

Histories of Protected Areas: Internationalisation of Conservationist Values and their Adoption in the Netherlands Indies (Indonesia)

PAUL JEPSON* AND ROBERT J. WHITTAKER

*School of Geography and the Environment
University of Oxford
Mansfield Road, Oxford, OX1 3TB, UK*

**Corresponding author. Email: paul.jepson@geog.ox.ac.uk*

ABSTRACT

National parks and wildlife sanctuaries are under threat both physically and as a social ideal in Indonesia following the collapse of the Suharto New Order regime (1967–1998). Opinion-makers perceive parks as representing elite special interest, constraining economic development and/or indigenous rights. We asked what was the original intention and who were the players behind the Netherlands Indies colonial government policy of establishing nature ‘monuments’ and wildlife sanctuaries. Based on a review of international conservation literature, three inter-related themes are explored: a) the emergence in the 1860–1910 period of new worldviews on the human-nature relationship in western culture; b) the emergence of new conservation values and the translation of these into public policy goals, namely designation of protected areas and enforcement of wildlife legislation, by international lobbying networks of prominent men; and 3) the adoption of these policies by the Netherlands Indies government.

This paper provides evidence that the root motivations of protected area policy are noble, namely: 1) a desire to preserve sites with special meaning for intellectual and aesthetic contemplation of nature; and 2) acceptance that the human conquest of nature carries with it a moral responsibility to ensure the survival of threatened life forms. Although these perspectives derive from elite society of the American East Coast and Western Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, they are international values to which civilised nations and societies aspire. It would be a tragedy if Indonesia rejects these social values and protected areas because subsequent management policies have associated protected areas with aspects of the colonial and New Order regime that contemporary society seeks to reform.

KEY WORDS

Conservation ethics, Indonesia, nature conservation history, protected areas

INTRODUCTION

Protected areas (national parks, nature reserves, etc.) are one characteristic of the modern nation state; in 1993, 169 of 171 countries had protected areas and supporting legislation.¹ The Netherlands Indies (Indonesia) was among the first countries to designate protected areas: the Dutch colonial government passed protected area legislation between 1916 and 1933. Subsequently, the Suharto New Order Government (1967–1998) adopted a science-based protected area policy and expanded the designated area to nearly 10% of the terrestrial land area in the form of national parks, wildlife sanctuaries and nature reserves.²

Contemporary conservation and protected area management policy in Indonesia is wrought with tensions. In this post-Suharto era of *reformasi* – democratisation and decentralisation – the legitimacy of the state forest regime, including parks, is being questioned.³ Leaders of Indonesia's vibrant social justice movement, and others, contend that parks represent the control of territory for elite special interests, the imposition of a western or urban legacy of colonialism, and/or the suppression of indigenous rights.⁴ Bureaucrats and politicians speaking for newly decentralised districts contend that parks constrain their economic development by locking up natural capital, and entrepreneurs and communities are seizing *de facto* control of park territories. Logging, poaching and land clearance within parks is rife following the collapse of Suharto's New Order regime.⁵ The state is unable, or unwilling, to act. International donor agencies are losing interest due to poor performance of protected area management projects. Parks in Indonesia are under threat both physically and as a social ideal.

Given that natural resource management is a key issue in the debate on the future shape of Indonesia as a nation state,⁶ it is relevant to examine the historic reasons for park designation in Indonesia to ascertain if parks do indeed represent the imposition of elite special interests and western values on indigenous cultures; or, alternatively, if they embody social values that Indonesian society may want to retain and/or aspire to in the future. This exercise also forms a contribution to the wider scholarly discussion on Orientalism and nature conservation.⁷

Environmental historians have been at pains to show that conservation impulses of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries represented certain cultural perspectives and the objectives of groups concerned with specific social, political and/or economic gain goals.⁸ We broadly concur with this proposition. This is because we view conservation as a social movement working to develop and maintain (sometimes impose) values in society concerning the human-nature relationship.⁹ Most social values are elitist in the sense that they originate from a small group of articulate and influential opinion makers who are invariably well-educated, well-networked and with the means and time to pursue their social visions. Social values are the basis of public policy and its subsequent

implementation but are distinct. This is because values legitimise society, whilst implementation policy invariably reflects political expediency and is more transient. Thus social values and related implementation policy should be debated separately, particularly during periods of social transformation, to avoid the risk that the desire to change political regimes may lead to the undermining or re-writing of some social values that form the foundations of the modern nation state.

In considering these questions two assumptions were made. First, that an international lobby would be behind park establishment in the colonial era, as it has been since. Second, that reasons for designating parks would relate to social values concerning the human-nature relationship. Our approach, therefore, was to review a wide range of conservation-related literature dealing with the late-colonial era and to look for linkages between trends in conservation internationally and events in the Netherlands Indies: in short, to construct a picture of the flow and translation of ideas¹⁰ concerning protected areas into the Netherlands Indies. Our readings in this framework revealed a story with three distinct but inter-related themes: 1) the emergence in the 1860–1910 period of new worldviews on the human-nature relationship, rooted in anglophile natural history and hunting traditions, but inspired by fundamental changes in human perceptions of self and the interaction of metropolitan people with frontier landscapes; 2) the translation of these new worldviews into social values and public policy goals, namely designation of protected areas and enforcement of wildlife legislation, by groups of prominent men who established international lobbying networks; 3) the adoption of these policies by the Netherlands Indies government. These three themes structure the present contribution. The organisations discussed are listed in Annex 1 to the present paper.

CHANGING WORLDVIEWS ON THE HUMAN-NATURE RELATIONSHIP IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: THE INFLUENCE OF NATURAL HISTORY AND HUNTING

Natural history and hunting were two great passions of elite society in nineteenth-century Europe and North America that profoundly influenced worldviews concerning the human-nature relationship. Natural history was initially the domain of theologians, philosophers, scientists and aristocrats motivated by simple human curiosity and a desire to reveal the complexity of the creation, and the divine pattern of the moral and physical universe. In short, the ‘genteel’ – people with access to specimens, libraries, and learned discussions. Menageries and natural history collections were a source of pride and status among European nobility, nation states and metropolitan cities.¹¹ A collection’s status was determined by the extent to which specimens illustrated contemporary debate, featured in popular books on science and exploration and/or possessed intrinsic

beauty. The study of natural history was inextricably linked with European exploration and expansion in the tropics and gaining access to exotica was the privileged domain of the aristocracy. This brought gifted scientists, collectors, writers and adventurers from all classes into the elite circles and linked enthusiasm for natural history with exploration and trade in the tropics.

Hunting had long been a popular sport of the aristocracy. However, during this period, the advent of the railways and European expansion into North America, Africa and Asia created much enhanced opportunities for hunting big game. This sport combined European passions for travel with the virtues of courage, health and physical strength. Together, such virtues were believed to promote the moral conviction and mastery in horsemanship and marksmanship that were seen as pre-requisites for European expansion, success and survival on the frontiers. The hunting 'cult'¹² was the domain of warriors, soldiers and frontiersmen and all who aspired to such 'manly' qualities.

Downward percolation of elite values characterised this period in history.¹³ The values and abilities embodied in hunting were held up as role models for children of the era. By the late nineteenth century the British government and colonial administrations were filled with avid hunters, whilst enthusiasm for natural history in Europe, particularly in Britain, reached 'craze' proportions.¹⁴ The reasons for adoption of a hitherto elite special interest by the public are complex and beyond the scope of this review.¹⁵ However, for the purpose of the present discussion it is relevant to note that both pursuits created entry points to elite society for talented naturalists and hunters from all social backgrounds and the discoveries and insights generated by both pursuits were revolutionary for the time.

The study, description and cataloguing of nature eroded the eighteenth-century concept of man as a supernatural being.¹⁶ The debate surrounding Darwin's *Origin of Species* transformed perceptions concerning the human-nature relationship. The image of humans as divinely created beings was replaced with the realisation (or possibility) of kinship with animals. This has been described as one of the great revolutions in western thought.¹⁷ P.D. Lowe describes how recognition of kinship with animals profoundly affected the image that Victorians had of themselves and of fellow human beings.¹⁸ They became obsessed by the threat of innate animal instincts to the dignity and uniqueness of humanity and to the maintenance of morality and civilisation. Cruelty to animals was seen as disturbing, not only because of what it did to the victims, but also because of what it implied about human nature. Conversely, kindness to animals (humanitarianism) seemed a sure refutation of man's bestial savagery.

Hunting and natural history brought metropolitan people into contact with nature and with the frontier landscapes of Africa and the American west. Field naturalists saw evidence of the negative impacts of collecting and industrialisation on flora, fauna and the landscape of Europe. Hunters quickly recognised the

depredation their sport could wreak on large mammal populations. The well-publicised spate of extinctions in the second half of the nineteenth century,¹⁹ including the sudden extinction or near-extinction of once abundant species, such as the Passenger Pigeon (1899 wild/1914 captive) and the vast North American Bison herds (1870s and 1880s), laid to rest the widely held view ‘that only the same blind forces which had caused it (a species) to be there, could in the fullness of time cause it to perish’.²⁰ The concept of human-induced extinction was established in the public mind. Similarly, public shock at the speed of devastation of the vast forests in the Great Lake states of the American Midwest laid to rest the notion expressed for example by Sim, that ‘the vast domain of nature can never be fully explored, her attractive resources being infinite and inexhaustible’.²¹ By the end of the nineteenth century, concepts of nature as a robust preordained system of checks and balances had been replaced by the notion of delicate and intricate systems sensitive to human interference.²²

Contemporary with these debates was a rediscovery of countryside by all sectors of society, fuelled by the new transport infrastructure and a desire to seek temporary escape from Europe’s unhealthy industrial cities. The eighteenth-century fashion among French nobility for searching out and praising picturesque landscapes²³ took on a new dimension with the advent of international rail tourism, which brought Europe’s metropolitan ‘genteel’ into contact with the invigorating beauty of the Alps. Against the backdrop of the changing worldviews described above, this fashion inspired three general perceptions of the human-nature relationship: a) nature as independent and perfect,²⁴ embodying the existence of gardens of Eden, pure and unsullied by man’s hand; b) the rural idyll, of a pastoral harmony where naturally-beautiful man improves upon God’s creations; and c) man the destructive despoiler of nature.

THE PROMOTION OF CONSERVATIONIST VALUES AND THEIR TRANSLATION INTO GOVERNMENT POLICY: THE ROLE OF ELITE SOCIETIES

The American movement for hunting ethics and wildlife sanctuaries

Changing perceptions of nature during the nineteenth century led to distinct new social values governing the human nature relationship. Prominent in the formulation and institutionalisation of these values were elite lobby groups located in New York, London, Amsterdam, Brussels and Paris. The first of these lobbies was formed by Theodore Roosevelt (1858–1919), passionate big-game hunter, popular writer and President of the United States (1901–1909). Following the death of his wife and of his mother in 1884, Roosevelt retreated to his ranch in the Dakota badlands (1884–1886) where he thought and wrote about human-induced changes to landscapes of the American west.²⁵ Roosevelt formulated,

or at least promoted, two foundational values of the conservation movement: 1) that needless slaughter of wildlife is cruel, unnecessary and barbaric;²⁶ and 2) that the human conquest of nature carries with it a moral responsibility to preserve threatened life-forms. Roosevelt was an Anglophile²⁷ and the first value is an expression of the Victorian humanitarian worldview (above). The second value is described by Aldo Leopold as a 'milestone of moral evolution'.²⁸ This is because it recognises that humans are citizens not masters of earth, that animals have a right to survival, and that moral responsibilities extend beyond interactions between individuals to include relationships between groups, in this case the human species with non-human species.

In December 1887, shortly after his return to New York society, Roosevelt hosted a dinner for like-minded sportsmen friends and founded the Boone & Crockett Club with a mission to promote two major goals: the conservation of critical wildlife habitat and the principle of hunting in fair chase. This was a group of opinion-makers: politicians, businessmen, journalists and artists:²⁹ men with a global perspective on events and reading a literature inspired by the 'wild west'. As well as tales of bravery and hunting, this literature included many deeply philosophical works by writers from the European natural history tradition.³⁰ Roosevelt believed 'such a society, with a carefully screened membership, could exert considerable influence in shaping the future course of legislation'.³¹ Membership was strictly limited to one hundred. Only sportsmen 'of the highest calibre who had killed at least three species of the larger game animal of North America' were eligible for membership.³² The Boone & Crockett Club was a true elite club. Wealth and status alone were not sufficient for entry. Members also had to demonstrate that they were 'real' men.

Although this may sound overly macho today, a major concern of the founders was of white army officers and city-based hunters boasting about bag numbers as a means of demonstrating hunting prowess. Establishing a club of heroes to deride this practice and extol respect for the quarry and noble qualities of the hunt was a masterstroke of social marketing as witnessed by the subsequent adoption of the club's ethos in North American hunting society.

An early example of the influence that this group of gentlemen friends was able and willing to exert is provided by the case of the New York Zoological Park. For several years, a bill to establish a zoological park, promoted by Assemblyman Andrew H. Green, had been defeated. Prominent scientific minds in the Boone & Crockett Club's membership believed that most populations of large mammal were heading for extinction in the wild and that specimens should be preserved in museums and zoological gardens.³³ On hearing of Green's efforts in 1885, the Boone & Crockett Club intervened. That year the bill passed and the New York Zoological Society became a reality on May 7, 1885. Boone & Crockett Club member and prominent New York lawyer, Madison Grant, was the principal founder of the Society and its first management board included eight Boone & Crockett Club members.³⁴

Boone & Crockett Club members, and Roosevelt in particular, were regular correspondents with British sportsmen. One of these was Edward North Buxton, a public figure³⁵ and big game hunter who held similar views to Roosevelt. He was an associate member of the Boone & Crockett Club and often pointed to the examples set by the United States in wildlife protection.³⁶ In 1903, Buxton was alarmed at rumours that the authorities in the Sudan were about to abandon the Sobat game reserve. He organised a letter signed by a group of prominent politicians and naturalists³⁷ to Lord Cromer, Governor-General of the Sudan, which argued against abandonment of the reserve. Recognising the potential of this group he convened a meeting of interested parties at his home on 11 December 1903 to form the Society for the Preservation of Fauna in the Empire (hereafter Fauna Preservation Society).³⁸

The Fauna Preservation Society was in many ways the London equivalent of the Boone & Crockett Club. It was an elite society: its vice-presidents and members were men of great eminence, including the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Colonial Governors³⁹ and members of the House of Lords. Roosevelt became an honorary member in 1904. The Society operated through informal lobbying and high level representations and promoted the Boone & Crockett Club's view that species had a right to exist and this meant establishment of sanctuaries and national parks along the lines of USA and Canadian models.⁴⁰ Where the Fauna Preservation Society differed was that it was primarily a society of the governing elite, whilst the membership of Boone & Crockett Club was more eclectic.

The European Naturdenkmal movement

Implicit in natural history is regard for the objects of study and an interest in preserving them. Promoted by threats to favoured excursion sites, natural history societies in the UK began to include site and species preservation among their objectives as early as 1860.⁴¹ On the European continent there was concern in German forestry circles over clear-felling policies that were damaging landscape beauty, destroying magnificent specimen trees and areas of forests with special scientific and aesthetic value. The German (and continental European) response aimed to promote rational resource planning through inventory and protection of interesting attributes of nature. A preparatory step was the production of vegetation maps. The first published was for France in 1897 with similar maps published for Germany, the UK, Switzerland and North America in the first decade of the twentieth century.

The naturalists' desire to protect valued attributes of the European landscape gained momentum through the vision of Hugo Conwentz, a senior Berlin-based forester. Conwentz conducted a series of high profile lectures in European cities between 1903 and 1908 to promote his concept and vision of *Naturdenkmal* (roughly translated as nature monument). This consisted of three inter-con-

nected ideas: 1) that *Denkmal*, usually applied to anything in commemoration (e.g. eminent persons, standard works of literature, music and art, and ancient buildings), could also be applied to nature; 2) that *Naturdenkmal*, like great works of art, should be guarded against ruin; and 3) that such action had patriotic value, because 'by these undertakings, parts of the country at home become better known and more fully appreciated' (the German concept of *Heimart*).⁴² This last idea has resonance with the cultural nationalism factor in the early North American national parks movement.⁴³

Conwentz's vision of *Naturdenkmal* as places for contemplation of nature, antidotes to urban life, where people could develop a greater appreciation of their homeland, was simple and powerful. It catalysed the establishment of organisations to designate and manage nature monuments. Conwentz was appointed Commissioner for the Care of Natural Monuments by the Prussian State in 1906. The Swedish government established a national nature conservancy (1909), and the US Antiquities Act of 1906⁴⁴ provided for the creation of 'national monuments', to include sites important in history, prehistory and science.⁴⁵

Conwentz's lecture in Amsterdam in 1904 coincided with plans to drain the Naardermeer, a beautiful wetland area on the outskirts of the city. The same year a group of prominent citizens, including the banker Pieter Gerbrand van Tienhoven, founded the Society for the Protection of Nature Monuments (*Vereniging tot Behoud van Natuurmonumenten*) as a legal entity to purchase and manage land, and with the immediate goal of saving the Naardermeer. During the same period, societies to promote *Naturdenkmal* were formed in France (1901), Switzerland (1909) and the UK (1912).⁴⁶ These societies, like the Dutch society, were committees of prominent citizens. Membership of the British Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves, founded by another notable banker, Charles Rothschild, was by invitation only.⁴⁷ The ability of the European nature monument committees to form international networks later became a key factor in the internationalisation of conservation ideals.

Meetings of these like-minded gentlemen of the American East Coast and Western Europe were facilitated by two events in 1909–1910. The first was preparation for the world conference on the 'wise use'⁴⁸ of natural resources at the Hague with which Roosevelt was personally closely involved.⁴⁹ The second was the Roosevelt-Smithsonian Institution Expedition to present day Kenya and Uganda in 1909–1910.⁵⁰ This was probably the most elaborate scientific collecting trip in history and a big news story of the day, which brought together members of the Boone & Crockett Club with their soul mates in the Fauna Preservation Society and with leaders of the European nature monument movement.

Arrangements for the expedition were made by E.N. Buxton and Fredrick Courtney Selous, both associate members of the Boone & Crockett Club. Selous was a living legend as the world's greatest big game hunter and a first-rate naturalist.⁵¹ He had inspired Roosevelt's fascination for Africa through a

running correspondence dating from at least 1896. Buxton and Selous were able to call upon Royal assistance in their organisations. King Edward sent orders to acting Governor Jackson of the protectorate of British East Africa and Uganda to show Roosevelt 'every possible consideration'.

The expedition shot 13,000 specimens and is cited as an example of excessive killing and waiving of game laws on the part of the elite.⁵² This seems at odds with our portrayal of the Boone & Crockett Club and Fauna Preservation Society as moral crusaders for wildlife. But, as already mentioned, leading zoologists of the era believed that the chances of saving much of Africa's wildlife from extinction were slim on account of the combined threats from rapid human population increase, the spread of guns among native Africans, and rinderpest.⁵³ As an insurance policy it was deemed necessary to complete the collections of larger museums before it was too late.⁵⁴ Whether or not this was a convenient excuse for hunting is moot, but the justification on the above grounds of the shooting of all those animals served to emphasise the seriousness and moral consequences of current trends in the public mind.

Following the year-long expedition, Roosevelt toured Europe in the spring of 1910. He will surely have met with fellow sportsmen and naturalists from elite European society and promoted his views on wildlife sanctuaries and national parks. Yellowstone National Park was already well known in Europe, but in 1910 the Boone & Crockett Club was involved in a campaign to save the pronghorn antelope⁵⁵ based on the new concept of the fenced range.⁵⁶ This was an important development in the sanctuary idea on two accounts. First, it underlined society's moral obligation to save species even if this meant fencing-off pockets of land during rapid and uncontrollable human expansion into natural landscapes. Second, it introduced the idea of networks of reserves designed to meet specific conservation goals.

International action to save wildlife: adoption of the national park and sanctuary ideals by colonial powers

In the present narrative, we have outlined two conservation genealogies: first, the big-game hunters of North America and Britain promoting a moral limit to human exploitation of nature, expressed as sanctuaries and game law; and second, the learned naturalists and scientists of Europe promoting the protection of *Naturdenkmal* as objects for the contemplative side of human identity. Both pursued their aims through elite committees. The Roosevelt expedition marked: a) the cross over of the big-game-hunter-inspired goal of saving wildlife by protecting critical habitat into the scholarly domain of European naturalist circles, and b) the formation of an international lobby to persuade colonial governments, in particular the British, to adopt this goal.

The positions of the British and German governments (the major colonial powers in Africa) on sanctuaries (termed game reserves) were polarised by long

standing differences of opinion on how best to deal with the ivory trade problem. The British, influenced by the humanitarian worldviews described above, felt that cruelty and over-exploitation was the problem⁵⁷ and that they could be combated through the game-law system of closed-seasons, licenses and schedules of protected animals.⁵⁸ Such legislation was introduced widely in African colonies subsequent to the scramble for Africa in 1890.⁵⁹ The Germans, in contrast, favoured the 'game reserve' concept, namely designation of land where hunting is limited or forbidden at all times.

In 1896, and in response to German pressure (probably exerted through royal links), the Marquis of Salisbury (British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary) sought the views of Governors of British territories on the German model. Although some were in favour, influential figures were against on the grounds that small reserves would be ineffective and large ones hard to police, and game reserves would be counter to the tsetse fly control measures. In an attempt to resolve the issue, the British government convened the first Conference on African Wildlife at the Foreign Office in 1900. The resulting convention agreed game laws as the main instrument of control to be supported by the establishment of game reserves covering tracts of land of sufficient size to facilitate large-scale migrations.⁶⁰ Although the convention was never ratified it was generally implemented in colonial territories⁶¹ where governors or commissioners were 'nature minded'.⁶² The main purpose of the Fauna Preservation Society was to lobby such people.

Co-ordinated European action for wildlife sanctuaries and national parks

Coinciding with Roosevelt's European visits, Dr Paul Sarasin,⁶³ founder of the Swiss League for Nature Protection in 1909,⁶⁴ rallied national nature monument societies to press for government action to protect threatened wildlife globally. The first forum for action was the 1909 Paris Congress for Landscape Conservation.⁶⁵ It was followed by the Eighth International Zoological Congress held in Graz in June 1910 where Sarasin made public the concept of an International Consultative Commission for the Protection of Nature (hereafter the consultative commission). This resulted in the establishment of an interim committee, comprising representatives of the national societies, to examine the question of the protection of nature on a global scale. The committee, through the Swiss Federal Council, asked the governments of all States to agree to the formation of a Consultative Commission. This body was established on 19 November 1913 by 17 States.⁶⁶ Conwentz and Rothschild were among the delegates and Sarasin⁶⁷ was elected President of the Consultative Commission.⁶⁸ The Dutch Minister of Interior Affairs questioned government involvement in this initiative but was swayed by the strong case for participation put by Dr J.C. Koningsberger, Director of National Botanic Gardens in Buitenzorg (now Bogor, Indonesia)

voiced through the Minister of Colonies. The government duly appointed Dr J.Th. Oudemans and P.G. van Tienhoven of the Dutch nature monument society as the official Dutch delegate. The first meeting of the commission was cancelled due to the outbreak of the First World War.⁶⁹

The inter-war period, particularly 1922–1935, was characterised by the emergence of new leaders within the elite societies who consolidated and expanded the co-ordinated, but informal, network to promote wildlife conservation. Roosevelt died in 1913 but leading figures from his time, such as his son Kermit and Madison Grant, remained active in the Boone & Crockett Club. Buxton died in 1926 and was succeeded by the Earl of Onslow as President of the Fauna Preservation Society.⁷⁰ Onslow held many senior government positions, including Lord-in-Waiting to King George V (1919–1920) and Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords (1931–1944).⁷¹ Sarasin retired as president of the Consultative Commission in 1925 because of failing health (he died in 1929), and was replaced by Van Tienhoven.

P.G. van Tienhoven was from an influential family in Amsterdam. His father had been burgomaster and Minister of Foreign Affairs. He himself held influential positions in the insurance and banking sector. Following his marital divorce in 1917 he made an extended trip to Java, Japan and the USA, where he met with Boone & Crockett Club members. This trip reinforced his interest in international nature conservation and after Sarasin retired he set about establishing elite pressure groups on the Boone & Crockett Club and Fauna Preservation Society models. His views are outlined in the following extracts from letters.⁷²

Relations and understanding of prominent men in different countries is in my opinion the principal base on which we must influence our governments and rouse public interest. “Official” bodies are all right, but not quite needed and work very slowly and give so many complications.⁷³

Our committee is composed of influential men, scientists, political, travellers, nature friends etc. Societies can join, but our Committee is not like yours composed of societies, but members are chosen personally, as privates.⁷⁴

The committee referred to is the *Nederlandsche Commissie voor International Natuurbescherming* Dutch Committee for International Nature Conservation (hereafter Dutch Committee), which Van Tienhoven established at a meeting of ‘influential nature-loving friends and acquaintances’ on 10 July 1925.⁷⁵ During the same period, he facilitated the formation of similar national committees in France and Belgium (being the two other continental European colonial powers with major overseas territories). Prominent in the formation of each committee were Dr Jean Delacour, a famous aviculturist and tropical explorer from an old French aristocratic family⁷⁶, and Dr Victor van Stralen, Director of the Brussels Museum of Natural History.

Creation of Africa's first national park

These European Committees and the Boone & Crockett Club joined forces to create Africa's first National Park in the Belgium Congo in what Harraway describes as 'a significant venture of international scientific co-operation'.⁷⁷ In 1919, King Albert of Belgium toured US National Parks with van Stralen. They visited Yosemite National Park in the company of two Boone & Crockett Club members: John C. Merriam, Director of the Carnegie Institute in New York and Henry Fairfield Osborn of the New York Zoological Society and American Natural History Museum.⁷⁸ King Albert was inspired by the National Park concept but realised that this should be applied not in Belgium but in the colonies. This Royal interest took shape when in 1925 Boone & Crockett Club member, Carl Akeley, proposed the establishment of a gorilla sanctuary in the Belgium Congo. Akeley, who was a veteran of Roosevelt's 1910 expedition and a visionary museum sculptor, became concerned over the fate of the gorilla during an expedition to the Belgian Congo in 1921. On his return to New York he enlisted the assistance of Merriam to interest the Belgian Ambassador to America (1917–1927), Baron Cartier de Marchienne, in his vision. The Ambassador pursued the idea of a gorilla sanctuary with the authorities in Brussels.

During the same period, Akeley, together with Osborn, conceived the idea for an 'Africa Hall' in the American Museum of Natural History, with dioramas of African mammals. Using the good offices of the Ambassador and Van Stralen, they organised a collecting expedition to the Congo. This was financed by Boone & Crockett Club members George Eastman and Daniel Pomeroy,⁷⁹ who both participated in the expedition. King Albert took this opportunity to commission Akeley, in co-operation with the Belgian zoologist Dr Jean M. Dersfeld, a protégé of Van Tienhoven,⁸⁰ to survey the proposed sanctuary area. During the expedition Dersfeld wrote regular letters to Van Tienhoven⁸¹ and, although Akeley died while travelling to the site, the King Albert Park⁸² was nonetheless established in 1925.⁸³ This was a year before the Sabi game reserve in South Africa was converted to the Kruger National Park through the efforts of Colonel Stevenson-Hamilton, the then Secretary of the Fauna Preservation Society.⁸⁴

Build up to the 1933 London convention

In 1926, Van Tienhoven led a delegation of the Dutch, French and Belgium committees to meet with P. Chalmers Mitchell and other representatives of the British Correlating Committee on International Conservation to discuss the possibility of an International Federation of Protectionist Agencies, but arrived at no result. The British favoured the formal government and scientific committee route. The following excerpt from a letter from Van Tienhoven to Mitchell following this meeting captures the crucial tension during this period between those who favoured 'committees of prominent individuals' and those who

favoured a more formal, governmental-style of representative committees as the means to effect international conservation of nature. 'You can be sure that the influence of Committees, formed in Belgium and Holland, is much greater than ever could be reached by co-operation of Societies in a Correlating Committee'.⁸⁵

At the 1928 General assembly of the International Union of Biological Sciences, the Belgian, French and Dutch delegations (each included the chairmen of respective European committees) jointly proposed a motion to form an International Bureau of Information and Correlation (hereafter the International Bureau) on nature conservation,⁸⁶ which was passed. Van Tienhoven was elected president and Dersfeld of Belgium the director. The office was established in Brussels and brought the Dutch, Belgian and French committees under one roof and name.⁸⁷

A year earlier, in 1927, Van Tienhoven travelled to New York to encourage the Boone & Crockett Club to get more directly involved in international wildlife protection. His principal contact in the club was John C. Phillips,⁸⁸ a noted writer, businessman and head of American Wildfowlers. Van Tienhoven proposed the formation of a committee for international conservation within the Boone & Crockett Club and requested financial support for activities of the European committees. A subsequent visit by Charles W. Hobbly, Secretary of the Fauna Preservation Society, in the winter of 1929–1930, crystallised Boone & Crockett Club support for this idea, and Phillip's motion for the formation of an American Committee for International Wildlife Protection was adopted at their January 1930 meeting.⁸⁹ Phillips was elected chairman and the objectives of the club were stated as assisting the International Bureau and the Fauna Preservation Society and specifically Hobbly, Van Tienhoven and Dersfeld.⁹⁰ The Boone & Crockett Club financed publication of a review of nature conservation in the Nederland's Indies⁹¹ and a financed a special fund of the Fauna Preservation Society.⁹²

The Fauna Preservation Society used this fund in 1930 to commission Major R.G.W. Hingston to visit the British colonies in East and Central Africa and report on the status of wildlife and the potential for reserves and national parks. His tour was sanctioned by the secretary of state for the colonies. Based on a rational analyses of threats his report confirmed that many species of African wildlife were heading for extinction and concluded that the only sure way to ensure their long-term survival (his time scale was 50 years hence) was to separate man and nature through the establishment of sanctuaries that would be 'inviolable for eternity'.⁹³ He proposed establishment of nine national parks.⁹⁴ A year later, the Society sent Colonel A.H. Haywood to make a similar assessment for the four West African colonies.⁹⁵

The International Bureau was influential in pressing the national park and sanctuary idea on the British government, particularly with regard to the region of Uganda backing on to the King Albert national park in the Belgian Congo.⁹⁶

This, together with Fauna Preservation Society influence and the diplomatic efforts of Baron Cartier de Marchienne (who had moved to London to become Belgian ambassador to the UK) led to the British convening the landmark 1933 London Conference on African Wildlife. This resulted in the world's first major convention concerned with wildlife preservation.

The foundations for this conference were laid at an International Congress for Protection of Nature in Paris in 1931, co-chaired by Professor Gruel, chairman of the French Committee. The meeting was attended by the British Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald (who became an honorary member of the Fauna Preservation Society in 1932)⁹⁷ and the official British delegates – Onslow and Hobbly of the Fauna Preservation Society – carried with them the British government's suggestion for a London conference.⁹⁸

The 1933 London Conference on African Wildlife brought together delegates from colonial powers with territories in Africa. It was a small gathering of 60 people and was dominated by members of the network of gentlemen friends. Onslow, of the Fauna Preservation Society, chaired the conference, Dersfeld, Director of the International Bureau, was the Belgian delegate, and Van Tienhoven, Phillips⁹⁹ and Harold Coolidge¹⁰⁰ of the Boone & Crockett Club all attended as observers (neither Holland nor the US having territories in Africa).¹⁰¹ The conference was held in the House of Lords and had royal patronage. On the eve of the conference, the Prince of Wales¹⁰² introduced a lecture delivered by Crown Prince Leopold of Belgium in front of the Minister of Colonies and an audience of 600 at the African Society. Crown Prince Leopold presented nature conservation as an ethical and economic necessity of civilised nations. He extolled the virtues of the Albert National Park and concluded that 'The state alone can and must take responsibility for a protective organisation which will command the interest of all mankind in its moral, social, economical, and cultural development; and thus the political aspect of the question (protection of nature) becomes apparent'.¹⁰³

The significance of the 1933 conference is that it marked international agreement on protected areas (national parks and sanctuaries) as the primary goal for achieving wildlife preservation. This was a major shift in British government policy, which 30 years earlier was resolute on the game law system and until 1931 considered national parks premature in British colonies.¹⁰⁴ Two protected area categories were defined at the conference: national park and strict nature reserve. The British conceived of a 'national park' as borrowed from the US – namely a piece of public land to which public entry for recreation and observation was facilitated, but wherein fauna and flora were preserved in a near natural state. The French and Portuguese conceived a park as a place with lawns and flower beds and saw a contradiction between free public access and the preservation of anything in its natural state. This position reflects the French preoccupation with landscape mentioned at the beginning of this article. As a compromise the Belgians proposed a 'strict nature reserve' category denoting an

area immune to any sort of human exploitation or alteration where entry was permitted by special permit only.¹⁰⁵ Article 7 of the convention required governments to set aside areas where hunting of native fauna is prohibited (wildlife sanctuaries and game refuges) as a preliminary and supplementary step to the establishment of national parks and strict nature reserves. In conjunction with European nature monuments, this established a suite of protected area categories in public policy discourse, each with a different purpose, meaning and genealogy (Table 1).

The ramifications of the 1933 convention extended beyond Africa. The Netherlands Indies government, through Van Tienhoven's prompting, had already acted upon the recommendations of the preparatory Paris conference (see below). In India the convention was followed by the National Parks act of 1934¹⁰⁶ and designation of the Hailey (now Corbett) National Park in 1936. Furthermore, the Belgians established the l'Institut des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Belge (hereafter Belgian Parks Institute) in 1934, with Van Stralen as president and Van Tienhoven, Onslow and Merriam as commissioners. This created yet another official forum through which members of the international gentlemen's friend's network could co-ordinate and pursue their objectives.¹⁰⁷

The establishment of the IUCN

The Second World War profoundly affected initiatives for international nature conservation. In 1940, the International Bureau moved from Belgium to a room in the Colonial Institute in Amsterdam and was temporarily closed because of a lack of funds. Many influential figures in the younger generation of 'like minded gentlemen' were killed in the war. Europe was crippled financially by the war and subsequently by independence movements in the colonies. Nonetheless, this chapter in the history of conservation ends with the establishment of the International Union for Nature Protection (IUPN) at the International Conference for the Protection of Nature held in Brunnen, on 28 June 1947.

In 1946, the International Bureau began to resume activities under the directorship of Dr Westermann, who encouraged the Swiss League for Nature Protection to take the lead in resuming international efforts for the protection of nature on account of their political neutrality. During the next year the League convened informal conferences in Basel (1946) and Brunnen (1947) that gave rise to the provisional formation of the IUPN and agreement that this new organisation would assume the activities of the International Bureau.

The League's President, Dr Charles Jean Bernard, held discussions with Sir Julian Huxley, Director of the newly established UNESCO, and urged Van Tienhoven to move the office of the International Bureau to Switzerland. Van Tienhoven was at first sceptical of the proposals for the International Union. He felt that the Swiss were promoting too much European co-operation at the expense of other countries, particularly the USA, who he believed were crucial

| Category | Game reserve | Wildlife sanctuary |
|---|--|---|
| Alternative names | Hunting Reserve Taman Buru (Ind.) | Game reserve Wildlife refuge Suaka Margasatwa (Ind.) |
| Conceptual Origin | Germany (East Africa) | N. America (USA) |
| Historical equivalents | Royal hunting reserves | |
| Landscape context* category intended for | Primary, derivative and anthropogenic. | Primary landscapes |
| Motivators | Maintenance of game and their habitat for hunting; secure exclusive rights to the above; protection of key habitat so that game that overflows can provide a source of meat for natives, settlers and European and American sportsmen. | Belief that humanity has a moral obligations to ensure survival of other life forms; concern over humanity's potential for rapid conversion of vast natural landscapes; protection of 'source' habitat from which wildlife will repopulate the wider landscape at present or future date. |
| Adoption in Indonesia | 1967 Basic forestry law | 1933 Ordinance on Nature Monuments and Wildlife Sanctuaries |

TABLE 1. Summary overview of reserve categories in use at the

* Terminology is based on Milanova and Kushlin (1993). A primary landscape is one not discernibly altered by the activities of man and is normally uninhabited. Derivative landscapes are primary landscapes altered by man but that maintain a primary character. They may or may not be inhabited. Anthropogenic landscapes are those created by the

HISTORIES OF PROTECTED AREAS

| Narturdenkmal | National Park | Strict Nature Reserve |
|---|---|--|
| Natuurmonumentem (Dutch) Nature reserve (UK) Cagar Alam (Ind.) | Taman Nasional (Ind.) | Wilderness reserve Cagar Alam (Ind.) |
| Germany and UK Sacred forests | N. America (USA) | France |
| Cultural and anthropogenic. | Primary and derivative, with magnificent scenery. | Primary. |
| Place for study and contemplation of nature; belief that monuments of nature have value to human civilisation, culture and identity; belief that through appreciation and protection of nature monuments people will better know and value their country and national identity. | Promotion of patriotism through romanticised pride in natural heritage; create corporate profit opportunities through development of tourism to scenic landscapes; protection of threatened fauna, belief that people will be worse off in a future that is wholly economic. | A compromise adopted at 1933 conference to recognise perceptions that conservation of nature in a 'natural state' and human access are incompatible. |
| 1916 Ordinance on Nature Monuments | Ministerial declaration in 1982, established in law with Act 5 of 1990. | Complex. Indonesian <i>Cagar Alam</i> used for nature monuments in post-independence translations of Dutch law. Since 1980 Strict Nature Reserve used in English translations of Indonesian law. |

end of the colonial era (1940) and their adoption within Indonesia

activities of man. Cultural landscape refer to anthropogenic and derivative landscapes that are the product of a long and stable influence of traditional human cultural practices. In contrast anthropogenic landscape may be designed and constructed for the purpose at hand (e.g. British shooting estates or landscape parks)

to future conservation initiatives. Moreover Van Tienhoven's vision remained one of federations of associations of prominent men, whereas the IUPN vision was similar to the 1925 British Correlating Committee (see above), namely a federation of societies and organisations.¹⁰⁸

The Fontainebleau conference was convened under the auspices of UNESCO and presided over by C.J. Bernard. There was some politicising over the composition and seat of the IUPN. The Swiss government wanted it to be based in Switzerland, but the British (The Fauna Preservation Society)¹⁰⁹ favoured Belgium. Belgium was agreed upon. Bernard was elected president; Jean-Paul Harroy,¹¹⁰ Director of the Belgian Parks Institute (1935–1948), was elected first secretary general; and Coolidge, Secretary of the American Committee, was elected Vice-President.¹¹¹

Coolidge secured financial infusions from the US government to support the IUPN during its critical early days.¹¹² Harroy stood down in 1955. At the 1956 General Assembly the organisation changed its name to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources and in 1961 the headquarters was transferred from Brussels to Morges in Switzerland.¹¹³ These two acts signified the end of the direct involvement of elite networks of prominent gentlemen, and the growing influence of utilitarian and rational humanist thought in conservation.

NATURE CONSERVATION IN THE NETHERLANDS INDIES: ITS INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

The development and timing of events in nature conservation in the Indies and the development of supporting institutions closely reflect the European passion for natural history and influence of the nature monument and wildlife sanctuary lobbies (Table 2).

The natural history work of Sir Stamford Raffles, Governor of Java, during the brief period of British rule from 1811 to 1814, stimulated Dutch elite society to take an interest in the science of the colonies. King William I, who was already interested in science, was persuaded to send Professor Carl Reinwardt, director of the Royal Cabinet of Natural History, to accompany Baron van der Capellen, the first Governor General of Java.¹¹⁴ Van der Capellen was an enthusiastic natural historian who 'welcomed young naturalists like a benevolent father'.¹¹⁵

Reinwardt spent seven years in the Netherlands Indies (1815–1821) and established the Botanic Garden at Buitenzorg (Bogor) in 1818. After his return to the Netherlands, the King signed a series of decrees commissioning naturalists to conduct surveys. This group became known as the 'Natural History Commission' (*Natuurkundige Commissie van Nederlandsch Indië*) and came under the authority of Jacob Temminck, the director of the newly established Rijksmuseum¹¹⁶ at Leiden. The commission mounted a series of collecting

expeditions up until 1850 when it was disbanded because of the high mortality rate of the gifted young naturalists who vied to join the expeditions.¹¹⁷

The Natural History Commission had no apparent utilitarian purpose beyond serving the desire of educated European society for knowledge and exotica and building the status of the Rijksmuseum. Natural history only attained an economic relevance in the Netherlands Indies following the adoption of a new agrarian policy in 1870. This opened the outer islands (i.e. Sumatra and Borneo) to western plantation enterprises¹¹⁸ and created the need for government agricultural botanists and, later, zoologists. In response, a herbarium was established in Reinwardt's botanical garden and, from 1880 onwards, the small resident Dutch community was joined by professional biologists trained at the intellectual centres of Leiden, Utrecht and Wageningen.

The actions of Dr Melchior Treub, director (1880–1909) of the s'Lands Plantentuin (scientific institutes in Bogor comprising the botanical gardens, herbarium and, later, zoological museum) were consistent with the European trend at the time for inventory and rational resource management. In 1889 he established a 280 ha research reserve in Cibodas¹¹⁹ (now part of the Gunung Gede-Pangrango national park) and in 1888, at the time when work was starting on vegetation mapping in Europe, he charged Sijfert H. Koorders, a botanist in his employment, with the task of a scientific survey and determination of Java's forest types.¹²⁰

Hunting and species protection legislation was introduced to the Netherlands Indies in 1909, an action that reflects international support for such polices among colonial governments following the 1900 convention (above). The architect of this legislation was most likely Dr J.C. Köningsberger, who had arrived in the Netherlands Indies in 1894 to study pests of coffee. Köningsberger had a deep interest in wildlife and published the foundational study *Java, Zoologisch en Biologisch* in 1915. He was appointed the first government entomologist in 1898, established the Zoological Museum in 1901, assumed the influential position of Director of s'Lands Plantentuin¹²¹ following Treub's retirement in 1909, and was the first speaker of the Volksraad (the quasi-house of representatives of the Indies) upon its formation in 1919.

Koorders is identified as the main force for nature in the Netherlands Indies by the few histories dealing with this subject.¹²² An industrious and energetic personality,¹²³ he founded the Netherlands Indian Association for Nature Protection (hereafter the Association) (*Nederlandsch-Indische Vereeniging tot Natuurbescherming*) in 1912. Between 1904 and 1906 Koorders returned to the Netherlands on sick leave.¹²⁴ At this time, two public conservation campaigns had high profile. The first was the campaign by the Dutch nature monument society to save the Naardermeer (above) and the second was the humanitarian campaign¹²⁵ to ban the urban fashion for adorning hats with plumes of bird-of-paradise and egrets. Holland was a target of humanitarian sentiments because the Netherlands Indies was the major source of bird-of-paradise plumes for the

| International | Netherlands Indies |
|--|--|
| <p>1800–: Passion for natural history among European aristocracy. Founding of natural history museums</p> | <p>1818: Botanical Garden established in Bogor</p> |
| <p>1880–1900: Growing concerns over impact of industrialisation and clear felling leads to movement to inventory sites and map habitats. First published for France in 1896</p> | <p>1823-1850: <i>Natuurkundige Commissie voor Nederlandsch Indië</i> Natural History Commission of the Dutch Indies mounts expeditions</p> |
| <p>1887: Roosevelt founds the Boone & Crockett Club of New York</p> | <p>1888: Treub commissions Koorders to describe forest formations of Java</p> |
| <p>1900: British convene Conference on African Wildlife in London. Game law adopted as primary protective measure supported by games reserves</p> | <p>1909: Netherlands Indies government introduced species protection and hunting legislation. <i>Ordonnantie tot bescherming van sommige in het wild levende zoogdieren en vogels.</i> (Stbl. No. 497, 14.10.1909)</p> |
| <p>1904: Buxton founds the Society for the Preservation of fauna in the Empire</p> | <p>1914: S.H. Koorders founds <i>Nederlandsh Indische Vereeniging tot Natuurbescherming</i> (Netherlands Indian Association for Nature Protection) to lobby for nature monuments.</p> |
| <p>1904–1910: European campaign to designate nature monuments lead by Conwentz. Van Tienhoven founds the Netherlands Society for the Preservation of Nature Reserves in 1904.</p> | <p>1916: <i>Natuurmonumenten-Ordonnantie</i> Natural Monuments Ordinance (Stbl. No. 278, 18.3.1916) establishes legal basis for gazetting nature reserves; 43 <i>Natuurmonumenten</i> designated in next decade. Netherlands Indies Association adopts banning the plume trade as a main objective.</p> |

TABLE 2. Chronology of selected events in international

| International | Netherlands Indies |
|--|---|
| <p>1904–1921: Humanitarian campaign against fashion for adorning hats with bird-of-paradise and egret plumes</p> <p>1909/1910: Roosevelt's Africa expedition and tour of Europe. 1918: van Tienhoven tour of USA and Java</p> <p>1925: Van Tienhoven facilities foundation of elite nature protection committees in the Netherlands, Belgium and France. These committees collaborate with the Boone & Crockett Club to establish the King Albert National park in the Belgian Congo</p> <p>1927: Van Tienhoven travels to New York to meet Boone & Crockett Club.</p> <p>1930: Boone & Crockett Club establishes American Committee for International Nature Protection. Lobbying by American, London and Brussels-based committees results in 1931 Paris Congress on Nature Protection and the 1933 London Conference on African Wildlife. The resulting convention formalised national parks, wildlife sanctuaries as means of preserving wildlife.</p> | <p>First two large reserves established. Ujung Kulon nature monument in 1921 to protect Javan Rhino, Lorentz nature monument in 1923 to protect indigenous tribes people from sudden contact with western civilisations.</p> <p>1929: Dammerman presents a conservation review of Netherlands Indies nature conservation, financed by the Boone & Crockett Club at the Fourth Pacific Science Congress held in Bandung.</p> <p>1931: Species protection and hunting laws overhauled with <i>Dierenbeschermings-Ordonnantie Wild Animal Protection Ordinance</i> (Stbl. No 134, 27.3.1931)</p> <p>1932: A <i>Natuurmonumenten- en Wildreservaten Ordonnantie</i> Ordinance on Nature reserves and Wildlife Sanctuary (Stbl No.17, 11.1. 1932) established the legal basis for gazetting wildlife sanctuaries. 17 sanctuaries established by 1940</p> |

millinery trade.¹²⁶ Koorders modelled his Association on these two campaigns. The protection of nature monuments was stated as the association's main goal and the bird of paradise was chosen as its logo.¹²⁷

The Association, in keeping with the practice of its Dutch sister organisation, asked to own and manage reserves. This was rejected on the grounds that a private organisation lacked the resources to manage large areas. Nonetheless, the Association was granted legal recognition and an advisory role in all matters relating to nature conservation.¹²⁸ These decisions would almost certainly have been taken by Köningsberger and, together with his appeal for Dutch government involvement in the consultative committee (see above), indicate that he believed nature conservation should be a government matter (c.f. Prussia) but that the support of a public lobby was necessary to achieve this end.

In the ten years following its establishment, the Association proposed 46 reserves (Annex 2). The vast majority of reserves were small in size (average 54.4 ha), and established for reasons including protection of botanical, faunal and geological features, beautiful panoramas, specific species (e.g. *Rafflesia* and bird colonies), scientific benchmark sites,¹²⁹ a memorial reserve for Rumphius, and even a sacred fig tree.¹³⁰ These reasons represent an expression of Conwentz's concept of *Naturdenkmal* in pure form. Although sites for nature study and appreciation were not then threatened in the Netherlands Indies by land use change as they were in the Netherlands, it still made sense to identify nature monuments as a means of promoting appreciation of the colony's natural heritage by condensing the vast natural landscapes into a set of small sites that could be comprehended.

In December 1928, Van Tienhoven, in his capacity of President of the Dutch Committee, wrote to the Governor-General of the Netherlands Indies pointing out the declines in big game populations internationally and the success of Yellowstone and of Albert National Park. The letter requested the Netherlands Indies government to establish *reservaten* (refuges) along the US model.¹³¹ The Dutch Committee was in a good position to exert influence. The committee's first secretary (1925–1926) was Köningsberger, who had returned from the Indies to take up the position of Minister of the Colonies.¹³² Köningsberger's successor as speaker of the Volksraad (1929–1936) was Ch. H.M.H. Kies, a 'nature minded' person who wrote a treatise on nature conservation in the Indies.¹³³ In 1929, Van Tienhoven successfully encouraged him to submit a motion calling on the government to create wildlife sanctuaries.¹³⁴ The motion was unanimously adopted in 1930.¹³⁵

Köningsberger's successor at the Zoology Museum and then as Director of s'Lands Plantentuin (in 1932) was K.W. Dammerman. Dammerman was a major resident force for nature conservation in the last 20 years of the Nederland's Indies.¹³⁶ He was a council member of the association from 1913–1932, and in 1929 prepared a major review of nature conservation in the Indies, which was presented at the Sixth Pacific Science Congress held in Bandung in 1929.¹³⁷

As a result of representations from this group, the Netherlands Indies government overhauled its wildlife protection legislation in 1931 and 1932. First, with the *Dierenbeschermings-Ordonnantie* (Wild Animal Protection Ordinance, Stbl. No 134, 27.3.1931) and then with the *Natuurmonumenten- en Wildreservaten Ordonnantie* (Ordinance on Nature Reserves and Wildlife Sanctuary, Stbl No.17, 11.1. 1932). The 1931 ordinance extended the 1924 ordinance by introducing a system of lists for protected species and extending the legislation to cover the whole of the Netherlands Indies. The 1932 ordinance established the legal mechanism to protect large mammals and their habitats. Between 1932 and 1940, 17 wildlife sanctuaries were established – eight in Sumatra, two in Java, two in Kalimantan, one each in Bali and Lombok and three covering individual islands in the Komodo group (Annex 3). Furthermore, although The Netherlands was not party to the 1933 convention (having no possessions in Africa), the Netherlands Indies government adopted the principle that wildlife sanctuaries were to be compared with what other countries call national parks.¹³⁸ Article 9 of the convention, regulating trade in trophies, was adopted in a 1937 ordinance.

From 1930 onwards relationships soured between the Dutch Committee and the Association. The latter resented the fact that insufficient appreciation was given in Holland to the achievements of the Association in the Netherlands Indies and that the legislation on wildlife sanctuaries had been successfully brought about without their involvement.¹³⁹

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this article we have explored the emergence and translation of two ideas in conservation. We have described how natural history and hunting, the two great popular enthusiasms of nineteenth-century European and East Coast North America in the sphere of the human-nature relationship, lead to distinct new values in society and motivations for protecting nature in reserves.

Natural history we identify with the ‘genteel’ characteristics of human identity: contemplation, compassion, aesthetic appreciation, scientific curiosity, and civic pride, which found greatest expression in metropolitan society. From this background arose the desire to preserve monuments of nature; the recognition that these were comparable to monuments of human enterprise in terms of significance to human civilisation, culture and national identity; and also the recognition that they were varied in form and scale. At one extreme nature monuments were the spectacular natural landscapes of the American West, which could be conserved as National Parks, at the other extreme, in the cultural landscape of Europe, there were geological formations, rare habitats and even single trees that could be protected as *Naturdenkmal* and nature reserves.

Hunting, we identify with the ‘warrior’ and ‘pioneer’ in human identity;

characteristics of courage, honour, fair-play, self-reliance, respect for adversaries and adventure that found new expression in natural and frontier landscapes of Africa and North America. From this background arose the ethos of the sportsman and the desire to limit excessive killing through game laws and game reserves. We suggest that in North America, more so than Europe, these two sides of human identity and interaction with nature were combined within the same individuals and elite social groups, and this was a simple factor of geography. The American west was a two-day rail journey from New York, East Africa (the closest destination) a twenty-day sea journey from London. It was from this fusion of scholarship, contemplation, survival and first-hand observation of rapid landscape change that there arose the new ethic that human conquest of nature carried with it a moral responsibility to ensure the survival of threatened life forms.

This interpretation of the origins of conservation expands on that of Richard Grove, who demonstrates how modern environmentalism emerged from colonial conditions as a direct response to environmental degradation on tropical islands.¹⁴⁰ We argue that the late colonial era can be characterised by distinct new ethical and aesthetic concerns that were the product of interaction between metropolitan and frontier landscapes conditions. We suggest that these values define 'conservationism' within the broader discourse of environmentalism, which is more utilitarian in character.¹⁴¹ This interpretation offers the possibility of distancing conservation and imperialist values, and to paraphrase Benedict Anderson writing on nationalism 'Nationalism [conservation values] has to be understood by aligning it, not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with the large cultural system out of which – as well as against which – it came into being'.¹⁴²

We have provided evidence to suggest that this new conservation ethic was promoted by elite groups, first among the hunting fraternity in New York and London, but that in 1910, coinciding with Roosevelt's tour of Europe, it was taken-up by prominent members of the nature monument movement in Amsterdam, Brussels, Paris and Geneva. We have described how these prominent men organised themselves into semi-formal 'gentlemen' networks orientating around three nodes, the Consultative Commission in continental Europe, the Flora Preservation Society in London, and the Boone & Crockett Club in New York. These networks used their royal, political, scientific, business, and editorial contacts to promote the ethic that human conquest of nature carried with it a moral responsibility to preserve threatened wildlife and that this required designation of national parks and wildlife sanctuaries. P.G. van Tienhoven of Amsterdam exemplifies both the influence of this lobby and the purity of intent. Through the leadership and intervention of his group, the Netherlands Indies government, supported by the Netherlands Indies Association for Nature Protection, established a network of 101 nature monuments and 35 wildlife sanctuaries. Legislation to establish game reserves was introduced after Indonesian inde-

pendence in the Basic Forest Law of 1967. The wildlife sanctuaries were declared national parks in 1982 and legally designated as such during the 1990s.

Each 'node' of prominent men appears to have offered distinct and complementary skills. The Consultative Commission (the group of European Committees) was internationalist in out-look and promoted co-ordinated action, in particular encouraging the U.S. to support conservation in the colonies. The Fauna Preservation Society was adept at using governmental approaches and exploiting the leadership role of Britain, while the Americans provided a clear ethical vision, tangible action goals (e.g. national parks) and a gift for publicising the cause. Together, they had a profound influence on the structure of international conservation, in terms of public attitudes, the formation of the IUCN and a suite of reserve categories to meet different conservation goals.

We have provided evidence for a flow of conservationist ideas into the Netherlands Indies from Europe and North America and that the movement was metropolitan and international in character. This perspective helps explain the timing of conservation events in the Netherlands Indies, in particular why attempts to establish nature reserves in 1886 and 1887 failed and why hunting was not regulated until 1909. This interpretation of conservation history in the Netherlands Indies varies from that of Peter Boomgaard, who describes the character of the Netherlands Indies conservation movement as 'Orientalist' and colonial, and therefore quite different from the movement in the Netherlands.¹⁴³ Boomgaard is not explicit in his use of the terms 'Orientalist' and colonial. The movement to establish nature monuments in the Netherlands Indies was 'Orientalist' in the sense of being closely linked with western scholarship of the Orient,¹⁴⁴ and the designation of wildlife sanctuaries was colonial where this term is linked with the notion of extending 'civilised' values to distant territories. However, we suggest that the late-colonial conservation movement in Indonesia was neither 'Orientalist' nor colonial under the emancipatory meanings of these two terms relating to the oppression of societies in the broader context of European hegemony over Southeast Asia and other areas of the world. Contrary to Boomgaard's statement that 'Dutch conservationists in late colonial Indonesia copied the names of the relevant institutions from the mother-country, but not much more',¹⁴⁵ we have provided evidence that conservation movements in Holland and in the Netherlands Indies, were part of the same international movement with almost identical ideals and solutions.

In the context of contemporary debate on protected areas in Indonesian society the question arises as to whether the charges that parks represent elite special interest and the imposition of western values are valid. The narrative of this article demonstrates that parks encapsulate social values conceived and promoted by groups within elite society and that parks were designated in the Netherlands Indies without widespread public exposure or debate of these values in the Indies. This is different from imposing elite special interest, which in this context implies a desire to appropriate land for selfish ends.

Elsewhere, the motives of the colonial conservation movement in Africa and Asia are generally portrayed as self-serving on the part of white naturalists, hunters, plantation owners and administrators, within a general culture of colonial exclusion and subjugation.¹⁴⁶ It is conceivable, indeed likely, that the new conservation policies described in this article were appropriated by some people for selfish ends. However, we argue that the root motivations of protected area policy are noble, namely a desire to preserve sites with special meaning for intellectual and aesthetic contemplation of nature and acceptance that the human conquest of nature carries with it a moral responsibility to ensure the survival of threatened life forms. Cynics may point out that these values are self-serving because they maintain and rationalise opportunities to hunt and enjoy natural landscapes. Be that as it may, the very fact that these values embrace human needs, desires and aspirations in interactions with nature, while stating there is a moral limit, creates their practical strength and relevance.

In contemporary debates concerning national values and identity, such as those happening in Indonesia, we suggest it is important to focus on the root social values as a distinct exercise from examining the historic problems of delivery of the polices derived. The combination of events and insights that led to the formulation of the conservationist values discussed can not be repeated. They will not emerge independently within contemporary Indonesia.

The question conservationists need to address is can these social values, and the designation and management of parks which their expression entails, bring social and economic benefits to the people of contemporary Indonesia? We believe that they can for a variety of reasons, and that it would be tragic if Indonesia rejects these values and the protection of parks because of associations with either colonialism or the autocratic New Order regime. The utilitarian justifications for protected areas relating to genetic reservoir and ecosystem health values are frequently articulated in the conservation and development literature. This article has focused on intrinsic arguments. To these can be added arguments relating to the nature of society. For instance:

- The fundamental question for society (and Indonesia at this point in time) is, what sort of world do we want to live in?¹⁴⁷ There is still strong international opinion that protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage is a responsibility of all civilised nations and societies, as reaction to the Taliban's destruction of Buddhist statues in Afghanistan in 2001 testifies.
- The act of protecting natural landscapes constructs an 'other' – a base line against which human endeavour can be measured, enabling societies to review 'progress' and thereby keep vibrant and healthy.
- People form, and subjugate certain individual rights to, societies in order to gratify a set of basic needs: wellbeing, respect, affection, wealth, skill, enlightenment and rectitude¹⁴⁸. The role of the state and public policy is to create opportunities for citizens to realise such needs. Establishment of

national parks and reserves is an efficient and effective means of fulfilling this role, especially when linked with recreational and public health policy. The wealth of artistic, sporting, spiritual, and business activities associated with parks such as Yosemite (California), Everest (Nepal), Kruger (South Africa), and Kakadu (Northern Territories of Australia) is evidence of the social and economic potential of parks.

- Related to the point above, rural development is a major policy goal in Indonesia. Quality rural livelihoods are created when flows of capital, entrepreneurship, and creative innovation are established between cities and their urban hinterlands. Parks and reserves are among the best means of creating and maintaining such flows.
- Parks, especially those protecting magnificent scenery or impressive fauna and flora, are instrumental in creating a sense of national and regional pride and identity.

In short, parks are a crucial element of strategies to create quality lifestyles in the modern nation state. This potentiality should not be denied to future Indonesians.

Among the Indonesian social justice movement and scholars in this subject area it is fashionable to argue that the interests of indigenous people should not be subordinated to other more powerful sectors of society and that protected area policy has been guilty of this practice. In a detailed analysis of contemporary Indonesian protected area policy, P. Jepson shows that there has never been an intention on the part of national policies makers in Indonesia to subjugate indigenous rights.¹⁴⁹ Indeed, there are several examples of parks being established to protect territories of indigenous peoples from forestry and plantation companies.¹⁵⁰ There are cases in Indonesia of indigenous peoples being translocated from parks, but to our knowledge these have involved local government officials acting in their own interests. The social justice and parks movements should be highly complementary. This is because both are based on the liberal principle of the individual's right to choose his or her own destiny. Enacting this principle requires the creation and maintenance of option choices. Because human culture changes landscapes and culture is embodied by landscapes, protecting landscape variability, in particular natural and traditional cultural landscapes that are under threat, is fundamental to this cause.

This is not to suggest that Indonesian protected area policy does not need a thorough and fundamental review. Since the merging of the nature conservation and sustainable development agendas marked by the World Conservation Strategy¹⁵¹ the purpose of parks has become remarkably complex¹⁵² and is obscure to most Indonesians. The social values that initially led to the designation of protected areas are understandable to all. Re-focusing on these values creates the possibility of engaging wider Indonesian society in the debate on the future of Indonesia's protected area estate and through this creating for the first time a popular mandate for protected areas in Indonesia.

| Date | Full Name | Abbreviation used | Founders and leaders |
|-------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 1823 | Natuurkundige Commissie vor Nederlansch Indië Natural History Commission of the Dutch Indies | Natural History Commission | King William I, Reinwardt, J. Temmink |
| 1887 | Boone & Crockett Club | None | T. Roosevelt, M. Grant |
| 1900? | British Correlating Committee on International Nature Conservation | British Correlating Committee | P. Chalmers Mitchell, Government committee |
| 1903 | Society for the Preservation of Fauna of the Empire | Fauna Preservation Society | Lord Buxton, Earl of Onslow, C. Hobbley |
| 1904 | Vereeniging tot Behoud van Natuur-monumenten in Nederland Society for the Promotion of Nature Monuments in the Netherlands | Dutch Society | P.G. van Tienhoven |
| 1912 | Nederlandsh Indische Vereeniging tot Natuurbescherming, Netherlands Indian Association for Nature Protection. | Netherlands Indies Association | S.H. Koorders |
| 1914 | International Consultative Commission for the Protection of Nature | Consultative Commission | P. Sarasin, P.G. van Tienhoven |

APPENDIX 1. Date of establishment, founders and abbreviations used in text

(1) Theodore Roosevelt founded the Boone & Crockett Club to promote ethics of 'fair chase' in hunting and the establishment of wildlife sanctuaries. (Photo c.1900: www.theodore-roosevelt.com)

(2) Edward North Buxton (second left) founded the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire to lobby British colonial administrations to establish wildlife sanctuaries. (Photo c.1890: collection Edward & Fiona Buxton)

(3) Pieter G. van Tienhoven founded the Netherlands commission for International Nature Protection. (Photo c.1940: collection A. Coops)



| Date | Full Name | Abbreviation used | Founders and leaders |
|-------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| 1925 | Nederlandsch Commise voor Internationale Natuurbescherming, Netherlands Commission for International Nature Conservation | Dutch Committee | P.G. van Teinhoven |
| 1926 | Belgium Commission for International Nature Conservation | Belgium Committee | Van Stralen, J.M. Dershfeld |
| 1926 | French Commission for International Nature Conservation | French Committee | J. Delacour, A. Gruvel |
| 1928 | Office International de Documentation et de Correlation pour la Protection de la Nature International Bureau of Information and Correlation on Nature Conservation | International Bureau | P.G. van Teinhoven, J.M. Dershfeld, Baron Cartier de Marchienne |
| 1930 | American Committee for International Wildlife Protection | American Committee | J.C. Phillips, H. Coolidge |
| 1934 | l'Institut des Parcs Nationaux du Congo Belge | Belgian Parks Institute | Van Stralen, J.-P. Harroy |
| 1949 | International Union for Nature Protection, renamed International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (1956) | International Union | C.J. Bernard, J.-P. Harroy, H. Coolidge |

for organisations working to promote conservation ethics in the late colonial era.



| Reserve name | Province | Area (ha) | Reason for designation | Year & decree |
|---|----------------|-----------|---|----------------|
| Gn. Malabar | West Java | 8.3 | Aesthetic (panorama) | 1912 |
| Arcadomas | West Java | 2 | Historic | 26/04/13 |
| Depok | West Java | 6 | Botanical | Gb 1913 |
| Getas | Central Java | ? | Botanical | LGD 1913 |
| Gn. Lorentz | Irian Jaya | 320,000 | Botanical, fauna, aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Ulu Tiangko | Jambi | 1 | Historic/cultural (cave) | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Yunghunn | West Java | 2.5 | Botanical | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Rumphius | Maluku | 2.5 | Botanical | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Gua Nglirip | East Java | 3 | Geology | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Cigenteng Cipanyi I/II | West Java | 10 | Botanical | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Sangeh | Bali | 10 | Botanical, aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Batimurung | South Sulawesi | 10 | Aesthetics (waterfall) | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Panjalu (Koorders) | West Java | 16 | Botanical, aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Takokak | West Java | 50 | Botanical | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Keling I/II | Central Java | 60 | Aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Gn. Lokon | North Sulawesi | 100 | Botanical, geology | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Gn. Tangkoko Batuangus | North Sulawesi | 4,446 | Fauna (Babirusa, Anoa), botanical | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Laut Pasir Tenger | East Java | 5,290 | Aesthetic (panorama) | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Aceh Rafflesia Arul Kumbar & Jernih Munto | DI Aceh | ? | Botanical (<i>Rafflesia padma acehensis</i>) | 1919 Stbl. 90 |
| Napabalano | Sul. Tenggara | 9 | Botanical (<i>Tectona grandis</i>) | 1919 Zba. 4 |
| Bungumas Kikim | South Sumatra | 1 | Historic (prehistory) | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Watangan Puger I/V | East Java | 2 | Botanical (Koorders study site), aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Besowo Gadungan | East Java | 7 | Aesthetic, botanical (<i>A-leurites</i> spp) | 1919 Stbl. 392 |

| Reserve name | Province | Area (ha) | Reason for designation | Year & decree |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Janggangan -Rogojampi | East Java | 8.5 | Botanical (Koorders study site), aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Pancur Ijen | East Java | 9 | Geology, botanical aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Sungai Kolbu | East Java | 9 | Aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Manggis Gadungan | East Java | 12 | Aesthetic, botanical | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Corah Manis- Sempolan | East Java | 16 | Botanical (Koorders study site) aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Cadas | West Java | 21 | Aesthetic, botanical | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Tangkuban Perahu | West Java | 33 | Geology | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Sukawayana Pelabuhan Ratu | West Java | 46.5 | Botanical (primeval lowland forest), aesthetic (beach panorama) | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Cimungkat | West Java | 56 | Botanical (Fig trees) | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Telaga Patengan | West Java | 150 | Aesthetic | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Gn. Krakatau | Lampung | 2,500 | Geology | 1919 Stbl. 392 |
| Geding | East Java | 2 | Geology, Aesthetic | 1920 Stbl. 736 |
| Pringombo I/II | Central Java | 58 | Geology | 1920 Stbl. 736 |
| Kawah Ijen- Merapi Ungup | East Java | 2,560 | Geology, Aesthetic | 1920 Stbl. 736 |
| Nusabrun | East Java | 6,100 | Botanical (trees), fauna (Rusa deer) | 1920 Stbl. 736 |
| Baringin Sati | West Sumatra | 0.2 | Historic (sacred fig) | 1921 Stbl. 683 |
| Palau Bokor | West Java | 15 | Faunistics (bird sanctuary) | 1921 Stbl. 683 |
| Ranu Kumbolo | East Java | 1,340 | Aesthetic, geology | 1921 Stbl. 683 |
| Ranca Danau | West Java | 2,500 | Botanical (freshwater swamp forest) | 1921 Stbl. 683 |
| Panaitan & Peucang | West Java | 17,500 | Faunistics (Rusa deer) | 1921 Stbl. 683 |
| Ulolnang Kecubung | Central Java | 71 | Botanical (tree species) | 1922 Stbl. 765 |
| Ranu Pani Regulo | East Java | 96 | Aesthetic, geology | 1922 Stbl. 765 |
| Lembah Anai | West Sumatra | 221 | Aesthetic | 1922 Stbl. 765 |

in the Netherlands Indies, 1913–1923

| Wildlife Sanctuary | Province | Area | Date & designation decree |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Berbak | Jambi | 190,000 | 1935 Stbl. 521 |
| Sumatera Selatan I | Lampung | 356,800 | 1935 Stbl. 621 |
| Way Kambas | Lampung | 130,000 | 1937 Stbl. 392 |
| Ujung Kulon | West Java | 39,120 | 1937 Stbl. 420 |
| Gunung Leuser | DI Aceh | 416,500 | 1934 Z.B 317 |
| Kluet | DI Aceh | 20,000 | 1936 Z.B |
| Kotawaringin/ Sampit | Central Kalimantan | 205,000 | 1936 ZB 24, Stbl. 495 |
| Kutai | East Kalimantan | 200,000 | 1936 Zb. 80 |
| Pati pati | Central Sulawesi | 198 | 1936 ZB. 4 |
| Sikunder | North Sumatra | 79,100 | 1938 Z.B. 223 |
| Langkat Seletan | North Sumatra | 82,985 | 1938 Z.B. 223 |
| Langkat Barat | North Sumatra | 51,900 | 1938 Z.B. 223 |
| Dolok Sunungan | North Sumatra | 22,800 | 1938 Z.B. 223 |
| Komodo | NTT | | |
| Padar | NTT | 15,000 | 1938 Z.B. 32 |
| Rinca | NTT | 15,000 | 1938 Z.B. 32 |
| Banyuwangi Seletan | East Java | 62,000 | 1939 Stbl. 456 |
| Tanjung Puting | Central Kalimantan | 300,000 approx | 1939 Stbl. 495 |
| Gn. Rinjani | NTB. | 40,000 | 1941 Stbl. 77 |
| Bali Barat | Bali | 20,000 | 1941 GB 71/523/B. |

| Species to protect | Present Status |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Sumatran Elephant, Sumatran Tiger, Tapir | Berbak National Park |
| Sumatran Elephant, Sumatran Rhino, Tapir, Orang Utan? | Part of Bukit Barisan National Park |
| Sumatran Elephant, Sumatran Rhino, Tapir | Way Kambas National Park |
| Javan Rhino, Javan Tiger, Leopard, Banteng, Rusa Deer | Part of Ujung Kulon National Park |
| Sumatran Elephant, Sumatran Rhino, Siamang | Part of Gunung Leuser National Park |
| Orang utan, Elephant | Part of Gunung Leuser National Park |
| Orang-Utan, Proboscis Monkey | Part of Tanjung Putting National Park |
| Orang-Utan, Proboscis Monkey, Sumatran Rhino, Sambar | Reduced area Kutai National Park |
| Rusa deer | De-designated |
| Sumatran Elephant, Siamang | Part of Gunung Leuser National Park |
| Sumatran Elephant, Siamang | Part of Gunung Leuser National Park |
| Sumatran Elephant, Siamang | Part of Gunung Leuser National Park |
| Tapir, primates | Part of Gunung Leuser National Park |
| Komodo Dragon | Part of Komodo National Park |
| Komodo Dragon | Part of Komodo National Park |
| Komodo Dragon | Part of Komodo National Park |
| Banteng, Tiger, Rusa Deer | Las Purwo National Park |
| Orang utan | Part of Tanjung Putting National Park |
| Rusa Deer | Rijani National Park |
| Banteng | Bali Barat National Park |

during the 1930s in response to ethical concerns over species extinction

NOTES

We are grateful to Herman Erickson and Pieter van Dijk for discussions on Indonesian conservation history and to Bas van Balen, Matseo Boland, Alan Hamilton, Jim Jarvie, Susanne Schmitt, Judith Tsouvalis, Michael Williams and three anonymous reviewers for comments on earlier drafts of this article.

¹ IUCN, 1993.

² See Jepson and Whittaker, 2002; Jepson et al., 2002.

³ McCarthy, 2001.

⁴ E.g. Peluso, 1992; Boomgaard, 1999.

⁵ EIA/Telapak, 1999; Jepson et al., 2001.

⁶ Down-to-Earth, 2000.

⁷ See Grove et al., 1998; Boomgaard 1999.

⁸ J. MacKenzie, *in litt.*

⁹ Jepson and Canney, 2001.

¹⁰ *Sensu* McManus, 1999.

¹¹ Stresemann, 1975.

¹² MacKenzie, 1988.

¹³ MacKenzie, 1988, p.37.

¹⁴ MacKenzie, 1988, p. 37; Lowe, 1983.

¹⁵ In 1880s England, for example, there were several hundred natural history and field clubs, with a combined membership of 100,000. Lowe (1983, p33) suggests that this popularity was a by-product of the new prosperity of industrial Britain, of expanded opportunities for education and leisure, was an outlet for contemporary obsession for travel and self-improvement, and was, for devout Victorians, one of a restricted range of morally acceptable pastimes.

¹⁶ Lowe, 1993.

¹⁷ Thomas, 1984.

¹⁸ Lowe, 1983, referring to Burrow (1966), Persall (1969) and Turner (1980).

¹⁹ As many species of mammal went extinct between 1851 and 1990 as between 1A.D. and 1850 (31 vs. 33) (Harper, 1942).

²⁰ Hornaday, 1914, p.19.

²¹ Sim, 1864.

²² Lowe, 1983.

²³ Matagne, 1998.

²⁴ The philosopher Hillolithe Taine (1828–1893) was one such influential proponent.

²⁵ www.theodoreroosevelt.org.

²⁶ White settlers, colonial administrators and army personnel, all of whom had access to guns, carried out this slaughter. The outrage was not directed at indigenous peoples, although there was great concern that should they gain access to guns the slaughter would spread.

²⁷ MacKenzie, 1988.

²⁸ Leopold, 1933.

²⁹ The group included, for example, Dr. George Bird Grinnell, editor of the influential *Forest and Stream* weekly, and later to found the Audubon society, and the businessman Rutherford Stuyvesant who had built New York's first apartment block in 1869.

HISTORIES OF PROTECTED AREAS

³⁰ Influential were: Emerson's philosophical glorification of nature, Thoreau's moral naturalism, i.e. the belief that we can learn to live by observing nature (see Norton, 1994 for overview) and Muir's celebrations of 'wilderness' (Muir, 1992).

³¹ Trefethen, 1961, p.17.

³² *Ibid.*, p.18.

³³ Trefethen, 1961, p.192.

³⁴ www.wcs.org/about/history. The New York Zoological Society which manages the Bronx Zoo, formed the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) in 1949 following publication of Fairfield Osborn's seminal 1948 book *Our Plundered Planet*. WCS now manages wildlife conservation programmes all over the world.

³⁵ Buxton was a member of parliament, on the London School Board (1871–1888) and Vice-President of the Commons Preservation Society (*Who's Who*, 1998). He was one of the first people to photograph African wildlife, in 1902 (Haraway, 1992), and to promote the idea of hunting with the camera as an alternative to the gun.

³⁶ SPFE, 1924.

³⁷ The signatories included the Duke and Duchess of Bedford, Lord Avebury, Abel Chapman, Sir Edward Grey, Sir Harry Johnston, Ray Lankester, Richard Lydekker, John G. Millais, Phillip Lutley Sclater, Fredrick Selous and Oldfield Thomas (Fitter and Scott, 1978).

³⁸ Fitter and Scott, 1978.

³⁹ Sir H.H. Johnston, Governor of Uganda, was one of the society's founder members (Johnston, 1906).

⁴⁰ Hobley, 1924.

⁴¹ Lowe, 1983.

⁴² Conwentz, 1909, p.185.

⁴³ see Runte, 1979, pp.14–47.

⁴⁴ This act perhaps only envisioned small cultural monuments. However, Roosevelt acting in a manner consistent with the philosophy of the European Naturdenkmal movement, used the act to protect the Grand Canyon as a national monument in 1880. This action was challenged but subsequently upheld by the Supreme Court.

⁴⁵ Sellars, 1997, p.13.

⁴⁶ Namely the Société pour la protection des Paysages (France, established 1901), Ligue Swiss pour la protection de la nature (Switzerland, 1909) and the Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves (UK, established 1912) (IUCN 1988).

⁴⁷ Rothschild, 1979.

⁴⁸ The 'wise use movement' was a second and distinct strand of conservationism that flourished in America during Roosevelt's presidency, notably with the appointment of Gifford Pinchot as first director of the Forest Service. This aspect is not discussed in this article because prior to WWII it was mostly concerned with the management of natural resources in non-reserved lands and not as a justification for national parks and reserves. Subsequently, 'wise-use' arguments have become more prominent as a rationale for protected areas.

⁴⁹ Pelzers 1994a, 2000.

⁵⁰ In order to fulfil this great ambition, Roosevelt refused the Presidential nomination that was offered him in favour of William Howard Taft. Roosevelt sailed for Africa on 23 March 1909 (Trefethen, 1961).

⁵¹ Chapman, 1917.

⁵² E.g. MacKenzie, 1988, p.219.

⁵³ A cattle plague from Asia that affects wildlife and had swept through Africa (Reader, 1997).

⁵⁴ Trefethen, 1961. This justification inspired similar expeditions, including the famous 1929 Kelly-Roosevelt expeditions to Indochina, where Roosevelt's sons Theodore and Kermit spent more than five months hunting large mammals in present day China, Laos and Vietnam (Coolidge and Roosevelt, 1933).

⁵⁵ Pronghorn antelope hunting was one of the most exciting sports in America, which combined great horsemanship with physical danger.

⁵⁶ Trefethen, 1961.

⁵⁷ The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) and Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), two of Britain's (and Europe's) largest non-government organisations were established to fight these 'evils' in 1824 and 1891 respectively. The Netherlands Society for the Protection of Birds, which had similar objectives, was formed in 1899.

⁵⁸ Sheail, 1975.

⁵⁹ Game legislation had been introduced as early as 1657, by the Dutch East India Company in the Cape and in 1822 the British administration introduced the first major piece of colonial game legislation, also in the Cape colony.

⁶⁰ see Mackenzie, 1988, also Hayden, 1942, for fuller discussion.

⁶¹ For example, two game reserves were established in Kenya in 1900, soon after the conference.

⁶² Hobley, 1933.

⁶³ Sarasin and his brother had earlier made an expedition to Sulawesi, in the Netherlands Indies (Rijksen undated).

⁶⁴ The Swiss League had banning of commercial whaling as one of its objectives. Pursuing this objective obviously required co-ordinated international action.

⁶⁵ Rijksen, undated.

⁶⁶ Fourteen European, plus USA, Argentina and Russia.

⁶⁷ Through Sarasin's efforts the Swiss National Park, Europe's first, was designated in 1914.

⁶⁸ Büttikofer, 1947, p.132; IUCN, 1988.

⁶⁹ IUCN, 1988; Pelzers, 1994a, 2000. Sarasin did try to revive the Commission after WWI, but met with official reluctance and lack of support. None-the-less an International Congress for the Protection of Nature was convened in 1923 and revival of the commission agreed upon.

⁷⁰ SPFE, 1927.

⁷¹ *Who's Who*, 1998.

⁷² Reported in Pelzers 1994a, 2000. Van Tienhoven died on 5 May 1953. His will shows that he attached great importance to the survival of large mammals. He bequeathed the major part of his estate to the nature conservation organisations he founded.

⁷³ To Herbert Smith, Secretary of the British Correlating Committee for the Protection of Nature, May 1925.

⁷⁴ To Herbert Smith, July 1925.

⁷⁵ Pelzers 1994a, 2000, p 9.

⁷⁶ Delacour came into substantial inheritances at a young age from his rich textile family (Hellman, 1946). He kept a large and famous collection of live birds on his country estate, and was a leader in the passion for aviculture (a continuation of the fashion for menageries among Europe's elite) with close friends in the UK among the fraternity of peers,

department store owners and international bankers who dominated the pastime. It is said that he 'prefers the company of people who are wealthy, well connected, eccentric, scientifically minded, or, if possible, all four' (Hellman 1946, 17). He was one of the most successful tropical explorers of the day spending a third of his time between 1923 and 1939 on expedition to Africa, Indo-china and the Pacific. Delacour fled Paris to New York in 1940. He arrived on Christmas Eve 1940 and contacted his friend Fairfield Osborne of the Boone & Crockett Club, spending part of Christmas Day with him. In six days Osborne and Laurance Rockefeller, another of Delacour's friends, offered him the position of technical advisor to the Bronx Zoo of the New York Zoological Society. Shortly after he became a Research Associate of Dept. of Birds at the Museum of Natural History, a consultant on conservation to the US Fish and Wildlife Service and a member of the Executive Committee of the American Committee for International Conservation of the B&CC (Hellmann 1946). Delacour also founded the International Committee for Bird Preservation in 1922 (Mayer 1986). This was an elite lobbying group that fell into inactivity after WWII. In 1983 it became active again with the appointment of a professional director and grew steadily in terms of scope, number of staff and influence. In 1993 the organisation was re-launched as BirdLife International, a global partnership of national non-government bird-conservation organisations.

⁷⁷ Harraway, 1995, p.57.

⁷⁸ Fitter and Scott, 1978.

⁷⁹ Pomeroy was also a trustee of the Museum.

⁸⁰ Pelzers, 1994a, 2000.

⁸¹ Akeley, 1931, p.198.

⁸² Now the Park National des Vicuñas, Democratic Republic of Congo.

⁸³ www.wcmc.org/protected-areas/data.

⁸⁴ Fitter and Scott, 1978.

⁸⁵ Quoted in Pelzers 1994a, 2000.

⁸⁶ This was in response to a proposal by Professor Micheal Siedleck of Poland for the formation of an international union for nature protection, and establishment of the International Bureau was proposed as an interim measure.

⁸⁷ Büttikofer, 1946, p.42.

⁸⁸ Phillips was in the mining business. He was founder of Phillips Mine Supply Company in 1889 and became president of the company in 1906. He was especially interested in establishing state game preserves in hunting areas and was a member and President of the Board of Game Commissioners (1905–1924). His brother William was US Ambassador to Belgium.

⁸⁹ Trefethen, 1961.

⁹⁰ Anon., 1930.

⁹¹ Dammerman, 1929.

⁹² SPFE, 1933.

⁹³ Hingston, 1931.

⁹⁴ In 1932, Hingston presented his report in a lecture at the Colonial Institute in Amsterdam, presided over by van Tienhoven and attended by 400 people (SPFE, 1932).

⁹⁵ During this same period there was direct interaction between the South African and U.S. park movements. In 1930 R.H. Compton, Director of the National Botanic Gardens of South Africa toured the US, and in 1935 the International committee of the Boone & Crockett Club published a pamphlet on South African Wildlife conservation. South Africa and America shared a common design vision of linking urban centres with natural

landscapes via the railroad for an age of tourism where the camera replaced the gun (MacKenzie, 1988, p.264; see also Djuff, 1999).

⁹⁶ MacKenzie, 1988.

⁹⁷ SPFE, 1932.

⁹⁸ SPFE, 1932; Büttikofer, 1947.

⁹⁹ As a result of this conference Phillips realised that there was a basic need to compile present knowledge on extinction and vanishing species if the preservation of wildlife was to be intelligently planned. Through his position as chair of the American Committee for International Wildlife Protection he commissioned and encouraged the first such compilations for mammals of the Old and New World (Harper, 1942; Allen, 1945) and for birds (Greenway, 1958). Subsequently these formed the basis of IUCN Red Data Books that form an integral part of modern conservation planning.

¹⁰⁰ Coolidge was a young, and up-and-coming personality in the B&BC and American museum circles. He was assistant curator of mammals at the Museum of Comparative Zoology in Harvard University and had a special interest in gorillas, spending a year in Central Africa in 1928 with the Harvard Medical Expedition. As a result of his experience he was appointed in 1929 as leader of the prestigious Kelly-Roosevelt Expedition to Indochina, which brought him into the elite circles of the 'gentleman's friend' network. Kermit Roosevelt, president of the Boone & Crockett Club, was a fellow expedition member (though mainly travelling separately) and the expedition was facilitated by J. Delacour, chairman of the French committee for international nature preservation (Coolidge and Roosevelt, 1933).

¹⁰¹ Hayden, 1942. Professor Gruel, Secretary General of the Committee for the Protection of the Fauna and Flora of the Colonies was an assistant delegate of France, Dr J.M. Dershfeld, Director of the International Office for the Protection of Nature was a delegate of the Belgium government.

¹⁰² The Prince of Wales became patron of the Fauna Preservation Society in 1933 (SPFE, 1934).

¹⁰³ Reported in SPFE, 1933 p.58.

¹⁰⁴ MacKenzie, 1988, p.269.

¹⁰⁵ Caldwell, 1934; Hayden, 1942.

¹⁰⁶ SPFE, 1934.

¹⁰⁷ The Belgian Parks Institute shared offices in Brussels with the International Bureau from 1935–1940.

¹⁰⁸ Pelzers, 1994a, 1994b.

¹⁰⁹ The British did not send an official government delegate. The British delegation was led by SPFE.

¹¹⁰ This displaced Johann Büttikofer of Switzerland who had been acting general Secretary.

¹¹¹ SPFE, 1948.

¹¹² Rijksen, undated.

¹¹³ IUCN, 1988.

¹¹⁴ Prior to British rule, the colonial presence in the Indonesian archipelago comprised a few trading posts of the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) (Rijksen, 1990). Colonial rule by the Nederlands' government commenced with the London treaty of August 13, 1814.

¹¹⁵ Stresemann, 1975, p.136.

¹¹⁶ This became the Dutch Museum of Natural History in 1922.

- ¹¹⁷ Stresemann, 1975.
- ¹¹⁸ Vandenbosch, 1933.
- ¹¹⁹ Dr Vorderman, Head Inspector of the Government medical service, and M.E.G. Bartels the well known naturalist and manager of Pasir Datar tea estate had been trying to stop encroachment on the slopes of the mountain for some years (Rijksen, undated).
- ¹²⁰ Kehutanan, 1986.
- ¹²¹ The Director of s'Lands Plantentuin was in effect Minister of Agriculture and Director of Science for the colony as well as being neighbour and head gardener to the Governor-General.
- ¹²² Dammerman, 1938; Kehutanan, 1986; Rijksen, 1990.
- ¹²³ Dammerman, 1929 p.22.
- ¹²⁴ Anon.
- ¹²⁵ The campaign was active in both Europe and U.S.A. In England it led to the formation of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (1889) and in North America the National Association of Audubon Societies (1902).
- ¹²⁶ Gillard, 1969.
- ¹²⁷ Anon, 1916. It is puzzling why Koorders waited six years after his return from Holland to found the Association. One possibility, is that he felt a need to consolidate a body of support to shield himself from a vitriolic public attack by a colleague, C.A. Backer. Backer, a first class but plain-speaking botanist at the Herbarium, accused Koorders of publishing the 'worst Flora ever' and of wilfully misleading people (Backer, 1913). A year after Koorders established the Association, Backer formed his own Netherlands Indies Natural History Society. Few people were members of both clubs and the scientific community of Bogor was effectively split into two camps. Governor Idenburg was patron of the Association and Köningsberger a supporter.
- ¹²⁸ Kehutanan, 1986.
- ¹²⁹ The sites used to describe the various forest formations of Java in Koorders' *Flora of Java*.
- ¹³⁰ Dammerman, 1929.
- ¹³¹ Anon., 1925.
- ¹³² Pelzers, 1994a.
- ¹³³ Kies, 1936.
- ¹³⁴ Pelzers 1994a, 2000.
- ¹³⁵ Reported in Boomgaard, 1999, p.269. Kies presented a proposal to establish an autonomous government service to manage reserves on two occasions (1930–1931). Instead, the government charged K.W. Dammerman of the 's Lands Plantentuin with a token nature conservation service to provide advice to the forestry service (Rijksen, undated). Kies took on the presidency of the Dutch Committee after van Tienhoven's death in 1953.
- ¹³⁶ Dammerman returned to Holland in 1929.
- ¹³⁷ Dammerman, 1929, pp.17–18 The 4th Pacific Science Congress (1929) appointed a Standing Committee for the Protection of Nature in and around the Pacific. The chair was G. Elliot Smith, and committee members included F. Blondel (Indochina), Dammerman, van Tienhoven, and E.D. Merrill from Berkeley (Anon., 1930).
- ¹³⁸ Dammerman, 1938. These 17 sanctuaries are the basis of the present day Indonesia national park network, declared in 1982 at the World Parks' Congress in Bali.
- ¹³⁹ Pelzers, 1994a, 2000.
- ¹⁴⁰ Grove, 1987; Grove et al., 1998.

¹⁴¹ A third value that might be considered a 'definer' of conservationism is the so-called 'wilderness ethic', which was promoted by John Muir and the Sierra Club. This value or ethic is not discussed herein because it is mostly an American social value with less universal appeal, was not promoted by the 'gentleman's network' and has never entered Indonesia as a rationale for designating protected areas.

¹⁴² Anderson, 1983, p.12.

¹⁴³ Boomgaard, 1999.

¹⁴⁴ Said 1978, 1995.

¹⁴⁵ Boomgaard, 1999, p.284.

¹⁴⁶ E.g. Savage 1984; Anderson, 1987; MacKenzie, 1988; Grove et al., 1998.

¹⁴⁷ Procter, 1995.

¹⁴⁸ Lasswell, 1971. In a similar vein American psychologist, Abraham Maslow says that all customers are goal seekers who gratify needs by purchase and consumption and move up a five-stage hierarchy of needs: physiological (hunger and thirst), safety, social, self-esteem and self-realisation (Quoted in Carnall, 1999).

¹⁴⁹ Jepson, 2001.

¹⁵⁰ Notable examples include Lorentz National Park, in Irian Jaya, first designated in 1923 and Kayan Mentarang in East Kalimantan, established in 1996.

¹⁵¹ IUCN/UNEP/WWF, 1980.

¹⁵² Brandon et al., 1998.

REFERENCES

- Akeley, M.J. 1931. *Carl Akeley's Africa: The Account of the Akeley-Eastmann-Pomeroy Africa Hall Expedition*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.
- Allen, G.A. 1945. *Extinct and Vanishing Mammals of the New World*. New York: American Committee for International Wildlife Protection.
- Anderson, B. 1983 (reprinted 1991). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Anon. 'Cyclopedia of collectors'. *Flora Malesiana* 1: 292.
- Anon. 1916. *Jaarverslag over Januari 1914 t/m November 1916 (Annual Report)*. *Nederlandsch Indische Vereeniging tot Natuurbescherming*. Batavia: G. Kolf & Co.
- Anon. 1925. *Mededeeling* 1–6. *Nederlandsche Commissie voor Internationale Natuurbescherming Mededeelingen*.
- Anon. 1930. *Mededeeling* 7. *Nederlandsche Commissie voor Internationale Natuurbescherming Mededeelingen*.
- Backer, C.A. 1913. *Kritiek op de Exkursionsflora von Java (bearbeitet von Dr S.H. Koorders)*. Batavia: Privately published.
- Boomgaard, P. 1999. 'Oriental Nature, its Friends and its Enemies: Conservation of Nature in Late Colonial Indonesia, 1889–1949'. *Environment and History* 5: 257–292.
- Brandon, K., Redford, K.H. and Sanderson, S.E. 1998. *Parks in Peril: People, Politics and Protected Areas*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Burrow, J.W. 1966. *Evolution and Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Büttikofer, J. 1946. *Report on the Conference for the Protection of Nature*. Conference for the Protection of Nature. Basle: Swiss Library for the Protection of Nature.

- Büttikofer, J. 1947. *International Conference for the Protection of Nature : Proceedings, Resolutions and Reports*. International Conference for the Protection of Nature. Brunnen, June 28th–July 3rd 1947: Swiss Library for the Protection of Nature.
- Caldwell, K. 1934. 'The International Conference for the Protection of Fauna and Flora of Africa'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 22: 45–52.
- Carnall, C.A. 1999. *Managing Change in Organizations*. Third Edition. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Chapman, A. 1917. 'Frederick Courtney Selous'. *British Birds* 10: 200–205.
- Coolidge, H.J. and Roosevelt, T. 1933. *Three Kingdoms of Indo-China*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Conwentz, H. 1909. *The Care of Natural Monuments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Darwin, C. 1859 (reprinted 1985). *The Origin of Species*. Penguin, London
- Dammerman, K. W. 1929. *Preservation of Wildlife and Nature Reserves in the Netherlands Indies*. Fourth Pacific Science Congress, Bandung.
- Dammerman, K. W. (ed.) 1938. *Nature Protection in the Netherlands Indies*. Batavia: Department of Economic Affairs.
- Djuff, R. 1999. *High on a Windy Hill. The Story of the Prince of Wales Hotel*. Calgary, Alberta: Rocky Mountain Books.
- Down-to-Earth 2000. Special Issue on Regional Autonomy. *Down to Earth Newsletter* 46 (August 2000, available from www.gn.apc.org/dte).
- EIA/Telapak. 1999. *The Final Cut. Illegal Logging in Indonesia's Orang Utan Parks*. London, UK and Bogor, Indonesia: Environmental Investigation Agency and Telapak Indonesia.
- Fitter, R. and Scott, P. 1978. *The Penitent Butchers: The Fauna Preservation Society 1903–1978*. London: Collins.
- Gillard, T.E. 1969. *Birds of Paradise and Bower Birds*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Greenway, J. 1958. *Extinct and Vanishing Birds of the New World*. New York: American Committee for International Wildlife Protection.
- Grove, R. 1987. 'Early themes in African conservation: the Cape in the nineteenth century'. In *Conservation in Africa: People, Policies and Practice*, ed. D. Anderson and R. Grove. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grove, R., Damodaran, V. and Sangawan, S. (eds) 1998. *Nature and the Orient. The Environmental History of South and Southeast Asia*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Haraway, D. 1992. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race and Nature in the World of Modern Science*. London: Verso.
- Harper, F. 1942. *Extinct and Vanishing Mammals of the Old World*. New York: American Committee for International Wildlife Protection.
- Hayden, S.S. 1942. *The International Protection of Wildlife*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hellman, G.T. 1946. 'Profiles: The Great Aviculturist'. *The New Yorker* August 10th 7 17th:14–19;14–20.
- Hingston, R.G.W. 1931. 'Proposed British National Parks for Africa'. *Geographical Journal* 74: 401–28.
- Hobley, C.M.G. 1924. 'The Protection of Wild Life'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 20: 26–34.

- Hobley, C.M.G. 1933. 'The London Convention of 1900'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 20: 33–49.
- Hornaday, W.T. 1914. *Wild Life Conservation in Theory and Practice*. New Haven and Oxford: Yale University Press and Oxford University Press.
- IUCN/UNEP/WWF 1980. *World Conservation Strategy. Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development*. IUCN, Gland.
- IUCN 1988. '40 Years in Conservation'. *IUCN Bulletin (Special issue)* 19: 7–12.
- IUCN 1993. *1993 United Nations List of National Parks and Protected Areas*. Gland: World Conservation Union (IUCN).
- Jepson, P. 2001. *Biodiversity and Protected Area Policy: Why is it Failing in Indonesia?* Unpubl. Doctoral Thesis. University of Oxford.
- Jepson, P. and Canney, S. 2001. 'Biodiversity Hotspots: Hot for What?' *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 10: 225–227.
- Jepson, P., Jarvie, J.K., Mckinnon, K. and Monk, K.A. 2001. 'The end for Indonesia's lowland forests?' *Science* 292: 859–61.
- Jepson, P. and Whittaker, R.J. 2002. 'Ecoregions in Context: A Critique with Special Reference to Indonesia'. *Conservation Biology* 16: 42–57.
- Jepson, P., Momberg, F. and van Noord, H. 2002. 'A Review of the Efficacy of the Protected Area System of East Kalimantan, Indonesia'. *Natural Areas Journal* 22: 28–42.
- Johnston, H.H. 1906. 'Introduction', in G.G. Shillings, *With Flashlight and Rifle*. London; Hutchinson.
- Kehutanan 1986. *Sejarah Kehutanan Indonesia I: Periode Pra Sejarah – Tahun 1942–1983*. Jakarta: Departemen Kehutanan R.I.
- Kies, C.H.M.H. 1936. 'Nature Protection in the East Indies'. *American Committee for International Wildlife Protection, Special Publication* 8: 11–23.
- Lasswell, H.D. 1971. *A Pre-View of Policy Sciences*. New York: Elsevier Publishing.
- Leopold, A. 1933. *Game Management*. New York & London: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Lowe, P.D. 1983. 'Values and Institutions in the History of British Nature Conservation'. In *Conservation in Perspective*, ed. A. Warren and F.B. Goldsmith. London: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- MacKenzie, J.M. 1988. *The Empire of Nature. Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Matagne, P. 1998. 'The Politics of Conservation in France in the 19th Century'. *Environment and History* 4: 359–67.
- Mayer, E. 1986. 'In Memoriam: Jean (Theodore) Delacour'. *The Auk* 103: 603–605.
- Milanova, E.V. and Kushlin, A.V. 1993. *World map of present-day landscapes: an explanatory note*. Moscow: UNEP & Moscow State University.
- McCarthy, J.F. 2001. 'Wild Logging': The Rise and Fall of Logging Networks and Biodiversity Conservation Projects on Sumatra's Rainforest Frontier. *Occasional Paper No 31*. Bogor: CIFOR.
- McManus, P. 1999. 'Histories of Forestry: Ideas, Networks and Silences'. *Environment and History* 5: 185–208.
- Muir, J. 1992. *The Eight Wilderness-Discovery Books*. London: Diadem Books.
- Norton, B.G. 1994. 'Thoreau's Insect Analogies: or, Why Environmentalists Hate Mainstream Economists' *Environmental Ethics* 20: 235–249.
- Peluso, N.L. 1992. *Rich Forests, Poor People: Resource Control and Resistance on Java*. Berkely, C.A: University of California Press.

- Pelzers, E. 1994a. 'Inventaris van de archieven van de Nederlandse Commissie voor Internationale Natuurbescherming, de Stichting tot Internationale Natuurbescherming en het Office International pour la Protection de la Nature (1908–) 1925–1989 (–1992)' (Text: English translation by J.A.A. Boddens Hosang 2000, History of the Netherlands Commission for International Nature Protection). *Ned. Comm. Intern. Natuurbescherming Med.* 29 & 29A:
- Pelzers, E. 1994b. Inventaris van de archieven van de Nederlandse Commissie voor Internationale Natuurbescherming, de Stichting tot Internationale Natuurbescherming en het Office International pour la Protection de la Nature (1908–) 1925–1989 (–1992) (Annexes). *Ned. Comm. Intern. Natuurbescherming Med.* 29: 65–102.
- Persall, R. 1969. *The Worm in the Bud: the World of Victorian Sexuality*. London: Wiedenfeld and Nicholson.
- Procter, J.D. 1995. 'Whose Nature? The Contested Moral Terrain of Ancient Forests'. In *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, ed. W. Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Reader, J. 1997. *Africa: a Biography of a Continent*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Rijksen, H. 1990. *Indonesian Nature Conservation; A historical Overview*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Rijksen, H. undated, *Introduction to Nature Conservation, with emphasis on Indonesia*. Bogor: School of Environmental Conservation Management.
- Rothschild, M. 1979. *Nathaniel Charles Rothschild 1877–1923*. Cambridge, privately published by the author, printed by Cambridge University Press.
- Runte, A. 1979. *National Parks: The American Experience*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Said, E.W. 1978 (reprinted 1995 with new afterword). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Savage, V.R. 1984. *Western Impressions of Nature and Landscape in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Sellars, R.W. 1997. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*. New Haven & New York: Yale University Press.
- Sheail, J. 1975. *Nature in Trust: The History of Nature Conservation in Britain*. Glasgow and London: Blackie.
- Sim, J. 1864. 'Natural History'. *The Naturalist* 1: 3–6.
- SPFE. 1924. 'The Late Mr E.N. Buxton'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire*: 23–25.
- SPFE. 1927. 'Minutes of Meeting, 10th November 1926'. *Journal of the Society for the Preservation of Fauna in the Empire*. 7: 11.
- SPFE. 1932. 'Report of Annual General Meeting'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 16: 8.
- SPFE. 1933. 'Minutes of the Annual General Meeting, 13th March 1933'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 19: 11.
- SPFE. 1934. 'National Parks Act of India'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 21: 55–59.
- SPFE. 1948. 'International Union for the Protection of Nature'. *Journal of the Society for Preservation of Fauna in the Empire* 58: 12–17.
- Stresemann, E. 1975. *Ornithology: from Aristotle to the Present*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Terborgh, J. 1999. *Requiem for Nature*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press/Shearwater Books.

- Thomas, K. 1984. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500–1800*. London: Penguin.
- Trefethen, J.B. 1961. *Crusade for Wildlife*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: The Stackpole Company.
- Turner, J. 1980. *Reckoning with the Beast: Animals, Pain and Humanity in the Victorian Mind*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Vandenbosch, A. 1933. *The Dutch East Indies: its Government Problems and Politics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Who's Who* 1998. *Who's Who on CD-Rom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.