

Resistance and Cooperation in a North American Appalachian Community

by Carol Jo Evans

Elizabeth City State University, USA

Introduction

People who live in rural places usually define the surrounding territory and land as their home, as the places they recreate, collect and use natural resources, and bury their friends and kin. The land is a part of the people, and the meanings they give to places are reflections of themselves and their self-identity. That building over there is not just a building; it is Uncle Warren's cabin, built on the site where my grandmother is buried. But what happens to the meanings of the land and places on the land--indeed to the very meanings local people have of themselves--when the land is transformed from private ownership to public ownership and is managed by a government agency for the benefit of conservation, preservation, and recreation by the public? Examples of this include Protected Areas or National Parks. How do local people make sense out of and adapt to the new restrictions on traditional use and access imposed by the agency to meet a political mandate for preservation? How do the employees of a

public-land agency attempt to construct new meanings for the land and places on the land? Do these various social constructions or meanings compete or conflict with one another? What are consequences of competition, conflict, and/or resistance over resources (management problems, degradation of the environment, and vandalism for examples)? What measures can be taken to lessen conflict and resistance over the management of public land?

This paper examines these questions with the overall goal of understanding the perceptions and concerns faced by local residents and United States National Park Service employees over the management of the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area (BSFNRRRA), located on the Cumberland Plateau of Tennessee and Kentucky. This paper also investigates incidences of conflict and resistance between local residents and National Park Service (NPS) employees over the management of cultural and natural resources within the BSFNRRRA. For example, Uncle Warren's cabin may be a traditional hunting lodge to local residents, but a management problem for the NPS, or a symbol of human presence to the environmentalist who wishes the landscape to be designated as a wilderness area. Finally, this paper investigates measures that can be taken by the NPS to lessen conflict or resistance and promote cooperation over the management of public land, specifically public participation in the management of the BSFNRRRA. While this paper contributes to the body of resistance and conflict theory by providing a case example supporting the utility of James Scott's model of "everyday forms of resistance," it also has applied methodological implications for development projects, especially those impacting local residents' "social identity" and "livelihood."

In summary, the central argument put forth in this paper is that resistance is manifested among those who perceive a threat to both their "social identity" and "livelihood." Furthermore, resistance is either manifested in the form of routine and individual acts or organized and public acts based on the perceived severity of this threat.

Methods utilized in this research study include both quantitative and qualitative methods (a survey, formal interviews, informal conversations, focus groups, participatory mapping, participant-observation, and analysis of issues presented by local residents and special interest groups). Open House meetings sponsored by the NPS were also attended. The purpose of the Open House meetings was to gather public input to help in the

development of an information base to assist in the creation of a General Management Plan for the BSFNRRRA. Because of the low attendance at the Open House meetings by local residents, I was hired by the NPS as a consultant to investigate barriers or circumstances inhibiting residents from attending the meetings. Upon completion of my consultant position, I received a grant from the Ford Foundation-Community Forestry Research Program to collect additional data and funding to live one year within the research area. Not only did my residency allow for observation of the annual cycle of resource use, and NPS management policy, but also presented me with the opportunity to be accepted as a member of the community and not as a consultant for the NPS. Information collected during this research period helped to provide information on traditional access to and use of resources within the National Area, in addition to incidences of conflict and resistance between local residents and the NPS.

Research site

The BSFNRRRA is unique among public lands in the United States. It is one of the first attempts to combine the concept of a National River with a National Recreation Area, thereby promoting both preservation of the area's natural resources and the development of recreational activities (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1980:1-2). Because the BSFNRRRA is relatively new in its establishment, family members still remember when their land was acquired for the establishment of the National Area. Therefore, not only does the site provide a unique case study for research on local environmental knowledge and uses of resources, but also the development of social conflict over competing management concerns.

The "Park," as local citizens call it, was established by Congress on March 7, 1974, by Section 108 of the Water Resources Development Act (PL 93-251), as amended by Section 184 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 (PL 94-587). The act created a new public land area and provided for the protection of approximately 125,000 acres of the scenic and remote Cumberland Plateau, located in both Kentucky and Tennessee, in addition to the Big South Fork branch of the Cumberland River. A total of 103.5 million dollars was appropriated for the project, making it one of the largest development efforts in southeastern United States.

The BSFNRRA is divided geographically into two sections: the river gorge and the plateau area. According to NPS regulations (PL 93-251), the river gorge must preserve both its recreational and wilderness qualities, while the plateau area should allow for the development of recreational and cultural resources (horse trails, roads and paths to rock shelters, the preservation of significant historical buildings for examples).

Before the establishment of the BSFNRRA, local residents demonstrated strong ties to the Big South Fork area itself. For several residents, it was their ancestors who were among the first Euro-Americans to settle within the area in the early 1800s, with their descendants continuing to live in the same community for over a century. A few families can even trace part of their heritage to indigenous Native American populations. It was also these early self-sufficient farming families that gave place names to certain locations within the National Area, which are still in use today. For instance, the tributaries of the Big South Fork River on which the early communities of Station Camp and No Business were located still bear their names (Station Camp Creek and No Business Creek for examples).

Because a large section of the Big South Fork (BSF) area was purchased by large lumber and coal industries in the late 1800s, consisting primarily of absentee ownership, local residents were allowed continuous free access to resources within the BSF region. Employees of the industries were actually encouraged to use the forest and river as needed. Local residents could hunt, trap, fish, or gather forests products as “freely” as they pleased. The BSF area acted more as a “commons” for residents. For local residents, the area provided the resources necessary in order to maintain their self-sufficient life-style, from firewood and coal for heat, food for the table, medicinal plants to cure the ill, and swimming holes for entertainment and baptisms. Abandoned log houses of those who settled the area in the early 1800s were welcomed to those who needed a hunting lodge for the night. In addition to selling surplus hogs and other livestock, mountain farmers supplemented their income by cutting timber and gathering roots and herbs, especially ginseng. Not only did the area continue to be important to local residents for hunting, fishing, or the collection of various forest products, but also as a place of ancestral ghosts and family cemeteries; not only a place that symbolizes where they came from, but who they are today in their minds and hearts. In short, the BSF area is very important to local residents’ “social identity.”

With the establishment of the BSFNRRA, came NPS regulations and restrictive access to resources within the area. In keeping with its wilderness designation, only 11 motorized access points are now allowed into the gorge area. Traditional and meaningful access points to the river by local residents were not primary criteria in choosing the access sites, traditional fishing spots for examples. The choice of areas for these 11 access points was based primarily on constraints imposed by natural or cultural resources and recreational consideration, such as logical canoe trips and compatibility of canoe access with other recreational activities at the site. Other restrictions pertain to hunting and fishing, horseback riding, camping, hiking, and collection of nuts and fruit. It is illegal to collect items such as ginseng, or to pick flowers within the National Area.

Beginning in 1997, the NPS began to gather public input on the creation of a ten year General Management Plan (GMP) for the BSFNRRA. Following traditional procedures for gaining public input, the NPS held Open House meetings at local courthouses or town halls to obtain local input on the management of the National Area. Symbolically, according to local residents, Open House meetings presented a hierarchical and militant atmosphere, with NPS employees (dressed in NPS uniforms) leading the topics to be presented and discussed. Overall, the meetings were poorly attended.

The final draft of the GMP was completed in 2006, which serves as the overarching policy under which site specific plans are prepared in future developments. Therefore, the study area provides a perfect opportunity to observe and analyze the policy and methodology park officials are required to follow in creating a management plan and eliciting public participation. The BSFNRRA also offers a setting to monitor issues and sources of conflict, resistance, and/or cooperation among local residents and NPS employees pertaining to the management of the area's cultural and natural resources.

Conservation, displacement, and resistance

Originally, preservation and sustainable management efforts concentrated on the protection of nature and paid little attention to the needs and concerns

of people living in or around newly established protected areas or public lands (Stevens 1997; Hitchcock 1994; Greenberg 1989). Recent studies, however, examine the relationships between conservation/preservation activities and local residents (Chan, Pringle, Ranganathan, Boggs, Ehrlich, Haff, Heller, Al-Khafaji, and Macmynowski 2007; Xu and Melick 2007; Stonich 2001). Several of these studies demonstrate the social impact on local residents, especially in areas where people traditionally depended on resources for subsistence as a part of their “livelihood.”

In other incidences, people living near protected areas or public lands are impacted by both the over use of an area and depletion of resources due to the “implementation of conflicting natural resource policies and laws” (Kothari, Singh, and Suri 1996:61). Others may be subjected to government policies that restrict land use and access to important traditional resources such as forests, pastures, agricultural land, wildlife, and cultural sites (Hitchcock 1999; Hitchcock 1985). Those who were forced to settle outside of protected areas found that the natural resources of their former lands were now off-limits to local use. Traditional subsistence resource use that was critical for survival became criminalized. Traditional resource use became “poaching,” and settlement became “illegal squatting,” with the “protection” of the protected area from indigenous populations through fences, armed patrols, and threats of jail terms and fines. Stan Stevens (1997) places the origins of this model for protected areas with the creation of Yellowstone National Park in 1872.

An example of the utility of indigenous participation in the control of natural resources, and minimal social impact on the local populations is documented in the works of Marshall Murphee. Murphee (2004) has explored the rural development and conservation of Zimbabwe's wildlife through a program referred to as CAMPFIRE (Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources). CAMPFIRE emerged in the mid-1980s, seeking to restructure the control of Zimbabwe' countryside and giving people alternative ways of using their natural resources. Under CAMPFIRE, people living on Zimbabwe's communal lands, which represent approximately 42% of the country, can claim ownership of wildlife on their land and to benefit from its use. While the program includes the management of all natural resources, it focuses primarily on wildlife management in communal areas, particularly those adjacent to National Parks. Since the CAMPFIRE's official inception in 1989, the

program has engaged more than a quarter of a million people in the practice of managing wildlife and reaping of its benefits.

Research also demonstrates the important role of anthropologists in working with policy pertaining to protected areas in order to maintain cultural diversity (Crespi 1989), to promote cultural conservation and community development (Howell 1994), as advocates for local interests in the planning and management of National Parks (Olwig 1980), to document long-term consequences of tourism (Smith 1989), and in order to limit social conflict (Howell 1993; Howell 1989). While working in the 1970s on a folk life survey project in the area that was to become the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area, Howell was in a position to answer questions that local residents had pertaining to the new "Big South Fork Project" and hear their opinions about the establishment of the BSFNRRRA. Because of her position, Howell was able to inform the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers of residents' competing goals for development in the area, thereby curtailing "some" of the initial social conflict and resistance when the project was in its infancy. According to Howell, however, if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had recognized the larger social impact that the creation of the BSFNRRRA was to have on local residents at the time, and not just give " cursory attention" to its social impact, then perhaps the degree of social conflict and resistance that currently exists would have been diminished or nonexistent (Howell 1994; Howell 1989). The social impact statement did not assess the possible social and cultural impacts of residents' impending relocation.

The previous studies indicate that conservation, preservation, and recreation efforts must address the needs and concerns of local people if protected areas or public lands are to be managed with minimal social conflicts and stress, or impacts on the environment. Research also points to the importance of understanding local environmental knowledge along with livelihood strategies, social organization, and the dynamics of public land management (McNeely 1994; Western, Wright, and Strum 1994; Little and Horowitz 1987). Yet despite the growing awareness of social conflict over public land, minimal attention has been given to issues surrounding preservation activities and its social impact on local residents, especially incidences of conflict or resistance after resettlement of local residents for the purpose of conservation (Oliver-Smith 2006:143). Research in this area is especially important in light of current development projects supported by

global ideological practices for and funding of certain kinds of conservation strategies (Gezon 2006).

Methods and theory

Methods utilized in this research study include both quantitative and qualitative methods (a survey, formal interviews, informal conversations, focus groups, participatory mapping, participant-observation, and analysis of issues presented by local residents and special interest groups). A central goal of the research is to investigate the various perceptions towards the management of the BSNRRA, focusing on potential conflict between the ideology of private versus public land management issues (conflict between conservation, preservation, and recreational goals for examples), and how this conflict and resistance is manifested. In order to gain an understanding of findings, the paradigms of conflict and resistance theory is used as a framework to analyze data.

One could date the beginnings of resistance theory to the writings of Karl Marx in the late 1800s, with Marx's prediction of the insurgence of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Marx's viewpoint was founded on what he called the "materialist conception of history." According to this view, it is not the ideas or values human beings hold that are the main sources of social change, but economic changes. Therefore, the conflicts between classes, the rich versus the poor, provide the motivation for historical development. In Marx's words, "All human history thus far is the history of class struggles." Numerous interpretations or expansions of Marx's major ideas are possible, also given rise to various contemporary theoretical positions (conflict and feminist theory for examples). What these various perspectives share in common is a central focus of analysis pertaining to the struggle for scarce resources by groups in society, and how the elites use their power to control the weaker groups. People may invest in meanings over symbols as well as in the means of production, with struggles over meaning as much a part of the process of resource allocation as are struggles over surplus or labor process. Struggles over land and environmental resources are simultaneously struggles over cultural meanings (Peet and Watts 1996). Drawing on case studies, William Schweri and John Van Willigen (1978) demonstrate three components of what they refer to as a "provisional theory of resistance." In their own study, Schweri and Van Willigen conducted

research among local residents who organized to resist the proposed development of a dam and reservoir project by the Corps of Engineers in eastern Kentucky. Resistance manifested itself as residents realized the threat of the dam to their every day way of life. They perceived the costs of the proposed dam as outweighing its benefits, such as the lost of cemeteries, churches, and residents' homes due to flooding of the area.

From these case studies, Schweri and Van Willigen (1978) proposed three components for a "provisional theory of resistance." The components include: 1) resistance processes require the linkage of behavior to "fundamental beliefs" through "ideology," 2) the resistance process is fundamentally a symbolization process, and 3) communities will tend to determine the impact and assess its cost. Cost levels [impacts] are related to the motivation to resist. If the perceived costs are high enough, communities will develop and maintain resistance organizations.

This brings us to a discussion on the current division within resistance studies. While early research focused primarily on public, collective, and organized forms of resistance (at times manifesting in violent forms, grand social movements, or revolutions), James Scott (1990; 1985) illuminated the importance of everyday and individualized forms of resistance. While resistance can be understood through multiple theoretical paradigms, this paper situates itself within the framework of the latter.

The Power of Everyday Resistance

When coercive power is enforced by the state, whether it is a prison guard or an employee of the National Park Service, an individual's power to resist is often curtailed, sometimes severely. Yet, it is not wholly destroyed. What remains may be no more than what James Scott (1985) refers to as "the power of everyday resistance." One of Scott's main objectives in *Weapons of the Weak* is to examine the relationship between the proletariat (poor peasant class) and the bourgeoisie (the rich farmers) in the Malaysian village of Sedaka (a pseudonym). In his study, Scott attempts to refute the Marxist theory of "false consciousness" by studying the social consciousness of the subordinate classes. For example, false consciousness is recognized in the classical Marxist view that the bourgeoisie create a "false consciousness" among the proletariat who are led to believe that if they were not successful, it is due to their own fault for not working

sufficiently hard enough rather than because their opportunities for advancement were blocked by the powerful upper class. According to Scott, a “false consciousness” rests on the assumption that elites not only dominate the physical means of production, but the symbolic means of production as well, and that this symbolic hegemony allows them to control the very standards by which their rule is evaluated (Scott 1985:39).

Although Scott comes from a political economy background, he chose to approach his fieldwork using a phenomenological methodology. His goal is to discover the meaning of actions based on an understanding of their context in a system of values and symbols. Using the technique of participant-observation, Scott attempts to describe the actions and conversations of all participants in village life in the context of changing social relations that resulted from the green revolution. Scott recognizes, however, that observing behavior alone is not enough, but that consciousness of symbols, norms, and ideological forms underlying behavior is needed to fully understand actions of resistance.

Influenced by the reading of Goffman and his concept of dramaturgy, Scott speaks of “on stage” behavior (where one offers credible performances to the other side) and “public transcripts,” related to the public realm and found under the control of the dominant group. He also speaks of “hidden transcripts” and “off stage,” practiced by both the dominants and subordinates, where both take off their masks and begin to talk safely in the secure limits of their own private spheres. It is in within the private domain that plots start, where discontent and forms of resistance arises. Scott uses this as evidence for a separate ideological consciousness between the peasant class and the elite, thereby weakening the Marxist argument for a “false consciousness.”

In his study of hegemonic control of the peasantry by the elite, Scott found that these peasants are not kept in line by some form of state-sponsored terrorism, but what he calls “routine repression” (legal restrictions, occasional arrests, and warnings for example). It will be demonstrated in this paper that local residents of the BSF area claim to experience “routine repression” by NPS rangers, manifested in the form of “harassment,” believing that they are treated more unfairly than “outside visitors,” especially in the issuance of citations.

Scott also recognizes that because of local economic, political, and kinship ties, the peasants knew that overt political action would cause more harm than good. Therefore, Scott contented that peasant rebellions and revolutions are not always the most effective means of resisting hegemonic control, exploring instead “everyday forms of peasant resistance.” Everyday forms of resistance include: foot dragging, sabotage, dissimulation, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, gossip, rude nicknames, character assassinations, and arson (1985:29).

Scott notes that while these actions may not alter the peasants’ situation in the short run, it is in the long run that they may be more effective than overt rebellion in undercutting state repression and authority. Furthermore, everyday forms of resistance do not require coordination or planning and typically avoid direct symbolic confrontation with authority or with the norms of the elite. Instead, this form of everyday resistance often acts as a form of self-help for the peasant, acting as an indirect attempt to make an alternative account of the social situation count and to gain back a sense of control. According to Scott, both the peasant class and the elites are simultaneously constructing a worldview.

This is especially true with the changes in class relations due to the green revolution. Although there was always an extreme class division between the peasant class and the elites, there was a mutually held normative ideology that the two classes were dependent upon each other. While the peasants provided needed labor for the rich landowners, the latter were obligated to treat the poor fairly, to provide jobs, and to give alms to the faithful and needy during certain times of the year. With the green revolution, class relations shifted due to changes in the method of planting and harvesting of rice. Because of the introduction of combine harvesters, there was no need of hired labor. The landless peasants no longer had a means of “livelihood.” The stinginess of the rich not only brought economic loss to the peasant class, but it also attacked their social identity. The only weapon the peasant class controlled in this struggle was their ability to undercut the prestige and reputation of the rich.

Summarizing, resistance happens because of some perceived threat to a community and its “fundamental beliefs.” We see this in *Weapons of the Weak* when the peasants’ livelihood is threatened due to the introduction of machinery in the rice fields. Secondly, resistance is a symbolic and dynamic

process, often-using existing social structures or channels of communication. Lastly, resistance occurs when there is a perceived threat to the continuation of one's livelihood, with the impact and perceived costs to one's way of life influencing the degree of resistance. The latter is congruent with Schweri and Van Willigen's third component for a "provisional theory of resistance," that cost levels [impacts] are related to the motivation to resist. If the perceived costs are high enough, communities will develop and maintain resistance organizations. It is this conceptual framework which is used as a model for identifying manifestations of resistance within the Big South Fork area, that resistance is manifested among those who perceive a threat to their "social identity" and "livelihood," and the form of resistance is influenced by the perceived severity of this threat.

Manifestations of resistance in the Big South Fork area

Examples of Scott's forms of "everyday resistance" among local residents of the National Area include incidences of vandalism and theft, demonstrated at the historic Blue Heron mining site where display cases describing the history of the former coal-mining town were broken into with artifacts (a mining helmet, lunch pail, and auger) either stolen or destroyed. As one NPS employee relayed:

There have been many break-ins, vandalism, destruction, and theft at Blue Heron, yet every time the NPS threatens to remove the mining objects on display, there is an outcry in the newspaper and on the radio. You just can't win.

Other forms of vandalism at the site include the destruction of soda machines and phones at the concession area, in addition to the destruction of signs describing the "ghost structures" located within the historic site. Another form of what Scott describes as "everyday resistance," arson, occurred when the gazebo located at the Overlook which looks down on the Blue Heron mining site was set on fire, and when the port-a-john at the Overlook was blown up with dynamite. Others examples of arson, which occur throughout the BSFNNRA, include the burning of historic structures, especially log cabins that were built in the 1880s by residents' ancestors.

The feeling of local residents being that they would rather “have it burnt to the ground than in the hands of the government.”

Forest fires are also continuously set after the closing of trails or roads that prevent access to traditional areas. According to another NPS employee:

People around here get really upset when we [NPS] have to close off vehicular access to areas they use to use in the past. They either rip down our signs saying ‘No Vehicles Allowed’ or set fire in retaliation ...I would say that 95% of the fires in the Big South Fork are due to arson.

Examples of “everyday resistance” also exist in the form of slander, character assassination, and malicious gossip. Examples of these are found in newspaper articles, nicknames for park rangers such as “jack boot nazis,” graffiti such as “NPS Sucks,” and even a song on the radio comparing a female NPS ranger to Lizzi Borden. Looting continues to be a problem in the BSNRRA, especially of Native American artifacts, in addition to poaching and the illegal collection of medicinal plants such as ginseng, primarily for profit.

The importance of collecting ginseng to supplement local income is demonstrated in an interview with a local resident who is a waitress at a local restaurant:

Well I don't care how much those park rangers tip, they have hurt us financially with all their restrictions on what you can and can't do now in the park. That's why I serve them sneezers. I sneeze in their coffee. ...My family use to make a lot of money collecting ginseng, it was like a family tradition. We would all go out together and teach the young ones how to harvest the root and put the berry back so plants would be there for future generations. We can't do that anymore. We use to get around \$40.00 [US currency] for a pound of ginseng. This helped out a lot to buy school clothes and other things we needed. Now we have to depend on a government check to help us out financially.

In addition to the importance of collecting ginseng in the past to supplement residents' livelihood, it was also seen as a family tradition and a part of residents' social identity of self-sufficiency.

Other examples of "everyday resistance" include local residents shunning NPS employees when they met them in public places, such as restaurants, gas stations, grocery stores, or the new Super Wal-Mart. Other NPS employees describe how residents often make derogatory remarks about them through "gossip" or that they will write "a nasty article in the local newspaper."

Resistance towards the NPS can be seen when local residents boycott the BSNRRA in general, when they "refuse to have anything to do with that Park again." During an interview with one resident and his eldest son, the resident described the symbolic meaning that the No Business Creek area held for him:

No Business always meant a lot to my family, for camping, now the NPS has turned its meaning on its head. There are restrictions on getting there, and if you do get there, there's more restrictions. You can't even pick a flower for your wife without taking a chance of going to jail. I had a ranger almost give me a ticket because I threw an orange peel on the ground. He said I was littering. Can you believe it? I tell, you, as long as I am alive, my son and his kids will never step foot in the park again.

Similarly, another resident describes her memories of the No Business Creek area:

I remember being with my family at No Business, and then later I took my children there to camp, picnic, to just be near the water. It was a family tradition. It doesn't mean anything to me anymore, because I can't get there. They [NPS] closed off the road to the river, and I'm too old to walk that far and my children refuse to go without me. I suppose those days are a thing of the past.

The previous statements demonstrate the severity of local residents' resistance towards the NPS, when they state that they "refuse to ever step foot in that park again." Resistance also manifests itself when residents boycott cultural festivals sponsored by the NPS, even when the festivals provide educational activities on the history of the area, and when residents resist attending Open House meetings sponsored by the NPS.

Concluding remarks

As discussed previously, due to the low attendance of local residents to Open House meetings sponsored by the NPS, I was hired as a consultant to investigate barriers or circumstances inhibiting residents from attending the NPS meetings. It was discovered that residents prefer communication between themselves and NPS employees on a more informal and common ground. A community center or church for examples, in lieu of the more formal Open House meetings held at courthouses or town halls. In addition, in place of a formal meeting, focus groups proved to be more beneficial by utilizing the methodological technique of participatory mapping in order to acquire local participation and input on the management of the National Area. For example, in using the focus group method and a common ground to obtain local input, the hierarchical arrangement of power is diminished, and the intimidating figure of authority is removed, thereby curtailing conflict and resistance between symbolic opposite parties.

Participatory mapping proved to be most beneficial in identifying locations of resources that are essential for the continuance and protection of the indigenous population's "livelihood" and "social identity." Currently, manifestations of resistance are in the form of routine and individual acts by local residents. Residents have found others means to support their livelihood. However, with the continuance of additional restrictions to access of natural and cultural resources within the BSFNRRA, impacting areas that are viewed as a part of residents' social identity, resistance may transform into more organized and public acts of resistance. An example of this additional restriction being the closing of the Oneida and Western Railroad bed to vehicular access. The railroad bed, currently a dirt road, also leads to traditional places for camping and family cemeteries. Family cemeteries are very important to the social identity of local residents. This fact was expressed during an interview with a local resident.

The park service needs to realize that this [BSF] area is a big part of who we are, my mom is buried here, my dad is buried here, and my great-grand parents, and so on. If the NPS recognizes this [social identity], then folks would participate more, we feel we are treated as if we were outsiders.

The NPS has been hesitant to close the road due to responses from local residents and the actions that they may take.

In conclusion, it is imperative that the NPS recognizes the continual threat to local residents' "social identity" and "livelihood." To work towards some means of sustainable access. If the cost levels [impacts] are related to the motivation to resist as exemplified in the works of Scott (1985; 1990) and in the work of Schweri and Van Willigen (1978), then it can be predicted that conflict and resistance will also continue to manifest itself between the NPS and indigenous population, and perhaps in the form of more organized and public acts of resistance. The importance of this research may also be of help to other organizations involved in developmental projects that affect the social identity and livelihood of indigenous populations.

References

- Chan, Kai and Robert Pringle, Jai Ranganathan, Carol Boggs, Yvonne Chan, Paul Ehrlich, Peter Haff, Micole Heller, Karim Al-Khafaji, Dena Macmynowski** 2007 'When Agendas Collide: Human Welfare and Biological Conservation,' *Conservation Biology*. Vol.21, Issue 1, pp. 59-68, Feb. 2007.
- Crespi, Muriel** 1989 'The Potential Role of National Parks in Maintaining Cultural Diversity,' *International Perspectives on Cultural Parks*. Proceedings of the First World Conference, Mesa Verde National Park. National Park Service.
- Gezon, Lisa** 2006 *Global Visions, Local Landscapes: A Political Ecology of Conservation, Conflict, and Control in Northern Madagascar*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Greenberg, Adolph** 1989 'Game Preserves and Native Peoples: A Northern Ontario Example,' *International Perspectives on Cultural Parks*. Proceedings of the First World Conference, Mesa Verde National Park. National Park Service.
- Hitchcock, Robert K.** 'Resource Rights and Resettlement Among the San of Botswana,' *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 22(4):51-55.
- Hitchcock, Robert K.** 1994 'Human Rights and the Environment in southern Africa: San Experiences,' *Who Pays the Price? The Sociocultural Context of Environmental Crisis*, edited by Barbara Johnston, 56-65. Washington, DC: Island Press.

- Hitchcock, Robert K.** 1985 'Foragers on the Move: San Survival Strategies in Botswana Parks and Reserves,' *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 9 (1):31-36.
- Howell, Benita** 1994 'Cultural Tourism: A Long-term Strategy for Community Development,' *Touchstone: The Magazine of the Tennessee Humanities Council*. Number 26, Pp. 3-5.
- Howell, Benita** 1993 'Social Impact Assessment and Cultural Conservation : Implications for Local Public Involvement in Planning,' *Environmental Analysis*, Stephen Hildebrand and Johnnie Cannon, eds. Pp. 274-312, Boca Raton: Lewis Publishers.
- Howell, Benita** 'The Anthropologist as Advocate for Local Interests in National Park Planning,' *International Perspectives on Cultural Parks*. Proceedings of the First World Conference, Mesa Verde National Park. National Park Service.
- Kothari, Ashish, Neena Singh and Saloni Suri** 1996 *People and Protected Areas: Towards Participatory Conservation in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Little, Peter, and M. M. Horowitz** 1987 'Land, Ecology, and Development.' *Lands at Risk in the Third World*. Little, Peter, and M. M. Horowitz, eds. Pp. 373-397. Boulder: Westview.
- Oliver-Smith, A.** 1996 'Fighting for a Place: The Policy Implications of Resistance to Resettlement,' *Understanding Impoverishment: The Consequences of Development-induced Displacement*, C.McDowell, ed., pp. 77-97. Providence RI, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- McNeely, Jeffrey A.** 1994 'Protected Areas for the 21st Century: Working to Provide Benefits to Society,' *Biodiversity and Conservation* 3:390-405.
- Murphree, Marshall** 2004 *Communal Approaches to Natural Resource Management in Africa: From whence and to where?* Center for African Studies. Breslauer Symposium on Natural Resource Issues in Africa. March 5, 2004.
- Olwig, Karen** 1980 'National Parks, Tourism, and Local Development: A West Indian Case,' *Human Organization*. 39 (1):22-31.
- Peet, Richard and Michael Watts, eds.** *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, and Social Movements*. New York and London: Routledge Press.
- Schweri, William and John Van Willigen** 1978 *Organized Resistance to an Imposed Environmental Change: A Reservoir in Eastern Kentucky*. University of Kentucky Water Resources Research Institute, Report No. 110.
- Scott, James** 1992 *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Scott, James** 1985 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Smith, Valene** 1989 *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Stevens, Stan** *Conservation through Survival: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas*. Washington, DC Island Press.
- Stonich, Susan, ed.** *Endangered Peoples of Latin America: Struggles to Survive and Thrive*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Western, David, R. Michael Wright, and Shirley C. Strum, eds.** 1994 *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** 1980 *Big South Fork National and River and Recreational Area: Master Plan*.
- Xu, Jianchu and David Melick** 2007 'Rethinking the Effectiveness of Public Protected areas in Southwestern China.' *Conservation Biology*. Vol. 21, Issue 2, pp. 318-328.