PROJECT MUSE®

Creolized Conservation: A Belizean Creole Community Encounters a Wildlife Sanctuary



Melissa Johnson

Anthropological Quarterly, Volume 88, Number 1, Winter 2015, pp. 67-95
(Article)

Published by George Washington University Institute for Ethnographic Research

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2015.0002*

For additional information about this article
https://muse.jhu.edu/article/576046

Access provided by Smith Library @ Southwestern University (27 Feb 2018 00:33 GMT)

ARTICLE

Creolized Conservation: A Belizean Creole Community Encounters a Wildlife Sanctuary

Melissa Johnson, *Southwestern University*

ABSTRACT

In this article, I analyze the implementation and management of Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary in rural Creole (Afro-Caribbean) Belize as a process of creolization. Encounters between different villagers, Belizean and international conservationists, and government officials in creating and running the sanctuary generated both synthesis and disjuncture in the conservation policy and practice that emerged. Differently positioned actors shifted their claims depending on context, reflecting the ambivalence that characterizes rural Creole culture, to further their interests as they created conservation in Belize. I use the metaphor of creolization to capture the ambivalence of subjects as they adopt varying and, sometimes, contradictory positions in fields of uneven relations of power. The metaphor shows how temporary syntheses emerge out of the encounters between these subjects. My analysis thus reveals how "local" peoples, often imagined as pawns in global processes, can be creative agents in the generation of global forms [Keywords: Creolization, globalization, conservation, Belize, Caribbean, environment]

Anthropological Quarterly, Vol. 88, No. 1, p. 67–96, ISSN 0003-5491. © 2015 by the Institute for Ethnographic Research (IFER) a part of the George Washington University. All rights reserved.

On a sunny morning in the mid-1990s, I walked to one of my favorite shops in Crooked Tree, a small Belizean Afro-Caribbean village on an island in the middle of a complex subtropical lagoon system. The village is home to the Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary, popular among birders, and a growing small-scale, locally-owned tourism industry centered around the sanctuary. I walked down the sandy road, between cashew trees, hearing the chatter of a group of parrots flying by, feeling the breeze wafting from the wide lagoon beyond the cemetery and church, looking forward to chatting with the shopowner and her extended family, whose company I always enjoyed. One of her sons, Al,[1] who operated one of the largest tourist resorts in the community, was an avid hunter and a popular guide. He earned a comfortable income from the tourists who came to visit the wildlife sanctuary to see large and other-worldly jabiru storks, abundant waterfowl, and a host of other wildlife. Al and I had a fun, joking relationship, and I always looked forward to seeing him; but today was different. He accosted me as I walked up the long driveway to their house: How could I have lied and told the Peace Corps Volunteer assigned to work with the Belize Audubon Society (the NGO deputized to manage the wildlife sanctuary) to improve sanctuary management that the village was populated by 700 people when the census numbers from a few years earlier put the size of the village at 1,000? The Peace Corps Volunteer had distributed a draft of the sanctuary management plan to residents a few days earlier, and Al was deeply angered by both its details, and his sense that not enough people had been involved in its creation (although the Peace Corps Volunteer thought he had scheduled plenty of community meetings, and had met with many interested villagers numerous times, including Al). Al claimed that the village would be relocated, just like communities in Africa that had been near National Parks had once been moved. He said residents of Crooked Tree would suffer, and that I had thrown my soul in with the other white people, and was a traitor to the community.

I was very surprised. I knew Al was outspoken and strongly opinionated (things I enjoyed about him), but that someone dependent on the wildlife sanctuary for their livelihood would be *so* angered by what seemed to me a very reasonable plan to manage the sanctuary flummoxed me. I knew that there had been numerous meetings inviting community input and that the plan's author had sought Al's input specifically. I was dumbfounded.

Al stirred up a firestorm over the management plan draft, and he and other residents made it very clear to the Belize Audubon Society that the interests and needs of the residents of Crooked Tree had to be considered first and foremost in the drafting of the plan. Al and I reconciled quickly; I assured him my interests lay with the community. In retrospect, I should *not* have been surprised at Al's and other residents' anger and concern. This was not the first time that villagers had dealt with external organizations. Crooked Tree residents have a long history of advocating for their interests, and this has especially been the case in the conservation arena.

Indeed, I argue that Crooked Tree residents, in their engagements with the Belize Audubon Society and other governmental and non-governmental representatives, have actively shaped environmental conservation in Belize. The actions of these villagers contributed to a global shift in the 1990s that encouraged community participation in conservation initiatives around the world. Analyzing these entanglements as processes of creolization, in which subaltern groups along with NGO and government representatives co-create *what conservation is*, makes visible how people too often only seen as victims contribute to the creation of the social formations with which they engage. Using this approach also highlights how the making of conservation emerges from the encounters of uniquely positioned actors with different and shifting agendas, and how these encounters generate continual changes in conservation discourse and practice.

Environmental conservation is just one example of this process of co-creation; my findings have broad implications for understanding how global institutions and ideas are co-constituted in a range of different contexts. I suggest that places and peoples that might seem relatively powerless, or as if they are only reacting to external forces, may indeed have significant impact and may themselves be participating in the creation of global forms. The data that support this analysis were gathered during ethnographic research in Crooked Tree and Lemonal villages (both adjacent to the Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary) between 1990 and 2013, including an intensive two-year period of field research between 1993 and 1995, as well as seven shorter periods of research between 1998 and 2013; extensive research in the national archives, newspapers, and NGO newsletters and websites; interviews with key figures in the conservation initiatives that affected these communities; and interactions with community members via social media and telephone.[2]

Rethinking the Global

Characterizing the relationship between specific places and global processes has occupied the attention of a wide range of scholars in the past 30 years. While earlier analyses typically viewed "local" in terms of resistance and "global" in terms of domination, in more recent years theorists have followed Appadurai (1996) in noting how transnational processes necessarily generate disjuncture, and confound any dualistic reading of global and local. A range of scholars have examined how cultural forms are generated as peoples, cultural productions, and political economies come into contact across structures of inequality (e.g., Alexandrakis 2013; Ferguson 2006; Ong 1999; Tsing 2005; Wilk 1995, 2006). Yet, many of these, while paying close attention to how specific places and peoples engage with "global" processes and often mold or appropriate them, do not closely examine how what is seen as "global" (e.g., capitalism, neoliberal policy, consumer culture) came to be. There is a small, but growing body of scholarship that attends to Tsing's (2000) suggestion that scholars analyze how "locals" situated in various places *contribute to the generation of* whatever might be identified as "global," (e.g., Gow 2008, Hathaway 2013, Sheller 2012). With this study, I develop this line of thinking and analyze how marginalized local populations, typically seen as suffering, resisting, or appropriating global processes also generate "the global." My approach illuminates how both local and non-local actors are not only diverse, but also often *ambivalent*: their contributions are not always predictable, their goals and interests not always pre-determined. Any given "global" process is ever-changing because local agency is varied and ambivalent.

My approach questions how fully powerful and seamless a "global" project can be. The global project in question here is environmental conservation, but the same question can be asked of other imagined globals—for example, capitalism (see Gibson-Graham 1996) or global whiteness (see Saldanha 2007). Any global project is uneven in its power, its implementation, and its ability to make a difference (Carrier and West 2009, Tsing 2005).

Creolization theory offers a fruitful lens through which to view how local agency shapes global process. Scholarship debating and elaborating the idea of creolization and applying it throughout the world has burgeoned in the past decade (e.g., Khan 2007, Lionnet and Shih 2011, Palmie 2006, Stewart 2007). While fully fleshing out these controversies is beyond the scope of this article, I build upon Trouillot's (2006) point that in the plantation economies of the 17th and 18th century Caribbean, the emergence

of cultural practices that were Afro-American was inherently creative because the system that contained African-descended peoples did not see them as human, let alone as culture-bearing subjects. Yet even in these abject conditions, enslaved people created culture that itself shaped plantation society (Trouillot 2006:18).

Mintz (2010), Trouillot (2006), and others (Khan 2007, 2006) call for close historical and ethnographic readings of moments of creolization, countering a tendency in early renderings of the theory to glibly celebrate a new creolized culture imagined as emancipatory. Bolland (2009) notes that a critical aspect of creolization is the never static dialectic between master and slave in plantation economies, between the colonial elite and laboring masses in post-emancipation societies, and today between urban elites and the poor. Creolization is a process that is ever-shifting, the cultural institutions and practices emerging out of the dialectics that make up this process never fixed, always becoming and containing within them disjuncture and difference (Strong 2006). Crichlow (2009) and Crichlow and Northover (2009) additionally emphasize that creolization consists of encounters between a variety of subjects positioned differently in uneven fields of power who are always already entangled in a range of subject-making projects and processes and whose identities and positions are not fixed.

One particularly productive aspect of creolization theory is its recognition of ambivalence, of how people orient themselves differently depending on context (Abrahams 1983, Burton 1997).[3] The way this ambivalence operates may be most clearly demonstrated through the linguistic use of this term in describing Afro-Caribbean languages. Each Creole language in the Caribbean is characterized by the linguistic continuum it contains. This continuum ranges from forms closest to the African contributions to forms closest to the European contributions (DeGraff 1999). Individuals who speak Creole languages also vary in 1) their mastery of the full range of the continuum, 2) their control of the politically, economically, and socially dominant European language related to their Creole, and 3) when they use which form of Creole; and each of these variations is closely tied to an individual's race and class. Thus, while there are two contrasting poles in linguistic Creolization processes (African and European), at any given moment people are positioned differently on these continua of race, class, status, and metropolitanism. Individuals maneuver along these continua depending on the situation they are in. Al, the birding guide and resort owner I opened with is a perfect example of this. He was a loud critic

of international conservation efforts in Crooked Tree one year, and the next year he was elected to the board of the conservation organization that he had so vocally opposed.

Analyzing the engagement of local actors with global forms as processes of creolization, then, allows for a full consideration of the creative agency of subordinate populations, and their capacity to generate shifting forms of the global across structures of inequality. In this case, I show how residents of a village in rural Belize are able to significantly shape what conservation is understood to be. Using creolization theory also foregrounds the ambivalence of subjects—who will align themselves at different times with different positions, just as Al did. Attending to these conceptual points through a fine-grained ethnographic analysis shows how what becomes global is generated, at least in part, by the subaltern, and is never stable.

The Global Dynamic of Environmental Conservation

Environmental conservation through the creation of protected areas can be traced back to the late 19th century, but became a global project in the middle of the 20th century, when there was a worldwide surge in the establishment of national parks. International conservation organizations, such as the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the Nature Conservancy often instigated early conservation efforts. These organizations worked with national governments to "protect" lands from human use, often without considering the needs of nearby populations. By the 1980s and 1990s, there was a significant shift in how international conservation organizations planned environmental conservation projects, from a top-down model of simply demarcating a protected area, to one that—at least in rhetoric—aimed to include the people living near proposed protected areas in planning and management processes.[4] In many instances, this "participatory" approach still reproduced top-down initiatives, and scholarly analyses of conservation efforts emphasized how these projects came from an elite environmental ethic, funded by Northern sources, and foisted onto rural populations in various parts of the Global South (e.g., Brockington 2002, Chernela 2005, Grandia 2012, Igoe 2004, Miller et al. 2012, Naughton-Treves et al. 2005, Neumann 2002). Other recent research in environmental conservation aims to complicate the simple model of global domination,

and scholars provide compelling ethnographic detail about how various local constituents are not only affected by, but also engage with conservation efforts (Agrawal 2005, Brosius 1997, Doane 2012, Escobar 2008, Grandia 2012, Haenn 2005, Mathews 2011, Moore 1998, Munster and Munster 2012, Sundberg 2006, West 2006). These studies align with recent research on other global phenomena that carefully characterize local articulations, appropriations, and engagements of global forms. However, they do not specifically focus on how populations throughout the Global South might be themselves shaping *what conservation is* (but see Hathaway 2013 who shows how people in Yunaan, China co-created conservation there). In this analysis, I show how encounters between residents of Crooked Tree and representatives from government and conservation organizations have generated conservation policy and practice in Belize. What appear to be "Western" or "Northern" initiatives have arguably been created through encounters, struggles, and syntheses—or creolization—between a variety of different entities.

Considering Belize

Evidence from Belize suggests that rural Belizeans—who have engaged with conservation to achieve a range of goals that are not centrally concerned with habitat, biodiversity, or wildlife conservation—have shaped what conservation has come to look like in this country. The actions and ideas of people living in areas targeted for conservation have expanded the boundaries of conservation so that it now also denotes goals beyond biodiversity, such as economic development and ensuring the maintenance of basic infrastructure such as roads, electricity, and running water.

Understanding conservation in Belize as a process of creolization draws attention to several key features of encounters across difference that generate new, but always temporary, syntheses.[5] First, such an analysis foregrounds the creativity and agency of all parties involved—from the seemingly most marginal to the seemingly most powerful. It also draws attention to the ways in which peoples and ideas occupying differently raced, classed, and otherwise divided social locations (that are in turn connected to rural Afro-Caribbean lifeways and/or Northern conservation agendas) intermingle within uneven fields of power. And it highlights how the outcomes of these encounters are themselves in a continual state of tension, reflecting compromise as well as the ambivalence of many of the

entangled agents. The establishment and management of the Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary illustrates how conventional understandings of local communities and external interests oversimplify complexly interconnected sets of actors whose positions and identifications are constantly shifting (e.g., Nadasdy 2004). Residents of Crooked Tree, government representatives, and conservation organization employees are all involved in the forging of conservation policy and practice. The result is that conservation in Belize encompasses not only a focus on protecting biodiversity, but also small-scale development and support for historically marginal communities to further enfranchise themselves in the larger political and economic contexts in which they are located. A key point I suggest here is that changes in conservation and development policy over the past 30 years emerged not primarily in northern cities, but rather in places like Crooked Tree, in the thoughts and actions of rural people as they engaged with members of NGOs from the global North.

The Historical Political Economy of Color and Class in Belize

Belize is a small, simultaneously Caribbean and Central American nation that is known for its multi-ethnic population. English buccaneers settled there in the 16th and 17th century when the area was sparsely populated by Mayan groups, initially using Belize as a way-station for raiding Spanish galleons imagined to be full of gold. As the textile industry in England expanded, buccaneers turned to exporting logwood for its rich purple dye. Some of the more prosperous early buccaneers purchased enslaved Africans to cut and haul logwood. Mahogany extraction replaced the logwood industry in the early 19th century. Because these trees required more labor, being larger and farther apart, wealthy woodcutters purchased increasing numbers of enslaved Africans and people of African descent (Bolland 1977, Campbell 2011, Shoman 2000).

By the early 1800s, poorer white English and Scottish settlers had concubines, sometime wives, who were enslaved “colored” women, and occasionally free women of color. A substantial population of people of color emerged from these mixings. Some were enslaved and some were free, and some even very wealthy. After the end of slavery in the mid-19th century, they began to define themselves as Creole. The emergence of the category “Creole” has been shown to be a move by economically and politically elite non-whites to claim more power. They used their nativeness

to justify claims against the interests of white British colonial administrators, and initially separated themselves from the working poor (typically the darker-skinned people they employed) by pointing to their higher class status and lighter skin color (Ashdown 1978, Judd 1992). What it meant to be a Belizean Creole became further solidified against the increased presence of other ethnic groups (Maya, Garifuna, and Mestizo) in the country through the 19th century.

Historically, Belizean Creoles have been both politically and economically dominant over the Maya, Garifuna, and Mestizo populations with whom they share this territory, and have defined the category "Belizean" (Ashdown 1978, Medina 2004). Typically, Creoles with lighter skin tend to occupy more elite economic status; even when they do not, there is a pervasive "white bias" in Belize, as elsewhere in the Caribbean (Alleyne 2002, Augustine 1998, Ulysse 2008). For rural Creole people, class and skin-color are critical defining features; people pay close attention to where they fall on color and class continua, and whiteness is a marker of someone being from somewhere else—the US or Europe.

Belizean Creoles choose how to identify themselves strategically, depending on context, and this conforms to the ambivalence and indeterminacy that creolization highlights. They are ambivalent in their invocation of their roots, at times emphasizing their Northern European heritage and their connections to those who have historically been advantaged, and at other times identifying with a pan-African diasporic solidarity that condemns the wrongs of slavery and recognizes their roots in that system. And still at other times, they emphasize their Belizean-ness—their shared nationality with the three other major ethnic groups: Mestizo, Mayan, and Garifuna. These vacillations are sometimes expressed in Creole people's use of the Belize Kriol language. Like other Caribbean Creole languages, Belize Kriol has contributions from West African and European (in this case, English) languages, and its speakers use versions either more filled with the African components or the English components depending on the context. Yet, just as there is a white bias in terms of skin color, there is a perception that Caribbean Standard English is at least in some ways superior to the versions of Belize Kriol that are "raw." Indeed, the verb "to speak" in Belize Kriol means to speak English, not Kriol. Yet, at the same time, and exemplifying the ambivalence I have already noted, Creole people are defiantly proud of their language and its rich capacity for punning and humor, and they celebrate individuals who can use Kriol to tell

stories, jokes, and "talk fool." In these ways, Creole people well exemplify the ambivalences that creolization theory stresses.

Crooked Tree was settled by British woodcutters and the enslaved Africans they purchased in the late 1700s (Johnson 2003). During the wet season (summer and fall), the village is an island amidst over 16,000 acres of large shallow lagoons, creeks, and savannas (Mackler and Salas 1994). Although the canoe trip to the lagoon from "the main" of the Belize River was long, the area was rich in logwood, and thus attractive from the outset to white British buccaneers-turned-woodcutters. However, because it was not home to large stands of mahogany, it became a relatively marginal economic settlement after the logwood boom in the early 19th century. The community today consists of roughly 1,000 people living in 130 households. Residents of Crooked Tree are known throughout Belize for their lighter skin, and villagers often identify with their British wood-cutting ancestors, downplaying the role of slavery in their past, and the presence of blackness in their identity. These tensions between marginality, rurality, and light skin color make Crooked Tree especially interesting. Residents celebrate their long presence in this place, and their close connections to their English settler forebears. At the same time, they reject colonial and postcolonial attempts to limit their activities (for example, through fishing and hunting restrictions) sometimes invoking the specter of slavery to strengthen their claims.

Residents of Crooked Tree "make *plantashe*" (practice shifting cultivation), raise cattle, and fish using a variety of types of nets, lines, or spears, depending on the season and what kind of fish they wish to catch in the lagoons and creeks surrounding the community. Some also hunt for deer, armadillo, peccary, gibnut, and other game in the pine savannas and tropical forests on the village's outskirts, gather various natural products (from pimenta and pine to alligator skins and cashew nuts), and engage in a wide range of subsistence and commercial activities. At the same time, members of the community participate in wage labor outside of the village—often in timber, sugar, tourism, or government work. Today, while not every household hunts and fishes, every household is likely to buy or receive fish and game from fellow villagers, and these foods are highly valued. With better transportation to Belize City becoming available over the past 20 years, a growing number of people commute daily to urban jobs. Many households receive remittances from migrants in the US, and there is a growing number of return migrants in the village. The wildlife sanctuary

provides four jobs directly to the village, and the developing ecotourism industry provides primary income to several households and supplemental income to even more (see Enriquez 1993, Haddle 2005).

The village has not historically had a clear class stratification, and the majority of residents are part of Belize's large lower class.[6] Some households have capital to invest in small businesses, but most have very little or none, and residents have welcomed the revenue brought into the area from tourism. Most people have fairly secure rights to the land on which they reside—lands in one-half of the village have been privately owned over a long period of time; a government land survey in the 1990s resulted in deeded house lots in the other half. Lands on the village outskirts that have traditionally been used for agriculture and hunting include both government and privately owned land. Nevertheless, most residents consider the lands they have traditionally used for hunting and agriculture as theirs to use.

Belize as a Site of International Conservation Interest

Belize is currently a focal point for international conservation efforts. This slim coastal strip of Central America has garnered interest for a number of reasons. As a colony built on a timber industry that collapsed in the early 20th century and that implemented land legislation prohibiting the rapid development of agriculture, Belize was left relatively environmentally intact, especially in contrast to neighboring countries. Its independence in 1981 coincided with a rapid rise of global interest in tropical rainforests and their rich biodiversity, and its new government was eager to participate in global environmental initiatives. Over the past 30 years, some 28 percent of Belize's national territory has come under some form of protection, ranking Belize higher than many countries in terms of its "protected" percentage of national land (Young 2008). Today, there are a host of both Belizean and transnational environmental NGOs interested in the health of Belize's biodiversity, ranging from the Government of Belize to the Sarstoon-Temash Indigenous Management Institute, the Programme for Belize, the Worldwide Fund for Nature, and the Nature Conservancy.

Some protected areas in Belize are only "paper parks," designated in policy documents, but not maintained in practice. A few others hew more closely to the "fortress conservation" model in which original residents of the protected area are removed and kept out of the park, with violence employed specifically to enforce such restrictions (Brockington

2002). However, the majority of Belize's conservation areas entail some sort of "people-environment balance"; partly because the Belizean government has limited resources for managing and maintaining protected areas (Young 2008). This situation in Belize is not uncommon for weak states in the Global South that sometimes rely on NGOs to manage protected areas (Brechin and Salas 2011). In these settings, government and non-governmental organizations cannot rely solely on strong fences and frequent patrols, but must also depend on local residents' willingness to comply with area regulations. As I show below, this situation offers some leverage to residents living near sanctuaries and parks.

The Making of Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary

The details of how Crooked Tree initially became a wildlife sanctuary reveal how differently positioned actors pursuing a variety of agendas engaged with one another, and in the process expanded what conservation was understood to encompass. These actors included residents of Crooked Tree, Belizean government officials, and representatives from both the Belize Audubon Society and transnational conservation organizations.[7] Belize Audubon, in particular, has served as a node around which all of these other interests convene, and as such has had a profound impact on the course of conservation in Belize since its founding in the 1960s. The people of Crooked Tree have profoundly shaped how Audubon thinks about conservation, and have contributed, in turn, to an expansion of what conservation means on a global scale.

The founding of Belize Audubon itself was a moment of creolization. Belizean nationals worked alongside US conservationists to create the organization. One of these conservationists was Dora Weyer, a white middle-class woman with graduate level training in tropical biology from the Florida State Museum at the University of Florida. Weyer focused Audubon's attention on Crooked Tree from the outset. In an interview with me, Weyer recounted that on her earliest trips to Belize, she was told by a white US expatriate sports-fisherman friend of hers that *the* place to see birds, particularly waterfowl, was Crooked Tree Lagoon. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Weyer made the long and rough trip to the lagoon, on a three-mile dirt track that was accessible only by Land Rover or Jeep, and only when the waters were low. She remembered being awestruck by both the numbers and variety of waterfowl she saw on the

long glassy waterways surrounding the village. Under the auspices of the Belize Audubon Society, Weyer regularly led small groups of birders, both from the US and from Belize, to Crooked Tree throughout the early 1970s. Weyer hired Mr. Rickford, a rural Creole and Crooked Tree-based transportation entrepreneur, to take these birders and Audubon supporters on tours of the lagoon complex.

The birders, reflecting growing international concern for environmental conservation, began to be concerned about the ecological health of the waterfowl in the lagoon complex, particularly the jabiru stork (*Jabiru mycteria*)—a relatively unusual and elusive species of the tropical Americas found in large numbers in the waterways around Crooked Tree. Through Belize Audubon, but also with the interest and approval of the still-colonial government of Belize, Weyer brought in white scientists and conservationists from the US to assess Crooked Tree's ecology and to provide support for creating a protected area in its lagoons. While some of these individuals focused primarily on the importance of protecting the jabiru, and advocated for a sanctuary that would allow bird and nature watching, others brought in different logics, such as creating places for sport-hunting. One of these was Alexander Sprunt IV, the Florida based Director of Research for the National Audubon Society. In 1972, Sprunt toured Crooked Tree and then put forward a report recommending a sanctuary. In his report, Sprunt highlighted his vision of creating a protected area that would not impact villagers because, he erroneously claimed, they rarely hunted birds, but that would allow for the development of a sport hunting and fishing industry that could bring revenue to the village. As I show later, villagers had a very different idea about the relationship between sport hunting and the sanctuary.

Villagers were equally diverse in the interests and concerns they brought to the table. Initially, the most enthusiastic resident was the aforementioned tour-boat operator, Mr. Rickford. Village leaders such as Rickford, the village council chairman, and other relatively well-positioned men, expressed interest and met several times with Audubon representatives. A color/class divide marked these encounters. Audubon members were typically individuals from Belize's small, light-skinned, and primarily urban middle class, and some, like Dora Weyer, were white scientists and conservationists from the US. In the early 1970s, the Audubon newsletter reported that Audubon representatives had met with villagers from Crooked Tree about the possibility of establishing a sanctuary and that the people responded:

> "The sooner the better." They said they would welcome the speedy drawing up of rules and regulations to protect the bird life in their area. (Belize Audubon Society 1973)

Villagers' recollections are a bit less rosy. Many recall emphasizing their interest in retaining access to the fishery for both commercial net fishing—several residents' main source of livelihood—and line and spear fishing—which many enjoyed for home use. The intensity of this interest impressed the individuals who were crafting proposals for the sanctuary and legislation for national parks. For example, William Deshler, a white US-based United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) consultant hired to produce a 1978 national parks plan proposal for Belize, stressed the importance of maintaining the commercial fishery at Crooked Tree. At one point in the proposal, he both underscored and used all capitals to emphasize what he was recommending:

> It is recommended that the area should be established as a National Reserve to be managed as a bird sanctuary with provision to permit THE CONTINUANCE OF THE ESTABLISHED COMMERCIAL FISHING PRACTICE. (Deshler 1978)

The National Parks Systems Act of 1981, reflecting Deshler's reports, allows for the possibility of fishing in Belize's protected areas. In our interview, Weyer also emphasized the commitment that she and her fellow conservationists had to maintaining the Crooked Tree fishery.

In the early 1980s, Weyer and others approached the village council chairman, Ken Grayton, with the sanctuary proposal in detail, and asked him to sign it on behalf of the village so that they could take the proposal to the newly independent government of Belize. Mr. Grayton refused, and said that the entire village council and the village as whole would need to meet before anything could be signed. A village-wide meeting was held within the next few weeks and, by all reports, was well-attended. From the perspective of Audubon and Weyer, villagers were supportive of the sanctuary. The villagers with whom I spoke, however, had a range of recollections about the process. Mr. Grayton said the meetings were quite "heaty," or argumentative, that there was a lot of resistance to the idea in the village, and that he really "helped her [Weyer] push the thing through." Other villagers remembered Audubon making promises.

One older man, very engaged in village matters, summarized what many people told me:

> A lady by the name of Dora Weyer came with a lot of white people. They put it to us, they wanhn put the thing in. They tell we they not gwan a restrict anything in the water, not gwan interfere with the villagers fishing. They only talk about the birds. They no mention anything about any wildlife. They me say only 100 yards from watside would be the sanctuary. So the people who gone back then support the thing.[8]

Others also specifically recalled promises that there would be no restrictions on villager fishing and hunting, and that tourism development would bring fresh economic opportunity to the village. Here, different villagers articulated their different interests, as did the variety of outsiders interested in this conservation project; the back-and-forth debate linked commitments to sustained livelihood and economic opportunity with protecting wildlife.

For many residents of Crooked Tree, Audubon and government representatives are marked by their whiteness, eliteness, and paternalism. One village elder commented that while Dora Weyer was "all right," she was sometimes a bit too certain that she knew more than anyone else about Belize's environment. This sentiment reflects villagers' recognition of how, in international conservationist circles, local people are often seen as not fully understanding the importance of wildlife and the natural environment; in the eyes of outside conservationists, local knowledge and appreciation of the environment is deficient (see Campbell 2002). Residents were also wary of the government, who had restricted their activity in the sanctuary in the past.[9] Villagers raised a host of concerns in the meeting, but focused particularly on ensuring their full rights to fishing and other subsistence activities. Foreign, white involvement in the project only augmented their concern. In raising these points, residents identified themselves in contrast to the lighter skinned and politically powerful government representatives and conservationists, asserting their long historied rural Creole rights to their fishery.

On the other hand, the sanctuary appealed to many villagers for a range of reasons. Then, as they do today, members of the community had multiple attitudes toward the sanctuary. Residents most commonly spoke of

tourism's potential to generate cash income—both from donations to the sanctuary, and in the form of jobs: guiding, feeding, and housing tourists. Villagers, who had yet to enjoy road access to Belize City,[10] and who lived frugally, had seen how the tour-boat operator Mr. Rickford had profited from taking birders into the lagoon and were excited by the prospect of new money-making opportunities. Should Crooked Tree become a site for tourism, they were also interested in the possibility of a road connecting the village to a main highway, an outcome that came to fruition shortly after the sanctuary was established. Residents' interests were duly noted, and the management of the sanctuary from its inception has focused as much on development as on protecting resources, thus cementing in the minds of conservationists and villagers alike an inextricable connection between conservation and economic development.

Ensuring economic development was not the only concern residents brought to the table. The issue of sport hunting also loomed large. In the years just prior to the establishment of the sanctuary, white, male sport hunters from Texas who were living in Belize came regularly to Crooked Tree to hunt waterfowl. They often chose to hunt along the lagoon-side from the center of the village. Villagers were not pleased with these hunters. Not only did the hunters' recklessly popping guns and careless hunting techniques scare away a game bird eaten as an occasional treat in Crooked Tree—the whistling duck—but these men often drank heavily when they were hunting. One evening, the Crooked Tree police constable went to the lagoon-side to convince the hunters to put a stop to their drunken shooting, when the hunters turned around and aimed their shotguns at him. Villagers remembered being outraged by this behavior, and they saw the sanctuary as a potentially effective means of keeping out unwelcome white outsiders who treated the community disrespectfully. Here, then, Afro-Caribbean villagers aligned with certain external "white" interests (conservation), and were willing to give up some hunting rights (waterbirds) to protect themselves from other external white forces. Villagers thus rejected Sprunt's proposal to retain sport hunting in the sanctuary, and were instead willing to give up hunting waterfowl in the sanctuary so as to limit unsavory characters from coming to Crooked Tree.

By the end of the meeting, both villagers and the village council formally approved the sanctuary proposal. By December 1984, the Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary was legally created. The lagoons and waterways that surround the island were protected from hunting and other extraction of

wildlife resources; as were 300-foot edges inland from each waterway and one 2,400-acre parcel of land south of the village. In 1985, Wild Wings, a foundation created by the Rockefeller family, provided funding for wardens and the construction of a visitor center. This funding was organized by Byron Swift, a US-based lawyer who worked for the IUCN and WWF, and who visited Crooked Tree several times in these early years. Crooked Tree villagers' primary demand that they retain full access to their fishery was duly noted and reflected in the National Park Systems Act under which Crooked Tree would be declared a wildlife sanctuary. Villagers successfully retained their fishery, excluded sport hunting, and opened the possibility of increased tourism, thus expanding "conservation" to include increased villager control over resources. Representatives of Audubon and the government were able to legally protect critical jabiru stork habitat and limit waterfowl hunting as well as manage natural resource exploitation. Furthermore, significant players in the international conservation scene—the aforementioned National Audubon Society's Alexander Sprunt, FAO Consultant William Deshler, and IUCN and WWF attorney Byron Swift—were present at some of these meetings. These leading figures in international conservation could see first-hand that there were limitations to how a simple fence-and-patrol style of conservation might function, and were themselves able to reimagine conservation as inherently including benefits for the people living near protected areas.

The creation of the Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary was part of a process of creolizing conservation, bringing together several elite, external, white points of view with non-elite, Afro-Caribbean concerns. Different individuals throughout this process adopted particular positions in a class and color matrix that are not predetermined but rather reflect ambivalence and shifting subjectivities. Through a process of creolization, conservation thus came to include maintaining fishing rights, protecting against intrusive white hunters, promoting new economic opportunities like tourism, and promising the construction of a new road.

The Fishing Controversies

By 1993, Belize Audubon had become a prominent NGO and was able to hire an urban mestizo—or Spanish-speaking non-Creole of Mexican origin—Protected Areas Manager to create a management plan for Crooked Tree. In his early work toward that goal, the manager worried about an

apparent increase in fish hauls by commercial fishermen and its adverse effects on the sanctuary. At the same time, in international conservation circles in the 1990s, the idea of "local participation" in protected areas management had become popular. I would argue that this new popularity of "participation" stemmed from residents living near protected areas all around the world suggesting that conservation must support their livelihoods. In the case of Crooked Tree, the Protected Areas Manager wedded the new call for local level participation with his concern about large fish hauls, thus facilitating a continuation of the creolization process.

In spring of 1993, the Protected Areas Manager called a meeting with the village to discuss the state of the sanctuary. This was the largest gathering of the village I have witnessed: the community center was packed, all the seats inside were taken, and people were standing outside waiting to be part of the meeting. On stage were the mestizo Protected Areas Manager, a Belizean Creole Fisheries official, a white Peace Corps volunteer from the US who worked with the Fisheries Department, and the Crooked Tree Village Council Chairman. The Protected Areas Manager opened the meeting by saying, "This is your meeting, the idea here is to work along with you." He then said that the meeting would focus on resources, fishing regulations, and the role of Audubon. The first speaker, the urban-based Creole Fisheries official, explained at length the restrictions on types of nets, how nets could be set out, and what would be defined as excessive hauls. He also underscored that people who fish commercially need a license. The longer he spoke, the more disgruntled the crowd became. People talked among themselves and loudly critiqued the official's comments, particularly the idea that a license is necessary for commercial fishing. One of the first critiques came from a middle-aged Creole man from the community, Geoffrey. Interestingly, years later Geoffrey developed a career working as a warden for Audubon and other conservation organizations. Geoffrey's movement from critic of conservation to working as a conservationist reflects the ambivalences and shifting positionalities so prominent in processes of creolization. Geoffrey spoke up loudly, stating, "You know at this time of year [the dry season] a lot of people make their living off of fishing." This elicited loud, confrontational applause from many in the audience. As the fisheries representative continued on, after briefly noting that the laws are for all Belizeans, more villagers spoke out. Villagers became especially vocal when the Fisheries official began talking about hicatee, or the endangered Central American turtle (*Dermatemys*

mawii), a very popular treat in the dry season in rural Belize. According to scientists, the turtle's populations are declining because of over-fishing.[11]

The Fisheries official—who had been speaking in impeccable Standard Caribbean English for the first portion of the meeting—began talking in an increasingly "broad" Kriol. As the noise from the crowd grew, he shifted further away from Standard Caribbean English into the version of Kriol most distant from English, finally ending his presentation early. This kind of shifting and parlaying is central to the creolization encounter, where people signal their allegiances and identifications in any given moment at least partially by how they speak. In this case, the Fisheries official began appealing to the crowd through the authority conferred on him by his status as a highly educated government official. As the crowd rejected what he was saying, he tried to connect with them by shifting into a broad Kriol—using the ambivalence of Kriol to his advantage—just barely holding onto the audience's attention, but ultimately having to abruptly end his speech before he had planned to.

When the meeting was officially opened to questions from the floor, most of the questions centered on fishing and licensing. Residents emphasized that Audubon owed the village something and that the organization must work with the village, rather than try to restrict villager access to the fishery. One particularly vocal community member, a skilled hunter, who also worked in the US for part of each year, said "Audubon *de deh fi* [has been for] a while trying to shove things down our throats, we need *fi* work together." And then a young woman said that she had heard that there was supposed to be a cash collection box to collect fees charged to tourists, and she wanted to know what had been earned. A soft-spoken young man, who worked as a warden for Audubon, echoed this point, saying that a lot had been promised by Audubon, but that little had come through.

The responses from the government and Audubon officials were conciliatory: they repeated, numerous times, that the government and Audubon were there to work with the community. For example, a white woman from the US working for the Department of Conservation made the point that "Fishing is technically illegal, but we recognize that you use it and have done for many years. We want to work with you to ensure the fishery is maintained."

Midway through the period of open commentary from the community, Audubon's Executive Director, an urban-based mestizo woman, walked into the meeting. She noted the meeting was "heaty" and full of tension

and disagreement—especially over fishing. From the edge of the room, she spoke about the importance of keeping natural resources healthy for the continued survival of the ecotourism industry. She then provocatively added, "…it's in your hands, whether it will remain a sanctuary or not." The nurse stationed at Crooked Tree, a young Creole woman from Belize City asked, "But hasn't government declared the area protected?" The Executive Director replied that the sanctuary has a certain status within the National Park System Act. But Mr. Rickford, the tour boat operator and one of the sanctuary's strongest supporters, spoke up and said "the Minister can change the Act if he sees fit," as a way of challenging his fellow villagers to support the sanctuary by encouraging them to imagine its removal. The Executive Director replied that the Government of Belize was considering Crooked Tree as a potential site to nominate for entrance into the Ramsar Convention, a prestigious international convention focused on the preservation of wetlands, but then said "we know we cannot go above your heads and say Crooked Tree can't be touched." This line of provocative talk was answered by the then-village council chairman, an older Creole cattle-man, who said, "As I understand it, the sanctuary was not shoved down people's throats, but it was with the consent of the people," reminding that the sanctuary had, at least at some point, been seen as a benefit to the community by most villagers. Quiet nods of agreement among the villagers affirmed their overall support of the sanctuary. Thus, the disjunctures that would animate conservation's creolization were laid out: conservationists wanted to protect habitat and ensure that there would be no decline in fish and animal populations; villagers wanted to retain their fishery and gain economic opportunities from tourism.

As the meeting came to a close, one village council member, a woman whose family owned one of the three main resorts, suggested that they start electing villagers to an Advisory Committee for the sanctuary—an idea that had been discussed by both villagers and Audubon for several months. The committee was elected from the crowd—and included many of the most vocal critics at the meeting, as well as some staunch supporters—fishermen and women, hunters, cattlemen, and tourism entrepreneurs.

The Advisory Committee was active for about six months. Made up of the elected community members, Audubon's Protected Areas Manager, and government representatives from the Departments of Conservation and Fisheries, the committee worked on developing policy to determine zoning, fishing seasons, and who would be allowed to fish in which areas

of the lagoon when. The committee was able to ensure villager ability to fish even when and where fish were scarce, but also allowed large commercial buyers to operate in the village when and where fish were plentiful.

Crooked Tree residents on the committee used effective strategies to advance their interests. One particularly vocal man, Harvey, invoked his connection to the land to emphasize that Audubon owed a debt to Crooked Tree. He said, defiantly, "I eat cluckin' hen [limpkin, a large wading bird, *Aramus guarauna*], I eat anything." With this, he referenced the cultural politics of food, which have been prominent in Belize, and which parallel the other forms of ambivalence I described above (Wilk 1999). Historically, middle-class Belizeans denigrated wild game as a food that only poor rural people eat. As Belizeans have been more recently celebrating their rural roots, wild game is becoming a symbol of authentic Belizean-ness. Harvey's comment nods to this shift. Harvey reminds Audobon representatives that eating these foods makes him rural Creole and that conservation must support local livelihood and culture.

The government representatives aimed to appease these villagers and asserted that "locals are seen as keys," that the government was not interested in hiring guards. Committee members from Crooked Tree tried to push government officials to confirm in writing that villagers had the right to fish in the sanctuary year round. The representative said he would do "more than that," but that any official legal charges would have to go through government channels first. Although there are not yet special provisions for Crooked Tree specifically in the legal instruments describing wildlife sanctuaries, the revision of the National Park System Act in 2000 retained the right of local residents to fish in wildlife sanctuaries. In that same spirit, in practice, Audubon wardens rarely stop villagers from hunting and extracting other natural resources. Thus, villagers' efforts to maintain their land and lagoon-based livelihood have ensured that Audubon puts assisting the community at the forefront of agenda, often ahead of biodiversity conservation.

Crooked Tree in the 21st Century

The relationship between Audubon and the village is constantly shifting from one marked by tension and animosity on both sides, to one of cooperation and working toward shared goals. When frustrations with the sanctuary and Audubon rise, villagers often talk about how they could

manage the area better than Audubon. They bring up the fact that they could gather petitions and go to the minister to ask to de-reserve, or, effectively remove, the sanctuary. Although this has not yet happened, and would not likely succeed because the Belizean government is committed to maintaining Belize as an ecotourist destination, it is indeed legally possible. That de-reserving is a possibility emboldens residents. One of the people who raised this idea with me numerous times was the charismatic Creole man, Al, with whom I opened this article. He was an heir of a long-rooted family in Crooked Tree, as well as one of the most successful tourism entrepreneurs and guides in the village. He was also a passionate—and skilled—hunter and fisherman. He put his money where his mouth was in the mid-1990s, running, and being elected, for a position on the Board of Directors of the Belize Audubon Society. Until his untimely death in 2008 while hunting, he remained ambivalent about Audubon, consistently pushing for Audubon to give back to the community. His viewpoints and actions were never fixed, but rather he occupied different positions at different times—in a complex mix of class, color, nation, and place—that constitute the creolization of conservation in Crooked Tree.

A more recent example of creolized conservation comes from the early 2000s. Audubon secured a grant from the European Union for co-management of Crooked Tree between 2000 and 2004 (Leikam et al. 2004).[12] Monies were granted to both build community capacity for management, and to provide a series of alternative income development possibilities to the community—a cashew cooperative (that ultimately failed), improved advertisement for tourism and improvements to the sanctuary, a fish farm to capitalize on the presence of the invasive Tilapia species in the lagoon complex, and a cattle project that aimed to both assist and improve animal husbandry and to remove stray cattle from the village by providing monies and incentives for fencing cattle away from lagoon areas. This cattle project addressed an issue that had been central to debate within the village since the 19th century—the problem of cattle roaming loose through the village. Residents who kept kitchen gardens and worked hard to keep their yards clean were angry that cattle roamed loose through the village, while cattlemen argued that cattle rarely broke into yards and that cattle needed the fresh forage to be healthy. The Audubon supported project resolved these tensions. For the duration of this grant, Audubon's energies were primarily oriented toward community improvement. In turn, community members supported the sanctuary and respected the idea of not over-exploiting the

area. Additionally, residents stood by Audubon when it worked to stop a large-scale commercial development in the sanctuary. A wealthy Belizean businessman had started to clear land in the southernmost portion of the sanctuary to create a crocodile tourism enterprise. Audubon brought legal action against the individual and halted the development. Villagers were pleased the project was stopped as it threatened to alter lagoon ecology.

While the 2000s saw a close relationship between Audubon and the village, by 2011 there was more disjuncture than synthesis in the relationship between the community and Audubon. New management in the Audubon society protested a government minister's authorization of a new road across one of the lagoons bordering Crooked Tree. The road acted like a dam on this lagoon, and opened access to an area rich in wildlife that had previously been difficult to reach. But for many villagers, the road provided, for the first time, a reasonable way to get to the richest agricultural lands near the village. The trip to agricultural fields and cattle pasture that had previously taken two or three hours by foot or horseback now only took 20 minutes in a pick-up truck. Audubon's protest against this improvement infuriated residents. For its part, Audubon was furious that villagers had worked with the government minister to expedite the creation of the road.

Recently hired wardens patrolled more often and more frequently stopped villagers who were hunting, fishing, and otherwise using natural resources. In 2012, when wardens confiscated logwood posts cut by a resident, villagers publicly protested, attracting the attention of national media and ending up on the evening news. They used this press attention and their relationships with government ministers to force Audubon to return the logwood posts. When I visited in June 2013, villagers were still irritated with Audubon. But all of this changed in September 2013 with massive flooding of the lagoons and waterways that surround Crooked Tree. After the floods, Audubon returned to its role as village helper as much as conservation enforcer, and provided critical boat transportation that allowed residents to leave Crooked Tree for work, school, and other needs outside of the village. The long-term flooding, in combination with a newly elected and invigorated Village Council, pushed Audubon back to a position of compromise and commitment to village well-being and, in turn, villagers agreed to some restrictions on their natural resource use. These examples show the tenuous and temporary nature of linking conservation to economic development and village improvement, and the constant

shifting between antagonistic and cooperative relationships between Audubon and villagers.

Residents of Crooked Tree may be unusually empowered compared to other communities living near protected areas. They were consulted before the sanctuary was created, they have the legal capacity to petition a government minister to de-reserve the sanctuary, and Audubon and the government have limited resources to enforce restrictions on natural resource use in the sanctuary. These factors embolden villagers to make claims and to evade laws and regulations. However, this situation—a weak and resource-poor state, laws that can be changed by a Minister, and a desire to work with local populations—is not unique to Belize. I contend that there are likely many places around the world where local residents have advocated for their interests and where that advocacy has contributed to the generation of global forms like conservation.

Conclusion: Rethinking Global Process

Many analyses of "global" initiatives miss the ways in which local people actively assert their interests and shape the course of the global. One arena in which global forms are so shaped is environmental conservation. This discussion of the establishment and management of the Crooked Tree Wildlife sanctuary shows how both residents and "outsiders" (whether government or NGO, international or Belizean) all played roles in generating conservation policy and practice that included a commitment to maintaining local livelihood and culture, and promoted economic development.

As Belize Audubon, international conservationists, government officials, and the varied residents of Crooked Tree encounter one another in sanctuary establishment and management efforts, none of the constituent groups fully achieves its goals. In Belize, the agendas of various constituents connected to the sanctuary are held in uneasy tension, yielding a creolized course of conservation. Elite, white Northerners who run large international conservation organizations only partially achieve their goals of protecting biodiversity. Elite Belizeans (often light-skinned or mestizo, keeping with the global-political economy of race) who run Belize Audubon, or who work for the government, juggle the global imperative of protecting biodiversity with the interests and practical realities of rural Belize. Rural Creole Belizeans from Crooked Tree find only some success in advocating their goals, and work to mediate power relations that do not favor them by appealing to

their long presence in Crooked Tree and their Northern European ancestry, or to their location in a prime site for conservation and tourism. At any point, any one of these individuals will identify with and advocate for a particular position on these contrasting poles; at another point, they might advocate for another, reflecting the ambivalence that marks Creole cultures. Through their encounters and these shifting tensions, creolization occurs, in the process intertwining conservation with community interests.

Understanding different moments in the history of conservation in parts of rural Belize as processes of creolization shows that a wide array of subjects—from those typically seen as marginal and powerless to colonial officers, international conservationists, and elite Belizeans—have all contributed to defining conservation. Loose and varied coalitions form between rural Belizeans, elite urban Belizeans, government and NGO administrators, and various expatriates and representatives of international conservation organizations. These coalitions—marked by mixing based upon a social matrix of class, color, nationality, and other lines of separation—have contributed to the redefinition of conservation. Starting from a primary focus on protecting birdlife, conservation in Belize has come to include a commitment to economic development and sustaining local culture and livelihood. What has been seen as a global concern coming from Northern centers of power—in this case, environmental conservation in the form of protected area creation—has been powerfully shaped by the assertions and interests of people in the marginal rural South. ■

Acknowledgments:

I am deeply indebted to the friends and family I have in and from rural Belize. This article has benefitted from smart and insightful commentary, and encouragement, from a number of brilliant colleagues: Michael Hathaway, Bridget Hayden, Laurie Medina, Gina Ulysse, Crystal Fortwangler, and my wonderful department colleagues in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Southwestern University—in Anthropology, Brenda Sendejo; in Sociology, Reggie Byron, Ed Kain, Maria Lowe, and Sandi Nenga. I also thank the anonymous reviewers for their comments, and the editors for improving the clarity and grace of the writing. Of course, any shortcomings are my own.

Endnotes:

[1]All names of villagers have been changed to protect anonymity.

[2]My positionality as a white middle class woman from the US with a strong interest in the environment shaped my ethnographic fieldwork in a variety of ways. Many residents of Crooked Tree identified me with the Belize Audubon Society; to them I was a white, external organization, that, like the government, sought to control the activities of villagers. Others assumed I must be working for the CIA. At the same time, many residents were excited by my interest in understanding rural Creole culture and their perspectives on conservation issues. My subsequent marriage to a Creole man from a neighboring village re-aligned me

with rural Creole interests in the eyes of many, but my whiteness and American-ness always mediates my relationships with people in rural Creole Belize.

[3]Social theorists have of course long made the point that individuals orient themselves differently, and strategically, depending on what context they find themselves in (e.g., Bourdieu 1977, Goffman 1969, Hurtado 2005).

[4]There is a rich literature on local participation in conservation projects and co-management of protected areas. For overviews, see Agrawal and Gibson (2001), Berkes (2009), Western and Wright (1994), and Wilshusen et al. (2002).

[5]Two other scholars have sought to link the concept of creolization with conservation or environmentalist issues, but have used the concept in a way not as tightly linked to the creolization literature, instead characterizing the process as "local adaptation" (Goeghegan 2009) or through a general metaphor of cultural mixing (Lynch 2006). I instead employ creolization theory to highlight the creative agency of rural Belizeans, the ambivalence of subjects in this creative process, and the temporary syntheses that result.

[6]With the increasing return of migrants who have been very economically successful, this lack of class stratification may be changing.

[7]I will refer to Belize Audubon Society as Belize Audubon or Audubon interchangeably, as do the residents of Crooked Tree. The organization began as a chapter of the US National Audubon Society, but has since become its own independent organization. The story of its founding is yet another example of creolization, but I do not have the space in this essay to elaborate that point.

[8]Interview, June 1993. The mix of language here between Caribbean English and Kriol was very common in interview contexts.

[9]Indeed, a celebrated hero of the community was the village council chairman who persuaded the Minister of Natural Resources at the time to restore deer-hunting rights to the village after a restriction in the 1960s.

[10]Residents of Crooked Tree had to first cross the lagoon (by boat in the wet season, or Jeep in the dry) to reach the Northern Highway.

[11]According to a recent comprehensive study, hicatee are declining in the locations where researchers have focused (Rainwater et al. 2012). But Belizean fishermen contest this assessment, and say that they have noticed no difference in the number of turtles they see.

[12]The grant was also for another early sanctuary—Cockscomb Basin Wildlife Sanctuary, in Belize's Stann Creek District.

References:

Abrahams, Roger. 1983. *Man-of-Words/West Indies: Performance and the Emergence of Creole Culture.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Agrawal, Arun. 2005. *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Agrawal, Arun and Clark C. Gibson, eds. 2001. *Communities and the Environment: Ethnicity, Gender, and the State in Community-Based Conservation.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Alexandrakis, Othon. 2013. "Neoliberalism and the New Agora: Exploring Survival, Emergence, and Political Subjectivity among Pluralized Subaltern Communities in Athens, Greece." *Anthropological Quarterly* 86(1):77-105.

Alleyne, Mervyn C. 2002. *The Construction and Representation of Race and Ethnicity in the Caribbean and the World.* Kingston: University of West Indies Press.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ashdown, Peter. 1978. "The Problem of Creole Historiography." *Journal of Belizean Affairs* 7:39-53.

Augustine, Elma W. 1998. *Colorism in Belize*. Belize City: Angelus Press.

Belize Audubon Society. 1973. *Belize Audubon Society Bulletin*, March. Belize City: Belize Audubon Society.

Berkes, Firket. 2009. "Evolution of Co-management: Role of Knowledge Generation, Bridging Organizations and Social Learning." *Journal of Environmental Management* 90:1692-1702.

Bolland, O. N. 1977. *The Formation of a Colonial Society: Belize, From Conquest to Crown Colony*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. 2009. "Creolization and Creole Societies." In Robin Cohen and Paola Toninato, eds. *The Creolization Reader: Studies in Mixed Identities and Cultures*, 106-122. New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brechin, Steve and Osmany Salas. 2011. "Government-NGO Networks and Nature Conservation in Belize: Examining the Theory of the Hollow State in a Developing Country Context." *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* 3(3):263-274.

Brockington, Dan. 2002. *Fortress Conservation: The Preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Brosius, J. Peter 1997. "Prior Transcripts, Divergent Paths: Resistance and Acquiescence to Logging in Sarawak, East Malaysia." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 39(3):468-510.

Burton, Richard. 1997. *Afro-Creole: Power, Opposition, and Play in the Caribbean*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Campbell, Lisa M. 2002. "Conservation Narratives in Costa Rica: Conflicts and Co-existence." *Development and Change* 33:29-56.

Campbell, Mavis. 2011. *Becoming Belize: A History of an Outpost of Empire Searching for Identity, 1528-1823*. Kingston: University of West Indies Press.

Carrier, James and Paige West, eds. 2009. *Virtualism, Governance and Practice: Vision and Execution in Environmental Conservation*. Oxford: Bergahn Books.

Chernela, Janet. 2005. "The Politics of Mediation: Local-Global Interactions in the Central Amazon of Brazil." *American Anthropologist* 107(4):620-631.

Crichlow, Michaeline A. 2009. *Globalization and the Post-Creole Imagination: Notes on Fleeing the Plantation*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Crichlow, Michaeline A. and Patricia A. Northover. 2009. "Homing Modern Freedoms: Creolization and the Politics of Making Place." *Cultural Dynamics* 21(3):283-316.

DeGraff, Michel, ed. 1999. *Language Creation and Language Change: Creolization, Diachrony and Development.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Deshler, William O. 1978. *Proposals for Wildlife Protection and National Parks System Legislation and the Establishment of National Parks and Reserves*. Belize: UNDP/FAO Project Working Document, Forestry Department.

Doane, Molly. 2012. *Stealing Shining Rivers: Agrarian Conflict, Market Logic, and Conservation in a Mexican Forest*. Tuscon: University of Arizona Press.

Enriquez, Jeremy. 1993. "Birds Come, Touris' Come. The Sociocultural and Socioeconomic Impact of Ecotourism on Rural Belizean Communities: The Case of Crooked Tree Village." M.A. Thesis, Development Studies, Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of the West Indies.

Escobar, Arturo. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movement, Life, Redes.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Ferguson, James. 2006. *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Geoghegan, Tighe. 2009. "Creolising Conservation: Caribbean Responses to Global Trends in Environmental Management." In James G. Carrier and Paige West, eds. *Virtualism, Governance and Practice: Vision and Execution in Environmental Conservation*, 112-133. Oxford: Bergahn Books.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1996. *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Goffman, Erving. 1969. *Strategic Interaction*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Gow, David D. 2008. *Countering Development: Indigenous Modernity and the Moral Imagination*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Grandia, Liza. 2012. *Enclosed: Conservation, Cattle, and Commerce among the Q'eqchi' Maya Lowlanders*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Haddle, Jenny. 2005. "Community Residents Perception of Ecotourism Impacts and Conservation Issues in Rural Creole Belize: A Case Study of Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary." M.A. Thesis, School of Natural Resources, University of Florida, Gainesville.

Haenn, Nora. 2005. *Fields of Power, Forests of Discontent: Culture, Conservation, and the State in Mexico.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hathaway, Michael J. 2013. *Environmental Winds: Making the Global in Southwest China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hurtado, Aida. 2005. "Mulitple Subjectivities: Chicanas and Cultural Citizenship." In Marilyn Friedman, ed. *Women and Citizenship*, 111-129. New York: Oxford University Press.

Igoe, Jim. 2004. *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Johnson, Melissa. 2003. "The Making of Race and Place in Nineteenth-Century British Honduras." *Environmental History* 8(4):598-617.

Judd, Karen. 1992. "Elite Reproduction and Ethnic Identity in Belize." Ph.D. Dissertation, Graduate Center of the City University of New York.

Khan, Aisha. 2006. "Feats of Engineering: Theory, Ethnography, and Other Problems of Model Building in the Social Sciences." *American Ethnologist* 33(4):566-570.

_____. 2007. "Good to Think? Creolization, Optimism, and Agency." *Current Anthropology* 48(5):653-673.

Leikam, Ginny, Stephanie Otis, Tristam Raymond, Nicole Sielken, and Tom Sweeney. 2004. "Evaluation of the Belize Audubon Society Co-Management Project at Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary and Cockscomb Basin Wildlife Sanctuary, Belize." M.A. Thesis, School of Natural Resource and Environment, University of Michigan.

Lionnet, Francoise and Shu-mei Shih, eds. 2011. *The Creolization of Theory.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Lynch, Barbara Deutsch. 2006. "Conclusion: Toward a Creole Environmentalism." In Sherrie L. Baver and Barbara Deutsch Lynch, eds. *Beyond Sun and Sand: Caribbean Environmentalisms*, 158-170. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Mackler, Robert and Osmany Salas. 1994. *Management Plan: Crooked Tree Wildlife Sanctuary, Belize.* Belize City: Belize Audubon Society

Mathews, Andrew. 2011. *Instituting Nature: Authority, Expertise, and Power in Mexican Forests.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Medina, Laurie Kroshus. 2004. *Negotiating Economic Development: Identity Formation and Collective Action in Belize.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Miller, Brian W., Susan C. Caplow, and Paul W. Leslie. 2012. "Feedbacks between Conservation and Social-Ecological Systems." *Conservation Biology* 26(2):218-227.

Mintz, Sidney W. 2010. *Three Ancient Colonies: Caribbean Themes and Variations.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Moore, Donald S. 1998. "Subaltern Struggles and the Politics of Place: Remapping Resistance in Zimbabwe's Eastern Highlands." *Cultural Anthropology* 13(3):344-381.

Munster, Daniel and Ursula Munster. 2012. "Consuming the Forest in an Environment of Crisis: Nature Tourism, Forest Conservation and Neoliberal Agriculture in South India." *Development and Change* 43(1):205-227.

Nadasdy, Paul. 2004. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Naughton-Treves, Lisa, Margaret B. Holland, and Katrina Brandon. 2005. "The Role of Protected Areas in Conserving Biodiversity and Sustaining Local Livelihoods." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 30:219-252.

Neumann, Roderick. 2002. *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa.* Berkeley: University of California.

Ong, Aiwha. 1999. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Palmie, Stephan. 2006. “Creolization and its Discontents.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35:433-456.

Rainwater, Thomas R., Thomas Pop, Octavio Cal, Anthony Garel, Steven G. Platt, and Rick Hudson. 2012. “A Recent Countrywide Status Survey of the Critically Endangered Central American River Turtle (*Dermatemys mawii*) in Belize.” *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* 11(1):97-107.

Saldanha, Arun. 2007. *Psychedelic White: Goa Trance and the Viscosity of Race.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sheller, Mimi. 2012. *Citizenship from Below: Erotic Agency and Caribbean Freedom*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Shoman, Assad. 2000. *Thirteen Chapters of a History of Belize*. Belize City: The Angelus Press Limited.

Stewart, Charles, ed. 2007. *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Strong, Pauline T. 2006. “On Theoretical Impurity.” *American Ethnologist* 33(4):585-587.

Sundberg, Juanita. 2006. “Conservation Encounters: Transculturation in the ‘Contact Zones’ of Empire.” *Cultural Geographies* 13(2):239-265.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2006. “Culture on the Edges: Creolization in the Plantation Context.” In *The African Diaspora and Creolization Literary Forum*, 9-22. Miami: ACTION.

Tsing, Anna L. 2000. “The Global Situation.” *Cultural Anthropology* 15(3):327-360.

_____. 2005. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ulysse, Gina A. 2008. *Downtown Ladies: Informal Commercial Importers, a Haitian Anthropologist and Self-Making in Jamaica*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

West, Paige. 2006. *Conservation is Our Government Now: The Politics of Ecology in Papua New Guinea*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Western, David and Michael Wright, eds. 1994. *Natural Connections: Perspectives In Community-Based Conservation*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Wilk, Richard. 1995. “Learning to Be Local in Belize: Global Systems of Cultural Difference.” In Daniel Miller, ed. *Modernity Through the Prism of the Local*, 110-133. London: Routledge.

_____. 1999. “‘Real Belizean Food’: Building Local Identity in the Transnational Caribbean.” *American Anthropologist* 101(2):244-255.

_____. 2006. *Home Cooking in the Global Village: Caribbean Food from Buccaneers to Ecotourists*. London: Berg.

Wilshusen, Peter, Steven R. Brechin, Crystal Fortwangler, and Patrick C. West. 2002. “Reinventing a Square Wheel: A Critique of a Resurgent Protection Paradigm in International Biodiversity Conservation.” *Society and Natural Resources* 15:17-40.

Young, Colin. 2008. “Belize’s Ecosystems: Threats and Challenges to Conservation in Belize.” *Tropical Conservation Science* 1(1):18-33.

Foreign Language Translations:

Creolized Conservation: A Belizean Creole Community Encounters a Wildlife Sanctuary
[**Keywords:** Creolization, globalization, conservation, Belize, Caribbean, environment]

克里欧化的保育：贝里斯克里欧社区与野生保育区的相遇
[**关键词：** 克里欧化，全球化，保育，贝里斯，加勒比海，环境]

Conservação Creolizada: Uma Comunidade Crioula do Belize Encontra um Santuário de Vida Selvagem
[**Palavras-chave:** Creolização, globalização, conservação, Belize, Caraíbas, ambiente]

Креолизированное заповедничество: Пересечение одного белизской креольной общины с одним заповедником
[**Ключевые слова:** креолизация, глобализация, заповедничество, Белиз, карибское море, окружающая среда]

الحفاظ الكريولي: مواجهة جماعة بليز الكريولية مع محمية الحياة البرية
كلمات البحث: الكريولية، العولمة، الحفاظ على البيئة، بليز، الكاريبي، البيئة