were quite different from their city or other regional forms, CARPA employees would assist with the translation in these camps. As in the villages we visited, we usually spent several nights in these camps in order to speak with herders who were out during the day, as well as those who had night shifts. Speaking with women in these camps was not always possible as the heads of the camps did not wish us to do so. We respected their wishes in these cases and only interviewed men. In other cases (particularly with transhumance herders) there were no women present in the camps.

Park Guards and Park Managers: To gain a park-guard perspective, I spent a week camping and traveling across Waza National Park with one of the park guards who had worked in the park the longest and a village “guide” who had worked with these guards for many years. We drove 103 transects across the park as I recorded what portions of the heavily burned landscape park management had burned and what other people had burned as well. At the same time, I recorded these guard’s stories about different encounters with people inside of the National Park. I also attended two guard-manager meetings to understand the state of the guards’ equipment, training and ability to patrol. I independently interviewed the current park manager on several occasions. I also interviewed two retired park guards and three of the seven former park managers, one was unavailable to speak with me. Abbakoura, the park manager before Badjoda was killed in action. Rene and Flizot, the park’s first two managers were long dead—as such they were unavailable for comment.

Regional Natural Resource Managers: I interviewed past and present Regional Delegates of Forests and Wildlife; Environment; Livestock and Fisheries; Agriculture; the Head of the Service Domain (Cadastral Survey) for the Far North Province; the Director of the CEDC (Centre d'Etude de l'Environnement et du Développement au Cameroun); Professors at the Garoua Wildlife School; and the Regional Delegate of Tourism.

Regional Leaders—Traditional and Non-traditional: I also interviewed the two primary district chiefs--His Majesty the Lamido of Logone Birni and His Majesty the Lamido of Pete, as well as many sub-district and neighborhood-chiefs. Aside from these traditional leaders, I also spoke with the former Prefect of Benoue and the Departmental Chief of Maroua, the former Mayor of Logone Birni, the Former Mayor of the North Province (when it included the Far North Province), the Sub-Prefect of Waza and Zina, and the Head of the Police Brigade in Waza. I spoke with these individuals’ staff members as well.

National Leaders: I interviewed the following leaders and members of their staff—The Minister of Forests and Wildlife, The Secretary General of Ministry of Forests and Wildlife/the former Director of the Garoua Wildlife School, the Secretary General of Defense, The Minister of Tourism, and Representatives of the Minister of Environmental Protection.

Conservation Organizations/Actors: I tried to speak with representatives of every non-governmental or non-Cameroonian organization that had worked in Waza over the last 20 years (that I could find). This included people from SNV, the Institute of the Sahel, the Lake Chad Basin Project, ACEEN (Association Camerounaise pour l’Education Environnementale),

103 In a truck I provided.
CARPA, OPEN (L’Observatoire du Pastoralisme dans la Province de l’Extrême-Nord), World Wildlife Fund (Garoua and Yaoundé), International Union for the Conservation of Nature (in Maroua and Yaoundé), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Bank Representatives, TRAFFIC (the Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network) and the former U.S. Ambassador to Cameroon. I also spoke with the director and other members of the CEDC (Centre d'Etude de l'Environnement et du Développement au Cameroun), attended a conference on Waza National Park there and interviewed its researchers and affiliates.

Others: I interviewed two hunting guides and five tourist guides based in Maroua who visited Waza regularly. I also interviewed journalists interested in the topic of Waza, oil representatives, and researchers interested in banditry/violence in Cameroon.