

POLLEN18 – Political Ecology, the Green Economy, and Alternative Sustainabilities  
20- 22, June 2018, Oslo and Akershus University College (HiOA), Oslo, Norway

**Securing Green, Greening security:  
Examining the Intersection of Green Economies and Green Securities**

**Conveners:** Francis Massé,<sup>1</sup> Brock Bersaglio,<sup>2</sup> and Rosaleen Duffy<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geography, York University

<sup>2</sup>Department of Geography, University of Sheffield

<sup>3</sup>Department of Politics, University of Sheffield

Analyses of green militarisation, related practices of securitisation, and the green economies they are embedded in have become an important focus in political-ecological work on biodiversity conservation (Büscher & Ramutsindela, 2015; Duffy, 2014; 2016; Lunstrum, 2014). Although some of this work is explicit about combining analyses of green economy practices and securitisation practices (Cavanagh et al., 2015; Dunlap & Fairhead, 2014; Massé & Lunstrum, 2016), the interplay between green economies and green securities in different places, spaces, and times warrants ongoing investigation. Accordingly, this panel brings together papers that examine the intersection of green economies and green securities (broadly understood).

Specifically, this panel draws inspiration from existing work that examines the related practices and processes associated with ‘securing green’ and ‘greening security’. For example, Massé and Lunstrum (2016) understand efforts to secure green as entailing both the acquisition of land and biodiversity *and* the practice of securing such acquisitions using (para-)military practices and technologies – a phenomenon they call “accumulation by securitisation”. Relatedly, some political ecologists examine how efforts to secure green end up (re-)producing certain forms of violence in different places, spaces, and times (Bersaglio, forthcoming; Büscher & Ramutsindela, 2015; Devine, 2014; Ojeda, 2012). Concerning efforts of green security, this panel is motivated by recent work that engages with the spectacle of green militarisation (Igoe, 2017; Marijnen & Verweijen, 2016; McClanahan & Wall, 2016). Insights into green security are also derived from work that considers the markets and patterns of accumulation that are emerging with growing demand for new partnerships and technologies for securing conservation areas or green investments (Adams, 2017; Labban, 2011; Lunstrum, forthcoming; Parenti, 2011).

With this in mind, this panel considers the different places, spaces, and times in which green economies and green securities intersect. It includes papers that make empirical, methodological, or theoretical contributions to the work outlined above – or to other relevant literatures. Paper topics include themes such as: intersectionality (e.g. class/ethnicity/gender/race/sexuality/etc.) at the intersection of green economy and green security practices; the spatial and temporal workings of green violence; the interplay between green economies, green securities, and ethnic, nation, or state identities; the geopolitics of green security practices; as well as the various ways that nature becomes enrolled in green militarisation, security, or violence more broadly. In short, this panel seeks to build on existing and developing debates to examine the myriad ways that efforts to develop green economies and the intensification of conservation’s securitisation and militarisation articulate and give rise to new political economies, market dynamics, accumulation

possibilities, changing conservation/security spatialities, and familiar and novel forms of violence and dispossession.

The following questions offer some additional guidance into the topics, themes, and questions to be addressed by the panel:

- How, and to what extent, are green economies and green securities ‘co-constituted’? What is the interplay between green economies, securities, and violence in particular places, spaces, and times?
- What new markets, values, and patterns of accumulation are emerging with securitisation practices in/around conservation areas or green investments? What are the implications for wider political ecologies and economies?
- How does extinction, the illegal wildlife trade, and poaching factor into the geopolitics of green economies and green securities? What interventions do illicit green economies evoke from different types of security actors and should such interventions be considered just, measured, or warranted?
- How should political ecologists make sense of the different actors and stakes represented by the private, public, and hybrid actors involved in militarised conservation and green violence? What concepts or methods might add to existing debates or understanding of how green economies are – or should be – governed?
- How do the impacts of green militarisation, security, and violence differ along the lines of biology, gender, race, etc.? How do such distinctions ultimately shape peoples’ experiences with green economies and green securities? Moreover, how might such distinctions influence the way green militarisation, security, or violence is performed?

## **Panel Abstracts:**

### **Session I**

#### **Towards a Political Ecology of Security: Militarization, Professionalization or Knowledge Exchange in British Army Training for Anti Poaching?**

Rosaleen Duffy  
Politics/BIOSEC Project, University of Sheffield

This paper seeks to develop the idea of a political ecology of security. The environment has become framed as a security issue, in part because wildlife, forests, marine resources, and so on, have all become valuable sources of accumulation as market logics are extended into more and more areas of the non-human world. However political ecologists have not engaged sufficiently with debates about security, despite the centrality of the dynamics of conflict and violence in the field. This paper will be anchored in political ecology debates to develop this idea, rather than on more mainstream accounts of securitization theory or environmental security. This conceptual development will be grounded in a current example: the growing use of external military trainers in anti poaching, and particularly the deployment UK troops to assist with anti poaching training in Gabon and Malawi. In July 2017 a team were deployed to Gabon in a joint initiative with the US Marines around Lope National Park; the purpose was to provide training in basic tactics such

as ambush and arrest, and in intelligence gathering. In the case of Malawi, troop deployment was in conjunction with the Malawi Department of Parks and Wildlife (DNPW) and a private entity, the African Parks Foundation with financial support from the Tusk Charity the UK Government's DEFRA. It was made clear that the learning was to be a 'two way process' in which the British Army hoped to re-learn the tracking skills they had lost in deployments in the Middle East. So, while the focus of this paper is how security dynamics are changing conservation, it also addresses how conservation could become an arena in which militaries trial new techniques for warfare.

### **Birds in Trenches: The Greening of Militarization and Militarizing Habitats for Landscape Conservation**

Kristīne Krumberga,  
Geography, University of Latvia

Environmentalism since its rise in 1970s as a protest to various market and military driven technologies has now become an influential force in shaping the world we live in. In this regard, the recent development of integrated military-environmental land management approach intended to improve existing environmental policies and protect global biodiversity shows that relations between the military and environmentalism have become more intertwined. Aiming to understand this shift, the paper explores contemporary landscape conservation practices in the biggest military training area of the Baltic states - Ādaži through the implementation of LIFE+ project "Birds in Ādaži". The study uncovers various means of how symbiotic portrayals of military activity and biodiversity are created by bringing birds to the front of the scene and joint discourse of "mutual benefits" developed to justify actions carried out and to propitiate the public. At the same time, it is observed that nature protection activities not only simulate several military practices but even outweigh military claims to area in its degree of control exercised towards human presence and activity, whether military or civilian, within the territory.

### **Policing Biodiversity: Biopolitics, Biopolitical Production, and Securing Conservation Economies**

Francis Massé  
Politics/BIOSECT Project, University of Sheffield

With the killing and neutralization of 'poachers' in the escalating 'war' on poaching, the biopolitics of conservation's securitization and militarization have come to the fore. Yet, biopolitics is about much more than doing away with threatening bodies to make valued bodies live. Biopolitics and its development is intimately connected to economies and notions and practices of policing. Liberal practices of policing have historically been about securing the health and well-being of certain populations as well as capitalist economies. Indeed, policing has served and continues to serve to produce and protect valued bodies as part of processes of capitalist (re)production. That is, from ordering bodies, disciplining labour, and maintaining healthy populations, the biopolitical production and reproduction of life through practices of policing is essential to the production and reproduction of well-functioning capitalist economies. How might this line of thinking extend to the (biopolitical) production of nonhuman life and help us understand conservation economies and practices of conservation law enforcement and anti-poaching, or the policing of human-biodiversity relations? In this paper, I develop the concept of

policing biodiversity as a framework for understanding the productive and problematic connections and logics that bring together processes of conservation's capitalization and securitization. Occurring within and beyond protected areas, policing biodiversity and its relations with humans is integral to the biopolitical production of the nonhuman and related spaces, and thus to the functioning of conservation economies.

### **Re-militarization of Wildlife Conservation in Tanzania**

Teklehaymanot Weldemichel

Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology

As Tanzania moves back to a stricter National park-based old model, it is undergoing a transition into more militarized institutions of wildlife conservation. Military personnel including retired generals are replacing civilian authorities in institutions ranging from specific park management to ministries and paramilitary trainings are given to existing civilian workers. Such transition may have serious implications on the future of wildlife conservation and communities adjacent or inside conservation areas. Existing blurred boundaries between conservation areas and areas outside are being redefined and demarcated causing new conflicts and aggravating existing ones. Between August and September 2017, over 200 houses of local Maasai communities have been torched and thousands of cattle seized by national park authorities on the eastern side of the Serengeti National Park in Tanzania. Local people have been displaced to establish what authorities call 'buffer zone' between the national park and community lands. Many have been put to jail, raped and tortured (some have been shot) for resisting such move. Positioning myself within the field of political ecology, I combine an ethnographic fieldwork and analysis of policy documents pertaining to wildlife conservation in Tanzania and beyond to look into the narratives used to justify such decisions and actions.

## **Session II**

### **Unraveling the Politics of Greening Extractive Investments Through Biodiversity Conservation in sub-Saharan Africa**

Charis Enns and Adam Sneyd

Geography, University of Sheffield

Across sub-Saharan Africa, multinational extractive companies are becoming increasingly entwined in biodiversity conservation. These companies are integrating biodiversity conservation initiatives into their corporate social responsibility programs, as well as establishing longer-term synergistic partnerships with biodiversity conservation actors to address mutual challenges. For example, in Cameroon, multinational extractive companies have partnered with biodiversity conservation actors to contract 'EcoGuards' who are responsible for monitoring pipeline routes in protected areas, as well as curtailing the poaching of rare animals and the harvesting of protected plant species. Drawing on document analysis and empirical research in Cameroon and Kenya this paper details initiatives being undertaken through partnerships between extractive and conservation actors. The paper considers how emergent norms, such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, have given rise to new forms of collaboration between these two sectors and then explores how partnerships between extractive and conservation actors are

initiated, regulated, monitored and evaluated. Ultimately, this paper asks whether new relationships between the extractive and conservation sectors illustrate deepening politics of environmentalism or the strengthening of extractivist models of development, as multinational extractive companies extend their role into new realms of natural resource management.

### **The Intersections of Conservation and Extraction in Tanzania**

Devin Holterman

Geography, York University

In the past few decades conservation scholars have been busy. Of their various key insights, scholars of neoliberal conservation have focused their critiques on the many ways that conservation alliances enlist the market as a means to “sell nature to save it.” Meanwhile, scholars of conservation’s securitization argue that, much to the detriment of marginalized rural peoples, the growing influence of (para)military actors and processes in conservation is largely rationalized by (inter)national security discourses. With evidence from Tanzania this paper argues that the extractive industries, through its involvement in anti-poaching policy and practice, are now apart of the broad conservation alliances concerned with the securitization of wildlife resources. Extending the aforementioned debates I argue that an economic rationale is foundational for the expansion of efforts to “green security and secure green” during East Africa’s second poaching crisis. Indeed the notion that poaching contributes to *economic* insecurity has been under-analyzed in the scholarly literature. For example, recent efforts to (re)value the African elephant’s contribution to national economies recommends countries such as Tanzania, with aspirations to attain middle-income status, do everything in its power to protect the elephant and expand its foreign-dominated tourism sector. This paper argues that further attempts to commodify living elephants justifies the broader (para)militarization of conservation spaces and attempts to *properly* sell nature to willing foreign tourists. This (re)valuation justifies new and re-inscribes old ways for the rational actors of the green economy to accumulate wealth through processes resembling accumulation by securitization. In addition to the propensity for increased violence such an approach risks exacerbating historic inequalities associated with the tourism sector, wildlife management, and land/resource access and control. Further, it helps to green large-scale extractive projects thereby creating potential spaces for future conservation-extraction partnerships to manifest in varying ways.

### **“Explore the Carpathian Garden!” – Securing Nature as Greener in the Periphery of Europe**

George Iordachescu

Analysis and Management of Cultural Heritage, IMT School for Advanced Studies

The present paper underlines the inconsistencies between the emergence of green economy and securitization logics in the process of constructing the Carpathian Mountains as a wilderness frontier. Green economy and securitization lump together across the globe, scholars from different disciplines producing critical analyses on how these two processes unfold and conceal each other’s genealogies. Cases particularly from the Global South account for the co-productive ontology of the two, where securitization practices are highly depoliticized and green businesses are assumed to be environmentally harmless. Highly ignored by academia, the same processes develop unabated in peripheral Europe where their necessity is locally predicated on narratives

of degradation, disruption and evanescence of wilderness mostly due to illegal logging and wildlife trade. Although Romania is supposed to implement EU environmental directives in which human-made landscapes are regarded as valuable, over the last few years the country has witnessed countless initiatives celebrating untouched nature. Some of the most extreme projects advocate severe measures of protection, fencing formerly communal lands and banning forest dependent groups from using their traditional sources of income. Both the country's touristic brand and the set of policies opening the agricultural and forestland markets for the global capital have encouraged a boom in green businesses developments, particularly ecotourism. By far the most notable player, a foreign foundation, has managed in just five years to acquire twenty thousand hectares of land for full protection, won the custody for several Natura 2000 sites and secured key positions in local forest commons councils. As part of their plan to develop the 'European Yellowstone', they promote green business plans for the region and engage in eco-farming, wilderness safaris and other nature-based enterprises. All these new possibilities for accumulation emerged after intense lobbying among the country's highest politicians. The former technocratic government of Romania initiated the legal procedure for granting state's support to the foundation's initiative. Nevertheless, local communities have voiced their opposition towards measures intended to criminalize their livelihoods, transforming them into irresponsible peasants, poachers, disturbers and outlaws. Based on two years of fieldwork, media monitoring and legal analyses, my work examines how policy and global capital jointly secure nature as untouched and wild in a region regarded as Europe's green backbone whose green development has become the hegemonic narrative.

### **The Influence of Plural Governance Systems on Rural Coastal Livelihood Strategies: The Case of Kosi Bay, South Africa**

Philile Mbatha, Merle Sowman and Rachel Wynberg

Environmental and Geographical Science, University of Cape Town

Thousands of rural households along the South African coast rely on fisheries resources, forest products and agricultural resources in order to support their livelihoods. These customary livelihoods have continued in many rural areas despite restrictive policies and laws during the colonial and apartheid administrations. More contemporary restrictions have emerged in the post-1994 democratic state due to an expansion of the conservation estate and increased efforts to improve compliance in existing protected areas. This conservation drive is due largely to environmental concerns as well as the country's international and national commitments to enhance biodiversity protection. Statutory conservation governance in rural areas in South Africa often operates in parallel to traditional and customary systems of governance. This results in confusion and conflict emanating from the plurality of governance systems, actors and institutions whose powers, roles and approaches are informed by different norms, discourses, values, images and worldviews. This study seeks to enhance understanding about the conceptual linkages between livelihoods and plural governance systems, using the case study of Kosi Bay, a coastal region in northern KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The study underscores the manner in which legal pluralism and historical context affect and influence governance processes, and demonstrates that the day-to-day livelihoods of rural people are diverse and dynamic, and can be profoundly affected by meta-level and institutional governance processes and practices.

## Works Cited (Panel Description):

- Adams, W. M. (2017). Geographies of conservation II: Technology, surveillance and conservation by algorithm. *Progress in Human Geography*, 0309132517740220.
- Bersaglio, B. (Forthcoming). Green Violence: Market-driven conservation and the re-foreignization of space in Laikipia, Kenya.
- Cavanagh, C. J., Vedeld, P. O., & Trædal, L. T. (2015). Securitizing REDD+? Problematizing the emerging illegal timber trade and forest carbon interface in East Africa. *Geoforum*, 60, 72-82.
- Devine, J. (2014). Counterinsurgency ecotourism in Guatemala's Maya Biosphere Reserve. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32, 984-1001.
- Duffy, R. (2014). Waging a war to save biodiversity: the rise of militarized conservation. *International Affairs*, 90(4), 819-834.
- Duffy, R. (2016). War, by conservation. *Geoforum*, 69, 238-248.
- Dunlap, A., & Fairhead, J. (2014). The Militarisation and Marketisation of Nature: An Alternative Lens to 'Climate-Conflict'. *Geopolitics*, 19(4), 937-961.
- Igoe, J. (2017). *The Nature of Spectacle: On Images, Money, and Conserving Capitalism*: University of Arizona Press.
- Labban, M. (2011). The geopolitics of energy security and the war on terror: the case for market expansion and the militarization of global space. *Global Political Ecology*, London, Routledge.
- Lunstrum, E. (Forthcoming). Capitalism, Wealth, & Conservation in the Age of Security: The Vitalization of the State. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*.
- Marijnen, E., & Verweijen, J. (2016). Selling green militarization: The discursive (re) production of militarized conservation in the Virunga National Park, Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Geoforum*, 75, 274-285.
- McClanahan, B., & Wall, T. (2016). 'Do Some Anti-Poaching, Kill Some Bad Guys, and Do Some Good': Manhunting, Accumulation, and Pacification in African Conservation *The Geography of Environmental Crime* (pp. 121-147): Springer.
- Parenti, C. (2011). *Tropic of chaos: Climate change and the new geography of violence*: Nation books.