REVIEW ARTICLE Agricultural Science Digest, Volume 40 Issue 3: 223-225 (September 2020)

Natural Resources Globalization and Its Effect on the Indigenous People; Evidence from the Theoretical and Empirical literature: Review

Birhane Anagaw Abebe

10.18805/ag.D-236

ABSTRACT

The globalized view of natural resource is strictly connected with quantitative measures and strongly depends on expert assessments and assumptions with poorly understanding local knowledge and local facts, finally leads to unreliable conclusion. Hence, this review intends to investigate the globalization of natural resources and its effect on the lives of indigenous people. The study found that the conventional global approach tends to focus on quantitative measures by contrast the local and traditional approach tend to focus on qualitative information. Thus, local tailored forest conservation and management programs create a social environment that allows unique local environmental values to emerge increasing motivational force of environmental values in the conventional science. This reflects that giving recognition to and work with and through local real situations where problems are identified and solutions are determined makes environmental conservation more cost effective and sustainable. Local people believed that resources not only provide material benefits but also other cultural and social values. Indigenous peoples with a historical continuity of resource-use practices often possess a broad knowledge base of the behavior of complex ecological systems in their own localities. This knowledge has accumulated through a long series of observations transmitted from generation to generation. Where indigenous peoples have depended, for long periods of time, on local forests for the provision of a variety of resources, they have developed a stake in conserving, and in some cases, enhancing biodiversity.

Key words: Globalization, Indigenous knowledge, Resource.

Environmental governance has been and continues to be problematic. The increasing land demand for capitalistic economy leads to peasant dispossession and become the ultimate cause of land rush across the globe (Fairbairn, 2013). Today's complex environmental issues often involving international players, yet demanding local solutions. Findings from case studies show that local social dynamics are missed or given insufficient attention in capitalistic environmental governance. The miserable life condition because of technological advancement and the dramatic climatic change call for a solution at the global level. Appreciation of the benefits of large firms, mining, and conservation without adequate compensation for the inconvenience they cause is incomplete. The benefits of nature to indigenous people are not only economic. The relationship between society and nature can't be quantified in market value. But, the neoliberal environmental governmentality insists on the capitalization of nature to save it (Arsel and Büscher, 2012).

The main aim of this review is to discuss forces for globalizing natural resources and its effect on local communities. The first part of the review discusses the meaning of nature for the local community. The second part highlights the theme of natural resources globalization and neoliberal conservation and the effects of natural resources globalization and neoliberal environmental governance on local people drawing on different theoretical and empirical literature.

Secondary data were obtained through extensive literature review from various local and international reports and publications. These secondary data were retrieved from journals, books, official reports and previous researches. Theoretical and empirical literatures about natural resources globalization and how it impacts the indigenous people were critically reviewed and analyzed. Moreover some primary sources of data through internet based interviews have been included for triangulation purposes.

Department of Rural Development and Agricultural Extension, College of Agricultural and Environmental Science, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Corresponding Author: Birhane Anagaw Abebe, Department of Rural Development and Agricultural Extension, College of Agricultural and Environmental Science, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia. Email: anagawbirhane@yahoo.com

How to cite this article: Abebe, B.A. (2020). Natural Resources Globalization and Its Effect on the Indigenous People; Evidence from the Theoretical and Empirical literature Review. Agricultural Science Digest. 40(3): 223-225.

Submitted: 10-02-2020 **Accepted:** 26-06-2020 **Published:** 22-08-2020

What is nature for indigenous people?

Indigenous people inhabit in the remotest parts of the world whose natural resources have been sustainably exploited by them using indigenous knowledge (Bebbington, 1999). Local-level tree planting and land resource management emerged long before governments and NGOs began to

promote such activities in these areas (Agrawal, 1999). Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that people's interests and local communities' social, spiritual and cultural attachments in a particular species or area are often more than financial (ibid).

Nature has a different meaning and is different things for the indigenous community. Nature, for instance, the holey mountain in Peru, has cultural, spiritual, recreational and aesthetic values for local communities and their identity (Cadena, 2010). It is the holy place for them where pleasuring and other social, spiritual and cultural activities have occurred. Likewise, the mangrove forest in Tanzania (Beymer-Farris and Bassett, 2012) and Tayrona National Natural Park in Colombia (Ojeda, 2012) is their livelihood. These two examples show that there is no universality acknowledged single meaning of nature.

Accordingly, nature for indigenous communities might be first and/ or second nature (Dressler, 2011) having a strong attachment to it. However, the capitalization of nature (third nature or putting an abstract market value on nature and its services) imposed from the west destroys the indigenous community's diverse meanings of nature and decoupled the relationship between nature and society. Capitalism used this displacement and dispossession as an opportunity to expand its arms.

Globalization of natural resources and neoliberal environmental management

Globalizing nature and market environmentalism are the early 21st-century dominant thinking in environmental policy and biodiversity conservation which is focusing on capitalization of nature (Arsel and Büscher, 2012). According to Arsel and Büscher (2012) transforming nature into marketable fictitious commodities is a need for capitalism to expand its reach into new spheres of accumulation. This supports capitalism by giving legitimacy and new market opportunity and it is a good business strategy that gives supremacy of capital over society's relationship with nature (ibid). Expansion of ecotourism in the case of Tayrona National Natural Park in Colombia (Ojeda, 2012) and carbon credit in the case of mangrove forest in Tanzania (Beymer-Farris and Bassett, 2012) are some of the witnesses for the global influence of capitalism. Neoliberal environmentalism becomes an inevitable solution for the apocalyptic (Swyngedouw, 2010) view of climatic change.

Neoliberal environmentalism and globalization of natural resources are normative, enacted internationally and passed through domestic state agencies and NGOs (Arsel and Büscher, 2012). In investor-starved developing countries the state creates legal frameworks that enable peasant dispossession and the land is allocated to international concessions such as mining, tourism, conservation and mechanized agriculture (Fairbairn, 2013). Governments in the south become a poster child for multilateral institutions (like the World Bank and IMF) led to the liberalization of environmental governance (Goldman, 2005).

Payments for ecosystem services, REDD, carbon trade, conservation marketing and economics of ecosystem and biodiversity and the green economy are the mechanism of capitalizing nature (Arsel and Büscher, 2012).

The capitalist way of solving environmental problems resulted from capitalism brings enormous effects, particularly on the lives of the indigenous community. However, these devastating effects of neoliberal environmentalism were overlooked.

The negative effects of globalizing natural resources and neoliberal conservation

The underlying socio-cultural and socio-economic consequences of alienating local communities from nature are not well understood in the capital-driven world. This is the sick world we live in; in which the danger of naive globalism ignores the social and cultural forces of the localities (Ojeda, 2012). According to Amnesty International (2013) report, in 2012 several people were forced to flee their homes and farms inside their own country. A large area of land is snatched for conservation, mining and modern agriculture. Conservation is done without alternatives found to replace. On the other hand, a large area of land is converted into mechanized agriculture, mining and other industrial zones. With the emergence of globalization, this situation has rapidly changed with varying impacts on the indigenous people. Some of these impacts have been transformational; for example, relocation of indigenous people from their ancestral lands has not only meant dispossession of their material resources but also the destruction of their culture and long term permanent spiritual incapacitation. They are forced to co-exist with global forces and lost autonomy on natural resources in their domain (Arsel and Büscher, 2012).

NGOs are considered as the voice of voiceless, albeit they are advocators of neoliberal environmentalism and implementers of the state plan. According to (Swyngedouw, 2005) the role and position of NGOs are related to the dynamics of state and market. This clearly shows the gravity of capitalism and its destructive effect on sensitive local needs and cultural contexts.

The major neoliberal environmentalism requires the eviction of local groups but does not always compensate for causing diverse economic, social and cultural consequences on these local groups. Many costs of neoliberal environmentalism are born locally, particularly by poor communities while the benefits accrue globally (Betsy and Thomas, 2011); even the payments for compensation are too few compared to the benefit they lost. The supremacy of mining over sacred or spiritual mountain in Peru (Cadena, 2010) and the supremacy of mangrove forest protection of over the local community livelihood in Tanzania (Betsy and Thomas, 2011) clearly showed land grabbing by the state and corporate power in the name of conservation and development is serving as a weapon for capitalism to expand its reach (Ojeda, 2012). The direct economic and social impacts caused by the involuntary taking of land resulting in relocation or loss of shelter, loss of asset or loss of income

sources and involuntary restriction access have adverse impacts on the livelihoods of the displaced persons. The mangrove forest (Beymer-Farris and Bassett, 2012) and Tayrona National Natural Park in Colombia (Ojeda, 2012) reveals that the local people in and/ or around these areas forced to be landless, jobless, homeless, loss of access to a common resource.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Indigenous communities' livelihoods are more likely to be strongly affected by the establishment of protected areas, mining, road building, large-scale agriculture or construction. For many years governments and international environmental organizations made environmental-related decisions (Sharp, 1998). Even the holder based governance (Swyngedouw, 2006) of the environment sees local people as one weak stalk holder in nature and environmental governance. Most of the southern states were influenced by the hegemonial power of the World Bank to adopt western society model regardless of its pre-existing cultural, social and economic structures at a lower scale (Goldman, 2005). The question rose by Sharp (1998) like what is conservation? What is the ultimate goal of Conservation? Who makes decisions about conservation? It still needs a clear answer. The socio-economic and socio-cultural impacts of nature capitalization and conservation are less emphasized compared to global economic, ecological and politically important in decision making.

The concern with 'the environment' includes concern about the perpetuation of society. However, many developments and Conservation projects face local hostility. Evicting people without consultation for the sake of mining, agriculture and conservation often bring about conflict. Therefore, this study recommends that development interventions have to critically consider the social, religious and cultural values and meanings of nature for indigenous people.

REFERENCES

Agrawal, A. (1999). Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation. 27(4):629-649.

Amnesty International Report (2013). The State of the World's Human Rights. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/report/world/amnesty-international-report-2012-state-worlds-human-rights.

Arsel M. and Büscher. B (2012). Nature™ Inc.: Changes and Continuities in Neoliberal Conservation and Market-based Environmental Policy. Development and Change. 43(1): 53-78. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.2012.01752.x.

Bebbington, A. (1999). Capitals and capabilities: a framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. World development. 27(12): 2021-2044.

Besty A. and Thomas J. (2011). The REDD menace: Resurgent protectionism in Tanzania's mangrove forests. Global Environmental Change. 22(2): 332-341.

De la Cadena M. (2010). Indigenous Cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual reflections beyond "Politics". In Cultural Anthropology. 25 (2): 334-370.

Dressler W.H. (2011). First to third nature: the rise of capitalist conservation on Palawan Island, The Philippines, The Journal of Peasant Studies. 38 (3): 533-557.

Fairbairn M. (2013). Indirect Dispossession: Domestic Power Imbalances and Foreign Access to Land in Mozambique. Development and Change. 44(2): 335-356.

Goldman M. (2005). Imperial nature: The World Bank and struggles for social justice in the age of globalization. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, chapters 1 and 2.

Nygren A. (2002). Development discourses and peasant-forest relation: Natural resource utilization as social process. Development and Change. 31(1): 11-34.

Ojeda D. (2012). Green pretexts: Ecotourism, neoliberal conservation, and land grabbing in Tayrona National Natural Park, Colombia, Journal of Peasant Studies. 39(2): 357-375.

Sharp, B. (1998). 'First the Forest': Conservation, 'Community' and 'Participation' in South-West Cameroon. Journal of the International African Institute. 68(1) 25-45.

Swyngedouw, E. (2005). Governance Innovation and the Citizen: The Janus Face of Governance-beyond-the-State. Urban Studies. 42(11): 1991-2006.

Swyngedouw, E. (2006). Impossible "Sustainability" and the Post-Political Condition. In David Gribbs and Rob Krueger (eds) Sustainable Development. New York: Guilford Press.

Swyngedouw, E. (2010). Apocalypse Forever?: Post-political Populism and the Spectre of Climate Change. Theory, Culture and Society. 27(2-3): 213-232.