

8. Propuesta de Reformulación, *op cit*, 3.

9. See chapter 1 of the GEF's Operational Strategy, Ten Operational Principles for Development and Implementation of the GEF's Work Program. Available at www.gefweb.org as of May 2000.

10. By the end of 1997, *Biopacífico* had dedicated approximately 40 percent of its total budget on community-level projects. Following completion of the negotiated operative plan, the project pursued subcontracts almost exclusively with community-level groups (Ríos and Wilshusen 1999).

11. The initial agreement of the *equipo ampliado* at Piangua Grande offered two guiding principles that touch on the importance of mutual respect among black and indigenous peoples: "As black and indigenous peoples, we jointly assume the defense of our ancestral territories of the Pacific Coastal region built upon mutual respect and tolerance as a foundation for living together and strengthening the unity of action." In addition, the statement proclaims, "We affirm the right to recognize and respect our differences, among ourselves and with the rest of Colombian society. Among the ethnic groups of the Pacific Coastal region are black communities, in their diversity, and distinct indigenous peoples: Tules, Katios, Woanan, Eperara-Siapidara, Chami, Awa, Zenues and Emberas."

Chapter Six

UNMASKING THE "LOCAL"

Gender, Community, and the Politics of Community-Based Rural Ecotourism in Belize

JILL M. BELSKY

Community-based conservation has emerged over the last decade in response to critiques that strategies for environmental protection have been developed at the expense of concern for people, especially historically marginalized peoples or the "dispossessed." The rationale for envisioning local communities as partners in conservation rather than as in the past as passive recipients of the latter's design, builds on the assumptions of integrated conservation and development programs (ICDPs). The goal of ICDPs is to increase the economic opportunities of resource-dependent rural communities as a means of increasing nature protection without the social problems caused by strictly protectionist approaches. Within the umbrella of ICDPs, community-based conservation attempts to locate design of local development strategies and management within the community in collaboration with other government and nongovernmental actors. The rationales for community conservation include: that local or resident groups have a strong, vested interest in the sustainable use of natural resources upon which their livelihood or cultural survival rests, that they have experiential knowledge that can assist in the identification and design of environmental management strategies, and that they are more capable of managing local resources than distant state or corporate managers

(Rao and Geisler 1990; West and Brechin 1991; Western and Wright 1994). Case studies of long-term community management of forests in Asia (Poffenberger 1990) and in Latin America (Alcorn 1993) have been instrumental in documenting the value of local communities and local knowledge in natural resource management.

To date, evaluations of ICDPs have yielded mixed results, especially in reaching significant environmental protection goals (Brandon and Wells 1992). The failure to successfully achieve environmental protection goals has led observers to suggest returning to a more strictly environmental protectionist paradigm (Kramer 1997; Hackel 1999; Robinson 1993). But supporters of integrated conservation and development projects in general, and those that promote community-based and collaborative approaches in particular, claim it is too early to discard them. They strongly caution about returning to what they refer to as a "new protectionist paradigm" and the social injustices as well as practical pitfalls associated with these approaches (Wilshusen et al. 2002). Instead, what they argue as critically needed are deeper and more comprehensive understandings of international biodiversity conservation approaches themselves as social and political process (Zerner 2000; Brechin et al. 2002).

Social science scholars and practitioners as well as conservation biologists have been raising important insights into the opportunities and constraints of integrated conservation and development approaches including community-based efforts. In an insightful article, Brosius et al. (1998) brought attention to the fact that despite similar labels and claims, community-based conservation and natural resource management programs are constituted differently and defended by claims and concepts that are often ill defined and not empirically well grounded. Furthermore, they highlight the problems encountered when advocates and practitioners, while deeply committed to the goals of devolution and community conservation, are unwilling or unable to approach resource management efforts with a nuanced understanding of resource conflicts in their areas. Adams and Hulme (2001) also argue that community conservation is not one thing but many, and is evolving both conceptually and practically. Importantly, these authors conclude that the key questions about community conservation are who sets the objectives on the ground and how trade-offs between the diverse objectives are negotiated. Li (1996) also warns that community conservation efforts are too frequently based on generic models that are neither sufficiently attuned to particular historical contexts and political struggles, nor critical of the multiple meanings and strategic deployment of concepts that guide such efforts. Agrawal and Gibson (1999) in another highly significant work caution that the image of community in conservation historically has vacillated between that of two extremes: either the cooperative and ecologically knowledgeable "enchanted" community or the tradition-bound and ecologically destructive "disenchanted" community. In the former archetype, the one commonly evoked in community conservation efforts, the rural community is

represented as a socially homogenous and conflict-less entity, despite the historic reality of intracommunity divisions, struggles, and conflicts (Agrawal 1997; DuPuis and Vandergeest 1996). Another assumption that is rarely acknowledged or explored in community-level efforts is whether communities can participate and operate successfully in resource management efforts in light of inequities and disincentives for conservation that persist at broader political, economic, and institutional scales (Little 1994).

In this chapter, I revisit a study that I have written about elsewhere (Belsky 1999, 2000). It explores a community-based rural ecotourism project begun in the early 1990s in Gales Point Manatee, Belize, that I, along with groups of American and Belizean students, examined over the course of six years. My writings on this project have been critical of an undifferentiated and apolitical understanding of this small, Creole community, including who/what constitutes the "local." They have also been critical of reserving analytical and management attention solely to the local or community level of social action without acknowledging the important and instrumental ways that the "local" is shaped by extralocal social and political forces. In the case of Gales Point Manatee, Belize, these extralocal forces include: the history of British colonialism, state formation in British Honduras, now known as Belize, development aid and debt restructuring, institutionalized racism, tourism, and the contested discourses of the causes and presumed solutions to environmental degradation, including the role of community-based rural ecotourism itself (Belsky 1999, 2000). My objective here is to discuss the variable ways men and women from Gales Point participated in a community-based rural ecotourism project, and the reasons why this effort was only partially successful at integrating conservation and local economic development. I particularly want to highlight gender and its politics in this volume because there has been insufficient and uncritical attention to these forces in analyses of biodiversity conservation efforts on the ground. In contributing to this discussion, I will discuss the ways that local politics including gender relations are intricately linked to inequities operating within and extending beyond the local community, which I submit lie at the root of problems with integrated conservation and development programs including community conservation. My position is that the obstacles facing ICDPs often have less to do with problems inherent in the model *per se*, but in the social and political systems in which they are embedded, which continue to deny the poorest and most vulnerable peoples access and control over resources to secure their livelihood and craft their own futures.

GENDER, COMMUNITY, AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

Few assessments of community-based conservation have explicitly taken up the question of who specifically within a community has benefited from these

efforts and what effect it has had on natural resource management. In particular, there has been limited attention to how gender influences these efforts. Indeed, some feminist scholars have questioned whether womens' interests are enhanced or submerged with a community-based approach to conservation (Leach 1992; Li 1996). Biodiversity conservation, especially as practiced in North American-influenced models, has largely been based on the environmental understandings and activist strategies of middle-class white males (Taylor 1997). Some suggest that when gender has been considered in international environmental management broadly defined, the design of interventions has largely been based on popular and partial understandings of womens' interests and activities, with unfortunate results (Leach 1992). This is despite the fact that development institutions and park managers have been urged to recognize rural women's multifaceted and crucial roles in resource extraction and environmental management (Agarwal 1986, 1989; Dankelman and Davidson 1988; Shiva 1989). Women are still largely depicted as victims of environmental degradation or uncritically assumed to benefit uniformly by "environmental" programs (Leach 1992). Few studies emphasize the differences among rural women and how they creatively think and reshape development and conservation programs to meet their own strategic goals and agendas (Johnson 1997, 1998; Momsen 1993).

The assertion of a biological connection between women and nature has also been controversial and contested. Some ecofeminists suggest an inherent or essentialist "woman/nature relationship" involving harmony among women as well with nature (Mies and Shiva 1993; Warren 1990). Others focus on a feminist critique of development emphasizing the perils of modern technology, Western development, and patriarchy for women (Shiva 1989; Harcourt 1994). Another group of feminist social scientists are highly skeptical of essentialist and universal arguments, preferring instead to understand women's relationship to each other, to men, and to the physical environment as socially and historically constructed (Jackson 1993; Leach et al. 1995; Rocheleau 1995). Their position argues the need to disaggregate the category of "women" and start from real-life situations and problems of resident people within concrete social and historical contexts. The answers to such questions as how does gender influence biodiversity conservation/protected area management including community conservation efforts and how is nature understood, used, and managed by men and women and for whose benefit, are largely contingent and need be answered through a context-specific, historically grounded approach. Whether and how particular groups of men and women and environmental interests are complementary or not cannot be theorized a priori, but must be examined empirically for a particular people, place, and time. To do so demands individual and micropolitical analysis, but also how these are linked to broader political, economic, and ideological projects.

COMMUNITY-BASED RURAL ECOTOURISM IN GALES POINT MANATEE, BELIZE

The community of Gales Point Manatee, Belize, is located on a narrow peninsula extending into the Southern Lagoon, a four-hour boat ride from Belize City, the nation's largest city. Since the early 1990s, American wildlife biologists and other long-term visitors to Gales Point worked to designate approximately 175,000 acres including the community of Gales Point Manatee as a biodiversity reserve known as the Manatee Special Development Area (MSDA). The MSDA has since been recognized by the Belize state and entails a comprehensive plan for protecting endangered species, particularly the manatee and sea turtle. Informed by their earlier work in the Community Baboon Sanctuary, the planners sought to foster conservation in the MSDA through an ICDP approach built around rural ecotourism, community management, and close collaboration between the private and public sectors (Horwich and Lyon 1998). Working with the support of Belizean government officials and the Belize Audubon Society, they organized residents into five associations based on the major ecotourism activities: a bed and breakfast (herein B&B) association; a tour operators and guides association; a farmers' association; and a craft association. These associations were managed through an umbrella cooperative known as the Gales Point Progressive Cooperative comprised of the chairs of each of the associations along with local village council leaders. The planners organized a Manatee Advisory Team to provide technical and logistical support during the first few years (Horwich and Lyons 1998). The project leaders (whose training was largely in the biological sciences) acknowledged the presence of complex social and political dynamics (Horwich, pers. comm. 1996; Greenlee, pers. comm. 1996).

In the early 1990s when the rural ecotourism project was being formed, Gales Point Manatee consisted of approximately 350 individuals living in seventy-seven permanent households, in addition to vacation cottages owned by wealthy residents of Belize City. The community was largely a mixture of older and young people, with many people in their middle years absent for months or years at a time seeking employment in the United States or Belize City (GPPC 1992). While many households farmed, fished, and hunted in the nearby karst mountains, forests, savannas, rivers, lagoons, and ocean, these activities provided supplementary food and income. The vast majority of households obtained their staple food of beans, rice, and vegetables through purchase from markets in Belize City. In telling stories about rural and environmental change in the area, residents emphasized the links between declines in local natural resources and commercial fishing, logging, and hunting by nonresidents. Residents' accounts differed strongly from those of local and foreign environmental groups who explained resource scarcities solely as the result of the unsustainable local livelihood activities and the "maladapted"

values of Gales Point residents. The majority of households in Gales Point earned food and income from hunting and selling bush meat and fishing. A smaller minority found employment in government service, nearby citrus farms, and tourist lodges, and wove baskets from local vines and prepared snacks for sale to tourists for supplementary income. Most families relied on remittances from employed children in Belize City or the United States for their income.

Given the sparse economic opportunities available in Gales Point and awareness of the income being generated in the Community Baboon Sanctuary, many Gales Point residents welcomed the efforts of outsiders to assist them with developing ecotourism. In exchange, those participating in the ecotourism associations agreed to limit hunting of threatened wildlife species, to cooperate with boating regulations to protect manatee habitat, and to provide labor on a limited basis to scientific studies conducted in the area.

As reported in more detail elsewhere (Belsky 1999), B&B operators increased their income considerably in the first few years of the ecotourism project (1992-1994). Of particular economic importance were student groups (such as ours) who stayed in a large number of B&Bs for longer than a few days. However, after 1994 the number of tourists visiting Gales Point declined, as did state funding. Additionally, the support of outside organizers became more sporadic, and the project "floundered" for a number of years.

Nonetheless, the rural ecotourism project generated important links between conservation and development among a handful of Gales Point households, but it also exacerbated rivalries and divisions across the community. I argue that the limited benefits as well as associated conflicts cannot be traced to singular causes, but rather to a complex intersection of gender, age, class, family allegiance, and political party affiliation that predated but were intensified as a result of the ecotourism effort. Within this matrix, the social construction of gender was pivotal though not sufficient to explain what happened.

GENDER, CLASS, AND FAMILY INTERESTS IN ECOTOURISM ASSOCIATIONS

Not surprisingly, gender influenced the composition of rural ecotourism activities and membership in the various associations in important ways. The socialization of women as the major caretakers of home and domestic activities underlies their control over B&B enterprises and in the craft association, as both home care and weaving baskets were historically taught to and expected from females. In contrast, males were more likely to fish, hunt, and be hired by commercial firms such as loggers. Hence, their knowledge of boating and the surrounding marine and forest environments led males to dominate the boat operators and nature tour guide associations (there was only one

female member in the tour boat association). Moreover, the potential for intra-household conflict, which could have arisen with women's increased income as a result of B&B enterprises was mitigated by the opportunity for males to earn income through complementary activities as nature and boat tour guides. Indeed, it was women and men of the same handful of households who had the material resources and interpersonal networks to enable them to take advantage of new opportunities.

Females welcomed the opportunity to operate B&Bs because there were few other economic opportunities in the community and this enterprise complemented their homemaking skills and responsibilities. One young woman explained that she began the B&B "because it can be done while I keep the house, cook, and watch the little ones, and don't put out my man." An older woman with three teenagers said she joined "because it based on skills I know and it's a way to make a dollar where I say where to put it . . . to help the children go to school in Belize City and [husband] don't always agree to it being spent that way." They enjoyed the fact that their domestic skills were honored and financially rewarded.

But gendered knowledge of housekeeping and cooking or of nature and boat touring were not sufficient to permit all women and men to operate B&Bs, become nature/boat guides, or to participate in management associations. There were important economic entry costs to operating B&Bs and serving as a nature and boat guide that excluded poor women and men. To operate a B&B, there had to be an extra bedroom or the ability to temporarily displace family members from their bedrooms. According to standards set by the project, guest bedrooms had to have walls and standard furniture such as beds with sheets, mosquito nets, and fans. Cooking and bathroom facilities also had to meet basic sanitation standards. Wallpaper and cheerful decorations were also desirable. To be a boat operator/nature guide required access to a boat, engine, life jackets, and fuel. Clearly, women and men who had access to these material resources were not from the lowest economic stratum.

In addition to economic prerequisites for entry, the ability to gain access to clients and wield power within the ecotourist association and community at large was also influenced by one's family ties. It is common among women's groups in Belize for social and material barriers to impede some women's membership (McClaurin 1995/1996). In Gales Point, the Welch clan extended their historic leadership to the new ecotourism trade. Hortense Welch chaired the B&B association for its first five years of operation. Her long-time partner, Moses Andrewin, was the lead boat operator and nature tour guide. Their son, Kevin, was the boat operators' association chair, and their relatives Ivan Welch, Osmond Welch, and Gibert Welch comprised a large share of the association itself. Hortense was also a long-term member of the Gales Point village council. Not surprisingly, Walter Goff, who chaired the GPPC, the umbrella ecotourist cooperative, also was the village council chair.

To provide a mechanism for promoting equal access to ecotourist guests, one of the planners organized the use of a rotation schedule. A sign was located at the entry to the village (via the road) instructing tourists to locate ecotourist association leaders for B&B and boat operating/tour guiding assignments. The leaders assigned tourists to particular providers *in turn*, following a list. Initially, many B&B providers commended the rotation schedule. They appreciated the assistance of project planners who made reservations and arranged for prepayment so B&B hostesses could purchase food before the arrival of guests. But especially when the number of student groups and ecotourists declined and the assistance of project planners decreased, the use of the rotation schedule became hotly debated. A major complaint was that formal procedures were not followed and that the B&B association chair, Hortense Welch, was unfair in her assignment of ecotourist guests. "Hortense always favor her relatives, and herself, and anyway the real decision are made by Hortense's family members outside of the association's meeting." Hortense countered that many B&B operators were not home to receive guests when they were assigned, do not publicly share their concerns at association meetings, and do not appreciate her work burden as association chair and the insufficient measures the project provided as compensation. She said she had "tired" of the other women complaining and "not telling their troubles in front of all but only behind my back." According to Hortense, the planners told her she could "take an extra guest here and there" as payment for her services as association chair. Hortense said,

The trouble with the rotation system is that when tourists enter the village they don't always get to me first. Sometimes someone else invites them to stay at their house. Or when I figure out whose turn it is, that person is in Belize City or not prepared to have a guest for that night—either they don't have enough food, or are too tired from doing some other works and don't want to cook and clean for a guest that night. So I keep going down the list. But the members don't remember this and complain I don't do it fair.

After three years as association chair, she said she was "burnt out" and admitted:

I don't like to call meetings anymore because not even half of the members come, the others are either out of the village or too busy with other activities. I'm tired of making all the decisions and being criticized later when someone doesn't like them. I was told in the beginning I could take a few extra guests because of the planning work I do, but the members don't like this.

As the project progressed, many of the B&B providers found employment in nearby tourist lodges that were also developing to take advantage of the tourism trade. But combining regular employment, their domestic duties,

and maintaining a B&B created tensions and difficult choices for B&B operators and their families. Those with access to female extended support transferred B&B hosting duties to daughters, sisters, or mothers. A young daughter in such a home communicated to us her strong dismay over her increased workload, though the burden was mitigated somewhat by the opportunity to interact with American students. Another strategy taken by a B&B operator with an outside job was to leave a cold, bag lunch on the table for guests rather than provide the customary hot cooked lunch of rice, beans, and meat (traditionally bush meat or fish). This coping practice raised contradictions between the advertised "authentic" Creole experience of rural ecotourism and the reality of being served a sandwich made from imported Spam and mayonnaise. Inauthenticity arose also over the implications of hunting prohibitions that foreclosed serving traditional cuisine based on local wild game (Belsky 2000).

GENDER, RURAL ECOTOURISM, AND NATIONAL PARTY POLITICS

Peoples' participation in the community ecotourism project was skewed not only as a result of gender and class, but also by connections to national politics. Historically, Gales Point has been known for its support of the PUP national party (Peoples United Party), rather than for the other major party known as the UDP (United Democratic Party). Their close connection to the PUP and to the minister of the environment at the time was widely understood as a reason for strong, initial PUP governmental support for the project (Belsky 1999). Most of the men and women who assumed key roles in the ecotourism associations were strong supporters of the PUP. Those with party affiliation to the UDP claimed that their party ties restricted their ability to participate in the rural ecotourism efforts, despite the fact that community associations were technically opened to any local resident. A female UDP supporter explained:

I know I can't work with Hortense and the other women. I have to go it alone if I want to run a B&B. But that's okay with me because I know I have the ability, and (her partner) knows many people through his work as a boat operator. We don't need the community nor the PUP to get tourists.

In 1994, the UDP regained political power (only to lose it again to the PUP in 1998). Starting in 1994 political and financial governmental support for the MSDA and ecotourism project declined (though it rekindled at the end of the decade to some degree because of resumed PUP patronage). The withdrawal of governmental backing in 1994, coupled with the sporadic presence of project advisors (who turned the project over to the community), took

its toll on the ecotourism project and community. Management of both the local village council and the Gales Point Progressive Cooperative faltered. In 1997, PUP backer Walter Goff resigned his positions as chair of the village council and the Gales Point Progressive Cooperative (GPPC). Not knowing the PUP would regain power so soon, both Hortense Welch and her son, Kevin Andrewin, switched political party affiliation to back the UDP. Kevin was elected chair of the GPPC in 1997, only to lose the seat the following year. Participation in community-managed associations continued to slide: few people attended meetings, paid dues, were willing to provide regular water transportation to and from Belize City, or take responsibility for producing and distributing brochures to market Gales Point as an ecotourist destination (Belsky 1999).

Indeed these intra-community conflicts produced further backlashes and resistance. Non-association members refused to carry phone messages and reservation requests for ecotourist providers. Some also refused to pay their share of the community electricity bill claiming that ecotourist homes with refrigerators and fans used more power. In addition, someone torched the craft center. Men and women not benefiting from ecotourism were particularly resentful that they were expected to abide by restrictions on hunting, fishing, and farming while other community members received some albeit small compensation through tourism. A particular source of anger and resentment was the presence of state and state-backed commercial entrepreneurs who flouted environmental regulations and logged, dredged, and purchased threatened wildlife in the Manatee Special Development Area. They were also greatly angered over state backing for development of commercial agriculture by foreigners in the area over assisting local farmers. A few stories circulating in the community at that time attested to these strong feelings. One story involved government officials who visited Gales Point to purchase threatened and prohibited sea turtle meat. Another entailed government officials who suggested that, in exchange for supporting the community ecotourism project, residents would receive legal access to farmland made available by the construction of the new Manatee road linking Gales Point to two major highways. But by 1999 no land titles had materialized for residents and, in fact, one Gales Point farmer with mature perennial crops, but no formal title, lost his land when the government sold it to a wealthy Jamaican farmer eager to establish a citrus plantation. The lessons were obvious: this poor rural community had little political voice, whether male or female, PUP or UDP:

We all vying to be close to the government. But it don't matter PUP or UDP either one going to sell that land to make big money. But without land to farm we in Gales Point never be able to get ahead. Food is expensive and now the government don't want us to hunt anymore. What are our kids going to eat? Why should we respect the government and its rules for hunting when they are cutting in the reserve? They don't care what happens to us.

Given this situation, one can understand why gender must be viewed in connection with national position, class, and race. As a woman in Gales Point summed it up for me,

It hard being a woman here. But it harder being poor and from this place where no one really care what happening to us. We hoped that the tourists make others see that we here. But it just the same, the same as always it hard to get by.

IMPLICATIONS FOR GENDER, JUSTICE, AND INTERNATIONAL BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

The case study of Gales Point Manatee, Belize, raises a number of issues that are germane to current debates in international biodiversity conservation and especially to the opportunities and constraints of ICDPs and community-based conservation. Above all, this example reinforces the fact that biodiversity conservation/protected area management is not a neutral but a highly social and political process. Every approach to conservation is constructed on a particular understanding of the forces selected as significantly shaping rural and environmental change in a particular area. In Gales Point and in many other cases, different accounts emerged that were hotly contested. The accounts given by poor, rural residents (and especially by poor, rural women) did not inform the objectives or procedures of biodiversity conservation policies and programs. Had they been given consideration in Gales Point, the project would have included the following: protection of threatened wildlife and habitats from state-supported logging, dredging, commercial fishing, and agricultural development; assistance to local residents to keep control of tourism from nonresident entrepreneurs and cruise ships; attainment of land titles for local farmers; development of markets for local goods and handicrafts; and improvement of basic community infrastructure. They also might have incorporated ways to minimize the economic and political costs that prohibited the most impoverished women and men from participating in and benefiting from the activities that were implemented in the community. Some loans were available but the terms and conditions were highly problematic especially for the least well off (Belsky 1999).

Second, this analysis recognizes and applauds the goals of project planners, Belizean nongovernmental organizations, and their backers in the government to develop a project that assisted Gales Point residents with economic development to support wildlife and habitat conservation. This coalition did try to develop local management capacity and control and assisted with economic activities that included women as well as men. And a handful of families achieved the hoped-for links between local development

and conservation, though it was not clear whether these could be sustained. Should we criticize the ICDP/community conservation model for its limited success or should we look to the complex and intersecting forces in that particular place and time that mitigated full community involvement and significant environmental management? Perhaps both. One problem is that development programs—ICDP or otherwise—need to build on existing development practices, especially those that are the most economically valuable. But their economic value also makes them of interest to elites who are usually unwilling to give them over to local residents. In the case of Gales Point, important opportunities for local development were missed by not building on local experience and keen interest to further develop sustainable farming, fishing, hunting, and possibly logging in addition to rural ecotourism.

Another issue regards variability in community governing capacity. While a village council provided local governance in Gales Point, there were no communal or customary natural resource management rules or traditions upon which to build community resource management. Indeed, resource use and management were open access, and strategic opportunism based on individuals and their families characterized the livelihood strategies of residents. The community is also remote, not well connected to transportation and communication infrastructure, and crisscrossed with historic rivalries and tensions. While its ecological conditions suggest the Gales Point area as a biodiversity "hot spot" worthy of conservation attention, it is a socially complex place to develop a community conservation effort. For such an effort to succeed, the community would require additional support and assistance that was not provided during earlier attempts. Indeed there were no special efforts made to understand the history of economic development activities in the area, and especially from the residents' perspectives.

Related to the above, it is likely that the "model" for biodiversity/protected area management implemented in Gales Point Manatee emanated from the minds and representations of its outside planners rather than from ongoing dialogue with members of the Gales Point rural community. A dialogue could have generated a different or modified approach or at least suggested ways to provide the social support and assistance structures noted above. Even so, there are no guarantees. Unanticipated or unintended consequences will always emerge. But no effort can survive, let alone succeed, if the majority of local residents continue to bear the large proportion of the costs of environmental conservation while marginally sharing in its benefits. This seems to be what has largely happened for so many attempted ICDPs, social and community forestry programs, and "participatory-based development efforts" of the past. The ideal model never really gets played out on the ground. Social and political forces operating from within but also from beyond, the local community rarely permit control over valuable resources from sustainable economic development to be controlled or even significantly

shared with and across poor, rural communities. While community dynamics, including the intersection of gender with other sociopolitical forces, are critical to understanding the micro-operation of community efforts, it is these larger inequities that seem to represent the real obstacles to ICDPs and to the symptoms we identify and lament in community-based efforts.