



AIBR

**Revista de Antropología  
Iberoamericana**

www.aibr.org

**VOLUMEN 6  
NÚMERO 1**

Enero - Abril 2013

Pp. 27 - 54

Madrid: Antropólogos  
Iberoamericanos en Red.

ISSN: 1695-9752

E-ISSN: 1578-9705

## **Discursive natures in protected areas**

**José M. Valcuende**

**Victoria Quintero**

**José A. Cortés**

Pablo de Olavide University

**Received:** 10.06.2010

**Accepted:** 01.11.2010

**DOI:** 10.11156/aibr.060103e

*La versión original en español de este artículo está disponible en la página web de la revista*

**SUMMARY:**

Local populations living in conservation-targeted areas often contest the environmental policies affecting them. This triggers conflicts between different stakeholders, who tend to activate discourses in which the category of “nature” becomes instrumental in legitimizing their dissimilar position toward conservation policies. This paper examines not only these different discursive constructions of nature, but also the connections between them and ideas of community, identity and belonging. To do so, we focus on a particular case: the Cabo de Gata-Níjar Natural Park, in Andalusia, southern Spain.

**KEY WORDS:**

Conservation, nature, environmental protection, discourse, representation, legitimacy, discursive communities.

## Introduction

The analysis of different ways of understanding and conceptualizing nature has historically been one of the main subject themes in Anthropology. In recent decades, following the rise of the so-called New Ecologies (Biersack, 1999), this field has been almost entirely monopolized by the query of the Western nature-culture dualism (Descola and Pálsson, 1996; Escobar, 1999; Ingold, 2000; Descola, 2005; Santamarina, 2008). Among other achievements, the questioning of this worldview has enabled us to approach the ‘myth’ of nature (Diegues, 1994) as a discursive category rather than a given reality. This has been instrumental in gaining not only a better understanding of other cultures (Descola and Pálsson, 1996) but also of ourselves (Glacken, 1976; Thomas, 1983; Narotzky and Millán, 1987; Pálsson, 1996; Ruiz et al., 2009). This is due to the fact that those within the Western cultural setting rely on the nature-culture duality to classify, order and hierarchically organize, living and nonliving things, as well as to justify their actions and relations with the environment. This is especially evident in the separation that we establish between “natural” spaces (those that should be protected) and “non-natural” spaces, where exploitative logics are allowed to operate (West et al., 2006). But how do some spaces come to be called “natural,” and what does this mean for the people who live there?

To understand the spectacular expansion of conservation policies and ‘Natural’ Protected Areas in recent decades we have to take into account the socioeconomic changes that have affected rural areas in Europe over the same period of time. The agrarian crisis, the rise of a service economy, and the assimilation of “the rural” as a recreational destination for city dwellers, together have led to the establishment of Natural Protected Areas, where the contemplative consumption of nature converges with the idea of environmental preservation. This phenomenon involves the introduction of conservationist logics that criminalize certain economic practices, while they promote new forms of supposedly sustainable land use (especially “quality” tourism, such as natural, cultural and rural tourism). Several studies have shown how these changes sometimes negatively affect conservation-targeted areas’ local populations. They have also proven that the idea of society as a realm apart from nature and as a force that threatens natural values, underpins and informs conservation policies, both in countries central to the world-system as well as belonging to the periphery (Escalera, 1993; Diegues, 1994; Brockington, 2002; Arruda, 1999; Guha, 2000; Anderson and Berglund, 2003; Compagnon, 2005; Coca, 2008; Valcuende and Cruz, 2009). As a result, these policies

tend to alienate local populations from their surroundings (Coca and Quintero, 2006). Although the resulting situation may differ according to the historical and geographical context, the outcomes often include:

- The displacement of people living in zones of exceptional environmental value.
- Limits on certain forms of land use considered harmful to the environment, and the intensification of other, new uses.
- Limits on the access that new populations have to these conservation areas.

Furthermore, the introduction of conservation policies in Natural Protected Areas has other consequences: the appearance of new social actors, the reworking of power relations linked to the redefinition of resources, and the subsequent development of new strategies in order to justify and/or contest new and customary forms of land use (Escobar, 2000; Mels, 2002; Sletto, 2002; Anderson and Berglund, 2003). These issues often trigger conflicts between global and local interests as well as between managers and stakeholders.

One of the key aspects that require a careful examination is the important role that different discourses about “nature” play in relation to these conflicts. While it is the idea of nature conveyed by the scientific discourse that warrants technocrats and politicians to intervene in the management of conservation areas (Milton, 2002), it is by appeal to quite different narratives of nature that local people contest such policies. In this sense, we should keep in mind that local actors are not passive agents (Escobar, 2000) but rather play an active role in opposing conservation policies, while appropriating and re-signifying environmental narratives with respect to their own interests (Sletto, 2002; Low and Lawrence-Zuñiga, 2003). It is also important to note that environmental discourses are rarely articulated without reference to ideas of community, value and belonging.

In order to analyze these phenomena we have selected one conservation area in Andalusia, southern Spain, which we take to be emblematic: the *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* Natural Park. Our goal is to explore the connections between conservation conflicts, different views of nature and different forms of collective representation. We depart from the idea that discourses about nature — which become essential to justifying certain land uses and practices in Protected Areas — involve particular views on the environment, natural resources, land-use rights and even the very idea of “community.” In this sense, we concur with the idea that process-

es of collective identification articulate themselves not only in relation to the various groups that interact within a given social context, but also in relation to the environment that constitutes these groups' socioeconomic, symbolic and affective basis. As we shall see, behind these discourses and representations of nature a range of economic logics come into play, sometimes generating confrontation.

This paper<sup>1</sup> draws on the ethnographic research that was carried out by us in different periods between 2003 and 2009 at the Cabo de Gata-Níjar Natural Park. We relied primarily on participant-observation<sup>2</sup>, as well as on in-depth and semi-structured interviews (including more than 100 interviews of the various stakeholders and social actors involved)<sup>3</sup>. We structured our interviews along biographical lines<sup>4</sup>. This was done as an attempt to study how people understand and position themselves regarding the introduction of conservation policies by reference to their own life experiences. In this way, we also sought to examine how they discursively redefine their relationship to the natural world. We also carried out interviews with key actors, selected on the basis of their authority in the economic, political and social fabric of the area. This qualitative study did not attempt to measure (which is to say, quantify) the degree of acceptance or rejection of conservation policies within the Park. Instead, we ultimately wished to highlight the heterogeneity of environmental discourses involved here, and their interaction with the idea of community. Such discourses, following the economic logics that have shaped these social spaces, have taken on a definitively polarized quality.

---

1. This text has benefited from Susana Narotzky's input (Universidad de Barcelona) as well as that of Gavin Smith (University of Toronto), Miguel Alexiades (University of Kent) and Esteban Ruiz (Universidad Pablo de Olavide). We are grateful for their contributions and commentary. We also thank, especially, all those people tied to the Park who have, in sharing their stories, helped us carry out this research.

2. During the research period, we carried out observations in different population centers, focusing on everyday social contexts as well as unusual ritual events and work situations. Two of the researchers visited the area sporadically, while one of us lived there for about a year over separate periods in three different towns: Pozo de los Frailes, Rodalquilar and Fernán Pérez.

3. The first phase of our fieldwork was carried out with funding from the Ministry of Education and Science, through the Proyecto I+D+i, "Reimagining the environment in relation to cultural tourism in Andalusia: Local actors, economic agents, administration and tourists" (Ref. 4/SOCI-06161); in the second phase we received support from the Council of Andalusia's Advisory Board on Innovation, Science and Business, through its Proyecto de Excelencia "Tourism, environmental renovation and sustainability in protected natural areas of Andalusia: Socio-ecological resilience, social participation and collective identities" (Ref. P06-RNM-02139).

4. For more details on life-history methodology see Pujadas (2002); Río and Valcuende (2007).

## A Protected Area in eastern Almería

The *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* Natural Park is a coastal Protected Area located in the southeast of the Iberian Peninsula, within the Region of Andalusia. The Park's boundaries intersect three municipalities — Almería, Níjar and Carboneras, all included within the Almería Province —. There are more than 5,000 people currently living in the area, scattered across small towns and farmsteads<sup>5</sup>.

For centuries, this peripheral borderland was used for grazing, logging and salt extraction. In the 19th century, the area experienced significant changes due to the rise and fall of mining activity in the Almería Province, the shifting demand for natural resources such as needle grass<sup>6</sup>, the enclosure of common lands, and changing patterns of population growth (Provansal and Molina, 1991; García and García, 1996/2007; Sánchez 1981/1996/1999; Góngora, 2004). This led to a mode of production based on subsistence farming and shepherding, combining dry farming with the breeding of livestock — mainly sheep, goats and pigs (Provansal and Molina, 1991) — a mode of production that would last until the 1960s.

Aware that this agropastoral system of production failed to meet basic needs, smallholders had to find supplementary means of existence with wage labor in the forestry and mining industry (Provansal and Molina, 1991). At the same time, on the coast, fishing centers underwent a development process marked by substantial ups and downs, depending on whether the conditions for shoreline fishing were more or less favorable. The factors creating this situation included the exhaustion of domestic fisheries, difficulties accessing Moroccan waters and the industrialization of the fishing activity (Compán, 1977; Siches, 1991/1998). The climatic, geographic and social particularities of the area hold the key to understanding the problems that local people have had in reproducing their lifestyles in recent decades. Chief among these particularities are the decidedly dry climate and the scarcity of connections with more developed power centers. Another determining factor is the unequal access to resources locals have historically faced in an extremely hierarchical local society, characterized by a dominant minority of large landowners on the one hand and a subaltern minority of smallholders and day laborers on the other. The result has been a slow but persistent migration toward other regions over the better part of the 20th century (Provansal and Molina, 1991).

---

5. Source: Plan de Ordenación de los Recursos Naturales (2008).

6. (Trans.) Also, esparto, or *Macrobloa tenacissima*. A grass common in southern Spain and North Africa, used for crafts and as fiber in high-quality paper making.

In the early 1960s, the disappearance of complementary activities — especially the closing of the Rodalquilar mine and the decline of needle grass exports — caused the agropastoral complex to undergo a definitive crisis. Most farming lands and farmsteads were abandoned as emigration became almost the only alternative for many local inhabitants (Compán, 1985; Provansal and Molina, 1990/1991; García and García, 2007). However, at almost exactly the same moment as this agropastoral crisis was taking place, other areas of Almería Province were experiencing what has come to be known as the “Almerian economic miracle” (Sánchez and Fernández, 2003).

The development of intensive, irrigated agriculture in plastic polytunnels would come to mark the final 30 years of the 20th century, becoming one of the main icons of this economic “miracle” (Hernández, 1987; Provansal and Molina, 1987/1990). Mass tourism also grew during that time, especially along the Province’s western coastal region (Aznar, 2000; Rodríguez, 1995). Through these new activities the region once characterized by low productivity became one of Europe’s most productive areas, with one of the highest income rates (Compán, 1985; Fernández and Egea, 1991; Sánchez and Fernández, 2003).

Small farmers gradually transformed themselves into polytunnel entrepreneurs, pushed along by the economic development policies of the Franco dictatorship, as well as with supplementary incomes provided by temporary emigration (Provansal and Molina, 1987). They were so successful that they soon required the hiring of waged laborers beyond the family unit (Provansal and Molina, 1990). By overcoming poverty, these people acquired a new social status, though not without difficult readjustments (Rodríguez, 2003). Agricultural companies have been growing in size ever since, and have attracted an increasing influx of outside investors seeking short-term profits. The area’s migratory patterns have become inverted, leading to a striking increase in population. Most fertile farm lands have been transformed into polytunnels<sup>7</sup>, bringing with

---

7. According to Hernández (1987), by 1968 already 6,800 hectares were being cultivated by using irrigation practices, primarily by farming on a sandy substrate. Between 1968 and 1984, the total surface area of sanded farms declined more than 50 percent, to 3,145 hectares, while polytunnels jumped from 30 hectares to nearly 11,500. This shift began in the rural setting of Campo de Dalías, and expanded into other areas, such as the Comarca del Bajo Andarax, the Campo de Níjar and the Bajo Almanzora, as well as in other coastal areas of the Granada and Murcia Provinces. By 1984, there were 33 hectares of sanded farms and 74 hectares of polytunnels in Bajo Almanzora, while in Campo de Níjar and Bajo Andarax there was a combined total of 2,153 hectares of sanded farms and 1,016 hectares of polytunnels. By 2008, in Níjar alone, 2,368 hectares had been dedicated to tomato cultivation in polytunnels. (Source: Statistics Institute of Andalusia, 2008).

them a whole series of new socio-environmental problems: the intensive use of pesticides and fertilizers, groundwater pollution, overexploitation of water and sand resources, startling population growth, rapid accumulation of wealth and high levels of illegal immigration from African countries, all of which has led to a worrisome exploitation of workers and housing shortages among the most marginal sectors of society (Carmona, Carrasco and Fernández-Revuelta, 1993; Martín, Castaño and Rodríguez, 1999).

It was in this context that the *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* Natural Park was established, with the aim of protecting this area from the pernicious ecological effects of intensified development in the agriculture and tourism sectors. The Council of Andalusia, which administers the region, opted to limit certain land uses and practices considered environmentally harmful, while trying to promote new, environmentally friendly activities. The Council established limits and prohibitions on intensive agriculture as well as on urban growth, associated as it was with the increase in mass tourism. Non-intensive farming and herding as well as inshore fishing — even though planners do not always consider such practices harmful (and often view them, in some ways, as beneficial) — also became subject to stiff regulatory measures and control within the Park. These limits and restrictions have promoted, in turn, the development of ecotourism and nature tourism.

In order to understand the origin of these changes in land uses within Cabo de Gata we need to take into account another extremely important phenomenon. Beginning in the 1970s, as the farming, herding, mining and fishing populations declined, more and more outsiders began settling in the area, coming from cities elsewhere in Spain and other European countries — including Germany, Austria, France and Switzerland. Strongly influenced by alternative ideals of ecological balance, refuge, tranquility and cultural preservation (Castro and Guirado, 1995), these new residents arrived in search of an “alternative” lifestyle detached from the urban world. Upon arriving, they created pressure groups, lobbying with experts and scientists who, from an academic and intellectual perspective, were striving to valorize and protect this space. Precisely these social sectors were the ones who benefited the most from the application of protectionist policies.

The aforementioned changes, and particularly the conservation policy introduced in the Park have had a significant social impact in the area. Local youth have for the most part left the Park, lured away to neighboring areas by the prospect of intensive agriculture and urban development. What remains of the local population within the conservation zone, aside



from a high proportion of retirees, are mainly a small subset of farmers, livestock breeders and fishermen who carry out non-intensive activities. Along with these, it is worth noting that many locals have left those activities for the service sector and construction industry in towns such as San José, Agua Amarga, Las Negras and San Miguel de Cabo de Gata<sup>8</sup>.

Likewise, these social transformations have also affected power relations and political hierarchies. Today, the regional and central government exert direct authority through the mentioned conservation policies. Experts and scientists have acquired an important role in territorial planning and in determining land-use practices. What is more, the exurban foreign population has fully coalesced into a highly influential group, mainly dedicated to ecotourism and nature tourism as well as other activities such as arts; with access to local, national and international networks (NGOs, professional associations...)

The changes and transformations that have taken place in the *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* Natural Park cannot be de-contextualized from those adhering to conservation policies across Europe. These policies have sought to rebalance land use among centers of high productivity and peripheral areas reserved for leisure, while revalorizing those areas previously subject to intense marginalization or population flight. Such areas, in turn, offset the externalities of intensified production in other regions (Baker, Milton and Yearly, 1994; Provansal, 2003). However, in contrast with most conservation-targeted areas, the twin logics of protection and exploitation simultaneously appear, in this case, in a single and relatively small area. On one hand, we are witnessing the recognition of “natural values” in regard to this space and a concurrent commitment to sustainable development; on the other hand, we also see sharp growth in intensive agriculture and mass tourism in the surrounding area. As such, the Park has become a kind of “island” surrounded by tourist resorts and thousands of hectares of polytunnels, comprising what is currently known as the “plastic sea”<sup>9</sup>.

---

8. Data on the socioeconomic composition of this population is not broken down by population center in statistical sources. For this reason, we have based our description on analyses available in the Plan de Ordenación de los Recursos Naturales (2008), the Plan de Desarrollo Sostenible del Parque Natural Cabo de Gata-Níjar (2004), and the contrasts observed in our fieldwork. We correlated our direct observations with others available from Social Services, municipal agencies and the Provincial Tourism Board of Trustees, among other sources. In any case, in order to understand the social and economic dynamics of those populations occupying the park one must also understand patterns of employment, kinship and residence, as well as political affiliation, in relation to other towns of Níjar and Carboneras; elements we consider crucial.

9. This term refers to the vast extension of cultivation in polytunnels.

Today we can observe marked contrasts between the Natural Park and its surroundings. A region of *laissez-faire* economy and farming and tourism growth coexists alongside enclosed areas characterized by special land-use regulations and conservation policies. In this situation it is no surprise to encounter contradictory narratives regarding the Natural Park's establishment; the "naturalness" of which is reaffirmed by some and called into question by others.

In the following pages we analyze how different groups both identify themselves and represent their counterparts while disputing land use rights and the management of natural resources within the Park; but more than anything what interests us is how these groups connect their representations with differing environmental views. For some people (scientists, conservation NGOs, new residents, ecotourists) this is an area where one might still find extraordinary landscapes, which remain untamed, unspoiled and almost completely unchanged. For other people (fishermen, herders, polytunnel farmers) this is an area ecologically threatened by the very human inaction imposed by the conservation policy. These different narratives and diverse ways of legitimizing land-use practices reflect within this space the relationship between the concept of nature and the "us-others" dichotomy.

## Narratives on nature: Constructing legitimacies

At the discursive level, *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* has become an emblem of conservation efforts both in Spain and Andalusia. From the perspective of both central and regional governments, its environmental singularity stands out, especially because of the exceptional desert ecosystems, volcanic geology, unusual vegetation and well-preserved marine ecosystems. These environmental narratives merge with those promoted by the new exurban residents, who emphasize the aesthetic value of the place: the distinctiveness of the light, colors and textures, the spectacular and unspoiled landscape... In a short period of time, these different narratives have been key in constructing the idea of a new "natural paradise" that ought to be protected<sup>10</sup>, as well as in promoting new land uses, mostly under the banner of 'sustainable tourism'. However, these narratives have been strongly contested by an important local population subset, which raises a whole series of questions about conservation goals and

---

10. Protecting a place means not only preserving plant and animal species, but also implies the creation of a "cultural image," — a "composition" that can be constructed as part of the national and local semiology (Cruces, 1998), turning these spaces into ideal sites for consumption.

procedures: What should the remit of the Park policy be? Which should be its boundaries? What should be protected and how should it be protected? And who must benefit from this process?

## Representing “paradise”

The aforementioned process that led to the construction of a ‘natural paradise’ in *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* occurred in parallel with the migratory exodus that affected this area over the greater part of the 20th century. By the ’60s and ’70s, the estates and houses of *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* had lost most economic value — a fact that attracted new people, relatively well off and who were in search of a new and ‘authentic’ life in a remote and undeveloped area. Yet what these people took as signs of authenticity re-imagined in a romantic light were in fact the remnants of the hardships of past life conditions. For these newcomers the land represented a lost Arcadia, an idyllic, unspoiled paradise, as it were, at a good price:

I was looking for a special bit of land in the south of Austria. [...] As I’m a woman of ’68, I wanted to live an alternative life. I found a country farmer there [...], but he was asking for an amount three times larger than what I could afford. So I was so sad... I couldn’t believe it. Then a friend told me: come with us, my sister has a boyfriend who has a little house in Las Negras. [...] We got a car and we arrived in Las Negras at three o’clock in the morning. There was a full moon and you could see the mountains and the sea and I liked it instantly. The next day we set out for a stroll and I think it was the first time we went down the path along the coast from Las Negras to El Playazo. It was a peaceful place, untouched, and I fell in love on the spot [68-year-old Austrian woman, now a Park resident].

These travelers and tourists eventually became new residents. They re-interpreted the landscape by way of their artistic references and alternative ideals. The establishment of the Park, ultimately, served to valorize and officialize this re-signification of the environment. Today the Natural Park, despite its being the result of human intervention, to these people represents, not only a “truly” natural place, but also a place where they can enjoy privileges that are hard to come by in other contexts. For them the idea of nature conservation enables the preservation of a paradise, *their paradise*, at the same time as it attracts new clients to the various rural inns and hotels that have opened up. As it turns out, many of these travelers escaping the urban jungle transformed themselves into ecotour-

ism and nature tourism entrepreneurs.

The protectionist logic held by Park managers and policy-makers resonates with the logic of these new social sectors. From an administrative perspective, what is discursively fundamental is protecting a vision of “nature” coterminous with profitability under new (political and economic) criteria. In the logic of the new Park residents, especially the tourism entrepreneurs, profitable activities must be permitted, so long as they do not destabilize the balance between human beings and the environment:

Within the limits of a Natural Park’s proper development, we find, in fact, that there are opportunities to develop tourism activities that preserve the ethnographic patrimony and are based on the principles of conservation, respect and integration of nature ... these are the principles that inspired the creation of the Park and what we found was an opportunity we could work with [55-year-old man from Galicia, now a business owner in the Park].

For those who support these similar logics the legitimacy of the means by which this space comes to be protected is given, precisely, by its intrinsic natural value, recognized as such in the technical-scientific discourse that underpins the Park policy and which is sanctioned in the larger political discourse. In this way, *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* transcends its value as a local space, becoming a public asset at national, continental and global levels; a fact aided by the various international awards and recognitions the area has received to date<sup>11</sup>. In this discourse, the Park’s natural values belong to “everyone”; local interests thus acquire a secondary position when it comes to decision-making.

---

11. In 1989, authorities established a bird sanctuary known as ZEPA (Zona de Especial Protección para las Aves). Salinas, in Cabo de Gata, was designated as a RAMSAR site in the same year and thus recognized internationally as important wetlands. In 1995 the area was also recognized as a marine reserve by the Spanish Central Government. And in 1997, the Park was designated as a Biosphere Reserve. In 2001, it was recognized for its importance in relation to the Mediterranean, under title of ZEPIM (Zona Especialmente Protegida de Importancia Mediterránea); and in 2006, by UNESCO’s Geopark program to protect and promote European geological heritage, which also identifies areas of interest for archaeological, ecological, historical and cultural reasons. In 2006, the area was declared a Site of Communitarian Interest (LIC, by its Spanish acronym), making it part of the Natura Network 2000. The Park is also home to 95 designated cultural heritage sites, many of these protected officially as Cultural Assets and registered in Spain’s General Catalog of Historical Heritage. Since 2006, the Park has acquired the ISO 140001 status, an environmental certification covering the entire management area (López and Pons, 2007:53).

On this basis a certain idea of local tradition is also valorized. The memories of the hard life that the local population went through until recent decades are transformed into an idealized past in which people knew how to live in balance with nature. In this way, just as the desert environment has been idealized as an unspoiled paradise, so too has emerged an idealized vision of local people that is, to a large extent, fictitious:

Traditional hydraulic systems developed in Campos de Níjar provide a sublime example of how the residents of a hostile and arid environment, driven by necessity, not only managed to survive with scarce and weak sources of spring water, but were able to settle in places that seemed on the face of it inhabitable, doing so by boosting and perfecting methods for groundwater extraction, thus making use of what in other areas would be considered adverse weather conditions (strong storms and downpours) (Muñoz, 2001).

However, contrary to the romantic vision of those residents that no longer exist, today's farmers and fishermen are represented as the paradise's enemies: they are indeed portrayed as having a materialistic and production-oriented mentality, lacking education, lacking long-term vision, having little knowledge of the environment... It is no coincidence that new residents and Park officers in particular are the ones who idealize the area's history. The idea of farmers or fishermen (so long as they are located in the past) reinforces precisely the uniqueness of this space; but it is quite another thing when farmers or fishermen (located in the present) aspire to farm under plastic polytunnels or to build new highways.

The anti-park groups are, logically, the supporters of urbanism<sup>12</sup> and polytunnel agriculture. [...] They don't get the real situation. Whenever they see on TV the image of a pimp in a sweet ride and a blonde in a bikini, they say: this is what the Park supporters have taken from us. So just imagine the mentality [45-year-old woman from Madrid, now a Park business owner].

A key element to understand the aforementioned issues is that an important segment of these new inhabitants have chosen to live in this space for its special qualities. Thus, they expect the idealized images of *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* to stay unchanged so that the paradise remains as it was when 'purchased', and just as it should in order to be 'sold'. The positions and needs of part of the local population collide head-on with this static vision of nature, especially valued by some owners of tourism busi-

---

12. This refers to the construction industry.

nesses and by Park managers, who consider the preservation of nature as their main priority:

Some of us want to organize a meeting with other business people to improve things, but it's hard because in the local mentality modern life is seen only in the form of a straight highway from here to Rodalquilar — the kind of thing that doesn't work well with a natural park [65-year-old woman from Germany, now a Park business owner].

## Representing “hell”

If newcomers consider the area their “chosen place,” for many farmers, livestock breeders and fishermen, it is the place where they belong, an unquestioned fact not related to choice; as they see it, “it's just the way things are, period.” For these local groups, people in this area have traditionally survived by figuring out how to control and store water, appropriately channeling it, in an unending struggle against the frequent droughts. Only in this way have they managed to establish small garden plots, resting places for livestock to quench their thirst, small reservoirs for drinking and washing. The work of constructing and maintaining watermills, reservoirs and cultivation terraces are remembrances of that hard life.

From this point of view, the region's aridness — what “foreigners” consider to be its true nature — is not nature at all. For them this land must be transformed, whether through technological advances to collect and store water (with canals, drip systems, desalination, etc.), or through the development of a conventional tourism industry. These are positive transformations, in this discourse, now inhibited due to limitations imposed by the conservation policies. What this discourse emphasizes is that the truly natural — life itself — is associated with human activity. What is stressed here is the role farmers, for example, play in conserving this space:

[When I] worked here and tilled the earth there was life and there were animals. There were birds here that we raised... all of that has disappeared. The council [the regional administration] wants nothing to be touched, but what I think happens in that case is that the land, what little there is, dies out. [...] Because as soon as you start farming those darn little white birds show up... [45-year-old man, a native resident and farmer].

In the discourse of local farmers and fishermen, the region's age-old plight is reproduced in a system of power relations that has historically relegated the "local" population to the status of bystanders in the use and management of their own land. For farmers, fishermen and livestock breeders, the ecological features that represent hunger, poverty and the rupture of community due to migration, are exactly the ecological features that Park Officers and newcomers are trying to protect.

They say this is the prettiest, the prettiest thing of all... but you can't live off pretty stuff! The poor people who were born here, well, we can't eat pretty stuff, huh? And then that idea of leaving everything for... for tourists to enjoy, let's say, to see things as they were, right? And why haven't they been here in my lifetime and at my side? [If they had gone through that] now they would tell me — the ones who moved in here, the ones who came [... they would tell me] whether they would have left or whether they would have done what I did. And I don't swallow that bull! No way... that doesn't work for me, that doesn't work for me! [70-year-old man, a native resident, farmer and livestock breeder].

A good example of these conflicts is related to the development of poly-tunnel agriculture. Many of the local people who own land within the Park have noted that this activity has been on the rise in the Park surroundings and they wonder: "Why should we be the ones to pay for environmental concerns? Why is it that beyond the park everything is allowed?"

This is not helping, this amounts to killing some people so you can give others something to eat [...] They say: "we're going to protect Almería so we can do business in some other province," and that's no good. [...] The Park managers and experts don't care about the landowners. [...] My family, my father, was from Pozo de los Frailes, we have land over there. Well it's all been sacrificed! [...] The truth is that it drives us mad, that there are people out there making use of our land... that they're making use of what belongs to our families — everything that our dearly departed fought for and worked for without the benefit of what a lot of those people [the Park officers] have today, and we see that there are people that are taking advantage of what our ancestors worked for, so that others might benefit from it. That's what gives us the urge to be confrontational, to say: "Let's fight them" [40-year-old farmer, a native resident]

Discrimination suffered in relation to other areas outside the park's boundaries is a focal point in the narrative of those that consider themselves the "natives". In other areas, local people are allowed to develop polytunnel agriculture as well as mass tourism. But that is not all: the nature that locals deem worth protecting is a "green" nature, made up of trees, garden plots, water... as well as polytunnels, because they all give "life" to this place. This is the very same life that they sought after during decades by working, farming and transforming this land in order to overcome its desert conditions; conditions that today are the object of conservation policies. As such, they wonder: "How can you call a desert 'nature'?"

All this protection is a bad thing. That's what I say, because it's one thing to see things from the officer view and another thing to see them in practice. Because those of us who are from here are seeing that everything is lost, everything extinguished, if there's no movement, no life. If you have polytunnels, for example, the birds make a meal of your tomatoes. They eat up all the ripe ones. That wouldn't be so bad... The thing is, for aesthetic reasons, people don't want those plastic polytunnels. [...] But people come here [...] people from Madrid, to buy some tomatoes, [...] and they ask me: Where do you grow them? And I tell them: look, over there in the polytunnel... And they tell me: Oh, well I'd like to see that! And when they see the polytunnel, the tomatoes, all the plants there, the sand on the ground, it's not very dirty in the polytunnel... And they say: And what's the sand for? Well the sand is for retaining the humidity, so you don't have to irrigate so much, so you use less water. And they're amazed. But even still what they have stuck in their heads are all these images they've been filled with: that this is practically a nuclear power plant, poisonous and all that [45-year-old farmer, a native resident]

## **Narratives of "us" and "others": Redefining identities**

The issues highlighted in previous sections are not exceptional. It is common for diverse territories as well as different representations of the landscape to converge on a single space. The problem arises when incompatible territorialization processes come together in a single space, that is, when the imposition of a given territorial logic excludes other forms of resource use and appropriation. It is precisely in this context that the justification of land use rights and the construction of the legitimate managing strategies in *Cabo de Gata-Níjar* hinge on ideas of nature, livelihood



and the symbolic bonds between different social groups and the environment. The Park's conservation policy has sharpened the conflict between those who, benefiting from their more privileged socioeconomic position, have been able to engage in ecotourism and nature tourism, and those others who, essentially, want to enjoy the same level of consumption, the same social standards and the same opportunities as all those who do not inhabit spaces designated as "natural."

The application of conservation policies has had huge consequences. On the one hand, these policies have affected the relationships people have with nonhuman elements, and, on the other, they have shaped the very definition of the collective as such, that is, the proper notion of community. We need to bear in mind that every notion of community implies a definition of modes, forms and rights with respect to land appropriation (Godelier, 1984). At a discursive level, there is no notion of community that does not refer to a physical and/or mythical space, habitually sustained in a historical-mythological account and through the construction of a particular tradition (Valcuende, 1998). In this way, the nonhuman aspects of the natural environment cannot be understood merely as economic resources that sustain a certain group — they are also factories for the reproduction of identities<sup>13</sup>.

If local people consider the "natives" to have proprietary rights over resources, for other actors (Park officers, experts, ecotourists, members of environmental NGOs), the space's "natural value" surpasses local people's interests. This confrontation of logics manifests itself especially and explicitly in a number of conflicts. This was exactly the case in one controversy, which gained international attention: the construction of the Algarbico Hotel in Carboneras.

The construction of this 22-story hotel, controversially located within the limits of the Protected Area and built by a company headquartered in Madrid<sup>14</sup>, alarmed conservationists<sup>15</sup>. The central and regional govern-

13. The meaning and significance of what is or is not nature, of which aspects define or should define everyday landscapes, of what should or should not be protected... these establish lines of continuity for monistic analyses, by which the environment and human beings become articulated within determinate socio-ecosystems. The link between environmental narratives and forms of structuring social relations has been the focus of various studies; perhaps one of the most interesting approaches is to be found in Pálsson (1996).

14. Azata del Sol SL, headquartered in Carboneras, is wholly owned by Azata SA, based in Madrid.

15. The construction on the hotel began in 2003, but it was not until 2005 that the controversy began making headlines in the national and international press: "Manifestación contra un hotel en el Parque Natural Cabo de Gata" and "El ladrillo invade el Cabo de Gata," both appearing in *El País*, respectively, on May 2 and August 28, 2005; "Un juez paraliza las obras del hotel 'ilegal' de Cabo de Gata," appearing in *El Mundo* on Feb. 22,

ments as well as environmental NGOs began a series of campaigns to stop the completion of the building; the Algarrobo Hotel thus became a banner symbolizing the prevention of ecological deterioration. For them, it had to be demolished. In the town of Carboneras, however, a large segment of the local people, including political representatives, saw the hotel plans in a good light, and considered the environmentalist agenda to be a clear attack on the public interest<sup>16</sup>.

In October of 2005, local representatives from Carboneras, with the support of the vast majority of residents, wrote and publicly read what came to be known as the Carboneras Manifesto. In this document, one can clearly see how the limits between “us” and “others” are intertwined, and how each collectivity’s rights are drawn. “The insiders” were thus ‘native inhabitants’; those with the legitimacy to make decisions regarding their own future. “The outsiders” represented those who, coming from other regions and countries, impose their own norms, impeding local development. “Insiders” are those who love their town and neighbors, but also love their region’s surroundings. “Outsiders” are those who attempt to create a *reserve* without giving up any of the comforts they enjoy. “The insiders” are those who have the right to live on their land. “The outsiders” are the same old privileged people, those who wish to force native residents to emigrate. While in areas adjacent to the Park — in Vera, Mojácar or Toyo — tourist resorts are built and tourism is flourishing, within the Park these activities are prohibited. For this reason the local discourse decries the way in which locals are made to “pay the quota” precisely so that development in other areas may be excused.

---

2006; “Building blight on Spanish coastline,” in *The Guardian* on July 7, 2006; “Costas turn back tide by blowing up a new hotel,” in *The Times* on May 12, 2006; “Espagne: Greenpeace recouvre d’une toile géante une construction illégale,” from *Le Monde* of Feb. 12, 2009; and “Naturpark in Spanien: Greenpeace verhüllt illegal gebautes Hotel,” appearing the same day in *Der Spiegel*.

16. To quote but one example, on pages 13 and 17 of the Sept. 12, 2005, edition of *La Voz de Almería* we find two full-page announcements published with the official seal of the Carboneras Town Council situated at the bottom right, under headlines demanding: “What is this Nature to those who oppose the development of tourism in Carboneras?” and “Carboneras will keep moving ahead. In every respect.” Both announcements were related to the hotel construction standstill. Both texts under these headlines follow the essence of the discussed “Carboneras Manifesto”. Between 2005 and 2010, *El País* – one of Spain’s most read newspapers – alone published more than 250 columns and news stories on the issue, with another 85 appearing in *El Mundo*, all of them covering, to greater and lesser degrees, the various conflicting positions regarding the hotel’s construction, views held by practically everyone involved: environmental NGOs — such as Greenpeace, Ecologists in Action, and the Friends of the Parque Natural de Cabo de Gata-Níjar; officials of the local, provincial, regional and central governments; the hotel’s promotion company; Park officers and experts; and local residents.

Carboneras is the town that has grown the least, in urban terms, and the one least allowed to flourish. We do defend sustainable development. We need to work here, and no one can aspire to turn us into an Indian reservation from which we will have to emigrate as our parents did. [...] They want it all, they marginalize and sink us, so that in other towns, yes, fierce growth may continue. They have chosen us as an example and it is a lie, they have identified us as decoys with which to hide their hypocrisy and shamelessness. What honorable person can believe that a hotel, for years under legal construction, without anyone saying a word about it, should now become, overnight, the greatest ecological problem the country faces? Why raise the question now when it is already finished? Why us yet again?

Outsiders always oblige us to do their bidding and then carried off the benefits. It is up to us now to decide our destiny — alone but united, we stand convinced that we are defending our future. [...] Carboneras wants to live, yes, in a protected natural environment, but we also want to feed our children. Carboneras wants to exist, yes, but in a way that our grandchildren might inherit something, without becoming the servants of those in Madrid who make poor decisions or come to bathe at Los Muertos beach only to leave their filth, while depositing their money somewhere else. (Carboneras Manifiesto, 2005)

From the environmentalist standpoint, alternatively, the Algarrobrico Hotel is not a “local” problem. These groups maintain that the Park transcends the interests of those who live in the area. They speak of a space of unquestionable ecological value, and it is therefore a patrimonial marker for all Andalusians, Spaniards and Europeans. According this point of view, damaging the Park is the same as damaging the region’s image as well as that of the nation as a whole, in the face of the international community.

It’s of no consequence to them that this reality is our commonwealth. [...] They couldn’t care less about the fact that it’s a protected Natural Park. What they’re looking for, with the Algarrobrico Hotel, with the illegal polytunnels and with their urban planning ideas, it’s all a trap. And then you realize how fragile this all is. What’s more, there’s the fact that this is a Natural Park and that here we’re trying to protect man as much as nature; those who live in the Park and whose livelihoods depend on the Park remaining as it is. When it comes to the Algarrobrico, how can you keep a straight face and claim that this is a Natural Park? [45-year-old woman from Madrid, a park business owner]

As one can see, in both discourses different rights confront each other by appeal to different environmental and social meanings imbued in the landscape. For the Park supporters the discourse is based on the idea of a concrete space anchored to an abstract human being, who requires nature — a certain idea of “nature” — to survive. For those that oppose the Park policy, the discourse is built in terms of land use and management rights pertaining to concrete men and women, who assert their shared history. “The outsiders” view themselves as the guarantors of preservation, for the local folk ignore the assets they have in *Cabo de Gata-Níjar*. Meanwhile, from the “insider” point of view, the legitimacy to decide how to manage this space is gained through the work of generations and thanks to their knowledge of a land in which they themselves were born.

In this example of the Algarrobico Hotel, we see how discourses on nature appear polarized between “insiders” and “outsiders.” Simultaneously, due to the complexity of this particular conflict, both conservation supporters and those who oppose the Park policy end up confronting the Park managers. Both sides believe the Council of Andalusia has betrayed their rights and claims. With managers and policy-makers engulfed in forced negotiation, everyone is left in deep dissatisfaction. And this also has to do with the timing, especially regarding decision-making processes on conservation management.

For example, even though the Park was established in 1987, it was not until 1994 that both the Natural Resources Organization Plan (PORN, by its Spanish abbreviation) and the Use and Management Governing Plan (PRUG) were implemented, specifying the various uses allowed, banned or restricted. From this point forward, fierce local confrontations arose over the amount of area allowed for polytunnel agriculture within the Park<sup>17</sup>, and also over what plots of land would be set aside for urban development<sup>18</sup>. These facts support the view held among

---

17. Under the 1994 plans, those polytunnels built since 1989 would now be considered illegal. Consequently, officers began citing these installations with the objective of having them demolished by judicial order. The argument was that they were located in areas under strict protection. By contrast, areas with polytunnels built before 1989 would be granted an exception so that this activity could continue. This is an example of a policy that leaves everyone unhappy. For conservationist groups, allowing polytunnel agriculture within the Park is unthinkable. For farmers and landowners who are affected, along with their families and neighbors, the fact that some have rights and others do not seems unjust and arbitrary. An item published in the *Diario Ideal* on Nov. 27, 2007, notes that as of that day 10 illegal polytunnels remained in the Park, which gives us an idea of how protracted this conflict has been.

18. Urbanization and construction in these areas nearby towns would become the subject of new local protests, controversy and tension, as seen in more than 50 news items published from 2006 to 2009 in *Diario Ideal*. Some twenty stories covered the plans to build and

some actors (including the two main political parties in the area: the conservative Popular Party and the Socialist Party) that they are not consulted by the Park officers and that their interests have never been taken into account<sup>19</sup>.

## Discursive links between nature and community

The production of narratives about *Cabo de Gata-Nijar* is not a process characterized by unconnected polar oppositions. On the contrary, there is a deep interrelation between the actions and discourses emanating from every group. This is not a question of dialogue between static narratives; it is more of a reflexive process, as shown in the dynamics of delimiting and building different communities. Some of these interactions, for example, include the preoccupation on the part of local farmers and fishermen with defining what nature is. By the same token, newcomers demand to be recognized in “their struggle” and “their sacrifice” to protect the land. This narrative tries to rearticulate local people’s legitimizing discourse alluding to their ancestors. Thus, we have before us discourses that attempt to legitimize different land uses and management rights by using the other’s terms and categories, however redefining them. Therefore, in the context of social heterogeneity, two groups are mutually constructed as representing discourses which seem to be apparently opposed, but whose discourses are nevertheless unintelligible unless one takes into account their mutual relationship.

For “insiders” four facts establish their connection to the land and justify their rights. In the first place there is one’s origin — belonging to the area by birth. Secondly, there is memory, and by implication, knowledge, of the community’s interest as much as the ways in which particular natural resources ought to be exploited. Third, there is a right linked to ancestors’ suffering and work experiences; locals who transformed this desert into nature. For them, “outsiders” are not of “our kind”. Besides, they also ignore and lack ties to the area, because they do not experience it in the same way. Which brings us to the fourth

---

develop the Marina de Agua Amarga. Another 30 covered the controversy over the proposal for subsequent urban development in La Fabriquilla.

19. For these social actors the means of participation that the 2004 Sustainable Development Plan (PDS, in Spanish initials) advocated are considered mere formalities, while none of them believes their claims have been adequately heard. They also believe their representation on the Park Governing Board is insufficient. In this way, the forms of social coordination, negotiation and mediation that regional and environmental officials espouse appear to lack legitimacy. Indeed, this turns into a justification for the polarized positions and apparently arbitrary behavior adopted by those collectivities that we have mentioned above.

factor: legitimacy is also constructed as a function of emotional connection.

A person belongs to this place only if he has ties to its ancestors and to the space itself. The “community” entitled to use local resources is made up of those who are born, bred and deceased within their “own” space. According to this perspective, the location is fundamentally a place for *living*, and it should be transformed just as the community itself is transformed, by its choosing. It is no secret that the community has been adapting and transforming the land, developing its “own” nature throughout history.

The discourse of environmental NGO members, Park officers, experts and members of the new exurban population, establishes a hierarchy between nature and human beings. True nature is usually regarded as that in which human beings are absent. Many recognize that they are “not natives,” but nevertheless believe that they ultimately know how to protect a natural environment they have chosen as their own. In accordance with this view, humans are the stewards of nature; legitimacy is not granted by birth, it comes from the intrinsic value assigned to this space, which far transcends the local community. These groups define an aim, associated with the practical means to be applied, with the express purpose of fighting to conserve the region as it was. They derive their right to the land from the very act of defending it and, in doing so, protecting the legacy of the area’s traditional residents.

Unlike the “insider’s” narrative, in this case the past is invoked to support a set of shared objectives (environmental protection), by selecting and reimagining certain visions of the past in the process, legitimizing concrete practices and defining the limits between “us” and “others.” Tradition is reinvented in the service of environmental equilibrium; and this tradition becomes the guiding thread of history, a form of history fixated on the idea of harmony and immutability, allowing people (1) to undo anything that might rupture the primeval balance of nature; (2) to select the socio-environmental elements that should be recovered to renovate an original state of nature along with a culture that knew how to adapt to it, hardly transforming the landscape at all; and (3) to generate legitimizing discourses by elevating a supposed tradition connecting “outsiders” with local residents, who are reimagined in a relationship of “balance” with the environment.

## Conclusions

The presence of incompatible territorialization processes in a single Natural Park gives rise to a series of discourses through which different social actors (1) give meaning to the nonhuman elements within the space; (2) legitimize certain practices while penalizing others considered harmful to nature; and (3) create a hierarchy between those who have greater or lesser rights to use and manage the park's resources.

The idea of Nature as defined by “outsiders” seeks to reproduce past environmental conditions, by reference to an indeterminate, imagined moment in history when human activity was in balance with nature and adapted to its surroundings. This narrative stresses those elements considered unique and exclusive while it revalorizes a desert-like landscape. Furthermore, this notion of Nature in the abstract supersedes specific interests (at least at the discursive level). Human beings are represented as separated from the environment, observing it from a position of contemplation and stewardship. Therefore any human activities that do not tend to preserve the natural landscape, especially following the logic of sustainable tourism, are seen as problematic.

For the “insiders,” the idea of Nature is opposed to the area's hard, dry ecological conditions. In their opinion, the uniqueness envisioned in the scientific and ‘foreign’ perspectives is opposed to their efforts to transform this arid land into gardens, woods, farms... According to them, that transformed space is the “nature” that needs to be vindicated, the nature that has permitted their subsistence, and which could provide new and important resources, if it were not for all the new restrictions the Park policy has introduced. From this point of view, nature has a dynamic quality, and human beings play a central role in shaping it. People's ties to their ancestors are what legitimize their use of the land. Thus, ‘insiders’ consider themselves the legitimate heirs to local knowledge; the knowledge that may enable them to reproduce nature anew, even if it is a nature involving the plastic roofs of polytunnels.

Each one of these discourses tends to deprecate the right of “others” to exploit and/or protect the area. In denying human influence on the environment, “outsiders” also deny the rights of present-day residents; and by denying “outsider” claims on environmental values, local people deny ecologists, scientists and newcomers any say in land-use matters. In short we are dealing with two radically different logics based on a single common denominator. Both claim to protect nature — although nature defined in opposite ways. And both narratives justify different land uses that appear completely incompatible with each other (ecotourism and nature

tourism vs. polytunnel agriculture and mass tourism, for example).

However, we can also see how this confrontation, in which differing economic interests are at stake, relies on assumptions borrowed from each other by both “insiders” and “outsiders.” For insiders, their discursive legitimacy has come to depend on valorizing nature. The key argument in the conservationist discourse is in this way reproduced, although through a different logic: plants and animals exist more or less at the service of human activity. “Foreigners,” in turn, assume the impact of human activity in the area and seek to establish ties with “locals” through notions of tradition and an idealized past when humans were more environmentally friendly.

The nature discourses here analyzed define rights and restrictions, distinguishing between those who have certain knowledge from those who do not, those who truly belong to the community from those who are foreign, and those who consider themselves to be the trustees and heirs of tradition from those who are no longer present but who have constructed a landscape that should be protected. Every human group needs to rationalize a given reality. The concept of nature is still essential within Western contexts, precisely for being a signifier containing mythical connotations which lack any univocal expression.

## Bibliography

- Anderson, D y Berglund, E. (2003). *Ethnographies of conservation. Environmentalism and the distribution of privilege*. New York y Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Arruda, R. (1999). Populações tradicionais e a proteção dos recursos naturais em unidades conservação. *Ambiente & Sociedade. Ano II. N° 5. Segundo semestre*: 79-92.
- Aznar, J.A. (2000). El sector turístico almeriense: evolución, estructura y perspectiva de cara al siglo XXI. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Almerienses*, 17: 27-47.
- Baker, S. Milton, K y Yearly, S. (1994). *Protecting the periphery. Environmental Policy in Peripheral Regions of the European Union*. Ilford: Frank Cass.
- Biersack, A. (1999). Introduction: From the ‘New Ecology’ to the New Ecologies. *American Anthropologist*, 101, 1: 5-19.
- Brockington, D. (2002). *Fortress Conservation: The Preservation of Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania*. Oxfrd, UK: James Currey.
- Carmona, S; Carrasco, F; & Fernández-Revuelta, L. (1993). Un enfoque interdisciplinar de la contabilidad del medio ambiente. *Revista española de financiación y contabilidad*, XXIII, 75: 277-305.



- Castro, H. & Guirado, J. S. (1995) La gestión del medio natural y humano en un sistema marítimo terrestre no insular: El caso del Parque Natural Cabo de Gata-Níjar. *La gestión de los espacios marinos en el Mediterráneo Occidental. Actas de la VII Aula de Ecología, Almería*:187-226.
- Coca, A. (2008) *Los Camperos. Territorios, usos sociales y percepciones en un espacio natural andaluz*. Sevilla: Fundación Blas Infante.
- Coca, A. y Quintero, V. (2006). Los de fuera claman por la naturaleza ¿Qué reclaman los de dentro?. En *Territorialização, meio ambiente e desenvolvimento no Brasil e na Espanha*. Valcuende y Maretti (Ed) Río Branco: EDUFAC.
- Compagnon, D. (2005). Gérer démocratiquement la biodiversité grace aux ONGs? "Représenter la nature? ONG et biodiversité. París: IDR, Editions.
- Compán, D. (1977) "La Isleta (Níjar). Evolución de una pequeña comunidad de pescadores almerienses en el proceso de desarrollo español. *Actas del V Congreso de Geografía*. Granada.
- Compán, D. (1985). Dinámica locacional reciente de la población en el espacio almeriense: Reestructuración de la red urbana tras la quiebra de la agricultura tradicional y la expansión del turismo y los cultivos extratempranos. *Paralelo 37*, 8-9: 183-200
- Cruces, F. (1998). Problemas en torno a la restitución del Patrimonio. Una visión desde la Antropología. *Alteridades, julio-diciembre vol 8 número 016*: 75-84
- Descola, P (2005). *Par-delà nature*. París: Gallimard.
- Descola, P. & Pálsson, G. (1996) *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Diegues, A. (1994). *O mito moderno da natureza intocada*. São Paulo: NUPAUB – Universidade de São Paulo.
- Escalera, J (1993). Espacios Naturales-Espacios Sociales: Por un Tratamiento Integral del Patrimonio Ecológico-Cultural de Andalucía. El Caso del Parque Natural de la Sierra de Aracena y Picos de Aroche (Huelva). En *Parques naturales andaluces. Conservación y Cultura*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- Escobar, A. (1999) After Nature: Steps to an Antiessentialist Political Ecology. *Current Anthropology*, 40,1: 1-30.
- Escobar, A. (2000). El lugar de la naturaleza y la naturaleza del lugar: globalización o pos-desarrollo. En *Antropología del desarrollo: Teoría y estudios etnográficos de América Latina*. Viola (Ed) Barcelona: Paidós.
- Fernández, D. & Egea, M. (1991). Dimensión económica y ecológica del modelo de desarrollo de Almería en el contexto de la Ordenación del territorio. *Paralelo 37*, 14-15: 55-68.
- García, J. & García, J. (1996). Los bosques ignorados de Almería. Una interpretación histórica y ecológica. En A. Sánchez Picón (1996) *Historia y Medio Ambiente en el territorio almeriense*. Almería: Universidad de Almería, Servicio de Publicaciones, 99-126.
- García Latorre, J. y García Latorre J. (2007) *Almería: hecha a mano. Una historia ecológica*. Almería: Fundación Cajamar.

- Glacken, C.J. (1976). *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century*. Berkeley: Univ of California Press.
- Godelier, M. (1984). *L'idéal et le matériel*. París: Fayard.
- Góngora, F (2004), La desarticulación del régimen comunal en la Comarca de Nijar en el cambio de siglo. En C. Rozalén Fuentes & R.M. Úbeda Vilches (ed.) *La crisis de fin de siglo en la Provincia de Almería: El desastre del 98*. Almería: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, 129-141.
- Guha, R. (2000). The authoritarian biologist and de arrogant of anti-humanism, wildlife, conservation in the Third World. Traducción Carlos Diegues. En *Etnoconservação, novos rumos para a proteção da Natureza nos trópicos*: 81-100. Cood. Diegues, Carlos. São Paulo: Editora Hucitec.
- Hernández, M.C. (1987). La agricultura intensiva del Campo de Dalías. *Paralelo 37*, nº10: 133-140.
- Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London: Routledge.
- Low, S.M. y Lawrence-Zuñiga, D. (2003). Locating culture. En *The anthropology of space and place*. Malden, Oxford, Victoria, Berlin: Blackwell.
- López Ornat, A. & Pons Reynés, A. (2007). *Utilización de las categorías de gestión de áreas protegidas de UICN en la región mediterránea*. Consejería de Medio Ambiente de la Junta de Andalucía, Sevilla, España y UICN, Gland, Suiza y Málaga, España.
- Martín, E; Castaño, A. y Rodríguez, M. (1999). *Procesos migratorios y relaciones interétnicas en Andalucía: una reflexión sobre el caso del Poniente almeriense desde la Antropología social*. Madrid: OPI, Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales; Consejería de Asuntos Sociales de la Junta de Andalucía.
- Mels, T. (2002). Nature, home and scenery: the official spatialities of Swedish national parks. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20, 2 (2002): 135-154.
- Milton, K. (2002). *Loving nature: towards an ecology of emotion*. London: Routledge.
- Muñoz, J.A. (2001). Cultura del agua. Aprovechamiento hidráulico integral en un entorno tradicional de extrema aridez. Campos de Nijar (Almería). *Narría*, 89-90-91-92 (2001): 12-21.
- Narotzky, S. y Millán, J.A. (1987). La naturaleza como factoría. Transformaciones y poder de una metáfora contemporánea. *La Balsa de Medusa* (Madrid), nº 4, otoño. En <http://jamillan.com/factoria.htm>. Accedido el 6 de junio de 2010.
- Pálsson, G. (1996). Human-environmental relations: orientalism, paternalism and communalism, in Philip Descola y Gisli Pálsson (Ed). *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives*: 63-81, London: Routledge.
- Provansal, D. (2003) Productores, depredadores y consumidores del paisaje: De la agricultura intensiva al desarrollo sostenible. En *Cultura y turismo*. Nogués, A.M (Ed). Sevilla: Signatura Ediciones de Andalucía.

- Provansal, D. & Molina, P. (1987). La movilidad como modelo de supervivencia en Campo de Níjar. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, Ciencias*: 43-62.
- Provansal, D. & Molina, P. (1990). El nuevo paisaje agrario andaluz o los avatares de las nuevas tecnologías. *Agricultura y Sociedad*, 57, 79-122.
- Provansal, D. y Molina, P. (1991). *Etnología de Andalucía Oriental*. Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Pujadas, J (2002). *El método biográfico: El uso de las historias de vida en ciencias sociales*. CIS. Cuadernos Metodológicos 5. Madrid: CIS.
- Río, A y Valcuende, JM (2007) Historias de vida y microbiografías. Una aproximación metodológica. *La recuperación de la memoria histórica. Una perspectiva transversal desde las Ciencias Sociales*: 169.185. Coord. Acosta, del Río y Valcuende. Centro de Estudios Andaluces: Sevilla.
- Rodríguez, M. (2003). *La agricultura intensiva, medio y modo de vida del poniente almeriense: estrategias productivas y organización del trabajo agrícola*. Instituto de Estudios Almerienses: Almería.
- Rodríguez, J.E. (1995). El turismo como fenómeno reciente. Cauces de actuación y gestión. Pasado, presente y futuro del subsector turístico almeriense. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Almerienses*, 14: 117-140.
- Ruiz, E et al (2009). Naturalising the Environment: Perceptual Frames, Sense, and Resistance. *Journal of Material Culture* 14: 147-167.
- Sánchez, A. (1981). Minería e industrialización en la Almería del siglo XIX: Explotación autóctona y colonización económica. *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Almerienses*, 1, 203-226.
- Sánchez, A. (1996). La presión humana sobre el monte en Almería durante el siglo XIX. En A. Sánchez Picón (1996) *Historia y Medio Ambiente en el territorio almeriense*. Almería: Universidad de Almería, Servicio de Publicaciones, 169-202.
- Sánchez, A. (1999). La ocupación humana y la explotación económica del litoral almeriense en el pasado (Siglos XVI-XX). *Actas de las Jornadas sobre el litoral de Almería: caracterización, ordenación y gestión de un espacio geográfico*. Almería, 35-51.
- Sánchez, A. & Fernández, I. (2003). Una mirada a la Almería de la autarquía y a la coyuntura económica del primer franquismo. *Sociedad y política almeriense durante el régimen de Franco. Actas de las Jornadas celebradas en la UNED durante los días 8 al 12 de abril de 2002 / coord.. Manuel Gutierrez Navas y José Rivera Menéndez*.
- Santamarina, B (2008). Antropología y medio ambiente. Revisión de una tradición y nuevas perspectivas de análisis en la problemática ecológica. *AIBR. Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana. Volumen 3, Número 2*. Mayo-Agosto: 144-184
- Santana, A (2003). Mirar y leer: Autenticidad y patrimonio cultural para el consumo turístico. En *Cultura y turismo*. Nogués,A.M. (Ed). Sevilla: Signatura Ediciones de Andalucía.
- Siches, C. (1991). La pesca en Campo de Níjar. En D. Provansal & P. Molina *Etnografía de Andalucía Oriental I. Parentesco, Agricultura y pesca*. Ed. Anthropos, 355-408.

- Siches, C. (1998). *Los Pescadores de La Isleta del Moro*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.
- Sletto, B. (2002). Boundary Making and regional identities in a globalized environment rebordering the Nariva Swamp, Trinidad. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 20, 2 (2002): 183-208.
- Thomas, K (1983). *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. London: Penguín.
- Valcuende, JM (1998). *Fronteras, territorios e identificaciones colectivas*. Sevilla: Fundación Blas Infante.
- Valcuende, JM y Cruz, L. (2009). Turismo, poblaciones locales y organizaciones no gubernamentales: un análisis de caso en Madre de Dios (Perú). *Pasos. Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*. Vol 7-Nº2: 179-196.
- West, P; Igoe, J. & Brockington, D. (2006) Parks and People: The Social Impact of Protected Areas. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35: 251-277.