The spectacle of nature in the global economy of appearances: Anthropological engagements with the spectacular mediations of transnational conservation

Jim Igoe
Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

Abstract
Demands for economic growth are often visibly at odds with public concerns about what this growth portends for the future of our planet. In this context the production and dissemination of images not only shape people's perceptions of the world, but mediate social and human–environmental relationships. Debord saw such mediation as a central feature of late capitalism, in which images become commodities alienated from the relationships that produced them and consumed in ignorance of the same. As biodiversity conservation and capitalism become increasingly intertwined, human–environmental relationships are being spectacularized in a proliferating smorgasbord of images and media. This article presents a theoretical framework for thinking about these transformations as they pertain to biodiversity conservation, consumerism and the environmental contradictions of global neoliberalism. I then use fieldwork from Tanzania to demonstrate the value of this approach. I conclude by discussing the larger social and theoretical implications of this material.

Keywords
alienation, capitalism, conservation, fetishization, image, Maasai, neoliberalism, spectacle, spectacular accumulation, Tanzania

Biodiversity conservation, traditionally portrayed as a bulwark against the environmental ills of capitalist expansion, is now thoroughly implicated in its

Corresponding author:
Jim Igoe, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH
Email: James.J.Igoe@dartmouth.edu

reproduction.[1] Indeed Brockington et al. (2008: 4) open their study of protected areas and capitalism with the statement that 'conservation and capitalism are shaping nature and society, and often in partnership'. Garland (2008: 62) argues that we should recognize a 'conservationist mode of production' that 'lays claim to intrinsic or natural capital' and adds value to it 'through various mediations and ultimately transforms it into a capital of a more convertible and globally ramifying kind'.

Work by social scientists has produced ample evidence for these claims.[2] Large areas of the world are being remade according to the fantasies of Western tourists (Brockington et al., 2008; Duffy, 2002; Ferguson, 2006; West and Carrier, 2004). Conservation enables the marketing of commodities (Igoe 2010, forthcoming) and the production of entertainment (Igoe et al., forthcoming; Vivanco, 2002). Partnerships between business and conservation emphasize the commodification of nature through payment for ecosystem services (Sullivan, 2009) and the mitigation of environmental harm in one context by conservation in another (Brockington et al., 2008; Goldman, 2005). All these transformations are set amidst a strengthening consensus that market logic and economic growth are the best, if not only, means of saving nature and protecting the future of our planet (Brockington et al., 2008; Castree, 2007b; Duffy, 2008; McAfee, 1999; Neves, 2010).

This article considers the relationships of images to these transformations. Such a consideration requires moving beyond simple dichotomies of representation and material reality. Following Debord (1967) I argue that images are not merely representations of late capitalist realities, they are an indispensable part of those realities. They are not different and separate from the conditions that they portray, they are produced by them and, in turn, define and reproduce them. 'Lived reality', Debord argued, 'suffers the material assaults of spectacle's mechanisms of contemplation, incorporating that order and lending that order positive support' (1967: thesis 8). Perhaps this is most clearly seen where images of pristine wilderness are essential to the transformation of landscapes according to Western tourists' dreams, and these same transformed landscapes then support the production of more wilderness images (Brockington et al., 2008: ch. 9).

Debord (1967: thesis 4) emphasized that spectacle is not merely 'an assemblage of images' but 'the mediation of relationships between people by images'. I expand this definition to include the mediation of relationships between people and the environment by images. Such mediations are essential to Garland's (2008: 62) insights concerning the transformation of 'natural capital' into 'more convertible and globally ramifying' forms. As such, they illuminate the broader linkages between biodiversity conservation and neoliberal capitalism. Finally, they offer important opportunities for more in-depth anthropological engagements with capitalism's environmental contradictions.

In the remainder of this article I discuss the documentation and theorization of this little explored, but important, area of ethnographic enquiry.[3] I begin by proposing a theoretical framework for thinking about biodiversity conservation and the mediation of relationships in the context of neoliberal capitalism. I then turn to the spectacular productions of biodiversity conservation and the aspects of the

world that they bring into view. Next I provide an example of how an ethnographic approach can be used to illuminate and engage with these processes. I conclude with a discussion of anthropology's potential to enhance current understandings of the social and environmental contradictions of late market capitalism.

World-making projects, consumption and connection

Digital photography, video and the internet, have allowed conservation organizations and their supporters to expand beyond the standard platforms of newspaper, magazines and film to produce a bewildering array of online videos, slideshows and fundraising campaigns. Through the internet these productions are also more interconnected, within and between organizations and with the marketing campaigns of for-profit companies. Some coordinated publicity includes multi-platform products that link commodity brands and environmental-conservation causes in a diversity of contexts and media, such as glossy magazines, in-store displays, billboards, iPod broadcasts, television ads and online promotions. These '360-degree' marketing strategies take advantage of complex webs of influence that affect people's decisions. They also present their messages in terms of complex, and often interactive, stories.

The work of these interlinked, multi-platform promotions is best understood through two slightly different processes, both, ironically, called 'world-making'. World-making in the film industry refers to the production of numerous films with overlapping characters and settings. Jenkins (2006: 294) describes this process as the 'creation of a fictional universe' that is 'sufficiently detailed to enable many different stories to emerge but coherent enough so that each story feels like it fits with the others'. Tsing (2005) envisions world-making as myriad groups of people self-consciously channeling global flows and interconnections in efforts to make global claims through processes of imagination. Examples run the spectrum from claims about the power and virtue of global capitalism to the counter-claims of globally articulated social movements (e.g. the slow food movement and the global indigenous peoples movement). These acts take place in what she describes as 'a global economy of appearances', in which 'dramatic performance has become an essential prerequisite of economic performance' (2005: 57). Venture capitalists engage in 'spectacular accumulation' by 'conjuring profits' before they are actually realized in order to 'draw an audience of potential investors' (2005: 57). Countries, cities and communities engage in similar conjuring acts: projecting visions of substantial wealth, friendly people and a stable investment climate (2005: 57).

Both forms of world-making combine to powerful effect in the spectacular productions of biodiversity conservation. The latter form, where conservation NGOs, as well as the foundations, government agencies and for-profit companies that support them, consistently use image and dramatic performance to conjure spaces for effective conservation interventions cum profitable investments. The former is visible because the media productions through which these performances are transmitted present a fictional universe in which many stories are possible and each feels like it fits with the others.

Conservation NGOs engage in spectacular accumulation, through which images of panoramic landscapes and exotic people and animals are used to communicate urgent problems in desperate need of the timely solutions that these organizations claim to be uniquely qualified to offer. They present an audience of potential supporters with compelling virtual opportunities (problems that need to be solved) and the resources necessary to realize these opportunities, provided they make the necessary investment (a generous gift). These productions influence individuals to provide financial support for conservation interventions, while presenting the only reality of conservation interventions that most will ever know (Brockington et al., 2008; MacDonald, 2008; Sachedina, 2008).

This type of spectacular accumulation hinges on the mediation of relationships by images. Most obviously they mediate relationships between Western consumers and people and environments at locations that are distant from them. As the following section will show, the interventions depicted and facilitated by these images often have significant impacts on social and human–environmental relationships in the places they are carried out. These mediations are also embedded in the globally expanding consumer culture of late market capitalism.

Considering the central importance of the mediation of relationships by images to spectacular accumulation, and the term 'spectacular accumulation' itself, it is surprising that Tsing does not engage with the works of Debord in her conceptualization of 'world-making', especially as they relate to Marxist concepts of alienation and fetishization (especially Marx, 1973). Alienation refers to a general loss of control by people over the conditions that shape their lives and their ability to express themselves in creative ways. It is commonly experienced as a severing of meaningful and abiding social relationships and detachment from place. Fetishization refers to the transformation of human relationships and the output of human production into commodities, such that objects, experiences and people are purchased and consumed without reference to the relationships and contexts from which they were produced.

Debord (1967: 1) describes spectacle as 'separation perfected', the ultimate expression of alienation and fetishization. Through spectacle, he argued, the fragmented realities of late capitalism are given the appearance of a unified whole and made visible everywhere. While spectacle presents itself as definitive of how people should live their lives and define themselves, its production is mysterious and apparently beyond the control of individual observers. Spectacle is simultaneously a commodity that people will pay to consume and a medium for marketing commodities.

The proliferation of new media technology over the past 20 years has rendered media spectacle less monolithic and more potentially open to contestation than under the conditions described by Debord in the late 1960s. As the work of Zygmunt Bauman (2007) reveals, however, the mass media also have rendered spectacle more pervasive and definitive of people's lives, as people increasingly interact with digital media, and less with real human beings. Bauman's (2000) prolific discussions of what he calls 'liquid modernity' refine and update

Debord's arguments about spectacle. He describes liquid modernity as a world of constant change and individuation, in which people must increasingly 'go it alone', without support of social networks or the welfare state. It is a world of seemingly infinite possibilities and opportunities, as well as one of infinite risk (Bauman, 2007). The fragmented fleetingness of these conditions is simultaneously exhilarating and terrifying, but ultimately unfulfilling. Consequently, individuals turn to mass media as a more palatable alternative to life actually lived. Here they encounter a bewildering parade of celebrities, experts and celebrity-experts who provide examples and reveal secrets of how to live a successful life, as well as comforting solutions to the disturbing problems now facing humanity (cf. Brockington, 2009). Because they compete intensively with one another, media celebrity-experts derive their authority from their ability to 'tempt and seduce' would-be choosers (Bauman, 2000: 64). Thus, as Adorno argued (1972), consumption offers escape from conditions of alienation, but one so fleeting that it must be constantly renewed. It also offers the connections and safety of community, but without the inconvenient obligations that earlier forms of community demanded (Bauman, 2001).

Many of the features and conditions described by Bauman, and the theoretical perspectives his description invokes, are visible in media productions related to biodiversity conservation. One of the latest and most sophisticated of these is the 'online community' orchestrated and mobilized by Prince Charles and his supporters to protect the world's rainforests. The website of the Prince's Rainforest Project features numerous videos of celebrities, as well as corporate and non-profit leaders. All these individuals appear on camera with a digitally animated 'rainforest frog' and urge viewers to take action to save rainforests.[4] In other films, corporate leaders like Steve Easterbrook, CEO of McDonald's UK, and Sir Richard Branson, founder of the Virgin group, are cast as experts on market solutions to climate change. Others feature leaders of Conservation International (CI) and Greenpeace.

Three messages are frequently repeated in these presentations. One is that tropical deforestation is a bigger cause of climate change than all the cars, trucks and airplanes in the world combined. Another is that the primary perpetrators of deforestation are poor people and their governments. Finally, the solution to this problem is to make 'live trees more valuable than dead ones', by swiftly moving to an effective and efficient carbon trading mechanism (see especially the Prince's welcome video on the home page of the website, in which he outlines the entire vision of this campaign). Problems and their causes are portrayed as occurring at distant locations, while solutions revolve around new forms of commodification. Individuals are invited to join this 'community' via Twitter and Facebook, submitting their own videos to the website, and 'texting' world leaders.[5]

A related story in this particular world-making project is McDonald's-Europe's Endangered Species Happy Meal Campaign, 'designed to educate and empower children to make a difference'. The boxes that the meals come in feature links to an interactive online game, which allows children to create a 'virtual passport to

explore the virtual world'. The 'virtual world' features multi-media presentations of endangered animals; it also invites parents to visit a virtual CI headquarters, where they may learn about the partnership between McDonald's and CI to protect rainforest ecosystems, thus helping to combat climate change, and make a donation.[6]

These examples suggest ways in which world-making projects of transnational conservation create possibilities for a diversity of apparently unrelated stories, all of which seem to fit with one another. They show how these stories promise escape from conditions of alienation by offering connections back to nature and people. These connections are offered in the mediated form of participation in a virtual community that offers comforting solutions to terrifying problems and the possibility such solutions lie, in large part, in the continued consumption of hamburgers, cell phones and online games. As such, these examples also contain elements of fetishization, in that they suggest and bring forth certain connections and relationships, while erasing and/or concealing others. Notably absent from these stories are the historical connections between McDonald's and the emergence of car culture in the US (cf. Schlosser, 2001), as well as the thorny issue of carbon emissions from Sir Richard's jumbo jets. Indeed Prudham (2009: 1604) argues that Sir Richard's 'entrepreneurial activism' portends new business ventures with 'an attendant set of new environmental problems', while obscuring the environmental limits of capitalist expansion.

Thus it appears that these kinds of productions and the mediations they achieve are an important element of capitalist reproduction in an era of increased environmental awareness. Because of their rapid proliferation and emergent properties (e.g. pervasiveness, interactiveness and connection to specific conservation interventions), the nature and influence of these productions remains poorly understood by social scientists. Future investigations of these images and mediations should be guided by the following questions: (1) what does the world vision presented by these productions look like, and by what techniques is it achieved? And (2) how do spectacular renderings of this vision mediate social relationships and human–environmental relationships across and between contexts? I address these two sets of questions respectively in the following two sections.

The nature of the spectacle of nature

My interest in conservation-related media productions began with my discovery that some of the Tanzanian communities where I had conducted field work in 2005–6 (Igoe and Croucher, 2007) figured in some short online videos produced by the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF). I was initially fascinated in the discrepancy between how these productions portrayed these communities and the ways in which I had come to understand them in the course of my fieldwork. Over time, however, I became increasingly interested in these productions in and of themselves and their potential impacts on the people and landscapes that they portrayed.

Ten videos of the AWF's work have been posted on YouTube, portraying the various interventions it is undertaking across Africa. Its work is also portrayed in videos and online dispatches of the Green Living Project, including a multi-media presentation, co-produced by National Geographic Explorer, which tours REI and L.L. Bean Stores in North America.[7] My exploration of these productions led me to discover others. Thus began my ongoing survey of online conservation-related media productions.

A production that intrigued me in these early stages was a video of Harrison Ford, of Indiana Jones Fame having his chest waxed in a launch for CI's Lost There, Felt Here campaign, which also coincided with the launching of a feature-length film called *Hotspots*.[8] CI's website features 37 videos, including one lauding the contributions of Wal-Mart and McDonald's in helping to solve environmental problems.[9] The Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) YouTube Channel currently boasts 174 online videos. Prominent among these are videos celebrating Earth Hour, in which people are urged to turn off their lights for one hour on Earth Day, and a video called *Let the Clean Economy Begin*, celebrating the leadership role of Nike and Coca-Cola leading up to the COP-15 meetings in December 2009.[10] Yet another example of these types of productions is *National Geographic*'s coverage of Wildlife Conservation Society's Michael Fay, as he 'walked across central Africa online', in an event called Megatransect (see Garland, 2008).[11] Most recently, the Prince's Rainforest Trust has posted over 100 videos related to rainforest conservation and climate change.[12] My survey of conservation-related media spectacle has focused on these prominent sites of production. These represent hundreds of online videos and are part of a proliferating array of similar productions too numerous to mention here.[13]

These productions fall into the following, sometimes overlapping, categories: (1) celebrity/expert interviews/appeals/testimonials, (2) general solutions to environmental problems (e.g. extinction and climate change) and sometimes social problems (e.g. poverty), (3) depictions of specific interventions and/or relationships of conservation NGOs to local communities, (4) exoticized presentations of places, animals, and/or people, (5) coverage of what Boorstin (1992 [1961]) calls 'pseudo-events' – staged intentionally for media presentation, and (6) videos produced by individual supporters, which tend to be more personalized and artistic in nature. As one would expect, there is a certain amount of diversity in the productions of these various organizations. They are characterized most, however, by their convergence, similarity and mutual reinforcing of one another. They employ similar techniques and arguments, as well as overlapping groups of celebrity spokespeople and corporate sponsors. The worldview they present is a remarkably unified one.

One technique common in these productions is a particular use of scale. Many films, especially those depicting specific organizations and/or interventions, toggle back and forth between large scales and small scales. Large scales include the earth from space and satellite images, but mostly revolve around spectacular wide-angle shots of landscapes and animals taken from the air.[14] Large-scale shots can also show the extent of damage to these ecosystems. Small scales consist of tight shots

of the faces of people and animals, as well as microcosm close-ups of different eco-systems (e.g. ants marching in a line or drops of water falling off of a leaf).[15]

The wide-angle shots of ecosystems, and especially rainforest ecosystems, invoke what Stephen Nugent (1994: ch. 8) has labeled 'ecodomain'. These are stretches of imagined nature 'so vast and exotic that they cannot fail to suggest unlimited potential'. This perspective is evident in Megatransect, which refers to the forests of Central Africa as 'the Green Abyss'.[16] A video from the Prince's Rainforest Trust discusses the vast potential of Africa's rainforest as a source of biodiversity, ecosystem services, and expanding carbon markets.[17] AWF describes its African Heartlands initiative as 'vast landscapes that function both ecologically and eco-nomically'.[18] In an appeal for CI, George Meyer, writer for *The Simpsons*, describes 'nature' as a 'giant utility that cleans our water and regulates our tem-perature'.[19] While Prince Charles recently warned that 'nature, the biggest bank of all, could go bust'.[20]

Small-scale shots focus in on people and/or animals who become icons for specific types of problems and/or their solutions. Images of animals most obviously indicate species that are threatened with extinction, but also populations that are making comebacks thanks to conservation.[21] Close-ups of people frequently rep-resent a community benefiting from a specific conservation intervention.[22] They also represent indigenous peoples who hold the line against destructive practices such as slash-and-burn agriculture, and sometimes act as guides for conservation-ists.[23] Iconified images of people also present them as environmental threats: crafty poachers, whose camps and traps are their only trace, chainsaw-wielding loggers and farmers who slash and burn the forest.

This toggling between large and small scales allows for the simultaneous pre-sentation of problems that are so large that they demand the attention of the whole of humanity, while identifying specific groups of people who are their primary perpetrators. It presents landscapes full of vast potential and wondrous beauty, while also showing the happy animals and prosperous people who have benefited from the well-designed interventions that have tapped into a small portion of this vast potential, thus promising even more positive outcomes. Missing from these presentations are the complex and messy connections and relationships that are invisible in both the open-ended vastness of spectacular ecodomain and the com-pelling specificity of prosperous villagers.

The construction of a seemingly holistic world out of carefully chosen bits and fragments allows these spectacular presentations to elide the highly uneven and fragmented nature of development and economic growth, both globally and in specific landscapes targeted for conservation (see especially Nugent, 1994: 151; see also Harvey, 2006; Smith, 2008). Indeed Ferguson (2006: 42) argues that 'globalization' is a process of 'point-to-point connectivity that bypasses and short circuits all scales based on contiguity'. Contiguous scales are notably absent from the spectacular presentations of transnational conservation, which tend to focus on the bits that are consistent with the stories they are telling. These elisions conceal things like the socio-economic complexities of tropical

deforestation and its connections to Western consumer societies (Nugent, 1994), the displacement and impoverishment of people by conservation interventions (Brockington and Igoe, 2006), and the impacts of mass tourism on specific ecosystems, as well as in terms of carbon emissions (Carrier and McLeod, 2005; Neves, 2010).

Once these elisions are achieved, the spectacular productions of transnational conservation are free to propose relationships and connections that are simple and direct. An especially poignant example is the online adoption centers of conservation NGOs. The WWF website features icons of 91 species that can be 'symbolically adopted' for $50.[24] The website of the Nature Conservancy's Adopt an Acre program similarly features icons of landscapes at exotic locales around the world.[25] The AWF's Engaging You website offers opportunities to adopt virtual animals, complete with names and bios, adopt an African acre, support an African park or buy school supplies for African children.[26] CI's 'Protect an Acre' page features an interactive rainforest divided into discrete acres; some bear the name of their adopters and some are marked as available.[27]

Similar connections and relationships are promised through the consumption of new commodities, which simultaneously promise opportunities for individual self-expression. WWF offers high-end eco-tours to help protect whales, as well as carbon credits to offset the emissions of the tours (Neves, forthcoming). With its support of Tonka Bean harvesters in Venezuela, CI has tapped into a growing market for beauty products that mark their users as possessing 'worldliness, self-awareness, and good taste' (Chalfin, 2004: 175). Conservation is also linked to the important niche market of 'designer coffee' (see Roseberry, 1996). CI's, and AWF's, partnerships with Starbucks outlines how consumers can help fight climate change and contribute to the prosperity of coffee-growing communities by drinking Starbucks.[28] AWF further notes that 'elephants don't like java', and so drinking Starbucks helps East African farmers keep pachyderms out of their farms.[29] WWF is a target charity for Nike's human race, a global event that allows runners in different cities to keep track of their mileage using the patented Nike+ website.[30] IPod is also an important component of CI's Rapid Assessment Program for recording and cataloging bird calls.[31] Finally, these organizations offer credit cards that promise to help save the planet with every purchase, so an act of spending becomes a simultaneous act of conservation.

The connections and relationships promised by these commodities are also the basis for the production of imaginary communities.[32] At their most expansive these communities are invoked as *the* community: 'all of us', 'we', 'humanity'. The Prince's Rainforest Trust video weaves together statements from Robin Williams, the Dalai Lama and an Indian school boy.[33] CI's 'Team Earth' video brings together Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, CI scientists, smiling villagers in CI t-shirts, Neil Armstrong, Katrina survivors, the Wright Brothers and a starving Somali woman with her starving baby.[34] WWF's 'Earth Hour' video celebrates the forging of global connections by 'families, businesses, local councils and Hollywood stars', by inspiring people around the world to turn off their lights for

one hour.[35] These imaginary communities not only appear in these productions, but are disseminated, reproduced and intertwined through myriad acts of individual self-expression, imitation, recruitment and linking on Facebook, Twitter, My Space, Flickr and YouTube. Individuals who post to these various websites can thus become active producers of these communities.

In spite of the active role they take, however, individuals who participate in the reproduction of these imaginary communities are most accurately described as target markets. Aside from sending text messages to policy makers and producing short online videos, they are primarily engaged in consumer choices. This includes making choices between competing conservation NGOs seeking to distinguish themselves in order to appeal to individual consumer-supporters (Chapin, 2004; Dowie, 2009; Sachedina, 2008). While these imaginary communities may inspire passion in their participant-producers, they are highly ephemeral in nature. Without resort to authority or compulsion, their success depends on their seductive allure. They offer escape from conditions of alienation, and the security of connection without the inconvenience of long-term commitment and mutual obligation (see Bauman, 2001).

Not surprisingly, the actions of these communities are rarely cast in terms of social movements based on common interests and experiences. Rather they are described in terms like 'campaign', 'event' and 'team' (most notably Team Earth) – things that bring people together for a specific purpose, regardless of background, and without long-term commitment. One exception is WWF's claim that Earth Hour had transformed an event into a movement: a proliferation of Earth Hour Blogs and people linking to Earth Hour on Facebook. Invocations of Gandhi and Martin Luther King notwithstanding, these types of actions bear practically no resemblance to classic oppositional movements such as civil rights, anti-colonialism and trade-unionism. They are not even similar to 'new social movements', like the Global Indigenous People's Movement (Niezen, 2002), in which local identity-based social movements come to form global networks.

The limitations of these imaginary communities as movements are related to their claims to universal inclusiveness and their simultaneous excluding and editing out of inequality, ecological contradictions and the aspects of human difference that undermine their proposed solutions to the problems currently facing humanity. As Nugent (1994: 182–3) has previously pointed out, the 'we-ness' of these imaginary communities is an especially slippery 'we-ness'. At its most expansive it proposes a bond between the whole of humanity that 'amounts to little more than a common need for a breathable atmosphere'.

As Nugent further points out, the 'we' of common humanity 'is not quite as collectively referential as might be imagined' (1994: 183). First and foremost, these videos are appeals for funding and/or participation. They are frequently directed at a 'you' (the viewer), who is invited to become part of the 'we' (those who are doing something about the problem). The 'you' in these videos is clearly profiled as a Western consumer concerned about environmental problems but feeling helpless to do anything about them. The 'we' that this 'you' is invited to join is a proactive group of celebrities, experts and a handful of regular folk who appear in

online videos. Another group of people, clearly separate from the 'we', are those whose lives will be transformed and administered by specific conservation inter-ventions – people who must be retrained and presented with the right sorts of incentives. This group frequently includes government officials in the global South who need to learn about the importance of conservation to the future pros-perity of their respective countries (cf. Garland, 2008). There are also people who are clearly bad, and thus not part of the 'we'. They are most commonly represented by eerily empty poachers' camps and the ominous sound of chainsaws. Finally, there are those who are edited out. This includes local people who do not fit the profile of the global 'we', the vast majority in many cases. It also includes corpo-rations contributing to any sort of socio-environmental harm.

The rapid proliferation of these productions in so many different contexts indi-cates that the mediation of relationships by images is important to the ways in which environmental problems are imagined, their solutions proposed, and resources mobilized for specific interventions and world-making projects. We now turn to an example of how ethnographic detail can illuminate the nature of these mediations.

The spectacular production of the Maasai Steppe Heartland

In 2005–6 I conducted fieldwork in a group of five villages on the north-west border of Tanzania's Tarangire National Park, which is part of AWF's Maasai Steppe Heartland (for details see Igoe and Croucher, 2007). In spite of its name and the ubiquitous images of Maasai people in AWF presentations of this part of Tanzania, the villages where I worked are dominated by Arusha farmers, a group closely related to Maasai, who migrated to the area in the 1960s and 1970s. They also contained significant numbers of Barabaig herders and marginal multi-ethnic clusters of people who had been displaced from other parts of Tanzania over the past 50 years. I undertook this project as the leader of a four-person team, which conducted an extensive survey of local livelihoods and people's relationships to AWF-sponsored conservation interventions.[36]

In stark contrast to the problems and inequalities that we documented, media productions of the AWF present this part of Tanzania as a prominent success story for the organization, where elephants roam unmolested, statuesque Maasai war-riors stand stoically in the midst of pristine savanna, Maasai women sing and sell necklaces to tourists, and happy children go to school with their bellies full.[37] These images are not mere fabrications. They are products of transformations that are highly consistent with Garland's descriptions of a 'conservationist mode of pro-duction', in that they entail laying claims to 'natural capital' and adding value to it 'through various mediations and ultimately transforms it into a capital of a more convertible and globally ramifying kind' (Garland, 2008: 62).

They capture geographic and temporal fragments from this landscape, which themselves are the product of specific interventions within the conservationist mode of production. Quite often the realities they portray are images of staged events

related to high-profile donor visits. Through spectacle these fragments are rendered into a timeless whole. More complex and problematic realities within the conservationists' mode of production are thereby hidden from view. Such images are used to mobilize resources for interventions that materially transform landscapes according the prescriptive worldview that they project (cf. West and Carrier, 2004).

The Maasai Steppe Heartland is part of the AWF's African Heartland Program: A Conservation Vision Big Enough for Africa. AWF describes African Heartlands as vast landscapes that 'function both ecologically and economically', in which 'people and animals live side by side and the needs of both are balanced', and where AWF works with 'local stakeholders to design conservation strategies that benefit all'.[38]

Sachedina (2008: 329) notes that the Heartlands program was branded with advice from an advertising consultant, and the name carefully chosen for its association with the culturally significant and emotionally laden American Heartland. The name was also chosen for its 'inspirational value', which meant, in part, its ability to attract funds. Indeed the initiative has been a major factor in AWF's doubling its bottom line over the past decade by capturing major funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), as well as corporate and philanthropic donations, and individual donations (Sachedina, 2008). All of this was part of a deliberate strategy of the organization to expand its geographical reach: a clear example of spectacular accumulation as conceptualized by Tsing (2005; for details see Igoe 2004).

As part of the expansion which resulted, AWF took over the formerly government-owned Manyara Ranch, a 17,800 ha property close to the Tarangire National Park (for details see Goldman, 2003).[39] AWF worked to transform the ranch into a conservation landscape and an attractive location for a luxury lodge. As part of this development, AWF procured funding to relocate the Manyara Ranch School to a new building, away from its former location at the center of the ranch. The organization further undertook an easement program, which sought to incentivize local people to refrain from farming in order to clear a relatively narrow strip of land between the ranch and Tarangire National Park as a wildlife migration corridor. To the south of the ranch, AWF worked with government officials and local people to establish Tanzania's first officially registered community-based wildlife management areas, designed to connect Tarangire National Park on the east to Manyara National Park on the west. Finally, AWF helped establish the Esilalae Cultural Boma to the north of Manyara Ranch, a 'modern cultural tourism enterprise' designed to 'empower Maasai women to turn old traditions into new income'.[40]

All of these initiatives and interventions have attracted funding and support for AWF, as well as becoming the basis for the productions related to further spectacular accumulation. By toggling between large scales (using maps and Google Earth mash-ups) and small scales (small groups of people, individual animals and controlled locations), AWF productions conceal contiguous scales and interactions. Fragmented sites in the Maasai Steppe Heartland thus become sites of

production of a spectacular unified whole: a vast landscape that functions both ecologically and economically. The school produces images of happy children; the ranch produces images of zebra and elephants, and African professionals working to promote the AWF vision; the Esilalae Cultural Boma produces images of prosperous singing Maasai women and their full-bellied children.

Another outcome of these and related transformations is that the Maasai Steppe Heartland now boasts the largest herd of elephants in northern Tanzania, with a population of 2300 (Foley and Foley, 2005), set to double once a decade at current rates of growth (TNRF, 2005: 14). Images of these creatures are indispensable to AWF success stories, an invaluable form of natural and symbolic capital in the highly competitive environment of NGO fundraising. Their physical density distinguishes the Maasai Steppe Heartland, especially Tarangire and Manyara National Parks, as an elephant landscape. This makes it a popular destination in the country's world-famous northern tourist circuit and the source of significant profit for lodges, safari companies and related enterprises (see Duffy and Moore, forthcoming).[41]

In this context it is apparently reasonable to propose that the needs of wildlife can be met through the creation of corridors that will connect the previously isolated conservation landscapes of Tarangire and Manyara National Parks (cf. Goldman, 2008) and that the resulting value added to these landscapes will incentivize people living in those landscapes to give way to migrating elephants (Igoe and Croucher, 2007). These people, the story of the AWF promotions goes, will prosper as they are absorbed into the expanding market economy. The Maasai Steppe Heartland thus produced embodies and affirms the larger vision of African Heartlands: a vast landscape that functions both ecologically and economically, in which the needs of people and wildlife are balanced. Here, as Debord asserted (1967: thesis 6) 'spectacle, grasped in its totality, is both the result and project of the existing mode of production', which in this case is the conservationist mode of production (Garland, 2008).

The spectacle produced by the conservationist mode of production here includes not only images but the very landscapes of the Maasai Steppe Heartland, which have been rendered into commodified objects of contemplation and consumption by tourists, and which are frequently further reified into images (cf. Green, 1990; Neumann, 1998). As a fetishized product, this spectacle, in both images and the tourist gaze, appears without reference to the relationships that produced it, and which it in turn mediates and transforms (see Carrier and Macleod, 2005).

For instance, the production of successful community-based enterprise and prosperous local people erases the historical relationships of production that made people poor in the first place. One need never ask whether the local benefits of a particular intervention offset the costs that people may have experienced as the result of foregone access to natural resources on which their livelihoods depend, nor whether the people who have realized those benefits are the same as the ones who have borne the costs (Igoe and Croucher, 2007). Consistent depictions of the happy beneficiaries as Maasai disregard the historical processes whereby Maasai

became icons for 'traditional Africa', rendering Maasai culture highly valuable in the East African tourist economy (cf. Hodgson, 2001). These depictions ignore and conceal a host of other ethnic groups (Igoe, 2006; Shetler, 2003).

The production of community-based conservation areas conceals the historical relationship of elite classes in Africa to states and/or access to external aid (Bayart, 2000). These relationships are often part of deep-rooted political cultures in which rural people are treated as subjects to be administered rather than citizens with inherent political rights (Mamdani, 1996). They also tend to blur distinctions between state sovereignty and external interests (Ferguson, 2006). The mobilization of local people to set aside land for conservation in the Maasai Steppe Heartland entailed coercive measures by Tanzanian wildlife officials with close ties to AWF (Igoe and Croucher, 2007; see also Sachedina, 2008). Our research also revealed that they entailed the evictions of 63 households (Igoe and Croucher, 2007). While AWF was not directly involved, internal memos reveal that it supported the evictions (Sachedina, 2008: 362). The evictions were captured on a video (ibid: 362). In the video the evictees are confronted with an entourage of uniformed military, police and prison officials, who stand beside the district commissioner as she describes the unpleasant things that will happen to them if they do not move. Shortly thereafter the people in the video 'voluntarily' relocated. Almost all these people were economically and politically marginal, while also failing to conform to the dominant aesthetic order of the Maasai Steppe Heartland.

Finally, the production of migration corridors premised on the segregation of people and animals conceals the complex intelligence and adaptability of elephants (see Thompson, 2001). The AWF websites highlights the use of tracking collars and GPS technology to figure out how to meet the migration needs of elephants so that they and humans can give each other a wide berth.[42] For the villages wedged between Tarangire and Manyara National Parks, however, no wide berth is possible. Elephants here do not appear interested in avoiding humans, but do appear to be treating people's farms as cornucopian extension of their habitat. They not only eat the crops standing in people's fields, but even take roofs off houses to get at food stored inside. In some areas farms are so overrun that people are moving away (for details see Igoe and Croucher, 2007). Sachedina (2008: 413) argues that continued crowding will result in 'epiphenomenal conservation', in which elephants succeed at removing people from landscapes where previous measures have failed.

In spite of these omissions and complexities, it is clear that the conservationist mode of production is succeeding in securing the conditions of its own reproduction in the Maasai Steppe Heartlands, and that spectacle is both a means and an end of the conditions it creates. Moreover, the realities of the Maasai Steppe Heartland are connected to much larger economies and environmental problems. As spectacle mediate the natural capital of the Maasai Steppe Heartland into more 'globally ramifying kinds', it circulates in the context of 'liquid modernity', offering Western consumers escape from conditions of alienation with a cup of Starbucks Conservation Coffee, a 'save-the-elephant' bracelet from the Esilalae Cultural Boma or by adopting a virtual animal.[43] Systematic ethnographic engagements

with these kinds of mediations and the connections that they promise would greatly enhance our understandings of the socio-environmental contradictions of late market capitalism and how these are understood and engaged by actors in a diversity of interconnected contexts.

Conclusion

For Tsing (2005: 76), world-making involves expansive imaginings that inspire new horizons and programs of action. She invites ethnographers to 'bring back the passion and stakes of global connection' by 'immersing ourselves in the drama of uncertainty of global capitalism' (2005: 270), to use ethnographic fragments to interrupt stories of a unified and successful regime of global self management' (2005: 271) in order to inspire new kinds of imaginings and world-making projects.

I am inspired by this invitation and have offered this article as a small interruption to some of these dominant stories. However, I would hasten to add that, as ethnographers, we must be just as mindful of global disconnection as we are of global connection. We need to pay special attention to the ways in which processes of alienation and fetishization effectively exclude some groups from global connections and the collective imaginings that they sometimes allow. We must be further mindful of the ways in which the mediation of relations by images influences and limits people's conceptions and imaginings of the world.

Spectacular images of biodiversity conservation promise Western consumers escape from alienation through consumption, self-expression and connections to imagined places, people and animals. Ironically, the pursuit of these imagined connections and relationships may contribute to new forms of alienation, as people like those with whom I worked in Tanzania experience a loss of control over the conditions that shape their lives through a severing of meaningful and abiding social relationships and detachment from place. The fetishization of connections and relationships through spectacle thus shields Western consumers from the more complex and problematic web of connections and relationships in which they are actually enmeshed.

In fact the conjuring of possibilities undertaken in these spectacular productions requires a double act of fetishization (cf. Richey and Ponte, 2008). First the relationships and connections that they present are themselves fetishized, since their larger historical, social and ecological contexts are hidden from view. Next, and more fundamentally, the connections and relationships that allowed for the selective concealment of these larger contexts are also hidden from view. These spectacular productions thus become their own evidence, continuously referring back to themselves in affirmation of the realness of the world(s) that they show their viewers. Without access to other sources of information, places and expertise, many viewers can only turn to the words of celebrities, images of spectacular nature and connections promised by new types of consumption for affirmation of the solutions they are participating in. As Brockington (2008) has observed, international support for wildlife conservation is rarely the sort of environmental movement which

is rooted in attachment to a particular place. Rather supporters are, of necessity, dependent on remote and distant connections, buttressed by the occasional, heavily framed visit by those who can affordit, or who are especially important supporters of a particular organization.

This does not mean that everyone is duped by these productions. Without more systematic research there is no way of knowing how individual consumers view and understand these spectacular productions and the ways in which they portray social and human–environmental relationships. Indeed, increasingly interactive forms of media technology and sites like Facebook require social scientists to move beyond dichotomies of knowledge-transmitters and knowledge-receivers. Audiences can, and increasingly are invited to, participate in the creation of the kinds of spectacular productions outlined in this article. The blogosphere and sites like Facebook and Twitter thus become potential loci for resistance, creative transformation, and even new types of world-making projects.

It is important, however, not to underestimate the significant structural limitations of these engagements. As Dingwall and Aldridge (2006: 134) have noted with respect to wildlife films, 'messages which are repeated, consistent, lack alternatives, and are concrete and unambiguous' are especially influential and difficult to dispute. These insights are even more compelling in the world of 360-degree marketing, in which products are no longer simply branded but woven into complex stories that are disseminated into as many media and locations as possible. In such a context it becomes extremely difficult to find other sources of information and alternative perspectives. It is also nearly impossible for people wishing to present dissident perspectives to author productions with as many reference points and as much reach as these larger world-making projects.

At the same time, producers of world-making projects are in a position to pick and choose the kinds of individual productions they will incorporate and those they will ignore. By participating in events such as the Human Race and Earth Hour, by producing their own personal videos, as well as through blogs and online community websites, consumers are actively providing fodder for marketing campaigns targeting them. They have thus been recruited in the reproduction and dissemination of particular world-making projects and the dominant worldviews they represent (Buscher and Igoe forthcoming). Indeed, the central importance of corporate spokespeople, consumption and profit in these productions seems to indicate that consumers are being recruited to help global capitalism resolve its own environmental contradictions (cf. Prudham, 2009). By choosing those individual productions most consistent with the stories they are telling, producers of world-making projects may thus create the appearance not only of participation but of consensus so strong that it demands to be seen in terms of common sense.

Two aspects of the world-making projects purveying this common sense are especially problematic. The first is the consistent message that the primary causes of environmental problems, and the landscapes most worth saving, exist in distant and exotic locales, most explicitly formulated in CI's slogan as 'lost there, felt here'.[44] The other is the essential role of exchangeability in the imagined solution

to these problems. The most prominent example is the near impossibility of determining whether money paid for carbon offsets is actually exchanged for less carbon in the atmosphere (see Brockington et al., 2008: 176–80; MacDonald, 2008: ch. 11). In the realm of policy this idea has been taken further to the more encompassing notion of mitigation: environmental harm caused by extractive enterprise in one context can be offset in measurable terms by environmental protection in another (Brockington et al., 2008; Goldman, 2005). Finally, there is the idea that people living in conservation landscapes can simply exchange land-based livelihoods for market-based ones (cf. McAfee, 1999). These pervasive assumptions potentially undermine more direct and embodied connections to more proximate and mundane landscapes (Adams, 2004; Cronon, 1995). Because of their tendency to reduce all relationships to market relationships, they further undermine alternative ways of understanding and connecting to the environment, while masking the socio-environmental costs of mass consumption.

These realities stand in stark contrast to earlier predictions by green Marxists that the increasingly visible and costly environmental contradictions of late capitalism would spark new alliances between environmental and labor movements demanding greener alternatives to current capitalist arrangements (O'Connor, 1988). Instead we appear to be witnessing the ascendance of world-making projects that invoke the aesthetics and language of previous social movements, but which prescribe the reproduction of capitalism as the most viable solution to its own environmental excesses (Igoe et al., forthcoming; Sklair, 2001; see also Dowie, 1996). This is not to say that effective social movements no longer exist and that new ones are not emerging. In the current 'realm of appearances', however, world-making projects seeking to entice and seduce consumers as participants are much more prominent, visible and accessible.

Notes

1. The question of 'what is neoliberalism' is beyond the scope of this article, but has been discussed at length in the social science literature. See especially: Comaroff and Comaroff (2000), Harvey (2007), Ferguson (2006), Castree (2007a, 2007b) and Igoe and Brockington (2007).
2. Although the study of the relationships between conservation and capitalism is a nascent endeavor, it is also a vibrant one. In May 2008, a group of scholars and conservation practitioners concerned about the ways in which nature has been commodified and appropriated in the context of biodiversity conservation came together in Washington at a workshop entitled 'Neoliberal Conservation: Displaced and Disobedient Knowledge', sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation and the International Institute for Environment and Development (http://www.iied.org/natural-resources/key-issues/food-and-agriculture/citizens-reframing-conservation-policies-and-practice-for-food-and-livelihood-, consulted 23 July 2009). The following September an overlapping group met at the University of Manchester Symposium on 'Capitalism and Conservation'; the proceedings appear in a special issue of *Antipode* 42(3). Then in

October a team of researchers examined the influence and impact of neoliberalism on the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona (the findings of which will soon be published in a special issue of Conservation and Society). Finally, in December 2008 and May 2009, yet another overlapping group of scholars has been meeting to discuss the influence of the celebrity industry on public understandings of conservation, climate change and related environmental issues.

3. Scholars have also argued for consideration of the role of mass media and image in contexts closely related to biodiversity conservation (see especially Davis, 1997; Green, 1990).

4. See: http://www.rainforestsos.org/ (consulted 30 July 2009). All of the videos cited in these paragraphs can be found at this website.

5. All of this extensive and rapidly expanding material can be viewed at: http://www.rainforestsos.org/ (consulted 10 July 2009).

6. See: http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=43 (consulted 10 July 2009).

7. See: http://www.greenlivingproject.com/projects/manyara-ranch/ (consulted 13 July 2009); http://www.greenlivingproject.com/events/ (consulted 13 July 2009).

8. See: http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=30 (consulted 13 July 2009).

9. See: http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=48 (consulted 13 July 2009).

10. See: http://www.youtube.com/user/wwfus (consulted 13 July 2009).

11. See: http://www.nationalgeographic.com/congotrek/ (consulted 14 July 2009).

12. See: http://www.rainforestsos.org/video/P6/ (consulted 14 July 2009).

13. These include the explicit linking of Hollywood films to conservation causes, such as Kung Fu Panda, The Golden Compass and, most notably, Earth; see: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bs5s0sudslcm, http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=50, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tkA-2Mg181k; (consulted 30 July 2009). There are also television shows such as Whale Wars, a special edition of Animal Planet; see: http://animal.discovery.com/tv/whale-wars/ (consulted 30 July 2009); a site called EcoRazi, which presents eco-gossip about Hollywood celebrities, such as Minnie Driver's endorsement of Dawn dish-washing detergent for rescuing wildlife from oil spills; see: http://www.ecorazzi.com/2009/07/19/minnie-driver-joins-pg-to-save-wildlife/ (consulted 31 July 2009); the linking of commodities and companies to nature and conservation such as Dawn's Everyday Wildlife Champions, Dow's Human Element Campaign, Rolex's sponsorship of conservation entrepreneurs and Outdoor Photographer's advice on how to save wildlife with a digital camera; see: http://rolexawards.com/en/the-laureates/shekardattatri-the-project.jsp; http://www.ibrrc.org/Dawn_Everyday_Wildlife_Champions.html; http://www.outdoorphotographer.com/how-to/more-how-to/saving-wildlife-and-land-with-a-digital-camera.html; http://rolexawards.com/en/the-laureates/shekardattatri-the-project.jsp, http://www.dow.com/Hu/, http://www.dow.com/Hu/ (consulted 31 July 2009); and videos of other conservation NGOs, such as the Wildlife Conservation Society; see: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lo2Z3DHJFKs (consulted 30 July 2009). Finally there are videos and films produced by individuals and small companies and organizations, which abound on Facebook, and even a website that helps aspiring film-makers link up with potential supporters; see: http://www.yourcause.com/thedandelion (consulted 30 July 2009).

14. See especially the trailer for *Hotspots* (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v= KY08NIXvrxc); 'Megatransect' (http://www.nationalgeographic.com/congotrek360/); 'About AWF' (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P98NDWsUf3s); and 'Hymn for the Rainforest'from the Prince's Rainforest Project (http://www.youtube.com/ watch?v=MSdNlHo_Zs [all consulted 14 July 2009]).

15. See especially WWF People and Places webpage (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v= gAwoJ1u6ZI&feature=channel) and AWF's Lamako Center webpage (http://www.you-tube.com/watch?v=kN-VoO9J7Po&feature=channel_page [both consulted 14 July 2009).

16. See: http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/data/2001/08/01/sights_n_sounds/media. 5.2.html (consulted 14 July 2009).

17. See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LGgYT7_m6CE (consulted 14 July 2009).

18. See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w1HmLRFwtj0&feature=channel (consulted 14 July 2009).

19. See: http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=55 (consulted 14 July 2009).

20. See: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/5780271/Nature-the-biggest-bank-of-all-could-go-bust-warns-Prince-Charles.html (consulted 16 July 2009).

21. This particular presentation can be found in most of the productions already cited.

22. See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P98NDWsUf3s (consulted 14 July 2009).

23. See: http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/data/2001/08/01/sights_n_sounds/media. 5.2.html and http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=34 (both consulted 14 July 2009).

24. See: http://www.worldwildlife.org/ogc/species_category.cfm (consulted 15 July 2009).

25. See: http://support.nature.org/site/PageServer?pagename=index_aaa (consulted 15 July 2009).

26. See: http://www.awf.org/section/engaging_you (consulted 15 July 2009).

27. See: http://www.conservation.org/act/get_involved/protect_forests/Pages/deforestation. aspx (consulted 15 July 2009).

28. See: http://starbucks.com/sharedplanet/ethicalInternal.aspx?story=conservation International and http://www.conservation.org/campaigns/starbucks/Pages/hotspots_and_ coffee.aspx (both consulted 15 July 2009).

29. See: http://www.awf.org/content/solution/detail/3372 (consulted 16 July 2009).

30. See: http://www.worldwildlife.org/sites/race/index.html (consulted 16 July 2009). To participate runners must own a Nike+ sensor, which they can put inside a Nike+ ready shoe. The sensor sends information to the runner's Nike+ enabled iPod or digital armband. These devices keep track of the runner's data, which can then be uploaded to the Nike+ website; see: http://nikerunning.nike.com/nikeos/p/nikeplus/en_US/ ?sitesrc=oldplus (consulted 16 July 2009).

31. See: http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=40 (consulted 16 July 2009).

32. While these communities share a great deal in common with Benedict Anderson's (1991) imagined communities, they are also quite literally imaginary – existing predominantly, if not exclusively, in the world of images. Spectacular productions of these communities encompass so much geographical and cultural distance that it is impossible that all the people they depict imagine themselves to be part of a single community of humanity. Certainly the starving woman and infant in CI's 'Team Earth' video, assuming they are

still alive, scarcely imagine themselves to be part of a community that includes Prince Charles, Sir Richard Branson, Harrison Ford and Kermit the Frog.

33. See: http://www.rainforestsos.org/ (consulted 17 July 2009).
34. See: http://www.conservation.org/fmg/pages/videoplayer.aspx?videoid=47 (consulted 17 July 2009).
35. See: http://www.earthhour.org/home/ (consulted 17 July 2009).
36. This team included my advisee Beth Croucher and our research assistants: Lobulu Sakita and Lengai Mbarnoti. In addition to our household survey, we also attended village meetings and conducted key informant interviews, including with government officials and AWF employees.
37. See especially the Green Living Project's material on the Manyara Ranch: http://www.greenlivingproject.com/projects/manyara-ranch/ (consulted 11 August 2009); 'About AWF': http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P98NDWsUf3s (consulted 11 August 2009).
38. See: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w1HmLRFwtj0 (consulted 11 August 2009).
39. See: http://www.awf.org/content/solution/detail/3505 (consulted 17 August 2009).
40. See: http://www.awf.org/content/solution/detail/3503 (consulted 11 August 2009).
41. This growth can be traced to the global ivory ban of the 1980s, driven in its early stages by AWF's circulation of graphic images of slaughtered elephants with their tusks removed. As the most successful direct-mail fundraising campaign in the history of US charities, this can be viewed as an early foray into spectacular accumulation by AWF. The financial success of this campaign prompted other conservation NGOs to reverse their position that a global ban would contribute to environmentally destructive densities of elephants in some parts of the continent (Bonner 1994). Also see: http://www.awf.org/section/wildlife/elephants (consulted 11 August 2009).
42. See: http://www.awf.org/section/wildlife/elephants (consulted 11 August 2009).
43. See: https://www.earthsbirthdaystore.org/prodinfo.asp?number=BRE (consulted 11 August 2009).
44. See: http://www.conservation.org/act/get_involved/protect_forests/Pages/deforestation.aspx (consulted 20 July 2009).

Acknowledgements

In Memory of Charlie Comes Killing and Edward Lengai Mbarnoti.

References

Adams W (2004) *Against Extinction: The Story of Conservation*. London: Earthscan.

Adorno T (1972) *The Culture Industry*. London: Routledge.

Anderson B (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Bauman Z (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman Z (2001) *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman Z (2007) *Consuming Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bayart J-F (2000) Africa in the world: A history of extraversion. *African Affairs* 99(395): 217–267.

Bonner R (1994) *At the Hand of Man: Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife*. New York: Vintage.

Boorstin D (1992 [1961]) *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Random House.

Brockington D (2008) Powerful environmentalism: Celebrity, conservation, and capitalism. *Media, Culture & Society* 30(4): 551–568.

Brockington D (2009) *Celebrity and the Environment: Fame, Wealth, and Power in Conservation*. London: Zed Books.

Brockington D, Igoe J (2006) Eviction for conservation: A global overview. *Conservation & Society* 4(3): 424–470.

Brockington D, Duffy R, and Igoe J (2008) *Nature Unbound: Conservation, Capitalism, and the Future of Protected Areas*. London: Earthscan.

Carrier J, Macleod D (2005) Bursting the bubble: The socio-cultural context of ecotourism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11: 315–334.

Castree N (2007a) Neoliberalizing nature: Processes effects, and evaluations. *Environment and Planning A* 40: 153–171.

Castree N (2007b) Neoliberalizing nature: The logics of de- and re-regulation. *Environment and Planning A* 4: 131–152.

Chapin M (2004) A challenge to conservationists, *Worldwatch* Nov./Dec.: 17–31.

Chalfin B (2004) *Shea Butter Republic: State Power, Global Markets, and the Making of an Indigenous Commodity*. London: Routledge.

Comaroff J and J Comaroff (2010) Millenial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming. *Public Culture* 12(2): 291–343.

Cronon W (1995) The trouble with wilderness; or getting back to the wrong nature. In: Cronon W (ed.) *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York: W.W. Norton, 69–90.

Davis S (1997) *Spectacular Nature: Corporate Culture and the Sea World Experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Debord G (1967) *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books.

Dingwall R, Aldridge M (2006) Television wildlife programming as a source of popular scientific information: A case study of evolution. *Public Understanding of Science* 15: 131–152.

Dowie M (1996) *Losing Ground: American Environmentalism at the Close of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dowie M (2009) *Conservation Refugees: The 100-year Conflict Between Global Conservation and Native People*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Duffy R (2002) *A Trip to Far: Ecotourism, Politics, and Exploitation*. London: Earthscan.

Duffy R (2008) Neoliberalizing nature: Global networks and ecotourism development in madagascar. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16(3): 327–344.

Duffy R, Moore L (2010) Neoliberalizing nature? Elephants as imperfect commodities. *Antipode* 42(3): 742–766.

Ferguson J (2006) *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Foley C, Foley L (2005) *Wildlife Trends in the Tarangire Ecosystem*. Arusha: Wildlife Conservation Society.

Garland E (2008) The elephant in the room: Confronting the colonial character of wildlife conservation in Africa. *African Studies Review* 51(3): 51–74.

Goldman M (2003) Partitioned nature, privileged knowledge: Community-based conservation in Tanzania. *Development and Change* 34(5): 833–862.

Goldman M (2008) Constructing connectivity: Conservation corridors and conservation politics in east african rangelands. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 99(2): 335–359.

Goldman M (2005) *Imperial Nature: The World Bank and Struggles for Social Justice in the Age of Globalization*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Green N (1990) *The Spectacle of Nature: Landscape and Bourgeois Culture in 19th-century France*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Harvey D (2006) *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographic Development*. New York: Verso.

Harvey D (2007) A Brief History of Neoliberalism. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hodgson D (2001) *Once Intrepid Warriors: Gender, Ethnicity, and the Cultural Politics of Maasai Development*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Igoe J (2004) *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota*. Riverside, CA: Wadsworth.

Igoe J (2006) Becoming indigenous peoples: Difference, inequality, and the globalization of East African identity politics. *African Affairs* 105(420): 399–420.

Igoe J and Brockington D (2006) Neoliberal Conservation: a Brief Introduction. *Conservation and Society* 5(4): 432–449.

Igoe J (2007) Human Rights, Conservation, and the Privatization of Sovereignty in Africa – a Discussion of Recent Changes in Tanzania. *Policy Matters* 15: 241–254.

Igoe J, Croucher B (2007) Conservation, commerce, and communities: The story of community-based wildlife management in Tanzania. *Conservation & Society* 5(4): 534–561.

Igoe J, Neves K, and Brockington D (2010) A spectacular eco-tour around the historic bloc: Theorizing the current convergence of biodiversity conservation and capitalist expansion. *Antipode* 42(3): 486–512.

Jenkins H (2006) *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press.

Mamdani M (1996) *Citizen and Subject: Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Marx K (1973) *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*. New York: Random House Publishers.

MacDonald C (2008) *Green Inc.: An Environmental Insider Reveals How a Good Cause has Gone Bad*. New York: The Lyons Press.

MacDonald K (forthcoming) Business, Biodiversity and the New Fields of Conservation. *Conservation and Society*.

McAfee K (1999) Selling nature to save it? Biodiversity and green developmentalism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 17: 133–154.

Neumann R (1998) *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles Over Livelihoods and Nature Preservation in Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Neves K (2010) Cashing in on cetourism: A critical ecological engagement with dominant E-NGO discourses on whaling, cetacean conservation, and whale watching. *Antipode*.

Niezen R (2002) *The Origins of Indigenism: Human Rights in the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nugent S (1994) *Big Mouth: The Amazon Speaks*. San Francisco: Brown Trout Press.

O'Connor J (1988) Capitalism, nature, and socialism: A theoretical introduction. *Capitalism, Nature, and Socialism* 1: 11–38.

Prudham S (2009) Pimping climate change: Richard Branson, Global Warming, and the performance of green capitalism. *Environment and Planning A* 41(7): 1594–1613.

Richey L, Ponte S (2008) Better (Red)^{TM} than dead? Celebrities, consumption, and international aid. *Third World Quarterly* 29(4): 711–729.

Roseberry W (1996) The rise of yuppie coffee and the re-imagination of class in the united states. *American Anthropologist* 98(4): 762–775.

Sachedina H (2008) Wildlife is Our Oil: Conservation, Livelihoods and NGOs in the Tarangire Ecosystem, Tanzania, PhD dissertation, School of Geography and the Environment, Oxford University.

Schlosser E (2001) *Fast Food Nation*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Shetler JB (2003) *Telling Our Own Stories: Local Histories from South Mara, Tanzania*. Boston, MA: Brill.

Sklair L (2001) *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith N (2008) *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*, 3rd edn. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Sullivan S (2009) An Ecosystem at your service: Environmental strategists are redefining nature as a capitalist commodity. *The Land* winter.

Thompson C (2001) When elephants stand for competing models of nature. In: Law J, Mol A (eds) *Complexities: Social Studies of Knowledge Practices*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

TNRF (2005) *Social and Ecological Dynamics and Complexity in the Simanjiro Plains: Roundtable Discussion*. Arusha: TNRF Workshop Report.

Tsing A (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vivanco L (2002) Seeing green: Knowing and saving the environment on film. *American Anthropologist* 104(4): 1195–1204.

West P, Carrier J (2004) Ecotourism and authenticity: Getting away from it all? *Current Anthropology* 45(4): 483–498.

Jim Igoe is an assistant professor in the Department of Anthropology at Dartmouth College. He has done extensive field research on conservation and the commoditization of nature and culture in northern Tanzania. He is co-author of *Nature Unbound: Conservation Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas* (with Dan Brockington and Rosaleen Duffy) and *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota*. His current research engages with community-based neighborhood recovery in Post-Katrina New Orleans.