

Protected Areas and Indigenous Peoples in Chile

Magdalena García Pérez de Arce

A Thesis in the Department of Geography, Planning and Environment

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science (Geography, Urban and Environmental Studies) at
Concordia University

Montréal, Québec, Canada

December, 2011

© Magdalena García Pérez de Arce, 2011

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Magdalena García Pérez de Arce

Entitled: Protected Areas and Indigenous Peoples in Chile

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science (Geography, Urban and Environmental Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

_____ Chair
Dr. Damon Matthews

_____ Examiner
Dr. Thora Herrmann

_____ Examiner
Dr. Kevin Gould

_____ Supervisor
Dr. Monica Mulrennan

Approved by _____
Dr. David Greene
Chair of Department

Dr. Brian Lewis
Dean of Faculty of Arts and Science

Date _____

Abstract

Political strategies undertaken by nation-states to conserve biodiversity, particularly through the creation of protected areas (PAs), have had deleterious impacts on many local and indigenous groups worldwide. Increasing recognition of these impacts has led to calls for more democratic conservation strategies and indigenous rights recognition in PAs. Addressing this legacy requires an understanding of the complexity and diversity of past experiences as well as an appreciation of the factors that might support the establishment of more democratic arrangements within contemporary PA contexts. Focusing on the experience of Chile, where twenty-nine percent of state-designated PAs are established on indigenous territories, separate lines of inquiry are explored in each of two manuscripts that comprise the core of this thesis. The first examines the history of Chilean state engagement with PAs in relation to an analysis of the state's evolving rationalities for the creation and expansion of PAs on and into indigenous territories and the resulting impact of state-led strategies of territorialization on indigenous peoples. The second investigates recent and emerging relations between the State and indigenous peoples as outcomes of particular instances of resistance, accommodation and negotiation in PA contexts. Particular attention is given to the factors that support the meaningful participation of indigenous peoples in the governance of PAs. The research is written from my vantage point as a Chilean geographer with a professional background in PA policy and is based on literature and document analysis, as well as interviews with representatives from Chilean state government agencies, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions and indigenous organizations.

Acknowledgements

Many people have helped me, as part of the development of my MSc research, to understand the complexities of the relationship between indigenous groups and the development of PAs. My MSc studies were funded by a Becas Chile scholarship, a government funding program that allowed me to dedicate the past two years to this research.

The intellectual support of my supervisor, Dr. Monica Mulrennan, was a constant inspiration for me during this research. Without her motivation, guidance and commentary this research would not have been possible. Also interactions with my colleagues and friends, especially Genevieve, Annie, Veronique and Andra, with whom I continuously had enriching discussions and shared experiences were invaluable. Special thanks to Andra Syvanen and Annie Lalancette who selflessly read and edited earlier versions of the manuscripts and to David Beauchesne who helped me with the figures.

I'm really grateful to Dr. Jochen Jaeger who supported different stages of my research and who provided me with an amazing working space that I have used for the two years of my MSc. Many thanks also for the intellectual support of Dr. Kevin Gould who provided guidance on qualitative research in geography and who suggested different approaches for me to work on my thesis.

For all the people of the community of Wemindji, especially Rodney Mark (Chief of the community), Dennis Georgekish (Deputy Chief) and Edward Georgekish (Director, Cree Trappers and Hunters Association), who helped me to understand their conviction in pursuing their PA project as a way to maintain their culture and their way of life.

In Chile, Jose Aylwin and Ximena Cuadra from the Observatorio Ciudadano, generously shared their documentation, experiences and a draft of their manuscript on PAs and Mapuche people. Their insights and perceptions were very useful for my understanding of the situation of many Mapuche communities in southern Chile. Colleagues from governmental agencies have always welcomed questions and provided comments, responded to my document requests and offered intellectual support; particular thanks to Diego Flores, Marie Claude Plummer, Cristian Cornejo, Juan Pablo Contreras, Tomas Mielsen, Ninoska Cuadros, Miguel Díaz, and Sofia Nilo. Thanks also for the valuable comments of Tita Espindola, Jaime Molina, Juan Oltremari, and César Ormazabal. I am very grateful to all my interviewees who so generously shared their time, ideas, thoughts and perceptions, which are the basis of my research.

My mother-in-law, Judith Zuloaga, and my father, Carlos García, assisted me by collecting all the information for the archival analysis in the Chilean National Library, CONAF library and the library of the National Congress. Without their exhaustive help, this research would not have been possible.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the most important unconditional and permanent support for me; this includes both my family in Chile and my own immediate family who are with me in Montreal. They were constantly supportive, inspiring, and nurturing during the period of my MSc degree. Special thanks to my husband, Raul Chacón, who in a basis of love has been my anchor, both intellectually and emotionally, including the many times he gave me rich discussions on my project and the many, times he took care of our sons so that I could work. To my older son, Ismael Chacón, who has been a permanent “ground wire” for me; after long days of thinking and writing he was always

waiting happy to play, read, and share stories and ideas with me. Finally, to Julián, my younger son, born during the writing stage of this MSc, as part of the love experienced during our student life in Montreal.

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Glossary of abbreviations and acronyms: | x |
| Chapter 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Organization of the thesis | 3 |
| 1.2 Research Design | 5 |
| 1.3 Chile: An introduction of the study area | 7 |
| 1.4 Methods | 10 |
| 1.5 Situating myself in the research | 13 |
| 1.6 Literature Review: Indigenous peoples and shifting conservation paradigms and narratives | 16 |
| 1.6.1 Political ecology and conservation policies..... | 16 |
| 1.6.2 State making and the development of protected areas..... | 17 |
| 1.6.3 Conservation and poverty alleviation | 18 |
| 1.6.4 Contemporary protected area definition: opening the fence approach..... | 19 |
| 1.6.5 Toward local governance arrangements and indigenous peoples..... | 20 |
| Chapter 2. Tracking the history of protected areas in Chile: Shifting State rationalities and their implications for indigenous inhabitants | 23 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 23 |
| 2.2 Phases in the historical development of Chilean PAs: | 26 |
| 2.2.1 Forestry and natural resource based PAs (1907-1924) | 32 |
| 2.2.2. Nature-based PAs (1925-1979)..... | 38 |
| 2.2.3 Ecosystem-based PAs (1980- 2011) | 43 |
| 2.3. Conclusions | 46 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Chapter 3. Protected Area strategies and Indigenous Peoples: Exploring dimensions of governance in Chile | 50 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 50 |
| 3.2 Methodology..... | 52 |
| 3.3 Global discourses of PAs and indigenous peoples' rights..... | 53 |
| 3.4 PAs as arenas for encounters between the state and indigenous groups in Chile | 56 |
| 3.5 State PAs and indigenous peoples' governance issues in Chile: Opinions and perceptions from the actors involved..... | 59 |
| 3.6 Factors that have facilitated the development of more democratic PA governance arrangements | 70 |
| 3.6.1 Emergence of a new political order | 71 |
| 3.6.2 Agency and political organization of indigenous groups..... | 72 |
| 3.6.3 PAs as opportunities for local economic development | 74 |
| 3.6.4 Building of local institutions..... | 75 |
| 3.6.5 Protection of indigenous ancestral lands from commercial interests | 77 |
| 3.7 Conclusions..... | 78 |
| Chapter 4. Conclusions | 82 |
| 4.1 Main findings of the research | 84 |
| 4.2 Limitations and strengths of the research | 88 |
| 4.3 Future research..... | 89 |
| 4.4 Some thoughts about my experience with PAs and indigenous peoples in Canada: the case of the Wemindji PAs project..... | 89 |
| References: | 94 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1 Historical growth of PAs in Chile..... | 27 |
|--|----|

Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms:

CBD: Convention on Biological Diversity

CONAF: Chilean Forestry Service

CONAMA: Chilean Environmental Agency

C 169 ILO: Convention No. 169 of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the International Labour Organization

NGOs: Non governmental organizations

E-NGOs: Environmental non governmental organizations

IUCN: International Union for Conservation of Nature- The World Conservation Union

ILO: Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the International Labour Organization

PAs: Protected Areas

SERNATUR: Chilean Tourism Service

SNASPE: National System of State Protected Wildland Areas

UN: United Nations

WPC: World Park Congress

Chapter 1. Introduction

In this thesis, I examine the history of state political strategies involved in establishing state protected areas (PAs) and also the current status of indigenous groups within PA governance in Chile. My objective is to investigate the rationales that have informed state policies towards PAs and the implications for indigenous communities, in terms of their land tenure and access to resources. I also seek to explore how, in light of changing political landscapes (both national and international), indigenous groups are trying to accommodate or negotiate their rights and interests in PAs.

From a historical perspective, Chilean PA policies and rationales have changed significantly over time. PAs were established originally to prevent forest depletion, to protect and commercialize forest resources (Klubock, 2006), to protect flora and fauna, and to conserve the beauty of the remote areas of the country (Benoit, 2005; Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002). The occupation of sovereign territories was part of the approach implemented for the PA expansion process (Oltremari & Thelen, 2003). In more recent decades, ecosystem-based objectives and approaches have been the dominant rationales for the establishment of PAs in Chile. Neoliberal rationales are increasingly informing PA managers and decision makers who have justified the privatization of tourism and other services provided by PAs as a way to finance the protection of biodiversity (see for e.g. OECD & CEPAL, 2005).

Current efforts within Chile to develop a political framework for a national PA system, recognize private PAs as new forms of PA governance, but exclude consideration of the social context of the establishment and management of PAs (Alvear, 2011). During

the last decade, new challenges have emerged in the nation-state agenda. The ratification of international agreements increased commitments to conservation goals, and indigenous rights policies have brought new requirements to explore and analyze issues of indigenous peoples rights in PAs.

Various domestic and international factors have influenced the current political framework for the PA agenda in Chile and its relation with indigenous groups. The following seven milestones are identified as most influential: (1) The “Indigenous Law” of 1993, (2) the Convention on Biological Diversity ratified by Chile in 1994, (3) the National Strategy for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of 2003, (4) the National Policy of PAs of 2005, (5) the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People signed in 2007, (6) the ratification of the International Labour Organization Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples (or ILO C169) in 2008, and finally, (7) the Bill that created the Biodiversity and PA Services (admitted for discussion in the Senate since January of this year- 2011).

While the establishment and management of PAs have marginalized and resulted in the dispossession of indigenous groups in Latin America and elsewhere, very limited research on this aspect of PA history has been conducted in the region (Brockington & Igoe, 2006). Oltremari and Jackson (2006) have observed that the PA expansion process into indigenous territories resulted in indigenous communities living in constant conflict with park officials, conflicts that lately, have been reduced due to the implementation of participatory mechanisms by CONAF as the Local Advisory Committees. Under these committees, indigenous communities have increased their access to resources located in PAs and sometimes strength their role in PAs management practices. Boundary disputes

involving indigenous land titles and PA boundaries have become a major impetus for indigenous claims against PA administrations (Oltremari & Jackson, 2006).

PAs can be understood as political practices through which nation-states have defined institutions and regulations to enforce boundaries on the ground. In response, local organizations such as indigenous and local communities have at various times and various places resisted, or accommodated those practices and/or negotiated their benefits. My findings confirm that PAs have caused dispossession and marginalization of many indigenous communities, but that they are no longer a major threat for all indigenous groups. PAs have become valuable political strategies which some indigenous communities use to resist the imposition of projects of national and transnational corporations on indigenous territories (mining, hydro dams and tree plantations). They are also associated with economic development opportunities, particularly tourism initiatives, which can be used to share the benefits of the increase in visitor numbers to PAs.

It is this evolving context of PAs that motivated my interest in the shifting rationales of state PA policies and the role that indigenous communities play by accommodating or resisting PA policies and practices, and negotiating their rights and interests with PA officials, both historically and currently.

1.1 Organization of the thesis

The thesis is organized in four chapters. The first introduces the parameters of the research, the research design, an introduction to Chile: the study area, the methodology and the most relevant literature on which the study is based.

The second chapter is a manuscript entitled “Tracking the history of protected areas in Chile: Shifting State rationalities and their implications for indigenous inhabitants”. The paper explores the history of Chilean PAs, based on an archival and document analysis. This allowed me to understand different perspectives on the history of PAs in Chile. Narratives on the historical context of PAs have been mostly written from a biological viewpoint, leaving aside social perspectives. I identify and discuss changes in the rationalities that informed the establishment of state PAs in Chile and the implications of the resulting practices and PAs for indigenous peoples.

The third chapter is a second manuscript entitled: “Protected area strategies and indigenous peoples: exploring dimensions of governance in Chile”, which is based primarily on my interviews with Chilean governmental officials, NGO representatives, academics and representatives of indigenous communities. The manuscript examines recent negotiations between the State (represented by CONAF) and indigenous groups in relation to strategies for improving governance arrangements in PAs. Particular attention is given to the factors that have facilitated the emergence of more democratic governance arrangements in PAs in Chile.

In my final and fourth chapter, I provide some thoughts on the process of recognition of indigenous rights in PAs for both Canada and Chile by presenting some reflections on field research I conducted with the community of Wemindji in James Bay, Quebec during the summer of 2010. This was an important dimension of my two years conducting research in Canada. As a team member of the Wemindji Protected Areas Project, I was fortunate in having access to an indigenous community who was committed to defining PAs on their terms as part of a political strategy to enhance local

autonomy in decision-making and to strengthen environmental protection on their traditional territory. I have shared deep and long conversations with my supervisor, Dr. Monica Mulrennan, and other team members about this project. My original intention was to include a comparative Chilean-Canadian dimension to my thesis, but for various reasons (primarily the challenges of doing comparative research), this will instead be written up as a separate third manuscript following the completion of my MSc. For the benefit of my thesis, I have included some preliminary thoughts and interview results from my fieldwork.

I hope these pages contribute to a better understanding of the political and social conditions of indigenous peoples in Chile regarding their rights and interests in PAs. I look forward to the implementation of more democratic approaches in PAs and conservation practices elsewhere.

1.2 Research Design

My experience working in two different governmental agencies involved in PA policies and practices motivated me to explore the relationship of State agencies with indigenous peoples in Chile regarding PAs. I worked from 2004 to 2005 at the local level at the National Environmental Commission (currently, the Environmental Ministry) located in the Bío-Bío administrative region and then at the national level at the National Tourism Service in Santiago from 2006 to 2009. My initial interest was to explore the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights in PAs historically and currently by looking at the cases of Chile and Canada. I had a valuable opportunity to be a member of the Wemindji Protected Areas Project through my thesis supervisor and to do fieldwork in Wemindji, northern Quebec, in July of 2011. I conducted interviews with members of

local indigenous institutions; the Chief of Wemindji, the Deputy Chief and the Director of the Hunters and Trappers Association, to understand how a local community was able to negotiate with state agencies to create a culturally appropriate locally-managed PA (Bussieres, 2005; Scott et al., 2009). The model of the Wemindji PA network led by Crees was highly informative and inspired my research. The empowerment of indigenous leaders, the proposal of flexible conservation ideas, and an ongoing process of negotiation between Canadian state agencies and Cree communities is an example of a democratic model of PAs developed on an indigenous territory. However, to work with the two scenarios, the Chilean and Canadian, presented several complexities based on the vast diversity of people and institutions involved, as well as different conservation policies, practices and structures.

In the end although I decided to focus on the Chilean case, my perspective was very much informed by discussions, readings and field research I conducted within Canada. I was also most fortunate in being able to get my hands on so many documents and sources of information on the Chilean case that I felt that to do justice to it would require me to focus exclusively on Chile. This is a context with limited comprehensive studies and where coincidentally, two important developments are influencing the public agenda: the ratification of the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 169 in 2007 that took almost twenty years to get approved, and the discussion of the Bill to develop the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service, under the recently created Environmental Ministry. Both developments, the ratification of the ILO Convention and the Bill have shed new light on and renewed energy to the discussion of democratic

governance approaches in PAs, and the recognition of the need to address the rights of indigenous peoples in a broader manner.

Using Chile as a case study, this thesis investigates the rationales that have informed the establishment of PAs in Chile and the implications for indigenous groups of the resulting practices and PAs.

I also examine State's strategies for accommodation and negotiation of rights and interests of indigenous peoples in relation to PAs, and identity and discuss those factors that contribute to the establishment of more democratic governance arrangements involving indigenous groups.

I base my research on the framework of political ecology and resource management. Within these areas I worked on issues related to indigenous rights and environmental governance as stated by the section: Literature Review.

I focused on terrestrial PAs that fall within IUCN categories of PAs. This includes national parks (category II), national reserves (category IV), and natural monuments (category III) as they are officially recognized and relate to the national level government agency, the National System of State Protected Wildland Areas (or SNASPE)¹ (Torres et al., 2007).

1.3 Chile: An introduction of the study area

Chile, a long and narrow country located in the southern cone of Latin America, is a democratically ruled and centralized nation-state. It is organized from north to south into fifteen administrative regions. Santiago, the capital placed in Central Chile, where the administrative and political power is located, also dominates in terms of population.

¹ This definition does not include marine PAs, private PAs, or other categories of biodiversity conservation strategies.

The country has grown economically at a reasonably fast rate over an extended period of time, bringing as a result “macroeconomic stability, non-inflationary growth, and sustained increases in savings, investments and exports” (Carruthers, 2001, p. 343). Today, Chile leads Latin American nations in competitiveness, economic freedom, government efficiency and low perception of corruption. However, the country has one of the lowest wealth equity distributions in the world based on the GINI coefficient (López & Miller, 2008) Income inequality in Chile is the highest in the OECD countries (OECD, 2011).

During 200 years of Chile’s Republic independence, the history, rights and needs of indigenous peoples have been undermined. This is reflected in the fact that the Chilean Constitution is today the only one in Latin America that does not recognize either the existence or rights of its indigenous peoples (Carter, 2010). Domestic and international pressures have forced environmental issues and indigenous peoples’ rights onto the national policy agenda. Big challenges for the recognition of indigenous peoples’ rights and needs are coming with the ratification of international agreements such as the Convention No. 169 of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the International Labour Organization (ILO) ratified in 2008, in addition to the UN Declaration of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights signed in 2007.

The Indigenous Law, established in 1993, for the "protection, promotion and development of indigenous groups", recognizes the presence of nine indigenous ethnic groups in Chilean territory: Mapuche, Aymara, Rapa Nui, Atacameños, Quechuas, Colla, Diaguitas, Kawaskar and Yaganes. Peoples were not recognized as such, and their right of self-government or other collective rights, were not acknowledged (IEI, 2003). The

law established a category of indigenous development areas (Areas de Desarrollo Indígenas or ADIs) to focus state-economic development programs in areas with a high indigenous population density. ADIs are not a legal definition for indigenous traditional territories. In fact, ADIs represent only a section of the total of these traditional territories. This is added to other complexities identified by the Instituto de Estudios Indígenas (Institute of Indigenous Peoples' Studies) of the University of La Frontera (2003); for example, the fact that indigenous communities located in ADIs do not have preferential rights among any other stakeholders to the establishment of water rights, mining, the management of forest and adjacent water resources.

There is an important coincidence of state PA and indigenous development areas. A recent IUCN report demonstrates that 29.5% of Chilean State PAs have an overlap with indigenous territories (Cisneros & McBreen, 2010). Similarly, a CONAF document shows that 26% of Chilean PAs impinge on indigenous populations; either they include indigenous inhabitants within their borders or indigenous communities live in surrounding areas (Díaz, 2004). Today, the State PA system has 100 areas under protection, consisting of national parks, national reserves and natural monuments (CONAF, n.d.), twenty-nine of which have conflicts of overlap with indigenous lands (Cisneros & McBreen, 2010).

Some indigenous groups have expressed firmly their rights and interest to participate in and benefit from the management of the tourism services in PAs located on their traditional territories. The State has driven tourism policies to privatize tourism services on PAs where surrounding indigenous communities will have to compete with corporations or other private agents for the establishment and management of those

services (see for example Alvear, 2011; Cayuqueo, 2006; Min. de Economía, 2010).

Today, an important challenge on the domestic agenda is the enactment of the PA and Biodiversity Bill that is currently under discussion in the Senate. It will represent the first official legislation for a PA system. It recognizes private PAs and other governance dimensions, but to date, no specific recognition of indigenous communities' participation or management rights has been taken in to account during the drafting of the Bill.

1.4 Methods

I have chosen three techniques as the main data source for the research: archival analysis, document analysis, and individual interviews as part of qualitative methodologies. This involved an exploration of documents such as government policies, regulations and reports and literature with respect to these PAs, both historically and currently, in order to determine how the status and role of indigenous peoples have changed in the PA structures and practices. This was evaluated (confirmed or refuted) with semi-structured interviews that I conducted with eighteen stakeholders: representatives from academia; governmental organizations involved in PA policies such as the Chilean Forestry Agency (CONAF), Environmental Ministry and National Tourism Service (SERNATUR) from the central as well as the provincial level; human rights and environmental NGOs; and indigenous representatives involved in PA management. I did not do fieldwork in Chile. Rather I conducted almost all my interviews during the months of June to September (2010) mostly by telephone or internet, but also face-to-face with participants who came to Montreal during that time. I did eighteen interviews in total, lasting on average between 30 to 40 minutes. Through the interview process, I explored contemporary discourses of PAs as they relate to

indigenous peoples, exploring interviewee understandings, perceptions and insights about the current situation of indigenous arrangements in PAs. In general, opinions and experiences varied enormously between people of different class, ethnicity, age and sex (Dunn, 2005). I was able to compare the information from documents and archives with them during the interviews. The research has a national focus with several analyses of particular cases of struggles and negotiation processes at the local level.

The Tri-Council Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects was followed for all aspects of my research. Every formal interview began with a preliminary explanation in which I briefly explained the purpose of the research and the importance of every particular interview for my study, and the rights of the interviewee. Then I offered two alternatives. One was to record the interview. If my interviewee chose this option, I was able to give them a copy of the transcription so that they could read, revise and correct the written version (Bradshaw & Stratford, 2005). None of my interviewees corrected or made any modification to the transcription. If the person chose not to be recorded, then I was only taking notes and there was no way to share a copy of the conversation. Finally, I explained that before any publication, I promised a draft of the manuscript with the information they gave me, so they were able to modify it if they wished. We also discussed, before beginning the formal part of the interview, the option of anonymity; i.e. they had the option to have their name and role in the organization included or not. Only some governmental officials opted to avoid the use of their names as a way to protect their identity.

The review of Chilean historical and current literature and documents was based on the records that I found in the catalogues of libraries such as the National Library of

Chile, Library of the Chilean Congress and CONAF's library. For this research, I did not have access to local and provincial libraries and archives. The exploration of that documentation will be part of my future research projects.

The methodology had both difficulties and benefits. The fact that I did not do fieldwork in Chile allowed me to talk with the different players from different administrative regions for an extended period and to go back to them to re-ask some questions without the time and funding restrictions of fieldwork. The experience of long-distance interviews was shown to be flexible in terms of time and space. But also the "long distance" issue materialized at the moment of trying to explore deeply certain issues, such as political contingencies or current conflicts within institutions. The phone calls or calls by computer using web cameras had as a limitation less possibility of building trust as part of the interviews.

Indigenous groups in Chile have a different post-colonial history and past relations with the state. This has affected the strategies they have implemented to negotiate their rights and interests. It would be impossible for me to present the whole picture from the diversity of cases at the local level, and that was not the purpose of this research. Rather it was to present an argument trying to include the struggles in the history of PAs, and highlight the negotiation process for management arrangements, taking into account a diversity of indigenous peoples within the nation-state.

Finally, I want to add that I am committed to providing a Spanish version of this research. I want to present the results in a congress in Chile next year and to write a column to be published on an indigenous digital medium as a way to distribute the results in a non- academic format to a wider audience.

1.5 Situating myself in the research

I wish to note that the research is partial and selective (Haraway, 1988; Rose, 1997). I have constructed the arguments based on my own position as a researcher, as a Chilean and as a woman, and exposing my past work experience in Chilean governmental agencies. This does not mean that I show perspectives and participants' discourses in an uncritical way. Rather, I have learned during my research that it was important to compare and critically evaluate different opinions and sources with my interviewees. I showed and discussed as part of the study different perspectives and contradictions presented by the diversity of interviewees.

I am convinced that there is no way to avoid my own partialities. To deal with this, I introduced myself to each interviewee by clarifying my professional background and my current research interests. I was very deliberate in situating myself by reflexively examining my positional status in this study, and making it visible with my interviewees (following Nast, 1994; Rose, 1997; Sundberg, 2003 suggestions). I continued to be transparent with my identity through the whole process of my research, as a step toward confronting relations of power and knowledge (following Smith, 2006). Also, I talked to different players representing a diversity of positions and analyzed all documents that I was able to reach.

Several factors have had an impact on the formation of my "*situated knowledge*" as a researcher. As a geography student, in 2000, I did one of my internships at the Malleco national reserve. Malleco is recognized to be the first PA established in Chile. Being there for a month, sharing with park rangers, timber workers, local residents and researchers allowed me to understand the complexities between objectives of

conservation and forest exploitation. Malleco is a national reserve in which forestry techniques have been implemented for decades and today there is a diversity of pines that coexist with the remains of a temperate forest. My job was to design an interpretative trail for forestry students, so they would be able to understand how today the reserve is managed in relation to past practices. During my master's studies, the images of people harvesting trees in the reserve, and old and obsolete forestry machines came to my mind. These images helped me to understand that the history of PAs in Chile is not a straightforward history of conservation, but rather that the rationales of the PAs have been shifting over the years from an early history of forest exploitation to the recent paradigm of the protection of representative ecosystems.

During the last nine years since I graduated with my Bachelor of Science degree in Geography in 2002, I have worked in different Chilean localities on environmental issues. I had the chance to be involved in the planning and management of different PAs for both the local and the national levels, and to experience struggles and conflicts among scales. At the local level, working for the Chilean Environmental Commission (CONAMA) in the administrative region of Bío-Bío, I was responsible for implementing a sustainable tourism project called *Sendero de Chile* (Chilean Trail) in three PAs in the region: Ñuble and Ralco national reserves and Antuco national park. I had to work with local organizations, including indigenous communities, as in the case of the Ralco national reserve in Alto Bío-Bío and with other state agencies such as CONAF. The experience made me understand the complexities of the relationship between state agents and indigenous communities based on top-down approaches that most of the time the government uses to implement its programs and initiatives. It showed me that even

though there are efforts made towards mutual respect, it has been hard to overcome past legacies of state dominion and to implement issues of participation in governance.

At the national level, working for the National Tourism Service (SERNATUR), I was able to participate in different studies, reports and law projects related to PAs. This included the Bill that created the Environmental Ministry, on which the current Bill for the Biodiversity and PA Service depends, and the Tourism Law. It was in this space that I realized the difficulties of integrating participatory approaches of local and indigenous communities involved in the Chilean legislation. The voices and interests of indigenous groups are not represented in the Bill for the Biodiversity and PA Service nor in the Tourism Law. The latter considers the privatization of tourism services in state PAs to implement tourism services for national and international visitors. Indigenous groups claimed that they cannot compete with private companies to have the concession of tourism services in PAs located on indigenous territories. Under the economists' logics of the law, the concession will be given to the best bidder. These complexities and realities motivated me to explore further possibilities to include indigenous interests in public policies.

Being a non-indigenous woman with past experience in public policies has affected my partiality in this study. The fact that I have my professional network in Chile facilitated my making contact with the interviewees coming from State agencies. Some of them were colleagues that I knew already. In contrast, organizing interviews with non-state persons such as researchers, NGOs and indigenous groups' representatives took me longer; some of them didn't respond to my request for an interview. That I was not present to talk with different personalities was one of the limitations of doing "long-

distance research”. Studying in a Canadian university where I have extensive access to information in both English and Spanish and support to look at my subject from an international perspective also adds to my partiality and privilege.

1.6 Literature Review: Indigenous peoples and shifting conservation paradigms and narratives

In this section, I review the literature most pertinent for this case study. This review complements the literature I have included in the two manuscripts that are the basis of my MSc thesis. My theoretical framework has been inspired by the fields of resource management, political ecology and environmental history and informed by a diversity of approaches in conservation, state conservation policy and resource management, indigenous peoples’ rights, and PA governance.

The section is organized as follows. First, I introduce the field of political ecology and its potential for the analysis of political strategies of conservation. Second, I present the literature on state-making and the expansion of PAs. Third, I describe important milestones for the shift in PA paradigms and narratives. I then summarize current discourses related to PA definitions. The literature related to global discourses in PAs and indigenous people’s rights is address by the third Chapter of this thesis. Finally, I offer some insights into the main narratives and critiques of the literature on PA governance and indigenous peoples.

1.6.1 Political ecology and conservation policies

As an interdisciplinary field, political ecologists analyze environmental or ecological issues as the product of political and social processes, regarding the influence of global political economic issues at the local scale (Robbins, 2004). It offers extensive

possibilities to explore political dimensions of conservation (Adams & Hutton, 2007; Peet & Watts, 2004) by bringing together the fields of anthropology, environmental history, forestry, environmental sociology and geography (Robbins, 2004). Using political ecology as a framework, I am taking different approaches within this field, approaches closer to environmental history and state-making (Neumann, 2005), and to the analysis of the role of the state in legitimizing the control of resources (Peluso, 1993; Robbins, 2004). Also, my research is informed by scholars that have examined struggles between resource users and land tenure issues, looking at social relations between actors and institutions as a result of political processes (e.g. Adams & Hutton, 2007; Brockington, et al., 2008; Sundberg, 2006). This research engages with this literature and focuses on the political dimension of PA strategies and its effects at the local level on indigenous groups.

1.6.2 State making and the development of protected areas

Nation-states have played a pivotal role in the history of PAs by setting aside lands for the protection of resources. As Neumann highlights, “the state, specifically the modern nation-state as it developed from the eighteenth century onward, plays the central role in biodiversity conservation today” (2005, p.120). States, by claiming sovereignty of land and resources, regulate their access and authority, asserting control of the most valuable territories and resources, which generated conflicts with local users (Neumann, 2004; Peluso, 1993).

State making by reorganizing the space within sovereign territorial boundaries has been a process to make society and nature visible and governable (Scott, 1998). The division between nature-culture, wilderness-society or conservation-development is based

on historical processes of state making that have segregated spaces to preserve wilderness for the use and access of humankind. This is a strategy that has caused political and ecological impacts and struggles with local inhabitants (Adams, 2004; Brockington et al., 2006; Neumann, 2004; Peluso, 1993; Robbins, 2004).

1.6.3 Conservation and poverty alleviation

The PA approach has often resulted in adverse effects on the livelihoods of local people (Adams & Hutton, 2007; Colchester, 2004). The establishment and successive policies of PAs have impacted indigenous and local peoples through eviction and displacement, disrupting their livelihood and increasing their poverty and marginalization (Adams, 2004; Brockington et al., 2006; Krueger, 2009; West et al., 2006). Numerous scholars have addressed the fact that the costs of conservation are not distributed in proportion to their benefits, which are commonly paid by local residents, indigenous peoples and rural communities (Adams & Hutton, 2007; Brockington & Igoe, 2006; Colchester, 2003; Dearden & Langdon, 2009; Dove, 2006; Timko & Satterfield, 2008). These are issues that mostly speak to African and Asian contexts, with less attention paid to Latin America.

Because of the relationship between rural poverty (both indigenous and non-indigenous) and high levels of biological diversity, efforts have been made to integrate the agendas of poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation (Sachs et al., 2009). The issue of linkages between poverty and conservation has been hotly contested by scholars and practitioners; by those who think that conservation should address poverty concerns (Colchester, 2004) and others who think that biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction should be separate goals (Sanderson & Redford, 2003). Conserving and

alleviating poverty led to the rise of people-oriented conservation and development projects, also called “integrated conservation with development projects”, which tried to combine conservation with development goals. The apparent failure of these projects to protect biodiversity while generating local development led to calls from some scholars for the return of the fortress paradigm in PAs (Redford & Sanderson, 2000), turning into a backlash in the late 1990s (Hutton et al., 2005). Issues of poverty reduction and human rights were highly supported by the last World Park Congress in South Africa in 2003. The presence of 120 indigenous leaders confirmed the centrality within international discourses of PAs the issue of indigenous collective rights to control their lands and resources (Colchester, 2008), and supported a return to participatory approaches to conservation (Brechin et al., 2002; Dove, 2006; West et al., 2006).

1.6.4 Contemporary protected area definition: opening the fence approach

PAs are currently the main strategy used by national and international conservation organizations to protect biodiversity. The official definition of a PA and different categories of protection were established for the first time by the IUCN in 1978. These were subsequently reviewed and refined and a more comprehensive definition and set of management categories were released in 1994 (Ravenel & Redford, 2005) and again more recently in 2008.

The categories as revised in 1994 represented a major contribution towards the recognition of indigenous land, resource use rights, and joint management possibilities of PAs. The 1994 Guidelines recognized indigenous settlements in all six categories of PAs, even in Categories I for “wilderness areas”, of which one goal was “to enable indigenous

human communities living at low density and in balance with the available resources to maintain their lifestyle” (Stevens, 1997a, p. 44).

Then in 2008, the IUCN definition further evolved to expand the range of types of PAs and include more management categories. Currently, a PA can be defined as “a clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values” (Dudley, 2008, p. 8). The recent categories consider a gradient of protection from the strict nature reserve (Category Ia), i.e. areas that are totally left aside to conserve biodiversity, and human use or visitation is totally under control; to PAs with sustainable use of natural resources (Category VI). This definition was informed by inputs on the social aspects of PAs, as addressed during the 2003 WPC, which led to a greatly expanded conception of PAs (Dudley, 2008).

1.6.5 Toward local governance arrangements and indigenous peoples

The term “governance” is openly and widely debated in the literature. In recent years, PA governance has been used by major PA organizations as a way to improve power-sharing, legitimacy and participation in biodiversity conservation. The development of local governance types and management arrangements in PAs has appeared in the conservation agenda as a strategy to improve democratization, transparency, accountability, and the recognition of human rights (Bawa et al., 2011; Dudley, 2008). For Lemos and Agrawal (2006), governance is “a set of regulatory processes, mechanisms and organizations through which political actors influence environmental actions and outcomes” (p.298), and “a social function centered on steering

human groups toward mutually beneficial outcomes and away from mutually harmful outcomes” (p.255).

According to Brechin et al. (2002), governance “in general terms, refers to arrangements for decision making and power sharing” (p.46). Governance principles are supported by international agreements and policies such as the CBD and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Based on guidelines established by the IUCN (Dudley, 2008), effective governance of PAs should be equitable and democratic based on the sharing of power and responsibilities among state actors and local users. It should be transparent, improve legitimacy, be accountable, and respect human rights by effectively conserving biodiversity while responding to the concerns and interests of stakeholders.

A growing body of literature on common property suggests that social conflict and resource depletion are minimized in cases where there are strong governance institutions, strong local organizations, and a supportive policy environment (Brechin et al., 2002; Ostrom, 2003). However, as Buscher and Dressler (2007) have pointed out, environmental governance is a term that responds to the era of globalization, in which there is continuous shifting of authority over resources. The role of organizations of governance agreements is always at risk of co-option from private stakeholders or governments.

The main critique of governance approaches is that it is an inherent form of neo-liberalism of the use of resources, in which increasingly different political actors from the state, local organizations, NGOs, private companies and transnational institutions are intervening in the nation-state’s governance agenda, which reduces its role in resource

management (Heynen & Robbins, 2005; Igoe & Brockington, 2007). According to Buscher and Dressler, “contemporary environmental management has become yet another neoliberal project” (p.597) which responds to dominant international actors, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, who have promoted self-regulatory systems with fewer roles for nation-states.

Governance arrangements are constructed as a form of social capital. As highlighted by Brondizio et al. (2009), “institutions facilitating environmental governance have become an important social capital” (p. 255). Brondizio et al. define social capital as “the value of trust generated by social networks to facilitate individual and group cooperation on shared interests and the organization of social institutions at different scales” (p.255). For governance arrangements, social capital needs consistent levels of trust and reciprocity to interact at different levels.

Chapter 2. Tracking the history of protected areas in Chile: Shifting State rationalities and their implications for indigenous inhabitants

Abstract

While the history of Chile's protected areas (PA) has been documented in relation to the overall development and distribution of PAs over time, and their contribution to the goal of ecosystem protection, limited consideration has been given to the larger social and political context of PA development. This paper attempts to address this by investigating the connections between PA creation and aspirations to extend state-level control over territory and territorial resources. We focus in particular on the rationalities and practices of state-led territorialization that have occurred through the creation of PAs at the expense of indigenous territories. We provide a history of evolving state justifications for putting aside land as PAs. We begin with the initial emergence of a conservation agenda informed by ideas of the protection of forest resources intimately linked and articulated through ideas of frontier colonization. Subsequent strategies for the expansion of protected areas were motivated by the protection of wilderness, but also linked to implications on sovereignty. More recent state-level rationales for PA development follow international guidelines and are focused on biodiversity conservation. Our findings suggest that while the prevailing discourses have shifted over time, the fundamental project has remained more or less the same - extending and elaborating state control of territory. We do not analyze the effects of this on indigenous people, but their dispossession and marginalization is clearly implicated in the process of PA creation in Chile.

Key words: protected areas, indigenous peoples, Chile, environmental history

2.1 Introduction

The nation-state plays a central role in biodiversity conservation, particularly through the setting aside of territories for the establishment of protected areas (PAs) (Neumann, 2005). Ideas of PAs, as areas claimed by the state for nature protection

through state control of land and resources have been dominant in conservation strategies for decades (Robbins, 2004). The paradigm of conservation applied in the establishment of Yellowstone national park in 1872, the first national park in the United States (U.S.), became the dominant model of PAs subsequently applied worldwide (Igoe, 2005). This model, referred to by Colchester (2004, p. 149) as “the model of colonial conservation”, has had several consequences for local and indigenous communities. These have been identified by many scholars and include: their eviction from the land, constraints on their access to and use of land and resources, and their marginalization in, or exclusion from, decision-making processes concerning land designated as PAs (Adams & Hutton, 2007; Brockington & Igoe, 2006; Colchester, 2003; Stevens, 1997; West et al., 2006). Robbins has observed these impacts as part of a broader trend where “territorializing conservation space and controlling surrounding communities is a central and primary goal in the history of environmental conservation” (2004, p. 150).

An understanding of this historical context of shifting rationalities in support of a consistent practice of state-led territorization, has contemporary relevance and importance for discourses of human rights, particularly those related to indigenous peoples who have been marginalized by PAs and sometimes erased from the history of conservation. This recognition has motivated several scholars to reconstruct the histories of PA development with respect to the role of indigenous populations within the North American, African and Asian contexts (see for example Adams, 2004; Dearden & Rollins, 2009; Jacoby, 2003; Kosek, 2006; Neufeld, 2008; Neumann, 2001; Spence, 1999).

In Chile, 20% of the country is covered by state-designated PAs (CONAF, 2011). According to an IUCN report, 29.5% of these PAs have been established on the territories of indigenous peoples (Cisneros & McBreen, 2010). Despite this, there are relatively few accounts of Chile's PA history. Cabeza (1988) explores the historical origins and growth of early Chilean PAs, reporting on the territorialization process, with particular attention to the early development of Villarrica, Chile's first national park. Pauchard and Villarroel (2002) provide background on the historical phases of PA policy development, as well as discussing present challenges and opportunities for the PA system. Correa (2002) and Sepulveda (2009) provide historical accounts of individual PAs. Benoit (2005) has documented the historical development of PAs in terms of surface area protected and number of areas under PA status, and analyzes their effectiveness in relation to the protection of biological diversity. More recently, Aylwin (2010) has investigated the links between the establishment of PAs on indigenous territories and indigenous legal or customary ownership. As Aylwin argues, "State institutions have been responsible for the protection of these areas and have considered indigenous groups as a threat or obstacle to conservation" (2010: 9).²

This paper fills a gap in the literature by examining Chilean state rationalities in the creation of protected areas from the early 1900s to the present day. Special attention is given to state-level strategies to set aside lands as PAs and the implication of those for indigenous peoples territories and their access to resources. We base our analysis on archival data, published literature and state-level documents and reports.

² "Las instituciones del estado que han tenido a su cargo el resguardo de estas áreas han considerado a los indígenas como una amenaza u obstáculo a la conservación".

We organize our account of the historical development of PAs into three main phases, each reflecting different state-level rationales for the creation of PAs: 1) forestry and natural resource-based PAs (1907-1924); 2) nature-based PAs (1925-1979); and 3) ecosystem-based PAs (1980-2011). Each phase is examined in relation to the influence of a particular rationale as well as strategies and practices, and their implications, applied in support of particular rationales. Our analysis suggests that while the rationales and justifications for the creation of PAs have changed over time, they have been consistently applied in support of state-led territorialization, often at the expense of indigenous peoples.

2.2 Phases in the historical development of Chilean PAs:

Our reconstruction of the development of state-led PAs in Chile is organized into three primary phases, each of which is associated with a distinctive set of rationales for PA creation. The first of these spans the period 1907-1924 and is centered on state-owned forestry reserves. These early PAs were tied to state aspirations for resource exploitation as well as forestry management implicated in the occupation of Chile's southern frontier. The second phase is associated with the creation of nature-based PAs from 1925 to 1979. The focus was on the creation of PAs in the extensive wilderness areas of remote and bordering territories. The rationale was articulated in relation to an appreciation for the beauty of nature as well as potential tourism revenue. The third phase begins in 1980 with a fundamental change in the administration of the PA system and a parallel shift to the protection of ecological values as the primary rationale for PA creation.

Reconstructing the history of the Chilean State's approaches to PA creation is a complicated and challenging task. This is partly due to the extent of changes and

revisions made to PAs over time, and the limited and often inconsistent effort taken in the documentation of these changes down through history and from one PA to the next. Table 1 provides a summary of the development of PAs. The names and spatial extent of several PAs changed many times over the years but these changes were rarely accurately or consistently documented. A particular gap concerns the creation of forestry reserves implemented before the 1980s. The borders of many of these PAs were not officially delimited and sometimes were never defined. As a result, some early state-owned forestry reserves simply disappeared from historical records. In other cases they were transformed from forest reserves to other management categories, resulting in confusion and incompatibilities between different historical accounts. The table attempts to address some of these limitations, by including information drawn from various sources on revisions or transformations to the original PA.

Table 1. Historical growth of PAs in Chile

| Phase | Protected Areas | Year of establishment | Size (ha) | Revisions | Source |
|----------|--|-----------------------|-----------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Phase 1: | State-owned forestry reserve (SFR) Malleco | 1907 | 33640 | Changes on size. Current national reserve | CONAMA (2008), CONAF Araucania (1996) |
| | SFR Tirua | 1907-1913 | n/a | | Cabeza (1988) |
| | SFR Alto Bio Bio | 1912 | 40000 | Changes on size. Current national reserve | Cabeza (1988), Sepulveda (2009) |
| | SFR Villarrica | 1907-1913 | 165000 | Changes on size. Abolition | Cabeza (1988) |
| | SFR Llanquihue | 1907-1913 | 147000 | Changes on size. Former NP Alerce Andino | Cabeza (1988) (Ormazabal, 2007) |
| | SFR Petrohue | 1907-1913 | 152000 | Changes on size. Abolition | Cabeza (1988) |
| | SFR Puyehue | 1907-1913 | 100000 | Changes on size. Abolition | Cabeza (1988) |
| | SFR Chiloe | 1907-1913 | n/a | Changes on | Cabeza |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|------|---------|---|--|
| | | | | size. Abolition | (1988) |
| Phase 2: | NR (national reserve) Villarrica | 1925 | 60005 | Several reductions on size | Cabeza (1988) CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP (national park) Vicente Perez Rosales | 1926 | 253780 | Several reductions on size | Cabeza 1988) CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Malalcahuello | 1931 | 29530 | Was reduced in part to create NP Conguillio | (Ormazabal, 2007) CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Rio Blanco | 1932 | 10175 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Magallanes | 1932 | 13500 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | National tourism park (NTP) Archipiélago de Juan Fernandez | 1935 | 9571 | Reductions on size given to local owners | (Ormazabal, 2007) CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Rapa Nui | 1935 | 7130 | Reductions on size to return to indigenous traditional owners | CONAMA (2008) (Comisión de Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato, 2003) |
| | NTP Tolhuaca | 1935 | 6374 | Created from earlier Malleco NR | CONAMA (2008) (CONAF Araucania 1996) |
| | NR Las Guaitecas | 1938 | 1097975 | Ex NR Taitao | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP Nahuelbuta | 1939 | 6832 | Changes on size. Were added public property | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM (Natural Monument) Cerro Nielol | 1939 | 89 | Created from former NTP Nielol | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP Villarrica | 1940 | 6100 | Changes on size | CONAMA (2008) (Cabeza, 1988) |
| | NTP Bosque Fray Jorge | 1941 | 9959 | Created from earlier FR Punta del Viento and Talinay | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Contulmo | 1941 | 82 | Transformed from earlier NTP | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP Puyehue | 1941 | 107000 | Several changes on size | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|------|---------|--|---|
| | | | | | 2007) |
| | NR Cabo de Hornos | 1945 | 63093 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Coyhaique | 1948 | 2150 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Conguillio | 1950 | 60832 | From former NP Los Paraguas, a section from earlier NP Malalcahuelo and private property | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP Laguna del Laja | 1958 | 11600 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Laguna San Rafael | 1959 | 1742000 | Several reductions on size | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP Torres del Paine | 1959 | 181229 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Lauca | 1965 | 137883 | Was reduced to create Surire NM and Vicunas NR as well as to return lands to indigenous owners | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) (Aylwin, 2010) |
| | NR Lago Palena | 1965 | 49415 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Lago Carlota | 1965 | 27110 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Alberto de Agostini | 1965 | 1460000 | Created from former FR Holanda and NP Magallanes | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Los Pingüinos | 1966 | 97 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Volcan Isluga | 1967 | 174744 | Size was reduced to return lands to indigenous traditional owners | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP La Campana | 1967 | 8000 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Huerquehue | 1967 | 12500 | Several changes on size | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NR Nalcas | 1967 | 13775 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Isla Guamblin | 1967 | 10625 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Lago Cochrane | 1967 | 8361 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR China Muerta | 1968 | 9887 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NM Cueva del Milodon | 1968 | 189 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Bernardo O'Higgins | 1969 | 3525901 | Created from | CONAMA |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|------|---------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | former NTP Monte Balmaceda, RF Rio Pascua and RF Alacalufes | (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NR Alacalufes | 1969 | 2313875 | Several changes on size | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Lago Penuelas | 1970 | 9094 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Cerro Castillo | 1970 | 179550 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NTP Pali Aike | 1970 | 5030 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Laguna Parrillar | 1971 | 18814 | Reductions on size | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NTP Las Palmas de Cocalan | 1972 | 3709 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NM El Morado | 1974 | 3009 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Nuble | 1978 | 55948 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| Phase 3: | NR Federico Albert | 1981 | 145 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Rio Clarillo | 1982 | 10185 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Alerce Andino | 1982 | 39255 | Created from earlier SFR Llanquihue | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NP Chiloe | 1982 | 43057 | Changes on size. Lads were returned to two indigenous communities | CONAMA (2008) (Correa, 2002) |
| | NR Llanquihue | 1982 | 33972 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Lago las Torres | 1982 | 16516 | Created from former NP Lago Las Torres | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Cinco Hermanas | 1982 | 228 | Created from former NTP Cinco Hermanas | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Dos Lagunas | 1982 | 181 | Created from former NTP Dos Lagunas | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Laguna de Los Cisnes | 1982 | 25 | Created from former Laguna de los Cisnes NTP | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NR Las Vicunas | 1983 | 209131 | Created from NP Lauca | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Salar de Surire | 1983 | 11298 | Created from NP Lauca | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|------|--------|--|--|
| | | | | | 2007) |
| | NR Las Chinchillas | 1983 | 4229 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Valdivia | 1983 | 9737 | Several reductions on size | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NP Isla Magdalena | 1983 | 157616 | Earlier national reserve | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NP Queulat | 1983 | 154093 | Created from former RF Río Cisnes and RF Puyuhuapi | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Katalalixar | 1983 | 674500 | Created from former RF Río Pascua and NP Guayaneco | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NR Lago Rosselot | 1983 | 12725 | Created from former NP Rosselot | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Pichasca | 1985 | 128 | Created from former NTP Pichasca | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NR Río de los Cipreses | 1985 | 38582 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Laguna Torca | 1985 | 604 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Pan de Azúcar | 1986 | 43754 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Pampa del Tamarugal | 1987 | 100650 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Ralco | 1987 | 12421 | Created from former Ralco NP and Ralco SFR | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) (Sepúlveda, 2009) |
| | NM Alerce Costero | 1987 | 2308 | Created from former NTP Alerce Costero | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NR La Chimba | 1988 | 2583 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Isla Mocha | 1988 | 2369 | Created from former NP Isla Mocha | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NP Hornopiren | 1988 | 48232 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NM Isla de Cachagua | 1989 | 4,5 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Los Flamencos | 1990 | 73987 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NM La Portada | 1990 | 31 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Pinguino de Humboldt | 1990 | 859 | | CONAMA (2008) |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|------|--------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | NR Los Ruiles | 1992 | 45 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Trapananda | 1992 | 2305 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Llanos de Challe | 1994 | 45708 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Nevado Tres Cruces | 1994 | 59082 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Mocho Choshuenco | 1994 | 7537 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Lullaillaco | 1995 | 268671 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Los Bellotos del Melado | 1995 | 417 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Los Queules | 1995 | 147 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR El Yali | 1996 | 520 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Robleria Cobre de Loncha | 1996 | 5870 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Altos de Lircay | 1996 | 12163 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Radal Siete Tazas | 1996 | 1900 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Futaleufu | 1998 | 12065 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Lago Jeinimeni | 1998 | 161100 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Los Huemules de Niblinto | 1999 | 2021 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NM Islotes de Punihuil | 1999 | 9 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NR Rio Simpson | 1999 | 41621 | Created from former NP Rio Simpson | CONAMA (2008) (Ormazabal 2007) |
| | NM Lahuen Nadi | 2000 | 200 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Corcovado | 2005 | 209624 | | CONAMA (2008) |
| | NP Radal Siete Tazas | 2008 | 4138 | | CONAF (2011) |
| | NM Quebrada de Cardones | 2009 | 11326 | | CONAF (2011) |
| | NM Quebrada de Cardones | 2009 | 11326 | | CONAF (2011) |
| | NP Salar del Huasco | 2010 | 110963 | | CONAF (2011) |
| | NP Morro Moreno | 2010 | 7313 | | CONAF (2011) |

2.2.1 Forestry and natural resource based PAs (1907-1924)

Several scholars have linked the creation and extension of PAs to the construction of modern nation-states in colonial and postcolonial contexts (Adams, 2004;

Neufeld, 2008; Neumann, 2004, 2005). In Chile, central government strategies focused on securing control over natural resources, especially forest resources, by protecting them from overexploitation by the new colonists and settlers in the occupation of Chile's southern frontier (Klubock, 2006). The frontier represented the boundary with the Mapuche territory known as the Araucanía, the name given to it by Spanish conquerors. In this process of colonizing the frontier, the first PAs were established as state-owned forestry reserves and justified in terms of the state's need to exploit and responsibility to protect forest resources.

The Mapuche's indigenous territory was an autonomous land recognized by the Spanish Crown in 1641 (Quilin's Treaty). The division between the Araucanía and the Chilean territory was the Bío Bío river located in central-southern Chile. It was not ceded to Chilean sovereignty until the last military conquest of the 1860s, as part of the "*La Pacificación de la Araucanía*" (the pacification of the Araucanía). This campaign was a military strategy intended to advance the frontier following the Republic's independence of 1810 (Bengoa, 2004). State expansion of the southern frontier into the Araucanía was motivated, according to Navarro (2008), by its very good quality of land and abundant resources. For Klubock (2006), this advance was a deliberate and intentional objective of a state strategy to control lands and resources. With the advance through the frontier, the Chilean state defined these lands as state property and proceeded to auction off parcels of them (Navarro, 2008). According to Bengoa (2000) the strategy was to disperse indigenous Mapuche across thousands of small units of property in order to dispose of state-owned lands. The Mapuche, as the original owners of the land, were displaced to indigenous settlements, referred to by the Spanish name

“*reducciones*” (which roughly translates as “reductions” or “concentrations”). This mechanism of Mapuche dispersal left the frontier available for colonization, through the settlement of “vacant lands” by foreign *colonos* (colonists or settlers) (Mallon, 2005).

In the process of colonization, an awareness of and concern for the depletion of forest resources emerged among the political elite, prompting a decision to set aside areas of forest under state protection (Cabeza, 1988). Practices of burning and forest clearing utilized by new settlers and colonists to extract lumber as well as to create agricultural lands were the main cause of forest loss (Klubock, 2006; Otero, 2006). State-level concerns about this loss resulted in the Forest Act of the fiscal lands of Angol, Arauco, Valdivia and Llanquihue of 1879³, which provided the legal basis for the establishment of state-owned forestry reserves on the newly opened frontier (Cabeza, 1988).

According to Pauchard and Villarroel these state-owned forestry reserves, which represented Chile’s earliest PAs, were “strongly oriented toward forest production and not to conservation goals per se” (2002, p. 319–321). The ideologies and logics of state forestry that were influential elsewhere also informed early rationales for state-owned forestry reserves in Chile. In nineteenth century Europe and the U.S., the protection of state forests was promoted using scientific forestry approaches and techniques to control and manage state resources with important implications for state revenue and security (Kosek, 2006; Scott, 1998). According to Scott (1998), the dominant conception of state “fiscal forestry” was a utilitarian perspective focused on serving the needs of the state through the use of lumber, firewood and other resources. In this sense state forests were

³ Bosques de los terrenos fiscales de Angol, Arauco, Valdivia i Llanquihue

understood “as an economic resource to be managed efficiently and profitably” (ibid 1998, p. 13).

These rationales associated with the control and use of state forest reserves influenced Federico Albert, head of the Water and Forests section within the Ministry of Industry and Public Works in the early 1900s. Albert, of German origin and with formal training in forestry science, established the basis for what would become Chile’s national forest policy throughout the twentieth century (Camus, 2003). According to Klubock, Albert “was a pivotal figure in efforts both to regulate the destruction of the forests and to promote commercial forestry” (2006, p. 543). His regular trips to Europe to study advances in scientific forestry techniques led to their subsequent application to Chile in the early 1900s.⁴ Following one particular trip to Europe, Albert returned to Chile resolute about the need to protect state forest reserves. The following statement reflects his vision: “To get an idea of the importance of our national forests in the territories located south of Bío-Bío, we should operate under the forestry regime in all lands that are unfit or unsuitable for agriculture crops. It is therefore urgently needed that the state should establish reserves in forestlands under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Colonization, Finance and the Interior” (Albert, 1911: 8).⁵ As stated by Klubock “Albert linked the development of forest management to the reassertion of state control over the frontier and the establishment of a stable social order” (2006, p. 543). The protection of

⁴ See Albert’s (1910) explanation of the importance of European forestry techniques and the account of Albert’s life by Camus (2003).

⁵ “[b]asta para formase una idea exacta de la importancia de nuestros bosques nacionales i de que debemos explotar *bajo el régimen forestal* todos los que están en terrenos ineptos o inadecuados para los cultivos agrícolas. Por consiguiente se necesita con urjencia que el Estado se preocupe de establecer reservas en los terrenos forestales que estén bajo la dependencia de los Ministerios de Colonización, Hacienda e Interior situados al sur del (río) Bío Bío”

state forests became an imperative to secure state hegemony over lands recently occupied by the army, which had been given to colonists and settlers.

While controlled use of forest resources was encouraged at this time, access to these resources within PAs was available only to colonists and restricted for indigenous groups. In Albert's vision, state-owned forest reserves were spaces in which indigenous inhabitants were not granted the right to freely use timber; rather, these forests were protected in order to "supply the free use of wood for the needs of the Supreme Government" (Albert, 1910: 49). As he stated, "[i]ndigenous inhabitants will have the free right, for the construction of shacks, canoes and firewood, but not in state-owned forestry reserves already set aside by the government"⁶ (p.49) Thus, Albert called for the protection of forests to conserve forest resources and to address soil degradation, while also promoting commercial exploitation of the forest for the state's needs, with only limited concessions for the basic needs of indigenous peoples (Albert, 1913). By defining indigenous people as inappropriate users of the forest inside PAs, Albert was able to justify their dispossession or their loss of rights to land and resources in lands set aside as state owned forestry reserves.

The creation in 1907 of the Malleco state-owned forestry reserve in recently colonized territory serves as an illustration of how indigenous peoples were treated. Malleco is one of the oldest PAs in Latin America (Ormazabal, 1988), created a few decades after the expansion of the frontier that began in 1861, when the Chilean Army occupied the "line of Malleco", territory located south of the Bío-Bío river (Navarro, 2008). On January 1st 1883, the lands between the Malleco river to the north and the

⁶ "Mientras no se hayan apartado las reservas de bosques, los habitantes indígenas, tienen derecho al uso gratuito de las maderas, especialmente para la construcción de casuchas, canoas i para la leña"

Toltén river to the south were declared the first “colonized territory” in the frontier. The dispossession of indigenous lands that followed left these territories available to the state for their purposes as well as for colonization companies in the Malleco valley (Bengoa, 2004). Once the lands were free of indigenous families, land titles were granted to Army generals and sold to new colonists and settlers (Bengoa, 2000). Lands associated with the Malleco state-owned forestry reserve, for example, were granted to two army officials, Coronel Cornelio Saavedra and General Basilio Urrutia (CONAF Araucanía, 1996). Thousands of hectares of forest were subsequently cleared by fire to support agriculture and livestock (Otero, 2006).

The Malleco reserve was intended to protect, as well to support the exploitation of forest resources for state interests (e.g. CONAF Araucanía, 1996). However, these motivations were diluted with the interests of colonists that were arriving to the area. After the reserve’s establishment, approximately three thousand cattle became the main source of economic activity on the reserve. Logging concessions for areas within the reserve were also given to several settlers (CONAF Araucanía, 1996). Later, 116 colonists were settled in the area and subsequently granted individual property rights, further reducing the size of the PA (Riquelme, 1977). The case of Malleco illustrates how the expansion of colonization by the occupying colonists was intertwined with the commercial exploitation of state forest resources.

Between 1907, when Malleco was established, and 1929 seven other PAs were created in the colonized territory, including the state-owned forest reserves of Tirúa, Alto Bío Bío, Villarrica, Llanquihue, Petrohué, Puyehue and Chiloé. However, the exact boundaries of these PAs were either inaccurately or never delimited, and some of them

were subsequently abolished (Cabeza, 1988). These early PAs were administered by the *Ministerio de Tierras y Colonización* (Ministry of Land and Colonization) (Otero, 2006), a governmental entity with dual and often conflicting responsibilities. The Ministry oversaw the occupation of new lands by Chilean settlers and foreign colonists, at the same time as it was responsible for state forest protection.

2.2.2. Nature-based PAs (1925-1979)

A second phase of PA expansion was promoted and articulated as part of the state's responsibility to protect the beauty of nature and in recognition of the potential for tourism revenue. This phase was directed to the protection of extensive wilderness areas in remote and bordering territories.

Protecting the wonders of the country

The Chilean State under the legal basis of the Forest Law of 1925 (subsequently modified in 1931) created a new category of state PAs known as the national tourism park, which was added to the national reserves (existing state-owned forestry reserves). The State's rationale for these PAs was to strength tourism revenue by protecting and showcasing the beauties of the country. As the document from the *Dirección General de Tierras* (1925) (General Direction of Land) indicates, the justification to implement national tourism parks followed the US national park model by focusing on preservationist values and tourism revenue (as cited by Cabeza, 1988). For example, the State's explicit rationale for the creation of the first national tourism park, Benjamin Vicuña Mackena, was "to attract travelers looking to experience intense emotions

produced by the contemplation of the wonders of nature”⁷ (Dirección General de Tierras, 1925, p.1 as quoted in Cabezas, 1988). With the Law, aesthetic considerations were added to the rationale of forest conservation (Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002).

The stated rationale for PA creation may have changed with the Law, but the practices or implications of PA creation did not. The imperative to open the frontier through the establishment of PAs was maintained from the 1920s to the 1970s. Ideas of forest protection and the aesthetic qualities of nature were intertwined in the process of colonizing the frontier. The latter was the primary objective of the Ministry of Lands and Colonization (Riquelme, 1977), which was also the State institution in charge of the creation of national tourism parks. This is reflected in the dual mandate of Forest Law of 1925, which was the exploitation of forest resources and the promotion of commercial forestry, as well as the protection of forests through the establishment of national tourism parks. The Law allowed the President to “[e]stablish forests reserves and national tourism parks on state-owned lands, in order to regulate the timber trade, guarantee the survival of certain tree species and preserve the beauty of the landscape” (art.10)⁸. These PAs were to be designated in lands unsuitable for agriculture, while lands with agricultural value were to be ceded or granted to colonists. National tourism parks were also designed for the State’s utilitarian purposes as spaces to serve and support public interests, such as through “the development of public infrastructure” (Ministerio de Tierras y Colonización, 1931).

⁷ para atraer a los viajeros que buscan experimentar intensas emociones que produce la contemplación de las maravillas de la naturaleza

⁸ Con el objeto de regularizar el comercio de maderas, garantizar la vida de determinadas especies arbóreas y conservar la belleza del paisaje, el Presidente de la República podrá establecer reservas de bosques y parques nacionales de turismo en los terrenos fiscales apropiados a dichos fines (...).”

As Klubock (2006) shows, the project of settling the frontier resulted in very unstable and badly constituted property. State lands were often occupied by private individuals. This resulted also in the reduction of the size of many PAs as lands were granted to "illegal inhabitants", colonists and settlers (Riquelme, 1977). For example, the first national tourism park, Benjamin Vicuña Mackena, was established by the Ministry of Lands and Colonization in 1925 (Benoit, 2005). In the years that followed, as part of the reorganization of land made available to colonists, the land was defined as suitable for agriculture, resulting in the discontinuation of the park four years later and the granting of land titles to colonist residents (Cabeza, 1988). Similarly, the Vicente Perez Rosales national tourism park, established in 1926, underwent several reductions of its boundaries to provide land to new colonists; but continues to exist today (Cabeza, 1988).

Protection was initially much less restricted in terms of human settlements than it would become in later years. As Otero notes, "[t]he state didn't have economic resources to control access and use of PAs, so many of them were exploited by colonists who were then granted the land" (2006: 140)⁹. According to Riquelme (1977), this was due to a lack of clarity in PA objectives and the limited and weak presence of the State on those lands. These land policies remain today as part of a legacy of colonization strategies, ignoring for the most part the rights and interests of the original indigenous owners.

Extending State control of remote territories and borderlands

The Chilean government, consistent with state-level strategies being applied elsewhere (Neumann, 2001, 2005), created PAs in distant and remote territories. In doing so the creation of PAs became intimately connected with the assertion of

⁹ "...[e]l Estado no disponía de los recursos para controlar el acceso y uso de estas unidades, y muchas de ellas siguieron siendo explotadas y luego entregadas a colonos" (Otero, 2006: 140).

sovereignty in these areas, particularly from the 1930s to the 1960s (Oltremari and Thelen 2003). Large parcels of such lands were declared under state protection in both the extreme north and south of Chile's long axis as well as on the Pacific islands. Scholars have argued that the justification for this major expansion of state-led PAs in Chile was to establish PAs on poor lands and in remote places, in lands typically associated with low population densities and low commercial values (Armesto et al., 1998; Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002). Aylwin (2010) has documented the extent to which the creation of these PAs also led to the denial of the customary and legal rights of indigenous groups.

The most significant period of growth in the number and surface area of PAs occurred in the 1950s and 1960s (Benoit, 2005), especially in the 1960s under the Government of Eduardo Frei Montalva (Otero, 2006). According to Pauchard and Villarroel (2002, p.321) “[t]his second wave of PA creation was focused in the wilderness or frontier regions of the national territory, both in the southern and northern ends of the country”. For example, in Patagonia at the extreme south of Chile, several national reserves were established, including Magallanes (1932), Las Guaitecas (1938), and Cabo de Hornos (1945), followed by many others. The administrative southern regions of Aysén and Magallanes have 50% of its territory under PA status (Benoit, 2005). National parks were created also in the Pacific islands; as in the case of the Archipelago Juan Fernandez national park (1935) on the Robinson Crusoe Island, and Rapa Nui national park (1935) which included initially the entire territory of Easter Island, resulting in the dispossession the Rapa Nui people. The latter was created two years after the State registered the whole island as State property under the principle of

terra nullius (IEI, 2003). Several PAs were also established along the northern border of the country, as in the cases of Lauca national park (1965) and Volcán Isluga national park (1967), both located in the Chilean altiplano, which is traditional Aymara indigenous territory. Although Aymara inhabitants continue to live within the boundaries of these PAs, their land titles and rights have been ignored since these PAs were established (Aylwin, 2010).

From 1925 until 1979 PAs were created almost continuously, with many changes and revisions to the sizes and categories of PAs. As a result, by the early 1980s 50 national parks and 53 forest reserves had been established, covering about 14 million hectares (this exceeds the number of PAs that currently exists). However, this included land that was already occupied by colonists and also reflects the lack of accuracy in the delimitations of PA boundaries (Ormazabal, 2007).

Towards the end of the 1970s, the state identified for the first time certain problems related to the occupation by colonists and indigenous families of lands within national tourism parks and state-owned forestry reserves (Ormazabal, 1992). Arguments in favor of forest conservation were strengthened by the state's increasing interest in the protection of lands for tourists and visitors as well as in control over natural resources (e.g. Riquelme, 1977). The vision of PAs as areas without human residents was reinforced in 1974 under the Austral Property Act (D.L. 574), which prohibited occupation of PAs by colonists in those territories south of the Bío-Bío river. According to Otero (2006), PAs were frequently "paper parks", areas which were declared state-forestry reserves or national tourism parks but for which management practices were never implemented. During the 1970s, the State became more interested in strengthening

the protection of forest and natural resources, as areas enclosed for the protection of wild ecosystems and free from human activities and interactions.

2.2.3 Ecosystem-based PAs (1980- 2011)

A major shift in state-level rationales for PAs occurred in the 1980s when the administration of all PAs was assigned to CONAF, with minor exceptions (Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002). The creation of PAs now focused on the protection of ecological values, such as the conservation of representative vegetation formations and endangered flora and fauna (Luebert & Pliscoff, 2006). Prior to this, a diversity of government entities was responsible for the creation and management of PAs, with the Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG) playing a major role.

Since 1984, PAs in Chile have been managed largely as part of the *Sistema Nacional de Áreas Silvestres Protegidas del Estado* (National System of State Protected Wildland Areas, known as SNASPE) (CONAMA & PNUD, 2008). The SNASPE is the largest state entity that regulates PAs; it is administered by the *Corporación Nacional Forestal* (Chilean Forestry Service, or CONAF), a state agency under the Ministry of Agriculture. The SNASPE was the first effort in Chile to establish a plan for PAs that defined legal boundaries and management objectives. Objectives of protection were defined according to four management categories; virgin regions reserves, national parks, national reserves, natural monuments based on categories defined by the “Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere” signed in Washington in 1940 (ratified by Chile in 1967) and the 1978 IUCN framework (Ormazabal, 1992). The administrative transfer of all state PAs to CONAF required some adjustments to integrate existing PAs into a national system

(Araya, 1989). Thirty-nine ancient forest reserves and national tourism parks were reclassified, and some PA boundaries were officially delimited or merged with other PAs or absorbed within State property (Ormazabal, 2007). This process was not limited to changes in PA management categories, but some PAs were extended in size, while others such as the cases of Lauca, Volcan Isluga and Rapa Nui national parks were reduced, with some lands returned to indigenous and private owners (e.g. Araya, 1989).

The enactment of the Indigenous Law in 1993 has, however, been an important milestone in beginning to address the encroachment of PAs into indigenous territories (Díaz, 2004). The Law gives official recognition for the first time to eight major ethnic groups. From north to south, these are Aymaras, Quechuas, Rapanui, Colla, Mapuche, Kawashkar, and Yagan. For the Mapuche, who comprise over 90% of the total indigenous population of Chile (MIDEPLAN, 2009), legal recognition of their indigenous rights has served two important purposes; to put a limit on further expansion of State-managed PAs into indigenous territories and to establish mechanisms for indigenous participation in PA management.

As a result of the Indigenous Law, and consistent with the IUCN Guidelines (1994) and the Convention on Biological Diversity, CONAF have implemented Local Advisory Committees since the 2000s to facilitate advisory participation in the management of PAs (CONAF, 2011; Díaz, 2004). Some of these committees include the participation of resident and adjacent indigenous communities. However, indigenous claims to traditional territories are still problematic. For example, as the Chilean report for the Second Latin-American Conference on National Parks and other PAs (2007) noted, not all PAs have formally delimited borders. This lack of accuracy and clarity

regarding PA boundaries has resulted in conflicts over the legitimacy of state property. In some cases, PAs overlap with private property, in other cases PAs are claimed by their occupants (Torres et al., 2007). The same report added that there are no systematic accounts of human settlement and occupancy in PAs. Three main groups are recognized, however: indigenous communities referred to as “isolated groups that have lived since pre-Columbian times in areas that today are considered as national parks”¹⁰ (Torres et al, 2007: 42); private owners of land inserted inside PAs; and colonists and occupants who do not have any legal basis to inhabit PA territories.

Today, the main goal of state-owned PAs is to protect ecosystem representativeness (CONAMA & PNUD, 2008). The system has been expanded gradually. Twenty percent of the terrestrial area of the country is currently under PA status (approximately 14.5 million hectares), comprising one hundred PAs: 35 national parks, 49 national reserves and 16 natural monuments (CONAF, 2011). A Bill has been proposed for the creation of a Service for PAs and Biodiversity under the Ministry of the Environment, which will replace the current national system of PAs with different categories of state and private PAs. A major objective is to achieve the minimum target of 10% for ecosystem representativeness as established under the Convention on Biological Diversity, ratified by Chile in 1995. Major criticisms have been raised, however, because the Bill does not address the needs and interests of indigenous peoples in PAs. Indeed, indigenous peoples were not consulted as part of the Bill’s negotiation process, in violation of a recommendation of the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 (Alvear, 2011; Aylwin & Cuadra, 2010a).

¹⁰ “grupos aislados o pequeños poblados indígenas que viven desde tiempos precolombinos en áreas que hoy corresponden a un parque nacional.”

2.3. Conclusions

In this paper we identify the evolving rationales applied in support of PA establishment in Chile. We also show how the establishment of State hegemony over territorial land and resources was intimately tied to the creation of PAs. We pay particular attention to the implications of this history for indigenous peoples.

The origins of PAs in Chile are an outcome of State imperatives related to colonization of the frontier. These early PAs were primarily established to safeguard forest resources, informed by a discourse of environmental crisis linked to concerns about forest depletion associated with the burning and clearing practices of early settlers and colonists. Utilitarian interests of the State in commercial forestry were a further motivation for PA creation. As such PAs served as an instrument of state-making by imposing control over land recently colonized, by asserting sovereignty on remote territories, and by marginalizing indigenous peoples from lands and decisions that affect them.

The Yellowstone model of PA creation, dedicated to the protection of nature as a space free from human activities and where people and nature are envisioned as separate and irreconcilable subjects (Brockington et al., 2008), did not inform early rationales for state-owned PAs in Chile. Rather they were influenced by a utilitarian perspective on commercial forestry, supported by scientific approaches to forest management that were imported from Europe, and subsequently integrated with ideas of state hegemony in the process of colonizing indigenous territories.

An alternative rationality emerged in the mid 1920s that supported the creation of nature-based PAs based on the protection of the aesthetic values of nature for tourism

revenue. The resulting creation of PAs in the northern and southern extremes of Chile's long axis, including in the high Andes and on the Pacific islands, served to extend state control and hegemony over remote territories and borderlands. These PAs were sometimes established on indigenous territories with ancestral and occasionally legal ownership. However, the interests of the state trumped those of indigenous people, with the rights and interests of indigenous people bent to fit the imposed conservation landscape.

The place of people in Chilean PAs has been controversial and inconsistent as it has elsewhere (Adams et al., 2004; West et al., 2006). Prior to the 1980s the creation of PAs in Chile were not tied to ideologies of wilderness without human presence. Rather, the rationales that informed the early establishment of PAs tended to be a response to more pragmatic imperatives. Human presence was generally not an obstacle for protection but experiences were uneven in the country. Tourists have been promoted since 1925 in areas under state protection, but indigenous residents and resource users have been greatly undermined by PA policies. The laxity and inconsistency of state policies and practices has resulted in the establishment of state-owned PAs characterized by a range and complexity of land tenure and resource rights that includes: indigenous land tenure rights, colonist and settler rights to live inside PAs, and state-endorsed commercial rights for colonists to exploit PA resources. Our tracking of the history of rationales and justifications applied in support of PA creation in Chile reveals the operation of State power in their historical development. Our findings show that while the particular rationales articulated in support of PA creation have shifted over time, the fundamental imperative behind PAs has been consistent; to extend and elaborate state

control of territorial lands and resources. Furthermore, the legacies of previous state rationales are still present in current PA policies.

Our account raises questions for future research, concerning what happened on the ground in relation to indigenous resistance to state PA policies. Notwithstanding significant limitations and challenges to documenting the latter, case analysis of the individual experiences of indigenous groups would contribute to a better understanding of the shifting dynamics over time between the State and indigenous peoples, while also acknowledging indigenous agency in the unfolding history of Chile's PAs.

Finally, while the establishment of PAs is an important part of Chilean history, the telling of that history has too often overlooked the injustices imposed by PAs on indigenous peoples. We hope that our account contributes to addressing this limitation by exposing the rationales that have informed PAs and by making some of the impacts of these PAs on indigenous groups more visible. In doing so we hope that this research provides a constructive space to expose the roots of some of the struggles that indigenous peoples confront today in relation to PAs, and underscores the need to move forward in resolving these by addressing past legacies.

Acknowledgments:

This research would not have been possible without the generous support of different friends, colleagues and family members: Kevin Gould, Jochen Jaeger, Diego Flores, Juan Oltremari, Ximena Cuadra, José Aylwin, Raul Ismael and Julián Chacón, Judith Zuloaga, Carlos García, Maria Isabel Perez de Arce and the generous support of individuals from state agencies and NGOs such as CONAMA, CONAF, Observatorio

Ciudadano and WWF-Chile. Special thanks to Andra Syvanen who reviewed earlier version of this manuscript.

Chapter 3. Protected Area strategies and Indigenous Peoples:

Exploring dimensions of governance in Chile

Abstract:

Over the last decade, governance arrangements for protected areas have received increasing attention from scholars, practitioners and policy makers. Challenges to the establishment of democratic relations between state government agencies and indigenous peoples have been acknowledged but comprehensive studies to assist in understanding and addressing these are lacking. Through an examination of Chilean state relations with indigenous peoples, this paper highlights the complexity and diversity of governance arrangements that have emerged in protected area contexts through particular instances of resistance, accommodation and negotiation with indigenous groups. Our research is based on document analysis and semi-structured interviews with representatives from Chilean state government agencies, non-governmental organizations, academic institutions and indigenous organizations in Chile.

Key words: protected areas, Chile, governance, co-management, indigenous peoples

3.1 Introduction

Currently the primary global strategy for the protection of biodiversity is the establishment of protected areas (PAs) by nation-states. PAs cover approximately 12 percent of the world's land surface (Adams & Hutton, 2007). This strategy of setting aside parcels of land for biodiversity conservation has received broad support from international fora, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Millennium Development Program, and has been implemented by governments all around the globe (Dudley, 2008). However, the establishment of PAs, particularly when implemented without local input or support, has had serious negative impacts on indigenous and local peoples, including their displacement or exclusion from land, resources, sacred places and from their stewardship responsibilities (Adams et al., 2004;

Berkes, 2008; Colchester, 2004; West & Brockington, 2006). In recent years, international discourses led by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) have called for a fundamental revision of governance arrangements within PAs, and endorsed co-governance or indigenous governance as legitimate governance options at the local scale (Berkes, 2009b). Such a transformation of the institutional landscape creates both opportunities and challenges (Brosius & Hitchner, 2010; Krueger, 2009) that need to be understood more fully.

This article presents an in-depth examination of the factors that have shaped the development of PA governance arrangements in Chile with respect to the State and indigenous peoples. Through our analysis of a variety of individual PA experiences, ranging from indigenous displacement to co-governance, we highlight the historical and spatial diversity of PA arrangements involving indigenous groups. In doing so we identify the divergences among cases and the implications of these for negotiations between CONAF and different indigenous groups.

We begin with a description of the methodological approach taken in this study, followed by a brief overview of the dominant international discourses in PA governance, particularly as they relate to indigenous peoples. The socio-cultural context and political status of indigenous groups in Chile is then introduced. Different PA experiences of marginalization, accommodation and negotiation involving indigenous groups are examined as well as strategies available for local participation and PA governance arrangements. We then identify the factors and mechanisms that are more likely to support positive outcomes for the development of democratic PA governance with

respect to indigenous peoples. The paper concludes with an analysis of the development of PA governance strategies across scales, from the national-state level to the local level.

3.2 Methodology

This study was designed as qualitative research and undertaken between September 2009 and October 2011. It focuses on terrestrial PAs within Chile that are both consistent with IUCN (or World Conservation Union) categories of PAs and officially recognized and managed under the National System of State Protected Wildland Areas (or SNASPE)¹¹. This comprises national parks (category II), national reserves (category IV) and natural monuments (category III) (Torres et al., 2007).

The research was based on document analysis and semi-structured interviews. The former involved an examination of government policies, regulations and reports relevant to these PAs. These sources were supplemented by eighteen semi-structured interviews that the first author conducted with government agency officials, researchers, representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and indigenous leaders. Interviews were conducted face-to-face, by telephone, and over the Internet. Participants were selected to provide representation from a range of different perspectives and positions. The interview process focused on contemporary discourses of PA governance as they relate to indigenous peoples, as well as understandings of and insights into existing and alternative PA governance arrangements with indigenous peoples. The research addressed both national and local levels.

¹¹ This definition doesn't include marine, private PAs or other categories of biodiversity conservation strategies.

All quotations are taken from interview transcripts and notes taken by the first author, which were subsequently translated from Spanish to English. The names of some representatives of state agencies have been omitted to respect their request for anonymity.

3.3 Global discourses of PAs and indigenous peoples' rights

The origins of mainstream approaches to conservation are widely linked to the establishment of Yellowstone national park in 1872 (Brockington et al., 2008; Colchester, 2003). The early vision of this national park is associated with George Catlin, a painter, who suggested in 1830 that there be a government policy to create what he called “national parks” to preserve large parcels of land of “pristine beauty and wildness”(Spence, 1999, p. 10). Catlin’s vision of the protection of nature was compatible with that of indigenous Americans who were occupying those lands. However, his ideas of wilderness and people together in a national park did not materialize at Yellowstone. On the contrary, the establishment of this park involved the violent removal and dispossession of indigenous peoples, which was justified in the interest of conservation (Kemf, 1993). Yellowstone national park subsequently became the model followed worldwide for the protection of wilderness landscapes as areas free from human occupation (Colchester, 2004); also called the “fortress conservation” paradigm (Brockington, 2002) or the PA “fence and fines” approach (Borrini-Feyerabend, 1997). Strict ideas of PAs as spaces restricted from human inhabitants and resource users were dominant and were applied worldwide over the last century, causing disruption of livelihood, displacement, denial of rights to land or use of and access to resources, increases in poverty and the marginalization of indigenous and non-indigenous groups (Adams, 2004; Peluso, 1993; Colchester, 2004). The historic removal of people

that occurred with the creation of Yellowstone national park and was then replicated elsewhere has been omitted or downplayed, until recently, from the history of PAs (Brockington et al., 2008).

Since the late 1970s, the world has witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of PAs (Zimmerer, 2006). This global expansion of PAs coincided with the emergence of social democratic movements, including alliances with indigenous groups, which drew attention to the impacts of the PA “fortress model” on indigenous and local communities (Igoe 2005). Their claims were increasingly supported by conservation and human rights organizations (Colchester, 2003). This led to a call from the IUCN in 1975 for national governments to conserve indigenous peoples’ land “without relinquishing their tenure rights” (Eidsvick, 1980, p.186 as quoted in Stevens, 1997, p.38). Researchers and global organizations warned also that the exclusion of indigenous and other local communities from PAs could threaten the conservation objectives of PAs by putting more pressure on surrounding resources and ecosystems (Hutton, 2005). This prompted calls from international conservation groups for a shift away from the strict separation of conservation and human development to a combination of both (Dove, 2006). During the 1980s, the international community agreed that while PAs were essential for biodiversity conservation, they should also address the concerns of local and indigenous communities related to development (Naughton-Treves et al., 2005). This view supported the emergence of “people-oriented” conservation initiatives in the mid-1980s, such as Integrated Conservation and Development Projects (ICDPs) and Community-Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM) (Brechin et al., 2002), to improve the quality of life of people living adjacent to PAs, thus reducing pressure on PA resources (Wells &

Brandon, 1992).

These people-centered PAs were expanded as a mechanism to achieve local resource management and to improve community decision-making, local empowerment and thus democratization of conservation practices (Naughton-Treves et al., 2005). However, the alleged failure of people-oriented conservation and development projects to adequately protect biodiversity was an argument advanced by some individuals and organizations to support stricter enforcement of PAs (Wells & Brandon, 1992; Brandon et al., 1998; Redford & Sanderson, 2000) by returning to the conventional ‘fences approach’ to PA management (Brechin et al., 2002; Dove, 2006). This apparent failure of people-oriented conservation triggered a backlash in the late 1990s known as the “back to the barriers movement” (Hutton et al., 2005).

The adverse social impacts of PAs have been the subject of much discussion by scholars and international organizations since the late 1970s. However it is only since the 1990s that international discourses on PAs have become linked to cultural diversity and indigenous rights (Brockington et al. 2008), or what Brosius and Hitchner (2010) refer to as the “biocultural perspective” in conservation. Concerns relating to human rights, particularly indigenous rights in PAs, have moved the conservation debate from an ecological concern to a more socially inclusive paradigm of conservation. At the same time, power relations between large environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs) and indigenous groups have come under scrutiny, especially in relation to concerns that funding priorities are being dictated by distant external sponsors which undermine and marginalize the role of local and indigenous peoples in PA implementation and management (Chapin, 2004).

Currently, indigenous peoples' rights and concerns are a focal point of attention at international conservation fora (Igoe & Brockington, 2007). The emergence at the international level of indigenous peoples' alliances with human rights and conservation organizations have provided opportunities for them to raise their interests and make demands at critical international and regional events, such as the 2003 World Parks Congress in South Africa and the 2007 Second Latin American Protected Areas Congress in Argentina. The dominant international agenda enacted by the Convention on Biological Diversity and the IUCN puts pressure on governments to ensure the full participation of indigenous peoples in the establishment and management of PAs and to put in place mechanisms to guarantee their share of the benefits of PAs (Greiber, M., 2009). The IUCN included an indigenous governance dimension to the PA categories in 2008 and has confirmed its position as a supporter of indigenous peoples' participation in the design, planning and management of these PAs (e.g. Dudley, 2008). Despite achievements at the international policy level, however, the implementation of these changes at the nation-state level and at the community level has often been met with resistance and certainly with challenges.

3.4 PAs as arenas for encounters between the state and indigenous groups in Chile

Latin America has witnessed a dramatic increase in PAs in recent decades (Zimmerer, 2006). This expansion has encroached upon territories traditionally inhabited by indigenous peoples; indeed, a report from the IUCN suggests that 85% of PAs in Latin America are inhabited by indigenous peoples (Amend & Amend, 1995). More recently, an IUCN document indicates that 27% of PAs (802 at the national-level) in South America overlap with indigenous territories (Cisneros & McBreen, 2010). In Chile,

approximately 20% of the national territory is officially under PA status (CONAF, 2011). As in much of Latin America, the Chilean system is based on the categories enacted by the Washington Convention¹², ratified by Chile in 1967, which defined the categories of national park, national reserve, and nature monument, and provided guidelines for the establishment of PAs. Since the ratification of the Washington Convention, the country has followed mainstream conservation paradigms for PA development (Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002). National parks and other state-directed PAs have been created under the Ministry of Agriculture as enclosed areas for the protection of flora and fauna or landscapes of “extraordinary beauty”. However, the rights and interests of local and indigenous communities have received only limited consideration.

In spite of the extensive commitment Chile has made to PA creation, it is the only Latin American country without a specific law on PAs (Cavieres et al., 2009). In 1984, a national PA system (Sistema Nacional de Áreas Silvestres Protegidas del Estado, or SNASPE) was established under the administration of the National Forestry Service (Corporación Nacional Forestal, or CONAF), which is within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Agriculture. While SNASPE has been in existence for almost three decades, the law that underpins the system has not been given formal approval due to political and financial issues (Benoit, 2005; Rovira et al., 2006; Torres et al., 2007). A new Bill for the creation of a Service of Biodiversity and Protected Areas, which will be under the Ministry of Environment, is currently in Congress. Environmental and human rights organizations, as well as indigenous groups, are critical of the lack of opportunity for their participation in the process, arguing that their rights and interests are not addressed

¹² Convention on Nature Protection and Wild Life Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, signed in Washington in 1940

by the Bill (e.g. Alvear, 2011; Aylwin & Cuadra, 2010). A particular concern for many indigenous groups is their right to manage and benefit from tourism fees and services located inside PAs (Aylwin & Cuadra, 2010, Espindola T., 2010 pers. comm., Cayuqueo P., 2010 pers. comm.).

The emergence of democracy in Chile in 1990, after seventeen years of military dictatorship, marked a new era in the protection of indigenous rights, including their inclusion and participation in PA governance. Indigenous peoples saw this moment as an opportunity to gain recognition of their constitutional, territorial, and participatory rights in addition to their formal recognition as peoples within the Chilean state (Aylwin, 2010, pers. comm.). In 1993, the first democratic government approved the law (No. 19.253) on “The Protection, Promotion and Development of Indigenous Communities”, commonly referred to as the “Indigenous Law”. This law recognizes and names from north to south eight indigenous groups: Aymara, Atacameño, Quechua, Rapa Nui, Colla, Mapuche, Kawashkar, and Yagan. The law acknowledges the existence of “indigenous communities” but does not recognize them as peoples, which means that political rights to self-government and other collective rights have been denied (IEI 2003). Indigenous groups are still lobbying for stronger formal recognition, such as their recognition in the Constitution and inclusion in political representation (Carter, 2010; Millaquen, 2011).

Territorial overlaps between indigenous traditional territories and PAs are significant, corresponding to 29.5% of all state-based PAs or 29 PAs (Cisneros & McBreen, 2010). As in Latin America and elsewhere, indigenous communities in Chile have coexisted in conflict with state led-PAs. According to an examination of Chilean PAs, the focus of indigenous peoples’ complaints is: (a) their exclusion from PA planning

and management; (b) their limited access to resources; and (c) the absence of land tenure recognition by the state (2006). Today conflicts have been reduced with the implementation of Local Advisory Committees, a participatory mechanism led by CONAF to work with the communities in the planning and management of PAs. However, as stated by Oltremari and Jackson (2006) autonomy in decision-making is an on-going demand of indigenous groups.

Chile has been identified by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) as the country with the greatest level of income inequality in the world (OECD, 2011). Despite two decades of economic growth, indigenous groups continue to be disproportionately poor and represent the most disadvantaged groups within the Chilean population (Agostini et al., 2010). By offering some insights into the challenges and opportunities for PA governance to respond to the rights and interests of indigenous groups, this article hopes to contribute to addressing this inequality.

3.5 State PAs and indigenous peoples' governance issues in Chile: Opinions and perceptions from the actors involved

PAs have been established in Chile since 1907 for a diversity of purposes; to address forest depletion, to preserve endangered species of flora and fauna, to protect beautiful landscapes, as a strategy for state sovereignty, and for the protection of representative ecosystems (Cabeza, 1988; Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002; Armesto et al., 1998; Oltremari & Thelen, 2003). However, as Oltremari and Jackson have pointed out, the establishment of PAs “ignored the presence of indigenous communities residing in those territories” (2006, p. 215). Until the “Indigenous Law” of 1993, PAs in Chile were

established without consulting indigenous inhabitants, nor were indigenous groups included in formal PA management structures.

While the overall experience of Chilean indigenous peoples with PAs is often described in terms of dispossession, marginalization and neglect (Aylwin, 2010; Sepúlveda, 2009), the experience of particular indigenous groups varied considerably both historically and geographically. Interviews conducted by the first author with government and non-government personnel, provide insights into the different experiences of indigenous peoples in terms of rights to land and access to resources within PAs. They also facilitated the identification of different strategies applied at the local level to resolve conflicts and advance negotiations between indigenous peoples and the State.

State strategies for the establishment of PAs in Chile were based on the idea of protecting and controlling state-owned lands and resources (Pauchard & Villarroel, 2002). However, some of the lands considered state property, on which PAs were established, were at least in part indigenous land with tenure or customary titles. Until recently this issue was rarely acknowledged. As a CONAF official explained, “until 2002, professionals and technicians, who were in charge of the design and management of PAs in the country, did not consider in its planning or management standards, their [indigenous people’s] rights, nor the value that indigenous culture added to PAs. This was because this issue was not integrated by CONAF”¹³. This statement highlights a fundamental policy constraint; that indigenous peoples’ rights and interests were outside

¹³ “Los profesionales y técnicos que diseñaron y manejaron las áreas silvestres protegidas (ASPs) en el país hasta el año 2002 no consideraron en su planificación ni en las normas de manejo, sus derechos, ni tampoco el valor que la cultura indígena podía agregar a las ASP. Ello debido a que internamente en la CONAF no existía integración del tema”.

of the mandate of CONAF. The primary mandate of CONAF was to protect or preserve wild areas, but no social implications or impacts of this mandate were considered or integrated by them. The statement reveals the marginal social, political and geographical situation of indigenous peoples. PAs were imposed on indigenous territories without resolving land tenure issues or accommodating indigenous resource use and management practices (Aylwin, 2010).

Chiloé national park is an important example of an indigenous struggle centered on the establishment of a PA. As documented by Correa (2002), since the park was established in 1982 on Chiloé island located in southern Chile, the relationship of the Mapuche-Huilliches communities with park authorities has been a source of conflict both because of the lack of recognition of the customary land rights of indigenous families and their limited access to resources located inside the park. The boundaries of the park cover three former state-owned forestry reserves and an extended territory, part of which was the traditional land of two Mapuche-Huilliche communities. In 1982, CONAF made a survey to delimit the PA territory from the land of the indigenous families of Chanquin and Huentemo (Correa, 2002). However, the survey was not comprehensive enough and resulted in an important reduction of indigenous land; it defined as indigenous property only the areas where houses were located but excluded the forest where they conducted their subsistence and traditional activities. It was subsequently declared a national park. The land restriction was the main cause of conflicts between the communities and CONAF. As Roberto Panichine, *lonko* (chief) of the community of Chanquin, explains “[t]he creation of the Chiloé national park meant for our community the loss of our territorial space, and also meant the prohibition and regulation of our resource extraction

system, making it impossible to access and use resources that exist there. It limited our work”¹⁴ (Bosque Modelo Chiloe, 2002, p. 45). With the emergence of democracy in 1990, indigenous communities were given new hopes of achieving recognition of their rights and interests (IEI 2003). The right to ownership was recognized for two indigenous communities, marking an important milestone for resolving a long-standing conflict (Oltremari and Guerrero 2003) and resulting in almost twelve thousand acres of the Chiloé national park being returned to indigenous families in 2001 (Correa, 2002). For the first time, indigenous land tenure in PAs was recognized officially and lands were returned to indigenous communities. Despite this development, park management within Chiloé national park remains top-down with limited opportunities for indigenous peoples’ participation in park governance. The case is nevertheless a good example of the integration of indigenous peoples within PAs as the indigenous communities here obtain certain benefits from the PA, specifically, through their involvement in providing tourism services to park visitors (CONAF official, pers. comm.).

Similar cases of land conflicts with indigenous groups have occurred in other PA contexts. National parks and national reserves were established in the north of Chile on indigenous Aymara-owned land. The total area of the Volcán Isluga national park, established in 1967, for example, is on indigenous tenured land. In the Lauca national park, established in 1965, indigenous land comprised more than 60% of the park’s area (Torres et al., 2007). In the case of Las Vicunas national reserve, created in 1983, the entire reserve had been traditionally used by indigenous families (Cunazza, 1989). For

¹⁴ La creación del Parque Nacional Chiloé significó la pérdida nuestro espacio territorial, y para nuestra comunidad significó también la prohibición y reglamentación del sistema de extracción de recursos, haciendo imposible acceder al uso de los recursos que existían allí, quedando limitados nuestros trabajos.

José Aylwin, co-director of the human rights' organization Observatorio Ciudadano, the creation of PAs in Aymara indigenous territory was a “tremendous negligence of the state!... I believe that they were not aware of the [indigenous] land tenure issue”.¹⁵ As Aylwin explains, in those cases the establishment of PAs was not a response to a deliberate state act to displace indigenous communities. The occupation of indigenous tenured land by PA initiatives instead reflects the arbitrary perspective of the State at the moment of establishing these PAs and the lack of any negotiating power that indigenous communities had at that time. Indigenous land tenure in the Aymara territory has, in fact, been acknowledged by CONAF since the late 1980s (e.g. Araya, 1989); however, state occupation of indigenous lands persists within the PA's boundaries.

The case of the Rapa Nui people illustrates a very different experience. In 1935, the whole territory of Easter Island was declared the Rapa Nui national park by the Ministry of Lands and Colonization (Decree Supreme No. 103, 1935), two years after the Chilean state registered the entire island's land in the “real estate registrar” as part of the colonization process that began in 1888. The Rapa Nui people were not informed that the land had been inscribed as state-owned property under the principle of *terra nullius* (IEI, 2003). This led to conflicts between the Rapa Nui people and the State, and to a resolve among the Rapa Nui people to self-govern the park and pursue land claims. The limits of the park were modified in 1966, and again in 1976, 1983 and 2002. As Ninoska Cuadros, CONAF Provincial Director explains, “the park has the control of the whole coastal edge; therefore, it cuts the ancestral use of the territory. We inherit the land use, not the land

¹⁵ Yo creo que hubouna negligencia del estado..... tremenda! ... yo creo que a ellos se les escapo el tema de propietatios

title rights”¹⁶. Because of the overlap of traditional land use with the boundaries of the park, some indigenous families got politically organized; they occupied a section of the park by grazing animals there and insisted upon getting their land rights recognized. The intervention of the Council of Elders, an organization that represents the political and cultural interests of the Rapa Nui people, was critical to the negotiation process, and more than 600 acres were eventually returned to the indigenous communities (Comisión de Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato, 2003). Demands for the return of additional lands continue today, as part of major claims of the Rapa Nui people related to land tenure and self-governance rights, attracting significant levels of national and international media attention. The case of the Rapa Nui national park is still under negotiation (El Mercurio, 2010; Ninoska Cuadros, 2010 pers. comm.). Today the park is under centralized state control, but the local level is responsible for daily management decisions and accountability measures are shared with the Elders Council. The Rapa Nui people have proposed that the administration of the Rapa Nui national park be managed by the Council of Elders of Rapa Nui (Comision Verdad Historica y Nuevo Trato, 2003). They also propose that they retain any revenue from the park and maintain the technical support of CONAF for conservation initiatives (Cuadros, 2010 pers. comm.). The context of these PA governance negotiations resonates with larger political aspirations for self-governance and decentralization, with their leadership role in the administration of the park as one of the priorities of the Rapa Nui people. This conflict represents an opportunity to develop a democratic governance system for the park, which covers more than 40% of the surface of the island.

¹⁶ El parque toma el control de todo el borde costero de la isla, y corta por ende, el uso ancestral del territorio. Pero nosotros heredamos el uso de la tierra, no los títulos de dmonio.

PAs have also been a source of conflict concerning the protection of sacred species and access to celebrate traditional ceremonies and/or subsistence activities. One example is represented by the Ralco national reserve, which was formerly Ralco national park. The creation of the park was in response to concerns of indigenous Mapuche-Pewenche families about the overexploitation of their sacred tree, the *Araucaria araucana* (known as the monkey puzzle tree) by the Ralco Timber Company (Maderas Ralco S.A.). The communities fought for its official protection as the *Araucaria* is part of Mapuche-Pewenche people cultural, economic and spiritual life (Herrmann, 2006; Herrmann & Torri, 2009). As documented by Molina and Correa (1996), the lands in question were bought in 1881 from twenty Mapuche-Pewenche families. Since they didn't speak Spanish, Mapuche-Pewenche representatives unwittingly ceded their titles through interpreters to Rafael Anguita, the former mayor of the city of Los Angeles, (the municipal territory in which the lands were located). The landowners changed several times until the Ralco Timber Company took control of those lands called as *Fundo Ralco* (Ralco country estate) and in 1966 started the commercial exploitation of the trees (Sepúlveda, 2009). The Mapuche-Pewenche families who remained living as squatters on their traditional homeland, struggled against the exploitation of the *Araucaria*. In 1974 as in response to indigenous demands, the park was established to protect the *Araucaria* from commercial exploitation within the borders of the *Fundo Ralco*. At the time, protection was given to the trees, not to the land itself. Only in 1987 when the Ralco national reserve was established, the borders were delimited in part of the lands of the *Fundo Ralco*. The rest of the land was granted to indigenous Mapuche-Pewenche families who were living there (Decree Supreme No. 429 of 1987). The reserve management

policies have generated conflict and many negative implications for local indigenous families including limits on their access to collect *Araucaria* seeds, a major element of their diet (Herrmann, 2006), and restrictions on their access to *veranadas*, the areas where they graze their animals during the summer season and where the celebration of traditional ceremonies takes place (Sepúlveda, 2009). This has promoted unsustainable management practices within the reserve (Herrmann, 2006). According to Sepúlveda's analysis, "for indigenous Mapuche-Pewenche' families, CONAF, more than taking care of the management of the reserve, is managing their lands for *veranadas* and interferes inevitably with the decisions that affect them" (2009, p.28). Following the enactment of the "Indigenous Law", their participation in the management of the PA was allowed through the creation of a Local Advisory Committee in 2004. However, according to Cristian Cornejo, Chief of the Department of Natural Resources within the Environmental Ministry at the regional level, "the Advisory Committee of the reserve is always imposed and directed by CONAF, and it answers CONAF's interests"¹⁷. According to the same official, although notions of participation are considered, the communities are still a disempowered partner in the management of the PA. The legitimacy and voices of the Mapuche-Pewenche communities have not been recognized in the management of the PA. A CONAF official at the national level, however, presents a different perspective, as he says "the Mapuche-Pewenche' communities of Quepuca Ralco and Ralco Lepoy are perfectly integrated. There are Mapuche-Pewenche forest rangers, and traditional ceremonies, such as the Nguillatun, are celebrated inside the park as well as traditional activities for subsistence such as the *talajeo* [to graze animals],

¹⁷ El consejo consultivo de la reserva, es una modalidad impuesta y siempre dirigida por CONAF, responde a los intereses de CONAF.

piñoneo [to take the seeds of the monkey puzzle tree], etc.”¹⁸. This difference in outlook suggests that government agents working at the sub-national level and the national level perceive the integration of indigenous peoples into PA management differently. While at the sub-national level the limitations of the Advisory Committee are acknowledged, consistent with the assessments of several researchers (Aylwin & Cuadra, 2010; Sepúlveda, 2009), the Committee is considered a success by the national level official.

The Los Flamencos national reserve represents a more progressive governance arrangement between park managers and indigenous peoples, in this case the indigenous communities of Lican Antai (Atacameños). However, its origins were not without controversy and conflict. Established in 1990 on indigenous traditional lands, including sacred sites, archeological sites and lands used for subsistence activities, their rights were not recognized by the State at the time of the reserve’s creation, resulting in the restricted access of indigenous families to these lands and resources. Seven indigenous communities subsequently claimed the lands of the reserve as their ancestral territory, and issued complaints because they could no longer practice their subsistence activities. They also objected to the fact that their ownership of cultural and sacred sites had been arrogated by the State (Valenzuela, 2005). As Contreras and Valenzuela confirmed, “nobody warned the communities that the establishment of the PA could mean restrictions on their traditional way of production, because the land is now a PA under the management of CONAF” (2001, p. 32).

¹⁸ Otra relación buena es la que ocurre en la RN Ralco, en el Alto Bío Bío. Donde las comunidades pewenches de Quepuca Ralco y Ralco Lepoy, están perfectamente integradas. Hay guardaparques pewenches, en su interior se realizan ceremonias como el Nguillatun, hay talajeo, piñoneo, etc..

CONAF's mandate for the management of PAs for biodiversity protection has been very narrow and they have neither the jurisdiction nor expertise to handle indigenous peoples' issues. For this reason, CONAF forbade the use of resources in the reserve by indigenous communities to protect local biodiversity. Pressures were further intensified with the huge growth of international visitor numbers and related tourism revenues, from which the communities wanted a share as a way to supplement their traditional economy (Contreras & Valenzuela, 2001). Following an escalation in indigenous resistance and further negotiations, CONAF and the communities reached an agreement for co-governance of the reserve (Contreras & Valenzuela, 2001). Issues of accountability, management and legitimacy among both partners are addressed in the agreement. The Los Flamencos national reserve is the only case in Chile where indigenous communities have achieved co-governance of a state PA. CONAF takes responsibility for the protection of biodiversity, maintaining their role as managers by protecting the PA's natural resources, a responsibility that is overseen by indigenous communities. The communities administer tourism services within the reserve, including the management of interpretative centers and tourism guides, and retain a percentage of the total tourism revenue generated by the reserve, which is the second most popular tourist destination in the country. Monitoring activities are shared between partners but are led by CONAF. The decision-making of both activities; resources management and tourism development are coordinated among partners. Managing the tourism revenue at the local level was certainly a unique achievement for the communities. In Chile park fees and tourism revenues are usually managed at the national-state level and then re-distributed to all PAs.

A significant incentive for CONAF to establish alliances with indigenous communities is access to additional sources of funding for ecotourism infrastructure, capacity building and resource management through third party funding sources, such as other state agencies or corporate funding from mining companies. As Juan Pablo Contreras, a CONAF representative at the regional level explains, “we did not have park wardens in the field, we had no infrastructure, so this partnership with the indigenous group helps us to capture money from both mining companies and the government that began with this policy of indigenous development. Money that we were not able to capture by ourselves; it was only possible as a result of the alliance we made with the indigenous communities... and it generated significant investment for the reserve”¹⁹. Tita Espindola, the leader of the Lican Antai indigenous organization is in agreement with this assessment: “we can get resources from partnerships that we or they could not have succeeded in doing otherwise”²⁰. The negotiation was a first step to establish co-governance. With the alliance, the communities have been able to demand more power sharing in the control of resources and in the decision-making process. This has fostered the development of alliances based on a win-win relationship; on the one hand indigenous communities have been empowered in the monitoring of PA resources while on the other, PA conservation objectives have been strengthened through the provision of more personnel and infrastructure.

¹⁹ no teníamos guardaparque en el campo, no teníamos infraestructura, entonces esta asociación con el mundo indígena, logro captar una serie de dineros de las compañías mineras, del sector de gobierno que empezaba con esta política del desarrollo indígena. Dineros que no hubiésemos podido captar nosotros , todo lo que se tenia se endosa a las comunidades y logramos generar una inversión bastante importante para la reserva .

²⁰ podemos conseguir recursos en asociación que nosotros o ellos no podríamos haber conseguido.

Despite this, the establishment of local co-management institutions and the development of power sharing strategies has produced tensions between the CONAF regional administrative level and the nation-state level. According to Contreras, “for the institution [CONAF], it was a tremendous threat. Our experience was a bad precedent for the national system [of PAs], was a bad precedent because we were affecting the integrity of the system”²¹. The support of CONAF officials at the sub-national and local levels combined with the political organization, agency and will of the Lican Antai people demonstrate that it is possible to establish an equitable and accountable arrangement for shared management within the context of PAs (CONAF official, 2010 pers. comm.).

3.6 Factors that have facilitated the development of more democratic PA governance arrangements

Several factors have facilitated the development of more democratic PA governance arrangements in Chile in recent years. We identify and discuss five of the most critical of these, with particular attention to their role in supporting the establishment of alliances between CONAF and various indigenous groups. These are: (1) Emergence of a new political order, (2) Agency and political organization of indigenous groups, (3) PAs as opportunities for local economic development, (4) Building of local institutions, and (5) Protection of indigenous ancestral lands from commercial interests.

²¹ para la institución fue una tremenda amenaza. Nuestra experiencia era un pésimo precedente al sistema nacional , estábamos afectando la integridad del sistema.

3.6.1 Emergence of a new political order

The democratization of the country in 1990 has been the main factor responsible for generating a platform for negotiations between indigenous groups and PA authorities. The resulting fundamental changes in the political system permitted a reevaluation of the purpose of and approaches taken in PAs. The recognition of certain indigenous rights by the Indigenous Law of 1993 provided the basis to begin the process of dialogue, negotiation and accommodation of indigenous communities' needs and interests in PAs. As a result indigenous communities got more representation within PA governance structures.

This shift cannot be fully appreciated without consideration of the change in conservation discourses occurring at the international level. As a CONAF official notes, “in the 1990s, the country entered into a path of democratization. The administration of PAs as islands was not possible anymore. (...) It was also as a result of the change in the conservation strategy of the IUCN leaving aside the traditional fortress PA management model” (...) ²². The same official added that “...changes were often in response to the pressure of indigenous groups. It has also helped to change the situation, having the presence of CONAF officials who are sensitive to the participation of indigenous groups [in PAs]...” ²³. Juan Oltremari, a Chilean academic expert in the planning and management of PAs, highlights the influence of international fora and discourses on the development of PAs but their limitation with respect to the recognition of indigenous rights and interests in conservation. According to him: “the Convention on Biological

²² [e]l país en 1990 entró en un camino de democratización donde la administración de las ASP como ínsulas, no era más posible. (...) Asimismo, como resultado del cambio de estrategia de UICN de que para conservar era necesario dejar de lado el modelo de administración tipo encalve de las ASP.

²³ Los cambios relacionales hasta el año 2010 han venido muchas veces en respuesta a la presión indígena. También ha colaborado a cambiar la situación, la presencia de funcionarios en CONAF, sensibles a la participación de los indígenas .

Diversity, the two Latin American Parks Congress and the World Parks Congress have been very important to promote the establishment and management of protected areas, but cannot be said to have influenced the recognition of indigenous peoples' demands. (...) “I think it has been difficult [for CONAF] to involve communities in the management of PAs. I think they do it because they have no choice”²⁴. The emergence of the new political order has facilitated negotiations between state agents and indigenous groups resulting in some progress towards the inclusion of participatory approaches in PAs. Unfortunately, these developments in the governance of PAs have yet to inform the nation-state’s agenda on PAs, but instead are still limited to a case-by-case basis at the local level.

3.6.2 Agency and political organization of indigenous groups

The political organization of indigenous groups has been critical in achieving equitable agreements for mutual cooperation and partnership with government agencies. The capacity of indigenous communities determines how effective the negotiations will be and the ability of the resulting alliance to resolve conflicts and advance toward more progressive governance arrangements.

For Los Flamencos national reserve, the political organization of the Lican Antai people was a key factor facilitating negotiations with CONAF. As Contreras highlighted, progress in this particular context “was possible at the local level because of the political organization and social capital of the Lican Antai people and because of the support of

²⁴ el Convenio sobre la diversidad biológica, los concejos consultivos de las áreas protegidas, los dos Congresos Latinoamericanos de Parques, los congresos mundiales de parques han sido muy importantes para impulsar el establecimiento y el manejo de las áreas protegidas, pero no se puede decir que han influido en el reconocimiento de las demandas de los pueblos indígenas. La situación en Chile no parece ser tan problemática como en otros países (...) Yo creo que ha costado involucrar a las comunidades en la gestión de las áreas. Creo que lo hacen porque no tienen otra opción.

CONAF officials at the regional administrative level to share power”²⁵. Tita Espindola, leader of the Consejo de Pueblos Atacameños (Atacama Peoples Council), presents a similar perspective with respect to the recognition they achieved of their rights: “when the reserve was established, we requested the official recognition of the Lican Antai as traditional owners of the land, as it was the only way to start a negotiation with the State”(…) “we have been for twelve thousand years the Lican Antai culture, so when they created the PA, they put the state to have control of the land... and it was removed from us [sic]... you could say that they did not recognize us at all until the Indigenous Law, nobody recognized us. There was an authoritarianism (...) thanks to the indigenous law, in 2001 we made an association with great difficulty, big problems, under long negotiations with CONAF”²⁶. An important aspect of their success in negotiating their rights and interests with CONAF was the legitimacy and effectiveness of the Atacama Peoples Council, a unique political organization representing Lican Antai communities.

The experience of the Mapuche communities, traditional inhabitants of central-southern Chile, has been different. The Mapuche people have implemented different strategies to resolve conflicts with CONAF’s park officials. According to Ximena Cuadra, a representative of the NGO Observatorio Ciudadano through which she coordinated a project related to the rights of indigenous peoples in PAs: “the way the communities are constituted is less united and cohesive than the way the Mapuche people were organized before. This has meant that the strategies of the different communities and organizational expressions are different; they don’t have one, they have many

²⁵ esto fue posible a nivel local, por la organización política y capital social del pueblo Lican Antai, además del apoyo de CONAF al nivel regional para compartir el poder

²⁶ Nosotros desde hace 12.00 años hemos sido la cultura Lican Antai. Cuando crean el AP ya hay un estado ahí para controlar la tierra... y bueno nos han quitado eso, se podría decir, no nos reconocían para nada hasta la Ley Indígena. Y de ahí a la ley indígena nadie nos reconocía, había un autoritarismo... (...) Gracias a la ley indígena nosotros el 2001 logramos hacer una asociatividad con gran dificultad, grandes problemáticas, grandes discusiones con CONAF .

strategies (...). For example, certain communities want to improve their participation in PAs, while others are claiming back the ownership titles of some PAs, as is the case of Villarrica national park²⁷. This diversity of strategies has diluted their impact and resulted in slow progress gaining recognition of the rights, needs and interests of Mapuche communities in PAs.

3.6.3 PAs as opportunities for local economic development

A significant incentive in the development of alliances between indigenous groups and CONAF local authorities is the opportunity presented by PAs for economic development by the indigenous communities themselves.

In Chile and elsewhere, indigenous struggles are not always about access to land and resources in PAs. As Igoe (2005) notes, due to the marginal situation that many indigenous peoples face worldwide, struggles are also related to economic conditions. For this reason indigenous communities have targeted tourism initiatives, and the associated opportunity for economic development, inside PAs. In Chile, CONAF has attempted to reduce conflict and respond to the demands of indigenous communities by integrating them into the tourism services provided to PAs (Díaz 2004). As a result some communities, living in and adjacent to PAs, have established small businesses such as guiding tours, and lodging and food services. These initiatives, according to Oltremari and Jackson (2006), need to be strengthened through greater empowerment and capacity building of indigenous groups. As a CONAF official from the national level explains, “much of what they [indigenous groups] know has been transferred from CONAF. I

²⁷ Hoy día la forma en que se fueron constituyendo como comunidades en un sentido mas restringido y menos asociativo como antes el pueblo mapuche se organizaba, y eso ha implicado que las estrategias de las comunidades y de las distintas expresiones organizativas del mundo mapuche sean distintas, en que no sean unas si no que sean muchas... (...) Hay algunas comunidades, por ejemplo que demandan mayor participación en Pas mientras otras están demandando títulos de propiedad de algunos parques nacionales.

believe that to advance the effective participation of communities in state PAs requires a capacity building program under the administration and management of both CONAF and indigenous groups”²⁸. Capacity building was identified by CONAF authorities as a critical factor for the local stewardship of tourism services associated with PAs. Due to their marginal situation, indigenous partners don’t have sufficient economic or technical resources to share in the benefits of tourism development in PAs. For example, the CONAF manager of the Villarrica national park, Jorge Paredes, explained that even though there have been conflicts in the past related to land ownership, today the communities are requesting access to PA resources and support for tourism development; as he stated “nothing major. They don’t have the money to invest in tourism equipment, so they offer services such as horse riding...”²⁹. A share of the benefits of tourism from PAs is one of the main demands of indigenous communities, however arrangements with CONAF have varied, dependent upon the social capital of indigenous groups as well as on the potential to involve third party stakeholders, as the case of the Atacama Peoples Council and mining companies for Los Flamencos national reserve, and the Council of Elders for the case of Rapa Nui national park.

3.6.4 Building of local institutions

To make progress toward establishing democratic governance of natural resources, scholars have noted that minimum requirements are: i) political empowerment of the people; ii) the restitution of rights; and iii) the building of local institutions (Bawa et al., 2010; Berkes, 2009a). In terms of building local institutions, in Chile, CONAF has

²⁸ Gran parte de lo que ellos saben les ha sido transferido por CONAF. Creo que si se quiere avanzar en una participación efectiva de comunidades en ASP es necesario un programa de capacitación en administración y manejo, y en un proceso “co-evolutivo” entre ellos y la CONAF.

²⁹ Nada importante. No tienen la plata para invertir en equipamiento turístico, ofrecen servicio como cabalgatas...

implemented local advisory committees comprised of park officials and community representatives. The committees, which are coordinated by CONAF, implement community consultation as a mechanism for participation in PA management. However, indigenous groups have found only limited legitimacy in these consultative mechanisms; their needs and interests are not necessarily reflected in the PA policies. Mechanisms to share responsibility and accountability for the management of resources are needed. Relations of power between the indigenous groups and CONAF are not equal; in fact, the role of CONAF has been strengthened in the PA decision-making process by the Local Advisory Committees. As a representative of the Environmental Ministry stated when asked about the role of indigenous communities in PA management: “it has evolved as strictly formal, as the law requires. They [indigenous communities] don’t have an explicit role, meaning that communities will co-manage or the PA system in the future will have an indigenous peoples’ component... Not much has changed I would say between the 1970s to date, in my perception (...). There has been a place of understanding, of participation but not of decision-making. It is CONAF who makes the management decisions at the end of the day”³⁰. A similar perspective was expressed by a CONAF official involved in PA planning and indigenous peoples’ issues: “from the point of view of PA governance, [the local advisory committees]] have been a regular mechanism for consultation and information; a space to look for support in defense of CONAF management decisions³¹”. Mechanisms of participation have been instrumental for endorsing CONAF’s needs and interests, maintaining top-down approaches to

³⁰ “Mira yo te diría que en lo pegado a derecho, en lo formal ellos no tienen un rol explícito, es decir, que las comunidades van a co-administrar o que el sistema de AP en el fuero va a tener un componente indígena, no... no ha habido grandes cambios yo te diría entre los años 70 a la fecha, en mi percepción... (...)Si ha habido un espacio de entendimiento, de participación no de decisión, finalmente quien toma las decisiones de gestión a final del día es la CONAF.”

³¹ desde el punto de vista de la gobernanza del ASP, han sido un mecanismos regular de consulta e información y búsqueda de apoyo en defensa del ASP.

conservation practices. In this respect, it is CONAF who organizes and coordinates the committees, calls for meetings, decides the agenda, and takes all decisions related the management of PAs. Aylwin confirms this limitation when he states, “local advisory committees only have a consultative characteristic. This has been a disincentive for indigenous communities to get involved; they don’t have an impact in the decision-making process (sic)”³². These statements show the weakness of these committees; i.e., the voices of the so-called partners are not represented equally, with power unevenly shared among stakeholders.

3.6.5 Protection of indigenous ancestral lands from commercial interests

Increasingly, indigenous communities in Chile are seeing PAs as a way to protect their traditional lands and resources from national and transnational corporations interested in developing mining, lumber or hydroelectricity projects on indigenous territories (Cayuqueo, 2010, pers. comm., Espindola, 2010 pers. comm., Aylwin, 2010 pers. comm.). For example, hydroelectricity projects are threatening the traditional territories, sacred sites and resources of Mapuche communities. In response the Mapuche are entering into alliances with CONAF in an effort to increase their ability to prevent or limit corporate investment in national parks and other PAs located in their traditional territory (Aylwin, 2010 pers comm.). Another case is the Lican Antai groups who have used the official status of state PAs as an argument to prevent commercial development that threatens indigenous resources. According to Espindola, “with the association with CONAF, today we can put a voice of warning when resources are threatened; we have observed that the disproportionate actions and depredation of groundwater by mining

³² los consejos consultivos locales sólo tienen un carácter consultivo. Este ha sido un disincetivo para las comunidades indígenas a participar, ya que no tienen un impacto en el proceso de toma de decisiones

corporations have impacted the local biodiversity in many places where flamingos used to nest but not anymore”³³. Thus for the Lican Antai people and the Mapuche, PAs can serve as an instrument to limit external commercial interests and increase protection and control over local resources.

3.7 Conclusions

An assessment of PA governance arrangements involving the Chilean state and indigenous peoples reveals a diversity of experiences. At the nation-state level, limited progress has been made to develop policies and/or practices that support an appropriate enabling environment for the development of more equitable and participatory approaches to PA governance. For example, the CONAF document “Institutional Guidelines in PAs and Indigenous Communities”, released in the year 2000, was never implemented. According to Contreras, “the document was never official, precisely because of this fear of the indigenous topic at the national level...”³⁴. Another example is the Bill that created the Biodiversity and PA Services. The drafting of this Bill did not involve the participation of indigenous groups, and, to date, measures to address the rights and interests of indigenous peoples are not included in the document.

At the sub-national and regional administrative level, CONAF has been more progressive in developing democratic governance approaches in PAs. Two indigenous groups have been able to negotiate co-governance approaches with provincial CONAF officials; the Lican Antai communities are participants in the co-governance of the Los Flamencos national reserve, while the Rapa Nui people are in the process of negotiating

³³ Con la asociatividad con CONAF, hoy día podemos poner una voz de alerta por la vulnerabilidad de los recursos, hacemos observaciones de las acciones desmesuradas y la depredación de las aguas subterráneas por las mineras que han impactado la biodiversidad, ya hay varios lugares donde los flamencos nidificaban y ya no nidifican mas .

³⁴ El documento nunca se oficializó justamente por este temor del nivel nacional del tema indígena

co-governance of the Rapa Nui national park. Despite this progress, hierarchical governance is still dominant in Chilean PAs, resulting in unequal power sharing between state agencies and indigenous groups.

CONAF has attempted to reduce conflicts and make progress in the recognition of indigenous communities' rights through the recognition of indigenous land rights, the creation of local advisory committees, and by supporting their involvement in small ecotourism initiatives linked to PAs. Recognition of land claims was part of the first stage of negotiations. The return of indigenous lands that were converted to PAs was part of the achievement of indigenous communities for the cases of Chiloé national park (Correa, 2002), Rapa Nui national park (Comisión de Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato, 2003) and Los Flamencos national reserve (Contreras and Valenzuela, 2001).

The creation of local advisory committees, intended to serve as a mechanism to facilitate discussions between CONAF and indigenous communities, have reinforced top-down governance approaches. The committees have confirmed and strengthened CONAF's role as decision-maker, while indigenous communities are merely consulted or informed about CONAF sanctioned plans and activities within PAs. Until there is genuine power-sharing within the PA decision-making process, further progress towards the development of more democratic practices will be limited.

In those cases where indigenous groups and CONAF form more equitable alliances, negotiations are more likely to generate mutual benefits for both partners. For some indigenous groups, PAs can serve as instruments to achieve control of lands and resources and to enhance opportunities for their own economic development. Indigenous groups are also availing of the official status of state-directed PAs to prevent commercial

development that threatens their lands, resources and ways of life. In addition, these alliances have created opportunities for funding to support the involvement of indigenous communities in ecotourism or resource management. This has been the experience in the Los Flamencos national reserve; however, there are few agreements, and only limited funds to support the broader engagement of indigenous communities in the development of PA ecotourism services.

While some progress has been made in the past 20 years towards implementing alternative governance approaches to Chilean PAs, much remains to be done. Fundamental issues of land rights and access to resources by indigenous communities have yet to be broadly addressed. PAs, as well as the wider conservation agenda, present an opportunity to resolve these issues by providing a platform for the political empowerment of indigenous communities. The latter should support the development of alliances and partnerships with state agencies, such as CONAF, provide mechanisms for the meaningful participation of indigenous groups in decision-making, establish joint management arrangements over resources located within PAs, and generate opportunities for indigenous communities to benefit from PA tourism services. Such strategies should take into account the intersection of PA-related issues and conditions with other social and political processes that face indigenous groups in Chile. As Mulrennan notes, efforts must address and “embrace the political complexities and socio-economic realities of communities if they are to have any relevance and achieve results” (2008, p. 72-73).

The recognition of indigenous rights on the global stage, coupled with the vision promulgated for indigenous peoples in PA contexts, presents an opportunity for countries such as Chile to reimagine conservation and nature protection at the domestic level. More

importantly, it challenges the new Chilean political order to be the platform to address past injustices to indigenous peoples by advancing a more democratic governance approach. It is no small irony that PAs, long associated with a legacy of dispossession and marginalization, could be transformed into sites of indigenous recognition, empowerment and reconciliation.

Chapter 4. Conclusions

The history of PAs in Chile has varied greatly in terms of the origins of PAs, associated shifts in conservation paradigms, and relations with indigenous groups. With this research, I have attempted to do justice to this diverse history, by highlighting the changes in state rationales for the creation of PAs and making the implications of this process of PA expansion visible in relation to indigenous people. I described first how government strategies of territorization led to the dispossession or marginalization of indigenous inhabitants from their lands and resources as well as from decision-making processes. I then focus on the state's current strategies and show how recent developments in national policies and sub-national practices have reduced conflicts within PA contexts by integrating participatory approaches and generating agreements of mutual cooperation with indigenous groups. A selection of PA governance arrangements established between CONAF and indigenous partners are examined. By presenting the perspectives of different PA stakeholders, the challenges and opportunities presented by these governance arrangements are investigated.

The present work aims to contribute to the understanding of the complex and evolving relationships between the state and indigenous groups in the context of PAs, and to advance democratic arrangements of PA governance with respect to the participation of indigenous peoples. Little has been published on the relation of PAs and indigenous peoples in Chile. One important contribution is a recent publication by Aylwin and Cuadra (2010) that addresses conservation territories and indigenous peoples in Chile, which coincidentally is going to be launched in Montreal as I write the closing chapter of

this research. Research into, and publications about. PAs have focused mostly on biological aspects of conservation. My attention to both past experiences of PAs and indigenous peoples as well as recent and current governance developments will hopefully help address this gap.

One of the most pervasive elements of Chilean state discourses has been the priority given to the rationality of conservation, in various guises, over the rights to land of indigenous groups. The establishment of PAs to protect biodiversity is a recognized duty of the state, that is uncontested by mainstream society. However, the implications for indigenous peoples, as we have seen, have resulted in a complex history of relations between indigenous groups and the State. On the one hand, the Chilean State sets the rules of the game, in the sense that it is the State that defines and controls institutions, regulations and practices on the ground. But indigenous peoples are not passive recipients of these rules; on the contrary they have at various times and places resisted, contested, and challenged state discourses, often requiring that state policies and practices be modified and adapted to meet their terms and respond to their needs. In this sense PAs have, at least in some instances, served as sites of empowerment and reconciliation, as the basis for a new relationship between indigenous peoples and the State.

In these concluding pages, I discuss the general findings of my research which I have organized into four main themes: (a) PAs and their interrelations with indigenous territories, (b) PAs and poverty alleviation, (c) PAs as a way to safeguard indigenous traditional territories, and (d) PAs and participatory governance approaches. Some of the limitations and strengths of this study are then outlined, followed by a section in which I present my future research interests. Finally, as a way to close this thesis, I share some of

my thoughts and observations from my trip to Wemindji in Quebec, Canada to highlight some of the broader connections and disconnections between my research in Chile, and the challenges and opportunities presented by PAs for indigenous peoples.

4.1 Main findings of the research

a) PAs and their interrelation with indigenous territories

My research has identified different outcomes for indigenous peoples that have resulted from the encroachment of PAs onto indigenous lands and resources. These include cases where: (1) indigenous peoples' ancestral territories are currently encapsulated by PAs in which indigenous land is not recognised, (2) indigenous land titles persist within and extend beyond PA boundaries, but are managed under CONAF PA policies and have not been returned to the communities, (3) legal recognition of indigenous land rights and the return of that land to the communities, thus reducing the size of PA territories, and (4) indigenous traditional or subsistence practices accommodated and integrated into PA management policies, but without legal recognition of indigenous land rights. The four categories are not mutually exclusive. All PAs analyzed as part of this research are located on territories claimed by indigenous peoples as part of their ancestral lands, but some of them have legal rights to land, and some others, only customary rights. In all cases CONAF have integrated traditional practices in PA management with different levels of meaningful participation in PAs management.

The Chilean legal framework is still weak in relation to international commitments and obligations. Improving arrangements between state agencies and indigenous communities in PAs represents a major challenge. Recognition of traditional

land ownership or institutions of indigenous resource management in PAs has been slow and limited. Top-down approaches restrict the self-determination of indigenous peoples in PA decision-making on their traditional territories. The implementation of Local Advisory Committees by CONAF has facilitated consultation with indigenous communities regarding PA management practices, but not their involvement in decision-making

To contribute to the consolidation process of recognition and respect of the rights of indigenous peoples, policies need to be strengthened at the national level. PAs located on indigenous territories should allow indigenous communities to exercise their own forms of social organization and government. To meet the dual objectives of biodiversity conservation and recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples, the body of public policies on these two issues needs to be properly coordinated and harmonized from the design stage to its implementation.

b) PAs and poverty alleviation

Through the present exploratory research, PAs are shown to be spaces with the potential to contribute to poverty alleviation. In Chile, PA boundaries have degrees of permeability in relation to the traditional practices of indigenous inhabitants. However, the results of this research show that PAs are not enough to ensure livelihood and food security for local populations, such as indigenous groups. Opportunities related to livestock activities and indigenous resource harvesting are limited to basic subsistence. The interest of indigenous communities in Chile in getting involved with tourism services and thus to share in the economic benefit of increasing numbers of visitors, needs much more state-funded economic support to the community and capacity building for both

community members and park personnel. Meaningful participation of the communities is essential to ensure the protection of their identity and their way of life. This cannot be designed as part of a centralized state-strategy; it must be conceived and developed from the bottom-up, with technical and financial assistance as necessary from external agents.

c) PAs as a way to safeguard indigenous traditional territories

PAs in Chile, as elsewhere, are shown to be used by indigenous groups as a strategy to protect their territories. PAs as areas officially recognized for biodiversity conservation can prohibit or decrease the deleterious impacts of economic activities associated with national and trans-national industrial development on indigenous traditional lands. In this way PAs offer a level of protection to indigenous territories against such activities as mining, forestry and hydro-electric dams, and contribute to safeguarding the natural resources and livelihoods of indigenous communities.

d) PAs and participatory governance approaches

Following the “Indigenous Law” of 1993, indigenous groups were consulted by CONAF regarding PA management practices. However, their voices are not necessarily heard or integrated into PA practices. CONAF is a centralized and top-down management institution that experiences great difficulty implementing democratic management on the ground. As many of my interviews reveal, while efforts to establish participatory approaches have been made in principle, these have not translated in to meaningful democratic practices at the local level. Efforts have also been made to respond to international calls and commitments to address the rights and interests of indigenous and local communities in the management of PAs. The primary challenge however has been to integrate an indigenous rights approach in national policies, sub-national and local

practices by CONAF practitioners. One example of this is the current Bill on the Biodiversity and PA Service, which excludes any requirement to address indigenous rights or accommodate indigenous peoples in the governance of PAs.

My findings also reveal the spectrum of possible relations possible within the same country; these range from quasi-equitable relations between indigenous groups and the State to a relationship of State dominance. For example, in Los Flamencos national reserve, indigenous communities achieved an equitable agreement, supported by CONAF professionals at the sub-national level that recognize the importance of addressing indigenous needs and demands. In the rest of the country, however, less democratic approaches have been implemented, in which decision-making powers are concentrated within CONAF while indigenous groups have a marginal role at best in the PA governance. The implementation of local advisory committees has served as a means for state agents to engage with communities in the management of PAs. While in principle these committees provide a space to increase democratic participation at the local level, in practice they have strengthened the role of CONAF in PA decision-making processes.

An important realization for me was that due to the marginal and impoverished situation of many indigenous groups, the management of PAs is not always a priority on their agendas (Cayuqueo, July 2010). This factor has helped to maintain the existing hierarchy through the apparent “non-involvement” of indigenous groups.

A main critique of governance approaches of PAs is that they respond to neoliberal strategies in which the role of the state is reduced by increasing the role of private actors (Brondizio, et al., 2009; Buscher & Dressler, 2007). The results of this research suggest that this enhanced role requires state funding for the implementation and

maintenance of participatory approaches in PAs that support legitimacy, accountability, transparency and power sharing among PA partners

4.2 Limitations and strengths of the research

One limitation of the research includes its scope. I chose to analyze a diversity of particular PA cases from the vantage point of the national rather than local level. The study of local archival data would have enriched the information on the past history of which I had analyzed an important amount, but was still limited to explore particular historical cases of indigenous resistance during the creation of PAs. This is because I opted to provide a national level overview, which inevitable is less rich in local details. Indigenous peoples do not have much written documentation. Therefore, the research was based on the interpretation of archives that tend to address different events and episodes through history from a non-indigenous perspective. These gaps or misrepresentations of the indigenous past are inevitably a limitation of my research. Because of my choice to conduct this research from Canada, it was a challenge to compensate for this as the voices of indigenous communities were difficult, although not impossible to obtain. This limitation accounts for why the research analyzes mostly state approaches rather than taking a more explicit focus on indigenous resistance or negotiating practices.

Some of the strengths of the research were also the spatial and temporal scales addressed. My analysis of both past and present approaches allowed me to explore a wider geographical area and diversity of cases which was necessary for the appreciation of the diversity of the state's rationales, conflicts, and challenges. Analyzing archives, documents, and interviews, was also a powerful approach to this study as it allowed me

to compare, verified and elaborate on the information I accessed from the different sources, which strengthened the overall results of the research.

4.3 Future research

In terms of future research, my findings and conclusions would benefit from research in the field involving ethnography and in-depth case-analysis, which would reveal a more complex and detailed account of evolving relations among actors over time. A more direct representation and integration of the voices of indigenous peoples would be an important dimension of this future research. Also, the exploration of archival material at the local level, complemented by oral history, would no doubt greatly enrich our understanding of past histories.

As explained in Chapter 1, my original research idea was to conduct a comparative study of indigenous and state relations in PA contexts addressing both the Chilean and Canadian contexts. I was fortunate to have had the opportunity to do research on the Canadian context, including field research. My intention is to write a third manuscript on this aspect of my research.

4.4 Some thoughts about my experience with PAs and indigenous peoples in Canada: the case of the Wemindji PAs project

My experience writing this thesis from Canada has provided me with a valuable vantage point from which to understand Chilean historical and current processes of PA creation and management. Today, global discourses are framing national policies of PAs worldwide, including Canada and Chile. International commitments such as the Convention on Biological Diversity are marking national agendas, and both countries are

working toward the achievement of the protection of 10% of representative ecosystems. Despite this, Canada has a longer process of recognition of indigenous rights. I was able to realize during the period of doing my Masters, that even if indigenous peoples are marginalized within Canadian society, they have a voice in PA policies. Also Canada has served as a space for indigenous activists worldwide, to meet and resist mainstream political practices and impositions. It was in Montreal, for example, that I had the opportunity to hear a presentation by Pedro Cayuqueo, a Chilean Mapuche activist, and as he said, for him it would be impossible to talk like this to a large audience in Chile.

These experiences, added to conversations with my supervisor, my observations during fieldwork and the articles I have read, have prompted me to finish my thesis with some thoughts about the interconnection of Chilean PAs with Canadian PAs, with particular reference to the example of the Wemindji PAs project. Just as no one Chilean PA case would have been representative of historical or current relations with indigenous peoples, Wemindji cannot be considered representative of Canadian experience. On the contrary, Wemindji is a distinctly progressive and powerful case in which an indigenous community is defining the boundaries of PAs and dictating the terms of protection. In this sense, Wemindji represents the aspiration of many indigenous communities to create PAs in which they set the rules of the game for the negotiation with state agents.

Indigenous rights' recognition in Canada has been complex and dynamic (P. Dearden & Langdon, 2009). The history of PAs speaks about exclusion and marginalization of indigenous groups, but also reflects a long path towards rights' recognition of indigenous peoples. The Cree nation of Wemindji, located in James Bay in northern Quebec, is a paradigmatic case of community empowerment, negotiation with

the state, and a PA envisioned for indigenous cultural survival. The community, with support from the regional leadership and neighboring communities, is in the process of negotiating a PA network comprised of terrestrial and marine components. I visited the community of Wemindji for one week during July of 2010. During the fieldwork, I participated in community meetings, festivities and trips to the bush, including a valuable opportunity to visit some of the islands proposed for inclusion in the marine PA. I was also able to see part of the territory that has been formally designated for protection within the terrestrial PA. I conducted interviews with Rodney Mark (Chief of the community); Dennis Georgekish (Deputy Chief); and Edward Georgekish, (Director of the Wemindji Hunters and Trappers Association). I arrived by car, after eighteen hours of travelling and a one-night stop in a hotel along the road. The trip showed me a little part of the complex spatial relations that converge in Quebec and imposed on indigenous traditional territories. Pine plantations and rivers cover the landscape all the way up north. We also crossed the Rupert River which was recently dammed as part of the hydroelectricity projects of Hydro Quebec. Numerous convergences with the Chilean context come to my mind. The Mapuche territory in Chile is also impacted by corporate interests associated with pine plantations and hydro-dams. Ralco also is a perfect example of that. However, in contrast to these James Bay Cree communities of northern Quebec, for geographic, historical and political reasons, today the Mapuche communities are relegated to marginal spaces, comprised of small individual holdings in community settlements with high population densities. Mapuche's communities retain just 5% of their ancestral territory (Bengoa, 2004).

This difference was basic to understanding indigenous peoples' realities and their negotiations with state agents in both contexts - Chile and Canada. In Chile, indigenous peoples have had to change their way of life to adapt their subsistence activities to lands that have been atomized and reduced. However, they have been able to implement creative solutions for their cultural survival (Bengoa, 2000; Mallon, 2005). In Wemindji, the Cree people are also confronting development issues and struggling to maintain their identity. But they have been able to adapt their way of life, and still retain hunting, trapping and fishing as core activities on extensive parts of their traditional territory, .

Both cases have important legacies of solidarity among groups to resist state policies and social injustice within societies. There are important differences in terms of economic situations. The Wemindji community is part of the communities that have benefited from negotiations with Hydro Quebec, from which they have had economic support since the late 1970s. In contrast, the indigenous communities in Ralco are the most marginalized and vulnerable communities within the Chilean territory (Mideplan, 2010). Also in terms of policies, indigenous peoples in Canada have a longer history of rights recognitions: indigenous peoples are included in the Constitution Act, 1982. Since then, certain court cases have supported their rights as resource users. While indigenous peoples in Chile are not recognized as such in the Constitution Act, 1980, rather a secondary legislation, the "Indigenous Law" identified the presence of eight ethnicities and gives certain land and cultural rights.

The Wemindji community is impressive in their ability to innovate and adapt. As I wrote in my field notebook (in Spanish), "the political organization of the community is impressive; their capacity to live in a first world country- maintaining community identity

and adapting to current realities by using, for example, the context of a PA as a strategy for their own benefit”. The case of the Wemindji PA project showed me that negotiation from the bottom-up is possible. In this case, the community, with university researchers as facilitators, is framing the needs and way of negotiation with state agencies for the creation of a culturally appropriate PA network. The marine and terrestrial PAs are in the process of being established under parameters defined by the community. For the Chief of Wemindji, Rodney Mark (July 2010, pers. comm.), “the PA is a way to maintain our way of life” as traditional activities such as hunting and trapping are present in the PA management practices. The flexibility of this framework was an example for me to understand and visualize the extent to which negotiations between a community and state agencies can be on equitable and democratic terms. As Edward Georgekish (July 2010, pers. comm.), explained, “our negotiation is to obtain more than 50% of the decision making of the PA”. The land under protection is part of the Cree land, legally recognized by the Quebec government. This was a primary element for the Cree Wemindji community to settle “the rules of the game” with state agencies and to lead the agenda for the creation of the PA network, both marine and terrestrial. This case illustrates that political empowerment of an indigenous people is possible and that PAs can at the same time serve as valuable platforms to address their rights and interests. In so doing PAs can provide mechanisms for more equitable relations between indigenous peoples and the State while also fulfilling and reinforcing their mutual interest in biodiversity conservation.

References:

- Adams, W. (2004). *Against extinction: the story of conservation*. Earthscan.
- Adams, W., & Hutton, J. (2007). People, Parks and Poverty: Political Ecology and Biodiversity Conservation. *Conservation and Society*, 5(2), 147-183.
- Adams, W., Aveling, R., Brockington, D., Dickson, B., Elliott, J., Mutton, J., Roe, D., et al. (2004). Biodiversity Conservation and the Eradication of Poverty. *Science*, 306(5699), 1146-1149.
- Agostini, C. A., Brown, P. H., & Roman, A. C. (2010). Poverty and Inequality among Ethnic Groups in Chile. *World Development*, 38(7), 1036-1046.
- Albert, F. (1910). La Organización que se debe dar en el futuro a los servicios de aguas y bosques, de acuerdo con los estudios hechos en Europa. Imprenta Cervantes, Bandera 50.
- Albert, F. (1911). La necesidad urgente de crear una Inspeccion Jeneral de Bosques, Pesca i Caza. Ministerio de Industria. Seccion de Aguas y Bosques. Imprenta Cervantes.
- Albert, F. (1913). Los bosques: su conservación, explotación y fomento. Imp. Kosmos.
- Alvear, S. (2011, April 20). Biodiversidad y áreas protegidas: ideologización de un problema país - El Mostrador. *El Mostrador*. Santiago, Chile. Retrieved from <http://www.elmostrador.cl/opinion/2011/04/05/biodiversidad-y-areas-protegidas-ideologizacion-de-un-problema-pais/>
- Amend, S., & Amend, T. (1995). *National parks without people?: the South American experience*. IUCN-the World Conservation Union.

- Araya, P. (1989). Evolución del número y superficie de las unidades del sistema nacional de áreas silvestres protegidas entre 1980 y 1988. Departamento de Areas Silvestres Protegidas, Corporacion Nacional Forestal.
- Armesto, J. J., Rozzi, R., Smith-Ramirez, C., & Arroyo, M. T. K. (1998). Conservation targets in South American temperate forests. *Science(Washington)*, 282(5392), 1271–1272.
- Aylwin, J. (2010). Conservación en territorios indígenas: Marcos jurídicos y experiencias nacionales y comparados y directrices internacionales. *Los desafíos de la conservación en los territorios indígenas*. Temuco, Chile: Observatorio de los Derechos Indigenas.
- Aylwin, J., & Cuadra, X. (2010). *Los desafíos de la conservación en los territorios indígenas de Chile*. Temuco: Observatorio Ciudadano.
- Bawa, K., Rai, N., & Sodhi, N. (2010). Rights, Governance, and Conservation of Biological Diversity. *Conservation Biology*, 25(3), 639-641.
- Bengoa, J. (2000). *Historia del pueblo mapuche (siglo XIX y XX)*. Lom Ediciones.
- Bengoa, J. (2004). *La memoria olvidada: Historia de los pueblos indígenas de Chile*. Cuadernos Bicentenario, Presidencia de la República.
- Benoit, I. (2005). Áreas Silvestres Protegidas del Estado: una visión histórica. *Revista Chile Forestal*, 312, 1–12.
- Berkes. (2008). *Sacred ecology* (Second.). Routledge, N.Y.
- Berkes. (2009a). Evolution of co-management: Role of knowledge generation, bridging organizations and social learning. *Journal of environmental management*, 90(5), 1692–1702.

- Berkes, F. (2009b). Indigenous ways of knowing and the study of environmental change. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 39(4), 151.
- Borrini-Feyerabend, G. (Ed.). (1997). Beyond fences: seeking social sustainability in conservation. *IUCN Gland*, 2.
- Bosque Modelo Chiloe (Ed.). (2002, Agosto , 25 y 26). Seminario- Taller: "Áreas protegidas y comunidades humanas: Experiencias, visiones y alternativas de colaboración para el desarrollo sustentable de la Cordillera de Piuché" Isla Grande de Chiloé. Organizado por Bosque Modelo de Chiloé. inédito.
- Bradshaw, M., & Stratford, E. (2005). Qualitative Research Design and Rigour. *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography* (Second Edition.). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Brechin, S., Wilshusen, P., Fortwangler, C., & West, P. (2002). Beyond the Square Wheel: Toward a More Comprehensive Understanding of Biodiversity Conservation as Social and Political Process. *Society & Natural Resources: An International Journal*, 15(1), 41.
- Brockington, D. (2002). *Fortress conservation: the preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania*. Oxford: James Currey Publishers.
- Brockington, D., & Igoe, J. (2006). Eviction for Conservation: A Global Overview. *Conservation and Society*, 4(3), 424-470.
- Brockington, D., Duffy, R., & Igoe, J. (2008). *Nature unbound: conservation, capitalism and the future of protected areas*. Earthscan/James & James.
- Brockington, D., Igoe, J., & Schmidt-Soltau, K. (2006). Conservation, Human Rights, and Poverty Reduction. *Conservation Biology*, 20(1), 250-252.

- Brondizio, E., Ostrom, E., & Young, O. (2009). Connectivity and the Governance of Multilevel Social-Ecological Systems: The Role of Social Capital. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 34(1), 253-278.
- Brosius, J. P., & Hitchner, S. L. (2010). Cultural diversity and conservation. *International Social Science Journal*, 61(199), 141-168.
- Buscher, B., & Dressler, W. (2007). Linking neoprotectionism and environmental governance: On the rapidly increasing tensions between actors in the environment-development nexus. *Conservation and Society*, 5(4), 586.
- Bussieres, V. (2005). *Towards a culturally-appropriate locally-managed protected area for the James Bay Cree community of Wemindji, Northern Quebec*. Concordia University (Canada).
- Cabeza, A. (1988). Aspectos históricos de la legislación forestal vinculada a la conservación. La evolución de las áreas silvestres protegidas de la zona de Villarrica y la creación del primer parque nacional de Chile. CONAF.
- Camus, P. (2003). Federico Albert: Artífice de la Gestión de los Bosques de Chile. *Revista de Geografía Norte Grande*, 30, 55-63.
- Carruthers, D. (2001). Environmental Politics in Chile: Legacies of Dictatorship and Democracy. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(3), 343-358.
- Carter, D. (2010). Chile's Other History: Allende, Pinochet, and Redemocratisation in Mapuche Perspective. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 10(1), 59-75.
- Cavieres, A., Puga, V., & Tramón, S. (2009). *Informe Final: Estudio de Homologación de Categorías de Manejo de Areas Protehidas en el Ámbito Terrestre, en relación*

- a las actuales figuras de Protección Oficial.* (p. 65). Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente, Santiago.
- Cayuqueo, P. (2006, May 30). Mapuches demandan administración de Parque Nacional Villarrica. *Azkintuwe. El periódico del país mapuche.* Temuco. Retrieved from <http://www.mapuexpress.net/?act=publications&id=367>
- Cisneros, P., & McBreen, J. (2010). *Superposición de territorios indígenas y áreas protegidas en América del Sur.* Quito, Ecuador: IUCN-DFID Department for International Development.
- Colchester, M. (2003). Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas: Rights, Principles and Practice. *Nomadic People*, 7(1), 33-53.
- Colchester, M. (2004). Conservation policy and indigenous peoples. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 7(3), 145-153.
- Colchester, M. (2008). Conservation and Indigenous Peoples: Assessing the Progress since Durban. Forest People Program.
- Comisión de Verdad Histórica y Nuevo Trato. (2003). *Vol. I Primera Parte. El pueblo de Rapa Nui.* Gobierno de Chile.
- CONAF. (2011). CONAF PARQUES. Retrieved October 12, 2011, from <http://www.conaf.cl/parques/index.html>
- CONAF. (n.d.). Corporación Nacional Forestal de Chile - www.conaf.cl. Retrieved December 9, 2010, from <http://www.conaf.cl/>
- CONAF Araucanía. (1996). Plan de Manejo Reserva Forestal Malleco. Documento de Trabajo No 212. Corporación Nacional Forestal.

- CONAMA, & PNUD. (2008, August 27). Creación de un Sistema Nacional Integral de Áreas Protegidas para Chile: Una Estructura Financiera y Operativa.
- Contreras, J. P., & Valenzuela, I. (2001, December). Las Comunidades Atameñas y la Conservación de Áreas Silvestres Protegidas en Chile in "Recursos Naturales y Comunidades Indígenas en Chile." CONAF.
- Correa, M. (2002, Agosto). *El parque nacional Chiloé y las comunidades Huilliches*. Presented at the Seminario- Taller: "Áreas protegidas y comunidades humanas: Experiencias, visiones y alternativas de colaboración para el desarrollo sustentable de la Cordillera de Piuché" Isla Grande de Chiloé. Organizado por Bosque Modelo de Chiloé, Cucao, Parque Nacional Chiloé.
- Cunazza, C. (1989). Predios privados y ocupantes en el sistema nacional de áreas silvestres protegidas del Estado. Diagnóstico y alternativas de solución. Departamento de Áreas Silvestres Protegidas, Corporación Nacional Forestal.
- Dearden, P., & Langdon, S. (2009). Aboriginal Peoples and National Parks. *Parks and Protected Areas in Canada: Planning and Management* (3rd ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Dearden, P. & Rollins, R. (2009). Parks and Protected Areas in Canada. *Parks and Protected Areas in Canada: Planning and Management*. Oxford University Press.
- Díaz, M. (2004). Chile: Espacios Naturales Protegidos y Pueblos Indígenas. Conservación del Patrimonio Natural y Cultural.
- Dirección General de Tierras. (1925, June 17). Oficio del Jefe de planificación y clasificación de tierras al Director General de Tierras, Bosques y Pesca del

Ministerio de Tierras y Colonización. Recomendación para crear un Parque Nacional de Turismo. Oficio No. 844.

Dove, M. (2006). Indigenous People and Environmental Politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35(1), 191-208.

Dudley, N. (2008). *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Dunn, K. (2005). "Doing" Qualitative Research in Human Geography. Chapter 6: Interviewing. *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography* (Second Ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Eidsvick, H. K. (1980). National parks and other protected areas: some reflections on the past and prescriptions for the future. *Environmental Conservation*, 7, 188–190.

El Mercurio. (2010, November 10). Conflicto en Isla de Pascua cumple 100 días. Retrieved from http://www.mercurioantofagasta.cl/prontus4_noticias/site/artic/20101110/pags/20101110175350.html

Greiber, M. (2009). *Conservation with Justice: A Right Based Approach*. (p. 118). Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 71.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.

Herrmann, T. M. (2006). Indigenous Knowledge and Management of Araucaria Araucana Forest in the Chilean Andes: Implications for Native Forest Conservation. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 15, 647-662.

- Herrmann, T. M., & Torri, M.-C. (2009). Changing forest conservation and management paradigms: traditional ecological knowledge systems and sustainable forestry: Perspectives from Chile and India. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 16, 392-403.
- Heynen, N., & Robbins, P. (2005). The neoliberalization of nature: Governance, privatization, enclosure and valuation. *Capitalism Nature Socialism (after Jan I, 2004)*, 16(1), 5-8.
- Hutton, J., Adams, W. M., & Murombedzi, J. C. (2005). Back to the barriers? Changing narratives in biodiversity conservation. *Forum for Development Studies*, 32, 341–370.
- IEI. (2003). *Los derechos de los pueblos indígenas en Chile* (Universidad de la Frontera. Instituto de Estudios Indígenas.). Santiago, Chile: Lom Ediciones.
- Igoe, J. (2005). Global indigenism and spaceship earth: Convergence, space, and re-entry friction. *Globalizations*, 2(3), 377-390.
- Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2007). Neoliberal Conservation: A Brief Introduction. *Conservation and Society*, 5(4), 432-449.
- Jacoby, K. (2003). *Crimes against nature: squatters, poachers, thieves, and the hidden history of American conservation*. University of California Press.
- Kemf, E. (1993). *Indigenous peoples and protected areas. The law of mother Earth*. Earthscan. London, GB. 1993. 296 p.
- Klubock, T. M. (2006). The Politics of Forests and Forestry on Chile's Southern Frontier, 1880s-1940s. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 86(3), 535- 570.

- Kosek, J. (2006). *Understories: the political life of forests in northern New Mexico*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Krueger, L. (2009). Protected areas and human displacement: Improving the interface between policy and practice. *Conservation and Society*, 7(1), 21.
- López, R., & Miller, S. J. (2008). Chile: The Unbearable Burden of Inequality. *World Development*, 36(12), 2679-2695.
- Luebert, F., & Pliscoff, P. (2006). *Sinopsis bioclimática y vegetacional de Chile*. Editorial Universitaria.
- Mallon, F. E. (2005). *Courage tastes of blood: the mapuche community of Nicolás Ailio and the Chilean state, 1906-2001*. Duke University Press.
- MIDEPLAN. (2009). Encuesta Casen 2009: Pueblos Indígenas. *Ministerio de Planificación, Chile*. Retrieved January 21, 2011, from <http://www.mideplan.cl/casen2009/indigena.php>
- Millaquen, J. (2011, Enero). Reforma Constitucional y reconocimiento de los pueblos indígenas | Instituto Igualdad. Retrieved December 2, 2011, from <http://www.igualdad.cl/2011/01/reforma-constitucional-y-reconocimiento-de-los-pueblos-indigenas/>
- Min. de Economía, Fomento y Reconstrucción. (2010). *Ley No. 20423. Del Sistema Institucional para el desarrollo del Turismo*.
- Ministerio de Tierras y Colonización. (1931). *Ley de Bosques No. 656 de 1925. Modificada por Decreto Supremo 4363*.

- Molina, R., & Correa, M. (1996). *Territorio y comunidades pehuenches del Alto Bio-Bío*. Colección La propiedad indígena en Chile. Santiago, Chile: Corporación Nacional de Desarrollo Indígena.
- Mulrennan, M. (2008). Reaffirming “Community” in the Context of Community-Based Conservation. *Renegotiating Community: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Global Contexts* (pp. 66-82). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Nast, H. J. (1994). Women in the field: Critical feminist methodologies and theoretical perspectives. *Professional Geographer*, 46(1), 54.
- Naughton-Treves, L., Holland, M., & Brandon, K. (2005). The role of Protected Areas in Conserving Biodiversity and Sustaining Local Livelihoods. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 30(1), 219-252.
- Navarro, L. (2008). *Cronica Militar de la Conquista y Pacificacion de la Araucania desde el año 1859 hasta su completa incorporacion al territorio nacional* (Segunda.). Chile: Pehuén Editores Limitada.
- Neufeld, D. (2008). Indigenous peoples and protected heritage areas; acknowledging cultural pluralism. *Transforming Parks and Protected Areas*. New York: Routledge.
- Neumann, R. P. (2001). Disciplining Peasants in Tanzania: From State Violence to Self-Surveillance in Wildlife Conservation. *Violent Environments* (pp. 305- 327). USA: Cornell University Press.
- Neumann, R. P. (2004). Nature-state-territory: toward a critical theorization of conservation enclosures. *Liberation ecologies: environment, development, social movements*, 195–217.

- Neumann, R. P. (2005). *Making political ecology*. Hodder Arnold.
- OECD. (2011). Society at a Glance 2011 - OECD Social Indicators. Retrieved April 13, 2011, from www.oecd.org/els/social/indicators/SAG
- OECD, & CEPAL. (2005). *Evaluación del desempeño ambiental de Chile*. Naciones Unidas, CEPAL.
- Oltremari, J. V., & Guerrero P, X. (2003). Planificación participativa en áreas protegidas con comunidades indígenas: el caso del Parque Nacional Chiloé. *Bosque (Valdivia)*, 24(2).
- Oltremari, J., & Jackson, R. (2006). Conflicts, Perceptions, and Expectations of Indigenous Communities Associated with Natural Areas in Chile. *Natural Areas Journal*, 26(2), 215-220.
- Oltremari, J., & Thelen, K. (2003). Planificación de áreas silvestres protegidas. Un manual para la planificación de áreas protegidas en Chile con especial referencia a áreas protegidas privadas.
- Ormazabal, C. (1988). Sistemas nacionales de áreas silvestres protegidas en America Latina. Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Agricultura y la Alimentación. FAO.
- Ormazabal, C. (1992). Proposición para el Fortalecimiento del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Silvestres Protegidas del Estado. Documento de Trabajo. Plan de Acción Forestal.
- Ormazabal, C. (2007, October 30). *Cronología de evolución del SNASPE en Chile en los años 1980*. Presented at the Coloquio recuperando la memoria histórica del Sistema Nacional de Areas Silvestres Protegidas del Estado.

- Ostrom, Elinor. (2003). *Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Otero, L. (2006). *La huella del fuego: historia de los bosques nativos: poblamiento y cambios en el paisaje del sur de Chile*. Pehuén Editores Limitada.
- Pauchard, A., & Villarroel, P. (2002). Protected areas in Chile: history, current status, and challenges. *Natural Areas Journal*, 22(4), 318–330.
- Peet, R., & Watts, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Liberation ecologies*. Routledge.
- Peluso, N. L. (1993). Coercing conservation?: The politics of state resource control. *Global Environmental Change*, 3(2), 199-217.
- Redford, K., & Sanderson, S. (2000). Extracting Humans from Nature. *Conservation Biology*, 14(5), 1362-1364.
- Riquelme, C. (1977). La Colonización en Parques Nacionales. *Fiscalía, CONAF*.
- Robbins, P. (2004). *Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rose, G. (1997). Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(3), 305-320.
- Rovira, I., Alvarez, D., Molt, K., & Ortega, D. (2006). Areas protegidas en Chile. *Biodiversidad de Chile. Patrimonio y desafíos* (pp. 512–560). Santiago: CONAMA.
- Sachs, J. D., Baillie, J. E. M., Sutherland, W. J., Armsworth, P. R., Ash, N., Beddington, J., Blackburn, T. M., et al. (2009). Biodiversity Conservation and the Millennium Development Goals. *Science*, 325(5947), 1502 -1503.
- Sanderson, S. E., & Redford, K. H. (2003). Contested Relationships Between Biodiversity Conservation and Poverty Alleviation. *Oryx*, 37(04), 389-390.

- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press New Haven, CT.
- Scott, K., Bussi eres, V., Archambault, S., Nasr, W., Fyles, J., Whitbeck, K., Stewart, H., et al. (2009). Augmenting Information for a Proposed Tawich National Marine Conservation Feasibility Assessment, James Bay Marine region: Cultural and Bio-Ecological aspect. *Publication prepared for arks Canada*.
- Sep ulveda, B. (2009). * reas Silvestres Protegidas en Territorio Pehuenche. Informe Final* (p. 33). CONAF (Chile)- Universit  de Rouen (Francia).
- Smith, L. T. (2006). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples* (Ninth impression.). Zed Books.
- Spence, M. D. (1999). *Dispossessing the Wilderness. Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stevens, S. (1997a). New alliances for conservation. *Conservation through Cultural Survival*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Stevens, S. (Ed.). (1997b). *Conservation through cultural survival: indigenous peoples and protected areas*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Sundberg, J. (2003). Masculinist Epistemologies and the Politics of Fieldwork in Latin Americanist Geography. *The Professional Geographer*, 55(2), 180-190.
- Sundberg, J. (2006). Conservation, Globalization and Democratization: Exploring the Contradictions in the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Guatemala. *Globalization & new geographies of conservation* (pp. 259-276). USA: University of Chicago Press.

- Timko, J. A., & Satterfield, T. (2008). Seeking Social Equity in National Parks: Experiments with Evaluation in Canada and South Africa. *Conservation and Society*, 6(3), 238.
- Torres, H., De la Maza, C., & Oltremari, J. (Eds.). (2007). Informe Chileno al Segundo Congreso Latinoamericano de Parques Nacionales y Otras Áreas Protegidas. Bariloche, Argentina.
- Valenzuela, I. (2005). Modelo de gestión asociativo en la Reserva Nacional Los Flamencos. Una década de aprendizajes. CONAF Antofagasta.
- Wells, M., & Brandon, K. (1992). *People and Parks: Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities*. Washington D.C: The World Bank.
- West, P., & Brockington, D. (2006). An anthropological perspective on some unexpected consequences of protected areas. *Conservation Biology*, 20(3), 609–616.
- West, P., Igoe, J., & Brockington, D. (2006). Parks and Peoples: The Social Impact of Protected Areas. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35(1), 251-277.
- Zimmerer, K. (2006). Geographical Perspectives on Globalization and Environmental Issues: The Inner-Connections of Conservation, Agriculture, and Livelihoods. *Globalization & new geographies of conservation* (p. 369). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.