



*Environmental actors in conflicts and crisis areas:
re-exploring conservation, locality, nature in podcasts*

Intercultural Encounters
Master's thesis
Faculty of Arts, University of Helsinki
Viliam Matomäki, September 2024

Tiedekunta/Osasto — Fakultet/Sektion — Faculty Faculty of Arts		
Tekijä — Författare — Author Viljam Kristian Aleksanteri Matomäki		
Työn nimi — Arbetets titel — Title Environmental actors in conflicts and crisis areas: re-exploring conservation, locality, nature in podcasts		
Oppiaine — Läroämne — Subject Intercultural Encounters		
Työn laji — Arbetets art — Level Master's thesis	Aika — Datum — Month and year 9.2024	Sivumäärä — Sidoantal — Number of pages 70
Tiivistelmä — Referat — Abstract <p>Researchers have discussed a significant overlap between areas needing nature conservation and areas experiencing conflict. This study examines how environmental issues connect with crises by analysing podcasts in which experts talk about nature protection in crisis and conflict areas.</p> <p>By thematically and narratively examining six different podcasts, the research focuses on three key areas: general nature conservation, animal conservation, and environmental health. Represented regions are both sub-Saharan and North Africa, Southeast Asia, the Caribbean and Eastern Europe.</p> <p>The podcasts' guests, who come from various backgrounds, share their stories and insights on how conservation efforts are influenced by local and global challenges and the realities of working in crisis and conflict areas.</p> <p>The questions asked concern strengths, limitations and styles of expert narratives (and the expert opinions' relevance), minimisation or underrepresentation of themes, and the description of local human reality.</p> <p>A major takeaway is that while each podcast has a different focus, they all emphasise the importance of local communities' livelihoods and the difficulties of working with limitations. The environmental health podcasts, in contrast to the others, tend to look at broader issues rather than focusing on what is happening in the field.</p> <p>The study also finds that the podcast format, with its informal and conversational style, leads to discussions that are more story-driven than expected. This allows for a wide range of topics to be covered but makes the expert opinions feel less organised. Nonetheless, the podcasts provide important insights into the political, technical, and emotional aspects of environmentalism in crisis areas.</p> <p>Interestingly, the idea of using conservation to build peace is not a central theme in these discussions. Instead, the focus is on the broad challenges and human understandings that shape environmental work in these difficult contexts. As the podcasts manage to give multifactorial descriptions, they can be insightful sources of information, if listened to with some criticism.</p>		

Tutkijat ovat kirjoittaneet luonnonsuojelua tarvitsevien alueiden olevan merkittävän usein myös alueita, joissa tapahtuu konflikteja. Tämä tutkimus tarkastelee sitä, miten ympäristöasiat yhdistyvät kriiseihin analysoimalla podcasteja, joissa asiantuntijat keskustelevat luonnonsuojelusta kriiseissä ja konfliktialueilla.

Tutkiessaan temaattisesti ja narratiivisesti kuutta eri podcastia tämä työ keskittyy kolmeen avainryhmään: yleinen luonnonsuojelu, eläintensuojelu ja ympäristöterveys. Edustetut alueet ovat Saharan eteläpuoleinen Afrikka sekä Pohjois-Afrikka, Kaakkois-Aasia, Karibia ja Itä-Eurooppa.

Podcastien vieraat, jotka tulevat monista taustoista, jakavat tarinansa ja oivalluksensa siitä, miten kriisi- ja konfliktialueilla työskentelyn paikalliset ja globaalit haasteet vaikuttavat luonnonsuojelupyrkimyksiin.

Esitetyt kysymykset koskevat asiantuntijanarratiivien vahvuuksia, rajoitteita ja tyylejä (sekä asiantuntijamielipiteiden asiaankuuluvuutta), teemojen minimisaatiota tai aliedustusta ja paikallisen ihmistodellisuuden kuvausta.

Eräs ratkaiseva tulos on, että vaikka podcasteilla on eri fokukset, ne kaikki painottavat paikallisten yhteisöjen elinkeinoja ja rajoitteellisen työskentelyn haasteita. Ympäristöterveyspodcastit, kontrastina muihin, tapaavat käsitellä laajempia asiakokonaisuuksia sen sijaan että ne keskittyisivät tilanteeseen kentällä.

Tutkimuksen tulos osoittaa, että podcastformaatti epämuodollisella ja keskustelullisella tyyllillään johtaa odotettua tarinavetoisempiin puheisiin. Tämä sallii laajat keskusteluaihepiirit, mutta saa asiantuntijamielipiteet vaikuttamaan polveilevimmilta. Siltikin podcastit tarjoavat tärkeitä näkökulmia poliittisiin, teknisiin ja tunteellisiin environmentalismin aspekteihin kriisialueilla.

Kiinnostavaa on, ettei rauhanrakennus luonnonsuojelun avulla ole keskeinen teema näissä keskusteluissa. Sen sijaan fokus on niissä laajoissa haasteissa ja inhimillisissä käsityksissä, jotka muovaavat ympäristön edestä tehtyä työtä näissä vaikeissa olosuhteissa. Koska podcastit kykenevät monisyiseen kuvaukseen, ne voivat toimia oivaltavina informaation lähteinä, kunhan niitä kuunnellaan ajatuksen kanssa.

Avainsanat — Nyckelord — Keywords

environmental health, humanitarian crisis, armed conflict, ecosystem protection, nature values, cultural, cultures, narrative, peace park, biodiversity hotspot, positive peace

Säilytyspaikka — Förvaringsställe — Where deposited

Helsingin yliopiston kirjasto

Muita tietoja — Övriga uppgifter — Additional information

työn ohjaaja Pirjo Kristiina Virtanen
handledare supervisor

table of contents

- 1. *Background* 4
- 2. *Literature review* 6
 - 2.1. Issues for environmental organisations..... 6
 - 2.2. Adjacent research on conservation in crisis areas..... 8
- 3. *Theory* 10
 - 3.1. Intercultural theories and study relevance..... 10
 - 3.2. Onto-epistemology and theoretical scope 11
- 4. *Research design* 13
 - 4.1. Research questions and the data 13
 - 4.2. Methodology and relevant ethics..... 15
- 5. *Description and analysis of contents, themes: practical experiences with but mostly above wider context awareness; the other way around in environmental health*..... 20
 - 5.1. Nature conservation, general: small organisations, co-operation, local issues 20
 - 5.2. Animal conservation: the animals, money, land, arms, international practices..... 29
 - 5.3. Environmental health: neocolonialism/imperialism, history, iniquity, uncertainty 41
- 6. *Analysis: narratives and interactions in these podcasts nuanced, yet partial to viewpoints*..... 47
 - 6.1. Nature conservation, general: balancing..... 47
 - 6.2. Animal conservation: management..... 52
 - 6.3. Environmental health: great threats..... 56
- 7. *Results and discussion* 59
- 8. *Conclusion* 66
- Reference list* 68

1. Background

This work makes a structural critical realist narrative analysis of expert descriptions of nature protection in crisis and conflict areas through two podcasts in each of three categories: general nature conservation, animal conservation and environmental health. The work is informed by the study of intercultural encounters. The questions asked relate to the assessment of expert opinions with regard to the topic, narrative themes and local human reality.

Conflicts and crises do not refer in this study to small interpersonal conflicts or conflicts between conservation organisations and other organisations. The types of crises included in this work are ethnic conflicts, coup, political instability or *failed state*, drought, fires, separatism, war. These are researched topics on their own, but in relation to environmentalism not as much. Drawing from what research there is, this study uses podcasts, an underresearched topic in its own right, to further the inquiry. Areas included in this study are Myanmar, Haiti, DR Congo, Namibia, the Sahel, Algeria and Ukraine.

Nature conservation often takes place in areas under some type of problems or upheaval. Environmentalism and peace and conflict is detailed in the readings, as these cases highlight the possibilities and challenges of it in these conditions. Territoriality and multiculturalism of environmentalism have been discussed, though the latter has apparently not been studied on a workplace-level. The study of podcasts is still a rising topic, so instead of a podcast theory this study draws on the contemplation of media culture.

With this background this work asks broad but revealing questions. The research asks how selected, typical structural coding categories describe strengths, limitations and styles of *expert* narratives on podcasts about conservation in crises (and in what ways is the expert opinion's relevance in the global discourse justified regarding to which I ask if I concur; I ask how reliable, valid and transferrable / generalisable it is). I also ask if some themes minimised or underrepresented and how the local human reality given voice to and information about.

What is analysed is expert opinions and accounts of the reality on ground as revealed in the podcast medium. My definition of an expert is inclusive as the guests are varied. What the hosts say is important as well, and analysed as part of the study of how, what and even why the podcasts say things to listeners, but in my analysis the term expert refers to the guests.

Podcasts are tied to social media, but they are only half-way there, so social media theory cannot be used. They are, literally, audio broadcasts within a platform that is very flexible compared to radio, and where listeners have more choice. This is why I attempt to link my media discussion to digital culture broadly, rather than social media culture. The method of this work is an application of narrative analysis with temporal notes for a look on expert descriptions of the ground and organisations working there in the contexts of crises which include kinds of conflict.

The interplay of culture and nature is dynamic (Bergholm, 2017) (Descola, 2013) in exceptional circumstances as well as in typical ones. Culture and society may be Global Northern concepts adapted into the language of social science. The separation of these from each other and nature may take many kinds of forms (with many kinds of continuities and discontinuities between humans and non-humans) (Descola, 2013) as human living is negotiated with its environmental surrounding in a multitude of ways.

Crises and environments are also linked in a great number of ways. This work zooms in on some of these issues, but the broader discussion is very wide and not all aspects of it can be centered. Conflicts and crises are related to environmental conservation issues in causes, solutions, in questions about cultures and cultural forms, and supply, terrain and law. Not only that, crises made by human actions can be made worse by such things as extreme weather phenomena. One such case is forest or bush fires and an example of them is included in this work.

This work does not strictly follow boundaries such as delineating what is conservation and including only things by that name, due to this manifoldness. Additionally, questions that are not asked in this thesis as the research questions may feature centrally in the background reading due to it, but I would caution the reader that even some central issues such as how the

environment can geopolitically lead to conflicts are not at the heart of this work's contribution.

In the next chapter the state of the literature is viewed, starting with more broadly talking through the relevant phenomena of environmental organisations and these in relation to 'the intercultural', again especially where peace is disturbed.

2. Literature review

2.1. Issues for environmental organisations

Even though environmental organisations are often multicultural, both bringing personnel from abroad and employing locals, the scientific discussion on multicultural spaces barely touches conservation. Therefore in lieu of empirical examples of conservation workplaces, there is some, if limited, intercultural theory discussion in the last subchapter of the literature review, 2.3.

In my definition *environment* includes geography, ecosystems, plants, animals and their interaction with the human element. Human culture is for a major part the relationship humans hold to their environment, be it natural or human environment, because human order, sustenance and many social changes have their basis in relation to nature. This much is a truism, but one that has led many to acknowledge something that compels us to react: that human health is environmental.

Environmental health has been more quantitative than qualitative, and a weakness of the subject is its lack of theory building (Scammell, 2010, p.1152). In practice, environmental health is often discussed under the heading of One Health, which as a concept is not opened up in this work but can be thought to be an adjacent approach.

Some species in conservation are considered umbrella species: their protection leads very significantly to the protection of an ecosystem. An example of this is red pandas and bamboo-broad-leaved forests. An indicator species on the other hand reveals the healthiness of an

ecosystem while a keystone species is a species especially active in maintaining an ecosystem. There are many complementary approaches to protecting biodiversity including less obvious ones such as reducing the amount of waste. Biodiversity can be defined in different contexts either as the varied web of life in its environments, or ecosystems-species-genetic diversity.

Environmental NGOs have come to stress participation and raising local awareness (Bryant, 2005, p. 172-173). NGOs try to maintain or expand a territorial focus to have legitimacy (ibid, p. 180) And this is said to extend to recruitment. There is an attempt to gather moral capital and be locally rooted for example in order to not seem like capital-city-imperialistic. (ibid., p.179) Defining whether or not there should be no-go-zones is also a territory question, as are threats of violence and relations to military organisations. (ibid., p.164,182-185) Such realities have to deal with law and justice more broadly, and thus climate justice is an inseparable part of environmentalism. It is also relevant to the Ukraine case in this work. Within a climate justice avenue, but even more broadly relevant, another research summarises the work environment and a possible future of progressively studying it thusly:

"The work of climate justice requires actors from across the world to come together in culturally diverse sites, where long-standing struggles continue for autonomy and control over natural resources, and where shared languages like English are unequally accessible, and tainted with colonial ideologies. While work in environmental anthropology has taken an ethnographic approach to understanding conflicts and miscommunication between the different actors involved in environmental conservation, the methodologies of sociolinguistics and related fields are uniquely situated to examine in detail the interactions, language choices, and ideologies involved in designing and implementing climate justice work, and the impact these have on how this work is carried out." (Edmonds, 2021, p. 482)

Some, particularly earlier, conservation has been centered on the strategy of fortress conservation, which means large-scale areas where humans are limited from living in (Rai et al., 2021), this having led to human rights concerns. The newest environmental movements, can be more focused on political targets rather than having a clear vision of practicality in contrast to the generations represented in this study (de Moor, J. et al., 2021, p.623-624).

2.2. Adjacent research on conservation in crisis areas

Conservation and conservation specialists in conflict areas are underresearched, which is why this study is looking into that direction. (There is however a richness of research generally on conservation and its relation to the local reality of human habitation.)

What about the research of podcasts, narratives, ideology? I found one podcast study that addressed ideology quite directly. Made in China, it is concerned with negative reportage about Chinese foreign investment. Suffice to say this is not a topic I take uncritically. The main argument is that Western news podcasts handle China as foreign and other. There are other interesting aspects of the study: coding properties, including a dichotomy of West vs. rest and the portrayal of Western countries as neutral, passive. (Apirakvanalee & Zhai, 2023)

Hanson et al. (2009) write that war has often led to abuses of wildlife and natural areas. Protecting facilities and areas have been left unstaffed, unequipped and cut off. Preparation for and activities following warfare also affect the environment. Sometimes a war can leave a certain area out of human use due to evacuations and buffer zones.

Conflicts are greatly overrepresented in biodiversity hotspots, which are ecoregions hosting 0,5% (1500) of the Earth's vascular plant species that must have lost 70% of plant coverage. An estimate of 81% of singular conflicts with over a thousand casualties happen at least partially within biodiversity hotspots. These are also overrepresented in all conservation funding. (While one actuality is that some modern wars are fought as skirmishes in remote pieces of land, which means less-inhabited border regions, again, these are hotspots only if both above conditions are met.)

Natural resources often form the majority of guerrilla groups' revenue. These, refugees and displaced persons use the natural resources, oftentimes indiscriminately. The writers suggest that a) organisations must be able to function in war situations and b) military, reconstruction and humanitarian aid must have strategies and training to guard biodiversity. (Hanson et al., 2009)

A military organisation that causes natural and wildlife loss can side with conservation e.g. for the purpose of prestige or legitimacy, if there is conservation pressure put on a conflict area. This happened in Northern Namibia in the late seventies and in the eighties. (Lenggenhager, 2018, p.128-129) In the book describing this, it is concluded that state politics need to be studied as a whole lest conservation can entangle with other interests and therefore justify discriminative control on a peripheral region. This is less a hit on conservation and more a recommendation that we should change our human-nature relationship on the whole to a more peaceful one without seeking to benefit global elites. (ibid., p.225-230)

To look at one proposed solution in environment and violent crisis, in the book Peace parks: conservation and conflict resolution, Ali (2007, p.1-21) writes about peace parks which can be one of these five cases:

"Two or more contiguous protected areas across a national boundary ... A cluster of protected areas and the intervening land ... A cluster of separated protected areas without intervening land ... A transborder area including proposed protected areas ... A protected area in one country aided by sympathetic land use over the border."

The remote areas at borders are in some cases not under any conservation efforts to begin with. The idea of peace parks challenges the ideas that conservation more likely causes conflicts rather than resolves them and that conservation is only an afterthought or a side consideration of peace processes (which it sometimes is currently). Natural threats like desertification can even be the first kinds of co-operation between belligerents.

Causally, Ali (2007, p.1-21) sees that conflict on the one hand and things related to conservation on the other do not follow strict rules, but abundance of a natural resource in a difficult site leads to overuse mostly if there is an easy way of extracting the resource and if there is a functional market for the sale of it. A fear of depletion is counterparted by high uncertainty of future benefits – these are close to each other, but the first leads to co-operation through awareness and the latter, influenced by a lack of trust between humans, can lead to conflicts.

This said, the book includes a game-theoretical approach at trying to test the effectiveness of peace parks and to find some causal links. Of course, this is not meant as a sharp realistic description of the entire process of the conflict. As the editor, Ali (2007, p.1-21) puts it shortly in reminding that a non-peace park solution to a border clash is more likely to lead to environmental harm than the peace park. The peace park is not supposed to be an anarchical region. (ibid.)

In addition to conservation strictly, values about the environment are a multicultural consideration. Starting with the introduction of colonial practices, values on nature have been through numerous upheavals in many sites. This does not mean an extinction of the traditional form of local human-nature-order heritage. (Given, 1995, p.877-879)

Multiculturalism requires discourse and legislation to find common conceptions of sustainability for the protection of biodiversity, including taking into account historical law, such as New Zealand's original treaty between queen and the chiefs (ibid., p.887) or historical findings that relate to the status of resources on a site. In what follows, I expand on *the intercultural*.

3. Theory

3.1. Intercultural theories and study relevance

When we ask what kind of dialogue do shared environmental conservation attempts in conflict areas create, we must also investigate in practice the *understandings* of nature, its protection and environmental co-operation's relation to culture.

Intercultural encounters, a programme that this work is a part of, is a crossdisciplinary programme, building not only a thematic but a synthetic area of study toward the theme. Additionally I am trained in anthropology, global development studies and recent history. The theories here are those that I think would be included in the emphasis of the Intecultural encounters undertaking.

According to Döveling et al. media culture centers the affective as cultural practice and its use links to power relations. Their study focuses on things that bring people together in imagined media communities, but what is relevant from their findings is that narratives adhere together audiences. They also note that normativisation is gradual (Döveling et al., 2018) which can be a narrative divergence mechanic (and of potential polarisation) in different corners of media.

Humans are adaptive in that they can regardless of their imperfection think widely. They can expand their multifactoral analyses (Guba & Lincoln 1981) and thus enlarge discussion instead of delineating topics to a few select phenomena. This makes this type of study insight-offering.

This theoretical discussion informs the methodology. Some parts of intercultural research notably stress epistemological issues, such as local knowledges. This work produces knowledge from a Global Northern University perspective, but it takes a clarifying look at the foundations of this knowledge before moving on to research questions and the data, which in turn leads the work to its methodological set of tools in use.

Another thing to note of media and influencing is that in environmental concerns, rhetoric about future generations may be a particularly effective tool, while catastrophic facts include actionability in already engaged people. (Bak-Coleman et al., 2024)

3.2. *Onto-epistemology and theoretical scope*

There is basis to regard the tying of social scientific and humanities' notions to strict ontology as superfluous. To illustrate, critical realism, applied in this work, has been claimed to be either a critical monism or transcendental idealism, but for the conduct of research, the importance lies in the contextualist epistemology. For social sciences & humanities, the scale is individual, communal and system actions and experiences. When the available bits of information do not fully comply with each other in any humanly discernable way, e.g. behaviour and phenomenology are in discord, we have the choice to make dogmata or move on.

"It appears to me that the 'real' is an intrinsically empty, meaningless category (pigeon hole), whose monstrous importance lies only in the fact that I can do certain things in it and not certain others." (Einstein, 1918)

The above is not an ontological claim, but ontological quietism. An epistemological claim I do have to make: that critical realism should be used in this work. Largely, we can only attempt objectivity. In other words, as we really take into account positionality we can as well forget objectivity, but vie for factuality. We may not tell the full truth, but we may be truthful. This is also an ethical question. Few things are more powerful than defining the truth.

I do not cite epistemological publications here as that would be a thesis-of-its-own-sized discussion, but critical realism assumes that narratives are products of the sociocultural setting and thus reflections of the world, but also of the different types of knowing the world (the experiential features of the world being just as important). Of which of the two does a work like this reveal more about, or equally both, I do not know. The allure of philosophy is not necessarily that it can answer these questions, maybe even the opposite.

Like values, getting and managing information can be a multicultural issue in the field of conservation. The lack of multicultural approaches can also be a noteworthy feature. Arriving then to the question of local knowledges, including traditions and citizen and traditional science, where applicable an awareness of their local legitimacy must be held. Local knowledges can be harmful or beneficial to natural protection in their context and they can be taken out of their context and used for benefit to external actors. From an anthropological perspective the difference between scientific and local information is not definite.

Many critics of moral Eurocentrism, among others world-systems-analyst Samir Aman (2017) have noted that a Western focus is not a true universalism but rather, they suggest, strategically gives the impression of tying good values to the West. My view is that like other cultures, the West routinely ignores its highest ideals. Ideals, often similar, are indeed found in all cultures.

I make reservations about grand theories and prefer middle-range and particular theories. That said, I am intrigued by symbolic interactionism, an unassuming grand theory, the main parts of which are hard to deny: that humans are poised to engage with their understanding of the world. Of course, some aspects of grand theories have become so widely accepted that they are included as something of a presupposition behind many mid-level theories, such as the reproduction of symbols from story to event. (Sahlins, 1981) Methodologies also tend to be theoretical in this way. The use of thematic and structural categories in narrative analysis allows me to describe the contents in a way that shows a balance, walks a balance between information-spread-questions and information-questions in seamless and critical realist ways.

4. Research design

4.1. Research questions and the data

To recount, the research questions are

- A. How do typical structural coding categories describe strengths, limitations and styles of expert narratives on podcasts about conservation in crises?
- B. In what ways is the expert opinion's relevance in the global discourse justified? Do I concur; how reliable, valid and transferrable (generalisable) is it here?
- C. Are some themes minimised or underrepresented?
- D. How is the local human reality given voice to and information about?

Working behind the research questions, two background themes mark this investigation: What are the strengths, limitations, and narrative styles present within the selected podcasts? How do these narrative portrayals contribute to our comprehension of crisis situations in the field of nature and environmental conservation? These research questions have not recurred from their original form after the start of the analysis. Though some studies require recursivity, I want to see that not only positive results get reported. The four research questions represent both a wide enough approach to the multifaceted reality and the accurate scope of this work. For question C, noting *what is missing* must be less than systematic, but the study finds that the results are valuable. For what is not included in speech can be as relevant as what is in it.

The research questions must lead to the methodology and the compiling of the data, so to answer them in the chosen context, I note there is no great mass of fitting podcasts, because there have not been quite so many relevant ones recorded. Protection of biodiversity is a rising topic, as is environmental destruction, even during crises. What limits the selection is finding explanation of protection of environment through the narratives of experts employed by organisations. The selected six cases, chosen in 2023–2024 and listened through Spotify, are over 24 min length and interview someone from a single non-governmental organisation. (Relevant background information that comes up in the episodes about each expert is included in the analysis part. The hosts are also important in the discussion, but their background is less audible.) The environmental health emissions, especially Algeria, diverge somewhat from conservation as such. All podcasts have at least 44 episodes, and one episode is chosen. The exception to these rules is the last podcast, which has 16 episodes and interviews multiple experts. These podcasts are first analysed and compared to each other in the pairings below and then the totality of them collated in the discussion chapter.

The list of podcasts included in the three categories, two in each, is as follows:

Nature conservation, general

'Conservation in a Time of Crisis' (Conservation Realist Podcast, Real Conversations for Better Conservation) [Myanmar], April 2023

Bonus Episode: Community Conservation in Haiti with [REDACTED], Into The Wild, Ryan Dalton & Nadia Shaikh, April 2024 [October 2023]

Animal conservation

#123 [REDACTED], DRC & Elephant relocation (Into The Wilderness with Byron Pace, The Pace Brothers) [and Namibia], September 2019

'Conservation in Conflict Zones' with [REDACTED], Co-Founder of Chengeta Wildlife (This Wild Life Conservation Podcast, Amy Turner) [Central African Republic and Mali], April 2021

Environmental health

The Political, Environmental and Health Crisis in Algeria (Voices of the Middle East and North Africa (VOMENA Team at KPFA)), September 2021

#8: Conflict, Climate, and the Environment, Part I: Ukraine (The Civilian Protection Podcast), November 2022

4.2. Methodology and relevant ethics

This narrative analysis work uses a deductive approach with some inductive and abductive remarks. Mid-level theory is applied to parts of the source data. This increases the risk of bias as there are preconceived notions used, but centering on an inductive approach via trial and error would be a larger project, probably requiring either a team or machine intelligence, the latter of which would be subject to the black box problem (that the method of data handling would be obscure: and no large language model is used as a tool in the writing of this work or in the analysis). Alternatively, if the amount of data were reduced, there would not be sufficient saturation (and certainly no generalisability).

With content analysis we ask what, with discourse analysis we ask how. With narrative analysis we ask about what. My narrative analysis is structural, emphasising larger wholes over single phrases, which is aside practical challenges the reason why transcription is not utilised and coding is done manually instead, and with temporal notation, that is to say there is a looser made-for-purpose transcript that functions as the basis of the analysis of contents and themes.

A critical realist take on narratives, explained shortly, (Elger & Smith, 2014) has been conjoined with a guide to narrative analyses. In addition to the spirit of structural holism, the coding categories used for research question A are structural in that they describe dichotomies and communication more than theme-specific issues. (Lieblich et al., 1995) The deductive pre-selected categories that have been selected are as ambivalent as possible: they could be used in many different context, but their precise selection is due to how they relate to podcasts and difficult circumstances. They are a) the differentiation of fact and subjectivity in speech b)

ethos-pathos-logos c) expressions of belonging and foreignness and d) activity and passivity. These are each widely used structural codes selected after consulting methodology literature. In addition, thematic categories are discussed in this chapter and listed at the end.

My narrative analysis is critical in the critical realist sense. This means that the narratives can reveal limited truths about the world and we can also assess (but not access) the situation itself, not only the narratives of it. This is unless there is reason to assume the makers of the narratives are lying or inventing memories. I do not write misrepresent: it is rather assumed that misrepresentation is bound to happen a little. (Elger & Smith, 2014)

Narrative analysis often pertains to individual, even biographical study. It takes some effort to direct it to the demesne of organisations and organisational experts. The decision to do so is rooted in the format. Podcasts recounting personal experiences are narratives (Barnwell & Ravn, 2023) and the larger topics of conservation on the one hand and podcast information spread on the other are demanding of study in this way, too.

With this in mind, there are two major ethical questions for this work: whose voice is heard, and how does the body of knowledge this work relates to affect the world. These are actively handled alongside the research. Though this research is not explicitly normative, I do consider the consequences of speech. Additionally, though podcasts are supposed to be public releases, some more intimate wordings may be omitted, but rarely are for specifically that reason in this work. Persons are not mentioned by name in the analysis to allow them to withdraw assent from their concerns on the situations, or more precisely, the arguments that this work makes about their speech, and maintain distance from this work, although the original podcasts can be traced if they remain available. The hosts names are included in the listing if they are in the publication details.

During this analysis, particular attention is paid to intercultural aspects within the interview-style podcast format. However, the primary focus is understanding the dissemination of information through these narratives. This includes examining how these narratives depict locations from both on-site and remote perspectives, all while considering the concept of positionality (seeing also that I am writing remotely or based on second-hand on-sitedness).

Duly noted, the researcher is European, Finnish. Opinions vary on how individually one should express their positionality. My approach is that it is rather the end product that should reflect the thinking on positionality in place of explanations reminiscent of 'handwaving'.

But for some positionality background I have never visited any locations the podcasts describe. With that, Southeast Asia is more familiar to me, having stayed twice in Ho Chi Minh and the second time continued onwards to Singapore; having investigated human ecology in both locations. When discussing the reality the narratives relate to I am also guided by the narratives, and would surely raise some different notes than people from the areas. That said, I rely on my training and on second hand information to assess their content.

All the research questions are related to values. Values expressed in speech are not necessarily the core values of an individual or an organisation, but at least they reveal talking points and explanation strategies. In the analysis, this work refers to the categories of Environmental Values and Nature's Contributions to People (Borrie & Armatas, 2022) which are instrumental economic, biophysical ecological, intrinsic ethical, shared social and relational between humans and nature.

When I refer to a critical event, it is in the professional context significance, in which it means that it has impacted on the professional role of the speaker. Critical event is something surprising, even traumatic, more subjectively than objectively. But it is not the case that professional or otherwise identity is solid and then disrupted by a critical event. (Mertova & Webster, 2020, p.60-61, 69) Mertova & Webster think that narratives are especially difficult to compress into pieces of data. They suggest there is a difference between zooming in and out of an event. Their advice primarily deals with zooming in. (ibid., p.87-88) All the while, I think of a bigger picture, too. They note that events must be understood as temporal which I take to heart.

Another context where expert opinions need to be storified is courts. Expert opinions are used that are using narrative tools such as priming and foreshadowing: preparing the hearer for an eventual conclusion. (Bullis, 2013) This is an example of structural wholistic analysis. The

classical split of ethos, pathos and logos is a narrative analysis tool that can examine expertness (ethos) in relation to other modes of persuasion.

As acknowledged in the literature review, some studies have pierced into the category of passive or active political entity in the analysis, which is to say a political entity is being represented in either way. This is one of my categories I comment on in this study: if politics is discussed, what kind of politics is discussed as a passive element and what as active agency. This may or may not have many implications for the work but it is a strand of thought I saw best nevertheless to have in it, if only for the fact that the themes are not apolitical.

Wholistically (in this work) I keep an eye on narrative traits including transportation (absorption by imagery, affect, and attentional focus), character identification, counterfactual thinking, engagement, causality, emotional reactions, perceived realism and even believability, which are elements of public narrative persuasion. (Yale, 2013) These are tools for the research and thinking process and are not directly deferred to in the results or analysis.

Finally, by the side of wholistic analysis of the flow of narrative persuasion, the categories mainly looked for in the texts (once more, decided as part of the methodology before the analysis with their backgrounds detailed above) and mainly handled in chapter 5 and sometimes expanded on in chapter 6 are

Structural categories

fact – subjectivity distinction making
ethos – pathos – logos
belonging – foreignness
activity – passivity (including politically)

Thematic categories

five nature-value types
the intercultural

on-site – remote

local reality, positionality

critical event

At some points, the analysis makes tiny segments of what may seem like transcription poetry. Simply summarised, the purpose of transcription poetry is not to make art but to raise combinations of points. With aid from the artistic form we are reminded that for meaningful success it is crucial to point out vulnerabilities (Vienna Poetry Festival, 2018) i.e. to lose is to lose the consequential: people, nature, culture. I include it as a practical enterprise of situating the knowledge (Aparna et al., forthcoming), trying to get if not in the head of the speakers then at the centre of how their words can affect.

As remarked, the themes behind the research questions, of narrative success or style and contribution to the listeners' understanding are strived to be dealt with.

The analysis is split into two parts, each podcast handled twice, split between contents and narratives specifically. Sometimes there is overlap and a few small aspects of the podcasts may be omitted due to lack of relevance. This split may be arduous for the reader as it was for the writer and perhaps not fully precise due to overlap. Still, the focus both on content and narrative in my mind called for this approach considering the length of the singular emissions, as this split allows to look both at the contents and the narrative form with more clarity and space, so that the aforementioned envisioned question of *about what* can be explored fully.

The two analysis chapters 5, 6 are followed by a results and discussion chapter bringing together the research, returning to the research questions and offering further thoughts after the research has been concluded. The conclusion chapter is a brief overview provided for textual cohesion.

5. Description and analysis of contents, themes: practical experiences with but mostly above wider context awareness; the other way around in environmental health

5.1. Nature conservation, general: small organisations, co-operation, local issues

In the two cases of general nature conservation, both experts are likely to be of a higher monetary or ethnocultural status in their respective societies, being able to build their career and go as outsiders to areas of their country. They originate from the countries they operate in and bring voice to that. In neither of the podcasts, the West is seen as passive, but was criticised – like Times magazine for giving Myanmar’s leader visibility in the influential people listing in the host’s introduction to the Myanmar podcast and big corporation’s carbon offsetting in discussion by the expert and the host in the Haiti one, where particularly, a strategy of double-tipping was named, signifying a situation wherein a corporation first exploits a locale, then trying to make earnings by reimproving its nature’s state. Both make a point about the people living in the sites of operation.

Starting with the Myanmar case, the host has also worked in Myanmar. The host warns Myanmar listeners that they will be talking about the reality of the coup, saying that it is hard enough to live and maybe not something they want from a conservation podcast. The host has lived two and a half years in Myanmar. She notes that it is not a human rights podcast. She also notes that Time magazine does a misservice in including dictators like Myanmar’s in their list of a hundred influential people. Here, the West, or a Western actor, is not seen as passive. Neither is the West passive in the other general nature conservation podcast about Haiti, where carbon offsetting is criticised.

In the 2010s there was a moment of opening in Myanmar when the host started working there. Myanmar is described as poor having bad healthcare. Impacts from the country’s crisis to marginalised communities have been severe.

The interviewee was a diver, not originally an expert in conservation. The interviewee and volunteers or team remove discarded diving gear in an archipelago. The problem is that the mainland is too far. The idea grew to drop-off stations where unusable gear can be left, and

communicating with fishers about conservation. She also does research on sharks and rays, collaborates on a comic project and met the host at a workshop about coastal conservation.

The host asks how the expert came to the conservation scene as an outsider, although also says that she would not like to speak of outsiders and insiders. This represents wideness of understanding who can be an expert. Interviewee said that richer divers brushed the project off and said that them having done a beach clean-up is enough.

On the first expedition the expert worried about logistics and safety, but her worries have changed: she worries about child labour, drugs, sea horse trafficking, a lot she'd like to pick up next. The host says the expert does not come to the field with arrogance and thinking she knows everything, which is a jab at some attitudes among others. Notably, *"You're eager to learn and to see what is actually going on."* In saying so, the host makes a fact-subjectivity distinction in favour of a less academic-conservation-establishment person. She says such an attitude that the expert has is not so common to see.

The host says some of the conferences can be peculiar with flower arrangements and everything. The host expresses admiration and speculates that maybe the reason why the expert can keep things going under challenging circumstances is networking as a small organisation.

The expert says it is strategic proposals. With no full-time team to help with bureaucracy, it is hard but free to manage different aspects. When she has divers to help, she can manage the team's relationship with the local community, which she cannot say about larger organisations. She notes various local populations have bad recollections of some organisations they have dealt with. She says the small town she works at is small enough for her to get a grasp on. According to the host, the gap between larger organisations based in Yangon and abroad, and local civil society organisations is big.

From this theme of locality the discussion turns to cultural practice: the expert says that in local culture not all naysaying is said out loud, recounts that she has encountered many examples of that and of language barriers. Usually the peasant with the strongest language

skill *decides* what had been said; imperfect or selective translation. The host notes the expert is from a different part of Myanmar than the communities.

She remembers the anxiety of going to a village she has never been in her first outing. She laughs about showing up with foreign divers and awaiting the local's response. She then had a feeling of foreignness, which is one of the categories I'm inquiring into. Though she is a national of the same country, she had a feeling of foreignness, where many foreigners express a feeling of belonging. She takes seriously the aspect of belonging and of local understanding.

She mentions waste management problems, part of coastal conservation questions that perhaps the expert has worked on, it is to an extent unclear. She says that on an island one sees waste management problems instantly.

On that island she settled quickly, there was a welcoming community and less intimidation of social hierarchy because she did not come with a badge of an organisation or the like. There, village leaders spoke with her, others not. Host adds that in many cases, people are not encouraged in the formal workshops. The expert was able to "*just be at that location*" with open communication. The expert also gives an example of her and her sister doing surveys on fishermen's practices, which did not correspond to the formal presentations, but the faults with either academic or government statistics may be because the fishermen are not reporting accurate numbers to them, rather than to her. The host gives an anecdote that some other kind of data collectors were badmouthing locals; ignorant is considered by her as a slur. The expert says that especially in *an Asian context*, social hierarchy matters so she is glad of being able to work. She has a kid in training from the village, and he helps because he is not perceived as threatening.

The expert says it can be people in positions of power who think the locals are stupid etc. She says she though she has to educate the fishermen, but then changed her thoughts that she needs to help the fishermen find solutions and educate the people in power. She recounts being in a meeting where an official in Yangon said that less sharks is better, because there is more fish for humans. The host laughs and adds that it is hard when one must remain polite and not publicly say it is wrong.

When asked about it, she notes the suddenness that many faced with the coup, that suddenly you have no governmental body to engage with. She notes the importance of her struggle to continue, talking of the changing stressful work environment and the coup's immediate effect:

"I feel like I've aged twenty years in the last two. I'm laughing about it now, it... restricted physically what we are able to do a lot."

"communities are suffering"

"I just wanted to pick up nets."

"sustained local ... sustainable solutions"

She continues on overcoming danger and being proud of her work, which I will return to in 6.1.

The host has experience of working with youth in two places in Myanmar. Unfortunately they could not cross state lines and internet was bad. The expert has more to say: even if it is again possible to cross lines, young people get harassed and searched. She says that she gets her phone searched every now and then. People on the ground need to decide what is safe. She says she shouldn't push them.

She says she has already an idea what Myanmar needs in terms of education. She also has positive experiences of *kids* in National University of Singapore environmental camp and a lady that kept asking if she wants to do different things. Good to feel noticed, still, and the same with another woman. So, anger-inducing relationships with third actors but also support when really needed by particular persons. Need to remember not all is high blood pressure she jokes. Her father was hospitalised, she gets so spent, needs a little time off every 2-3 months.

During the above discussion, the host notes the comics art made by the expert. She does not take on the topic. She says she is very grateful. She again expresses that starting is hard and she has diversified and has little things to manage. Host says she marvels. But the expert says she hasn't had the time to celebrate to which the host responds she would have deserved to.

They talk of a swing between extremes in response to the coup, what projects foreigners can or feel like they can support. This ties to what in the literature is the call to still protect nature in these circumstances – and to harness the potential for peacebuilding, a question for 6.1.

The expert would like to have the money to train divers. How long before foreign divers can come, she asks. She is grateful for her assistant, but wishes he could train him for other things. So what has been a bit unclear is made clearer: she probably works alone with a single assistant at the moment of recording the podcast. She says she will eventually try to squeeze funds. And, she is thinking of impact: can she make a big enough change, how to measure it, what to focus on.

The host is for youth-focused impact. During the host's *ridiculous* amount of years as a researcher, she tells she has had just a matter of months to figure things out at a locale. would rather leave the community *that is trying to learn from her* with not necessarily the most technical scientific skills but with what will serve them. As an example understanding why people leave their diving gear, like in the expert's case is important. They talk about reliable funding and structural support, which is handled in 6.1. The host says she was surprised by the small amount of [conservation] work done on the coastline, so it is important that the few who do, do.

Despite saying there has to be a long-term solution she says she is only thinking six months ahead, *"cannot really"*, in the circumstances, not *"detached enough to see or plan like five years"* but she believes it will get better probably in five years; or it will get better she says, but how quickly is unsure. She is inspired by young ambitious minds but all their opportunities are taken away. The host comments that young people are fired up to do something and the short window of opening up had been exciting to witness but young people still remain enthusiastic.

The expert goes on to say that kids and the kid in their twenties she works with are so keen to learn more. The ones she works with do not mind that she is not paying well. She says she does not *"mind rich white ... kids"* coming to volunteer because they can afford it. (To comment on this, depending on their support they can, but are looking for the required things to their CV, or genuinely want to help and develop. We must also remember the situation of Myanmar.) But

she would want to pay poor family kids from a village properly. And she cannot grow so much because management is hard and if she had free workers, she would want them to learn. The host's take is that they on the other hand have trained many interns and it is not right for them to go on an intern salary but there is not enough jobs for them to have a career in this sector, so she is feeling a moral weight getting people excited, giving experience for months or years, applying grants, then shrugging shoulders. Still, this mode of work is clearly selected. The host mentions people having to leave conservation or, the expert says, they have to do something else than their speciality within conservation.

The expert mentions the first time she visited a place after coup, they were chopping down trees, the place was a mess, drunkenness, drugs, she questioned why she is doing this. This may have been a critical instance for her.

The host talks about the sharp meaningful focus from which the expert branched. The expert says she sees a lot of opportunities to do other things, but feels they are for a bigger team (she could have later) if she then wanted to pursue all of them. After the expert laughing, the host says she would like to access her notes about all the secondary possibilities. The scaling of conservation remains a tensioned, open question as it appears in different narrative strands.

The host says she wants to spread information about Myanmar, she notes they have talked about one sector, how it has been affected by the coup, that there are more serious issues. The potential of conservation does not fully come through in these words. The host says global northern conservation people tend to be pretty naïve about conditions for colleagues in other parts of the world, and gives the expert thanks for sharing some of her reality, herein invoking both sides of the fact – subjectivity distinction. Non-naïve information – her reality.

To this, the expert wonders if she has been coherent, the host noting that she got a lot out of it, before the podcast ends with music which may or may not be in a Myanmarian language.

At the start of the Haiti case, the host, identifying as a London lad, has begun with speaking about how he is interested to know about conservation, already complicated, in a politically instable country. “*Who you are and what you do?*” he asks the expert.

The interviewee was born and raised in Haiti, loved the sea, studied in the US, returned to do work in protecting marine biodiversity. When he returned he realised no one was taking care of – his voice emphasises – a Caribbean island nations’ coastal and marine resources. He says he’s been working at it since, working on mangroves and coral reefs, fishes, fisheries, fishermen, coastal communities, trying to ensure that everybody finds what they want. People who their organisation is working with are on the same side, because an emphasis of resources that the people need in the future as well, fishermen to have fish, tourism industry to have the nice beaches they have. Here, there is value placed on instrumental economic nature values, and there is also a narrative of including locals on the same side, even if they will feel hesitant.

“All pieces must fit.” He wants kids (the most powerful rhetorical tool being future generations) to have clear water (values - human-nature), the fish to have mangrove for egg laying (values – ecosystem biological). Reefs for tourists, the fish and the fishermen.

He says it is not an easy process especially in a country like Haiti, in which they are going through a particularly difficult time. He is recounting the history of Haiti, after dictatorship instability has remained for decades, and is in particularly high degrees contemporarily, and the social fabric has lately been torn as a response to disparity between rich and poor.

Earthquakes, hurricanes and human disasters make it a difficult place to work. Those are hit hardest who can least afford to be so hit. Gangs’ situation in the country leading to 250 000 internally displaced people.

When this kind of situation continues, the expert says, it makes their work all the more important due to a lot of people depending on them.

“...waiting for us, we’re almost their only lifeline, they cannot count on the government for anything...”

“...we’re almost their only lifeline to be able to undertake any activities related to trying to make their lives better...”

The host notes that the wholistic approach to conservation in the organisation must make the work even harder. The expert agrees with the host's experience description of an uphill battle of conservation, specifying that it is the same in countries like Haiti, and similar in others going through social upheaval.

The expert says that if the economy goes bad, there is no fuel, natural resources and forests are targeted. At this point, we do not hear criticism of formal economy overusing natural resources or fossil fuel criticism.

He recounts that if a person cannot access their fields due to gangs or climate change, they might go fishing with unskilled damaging methods. The expert tells that in politico-socio-economic troubles natural resources are going to be the first to be impacted. It is extremely difficult to negotiate with someone that they should not cut down that tree. The expert gives the defense as an example: *"I have a family to feed and I have a doctor's bill and I need to eat."* He says the dire situations faced everyday are extreme and need to be dealt with delicately.

He does not appreciate when diaspora Haitians trained elsewhere [quite like himself] return trained in natural resource protection saying they are experts, going to yell at people cutting mangrove that they need to find something else to do. Empathy, wholistic understanding is emphasised instead, as is working with local communities and persons and people overexploiting resources.

This would include helping them to figure out how they can have a living and have their children in their time also have resources. The general poverty is mentioned to which the host notes that needs are still there, they do not change based on political instability. The discussion on politics continues:

The host asks, how do you start to approach biodiversity and natural resource management when you have these levels of political instability? The answer is heard: we have to work at the most basic level, create peer-pressure in a local community so everyone does better and if some are doing badly, everyone in the community is doing badly. Work with each community.

He gives a hypothetical as a tool and says funding is needed to have sustainable livelihoods: sustainable fishing gear for fishers and seaweed farming among other alternatives to fishing. *“We can provide training in anything, but we also need to give the equipment to get it going.”* I can see a desire to slowly expand operations:

“We’re alone, growing slowly, heavy heavy load.”

“We’re doing the best and if everyone did...”

Questions are asked by the host about carbon offsetting, does that system work. The host has been thinking about it when walking around. Does it work in Haiti, what would make it work?

The answer is given that it would work if it is not some money for the rich and intermediates. They would have to concentrate on work that is felt needs doing. Mangrove and fruit trees with local communities. If this type of project can provide income and benefits for local community, schools, clinics, the expert is all for it. There is the issue with making sure it is working properly, not being naïve. Regulation is needed. The vision is to help the local communities, so he does not want others to make profit off it. The host agrees on the need for regulation.

Answering to a question asked by the host – how do the people on the ground feel about offsetting especially by big companies who are also causing problems and it is fine to keep doing so, ‘this hypocrisy in the Global South’ – the interviewee states that this is called double-tipping. Make money originally and then some more money from offsetting. People in local communities are pretty much not aware and they have not had that conversation with them.

Prevention is better than healing: the expert calls for trying not to cut down the trees or make a mess and then a weird scheme. *“How about you do not cut your finger off and sew it back.”* Again, this is primarily about foreign corporation logic. In Haiti, he says, no attempt at richness, mostly just getting food. Says they need sustainability so that they and the next generations can benefit from the resources. It is to me very understandable that any kind of other restoration of nature in such a resource shortage is not discussed, but let it be noted.

“Tourism, intrinsic value and things along those lines.” This quote exemplifies the diverse use of nature values in the talk. Tourism is mentioned mostly because it can bring revenue, but still in the context of ecotourism, which tries to reorient the tourism industry. The expert talks of a small ecotourism activity, kayaking.

The expert says you can get “50 bucks” for killing a turtle or show it to tourists for “50 bucks” or use mangrove for mangrove honey instead of burning. You have to eat and the transition takes a lot of energy, funds and time, he says but reaffirms that they are in it for the long term – 35 years and counting. The podcast, again, is recorded in October 2023.

5.2. Animal conservation: the animals, money, land, arms, international practices

The expert in the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case is European, as many in conservation are, and brings voice to that. The expert on Central African Republic / Mali is from the context of Southern Africa, speaking roughly British English.

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case, the political situation is not much discussed. Congo has rebellions, but not all of its area is under such distress. The country is however considered to face some notable crises for its inhabitants, including the half a million refugees in the country. Namibia, like Algeria in its own case, has been suffering from drought.

The host's home country is the UK. The interviewee is a para-professional at Wildlife Vets Namibia. Originally from the Netherlands, recounting her experience in DRC. The larger podcast does many expert interviews of a wide variety and is different because it is also hunting-oriented.

The episode is recorded in the DRC. The host was documenting elephant relocation. The host says it is not the kind of place people think you can go. A beautiful country of contrasts, been a couple of times, would never have imagined. Kinshasa has so much people, the two agree. No-one knows if the estimated population of 18 million in the city is correct. Most people here do not have much, says the host, yet there is much food needed. They recount moving rhinos first, a small project, then elephants, a big project. Near the city a nature reserve built in two years,

which without effort would be just sprawling agriculture the host says. The expert remarks at the difference. Especially the host makes it sound like a binary choice: a reserve or no space for nature at all. To be fair, this is grounded in the locale and the expert notes the few trees; even no birds, this is common, was apparently reality before establishing of the reserve. (Not only conservation but restoration of ecosystems.)

Locals next to park work at the park. This is another thing they co-discuss. It shows that the park is not “taken”. Host notes wildlife has value (values - intrinsic) and this is educated / shown. Expert says showing a real zebra to youth is a start point for creating enthusiasm. Maybe they'll be conservationists, which are needed in an area with the big city. The expert tells she studied wildlife management after working in zoo, a Master's in forest and nature conservation. She wanted to see her animals from the zoo in the wild. (Belonging.) Always had a thing for Africa. Had passion, worked hard for tickets. Her family was hesitant. Knowing the work's contents was hard beforehand, but she never regretted conservation. They talk moving animals out and in within Africa, vaccines and maybe even hunt in that the interviewee says if there is a fence, there must be management of population, the host having noted that various kinds of reserves are not really untouched nature. Movement requires skillful helicopter pilots as well, with unorthodox manouevers and skill to read different animal species.

There is lack of rain, drought in Namibia. The expert says it is horrible with the eaten bushes, skinny animals as the farmers try to feed them, animals are tried to be kept alive but it is a lot of land area with even hay price rising. No one wants to buy animals so some have to be “culled”. Gives background: unpredictable yearly rains and hay needs to be imported from South Africa.

To protect valuable animals for farmers for tourism and hunting, vaccines are given. We can note here the instrumental economic values. Vaccines are given especially againts rabies, also against anthrax which is relatively common in Namibia specifically. Rhinos are also valuable because they are so rare, here we may see hints of biological nature values being espoused.

Anthrax tracking demands skill because it can also spread to humans from the ground around carcass. It is an expensive vaccine, “the people” use it for expensive animals. The host asks

how do you fund, there is a real risk if there is not funding. A farmer has to pay the expert says. The expert tells us that in Namibia animal prices rose too high and crashed. Some consider going back from wildlife farming to cattle farming, which is not a good thing for nature. In their discussion they consider that in some time frame land (and animals) is subject to markets.

The host expresses biological – ecosystems nature values, and the expert complements them with intrinsic values: The host mentions less visible species an ecosystem. Big changes from the change to cattle farm. Bugs, rodents, birds. Some generalist birds do well, but other birds do not have a home. The expert mentions dung beetles. The host notes that this is a good remark, because dung beetles require big animals. The expert says everything is connected. “*I don't think us people still understand half of it how everything is connected.*” The expert says that upon seeing a sort of intact ecosystem, the chance to protect that should be taken.

The host remind of sustainable funding, that as much as people want to protect them, they generate no revenue. The expert says one cannot just fund it otherwise. The host says then it is just donations. (Here, what is missing is international and national funding and rules type of discussion. The logic is very locally oriented and grounded, but exclusively “capitalistic”.)

The host tells about a previous interview with someone from a “*nature conservation equivalent in the DRC*” (ICCN) that they are gifted by EU, WWF and some from US and World Bank, 130 million USD every year, but that is not enough, that being 95% of their funding while 5% is budgeted by collecting taxes. How sustainable, if a partner is lost if an economic crisis hits? All that work could just disappear, the host remarks and continues by saying that funding the big areas is one of the big questions, showing humility in stepping back to look at the big picture.

The expert says that in Namibia, big game farms either for tourism or hunting get the animal numbers up, but they are privately managed. They are getting numbers up more rapidly, which the expert notes as good and notes that national parks are struggling much more. The expert says the concept of the game farm may not be always so great but they are important as the reason Namibia still has so much wildlife with. Here is a *realistic* acknowledgement, which is pointed out as such, not being an ideal situation.) Some big game farms have recently seen decrease in animal numbers due to drought and not being able to feed. (There is not so

deep an analysis of this and here I am at the edge of my expertise, but it seems that the higher numbers of animals may come at the expense of a somewhat-human-independently functioning ecosystem.) This discussion is still followed by talk of public lands, which is area for the segment in 6.2.

The expert is in the veterinary team. This has been her second elephant job. She monitors the breathing of immobilised elephants, vaccinates them, gives vitamin injections. (The host clarifies that this is in order to set them up for relocation.) The team has experienced elephant movers with them. The expert recounts things: They are not taking just small elephants, need “families” so the little ones get taught and do not get aggressive. Animals need to like each other also for the five to six day trip. All machinery and people need to be functioning correctly. It goes quick, taking some hours to move a bunch of elephants off. Anesthetics and people, she tells (and this is vague) makes it risky, the shorter the animal needs to be incapacitated the better. Waking up elephants is quite the sight. They both wonder at the animals’ size.

The travelling with the animals consists of a trip to coast, then embarking on a ship, being four days at sea on the Angolan coast and a day in the Congo river and monitoring elephants and hippos. Elephant crates do not fit on planes, the expert tells. The weather was good on their common trip but in the earlier trip it was hot and in general it can be hot in middle Angola, the expert speaks. Practicalities are discussed lengthily and also from the animals’ perspective.

The elephant crates are interconnected so elephants can move around. This reduces stress. They have to be separated to groups for the road transport. The expert says the driving, but also whole trip is stressful, for humans and animals. Try to care for the animals, get them used to one’s voice, but it is not a nice experience for them. A 15 hour road trip is the last stretch, the hardest one, trying to keep pace because of temperature. The road goes through villages, in Kinshasa police help get through traffic. The host remarks that the traffic is chaos with a purpose.

The expert commends the police doing an excellent job as they try to drive through in convoy. (There is respect for this local instance.) After the trip, the elephants are kept a day in

surveillance and then they freely explore their new home full of food and wonder, but, it must be such a shock. The host agrees it must be when they come from Namibia where everything is “*dusty as hell and nothing is really green*”. “*Yeah, nothing.*”

The expert says to wish she could get into the head of an elephant and know what they think. They agree if there are too many animals, they should be moved but where? and host says that it is not easy considering money and logistics, inaccessibility. (Clearly the podcast wants to be that of realistic ideators.)

The host says massive movements would take animal deaths. As I assumed, he mentions realism, as in this is the realistic way to make those bold statements. So, my realistic ideator assessment is correct at least about the host in his own words. Realism continues with expert saying “*they*” should see how they’re moved. Points out the question of where again.

The willingness of people to pay a lot and have space for animals, it is getting rare, the expert notes. This would, she says, be good for *people here* as they can enjoy animals. This defers to locals and the nature values of human-nature interaction. Returning to values again, the elephants’ value here noted is intrinsically. She says that even if was possible to move animals to the middle of the DRC, there is a lack of security there and agrees with the host’s statement that in ten years the animals would be gone *again*.

The host declares it is an epic story and he wanted to be a part of it and document it. (He showcases a realistic starting point but with unbelievable results.) It is taking these animals half across Africa. The expert recounts: From where there were too many with the droughts, they are given at least a chance in the DRC. And people here get to see the animals, maybe giving enthusiasm to conservation. The host laments the precarious future of wildlife in Africa, but he says there is carrying capacity in DRC.

The expert answers a question on future plans that it is difficult to know, because in Africa you never know work-wise, visa-vice. I note that she is giving herself to the job and being enthusiastic enough to accept the volatility. “*Would like to get a bit involved in **real** conservation projects, because that’s ultimately my...*” is an interesting statement because it

comes so late in the podcast. Furthermore, she wants to make sure the next generation (the most potent rhetoric as noted in the literature) can see what she has seen. She says Africa, though not the Lion King that people in Europe or America may think, is a magical place. Seeing a lion or an elephant or a small impala (nature values) and knowing that she can play even a little part in that inspires her, or as the host says, that's what makes her tick.

A couple of quotes from the expert juxtaposed:

"the farmers try to feed them"

"I do not think us people still understand half of it how everything is connected."

"new home full of food and wonder" (some little laughter)

"Yeah, nothing."

The Central African Republic / Mali podcast opens up with expressing sadness over the killing of the expert in Burkina Faso. Following this, the podcast starts. The interviewer is not the titular host of the show but a host of the episode.

The expert starts straightforwardly by answering a question about what their organisation does. They provide help in the form of etc. knowledge and techniques for, he emphasises the word the, the most challenging tasks for wildlife law enforcement. and for the communities living in those areas. *"Our mission in short is to protect the wildlife and people relying on them by providing support to those with the mandate to protect them, and support the communities."*

The theme of law enforcement (and opposition to iniquities) is well represented while the question of legitimacy is less explored. If we look at the above quote we see quite a technical wording, a mandate given by state or other entity.

The host lists that the expert's organisation has anti-poaching, counter trafficking, sociocultural research and engagement (including community liaison) and investigations. The expert says they analyse why poaching happens, often this is asking the locals if they want to do it or do it out of necessity, then engage with the community and rangers, noting community's and rangers challenges, motivations and needs. Then harmonising, which leads

to the ultimate goals of mentoring, training, education, harmonising actions with all stakeholders. It is not suggesting expensive solutions or overriding already existing local solutions. We develop the doctrine, he notes this is just a term used with *them*. Then they are also revisiting the things with the rangers and locals when evaluating.

As I have noted, the territorial descriptions are of interest. Here, the expert gets asked and replies that they are in the Sahel (a large area) and the Congo basin, specifically two Mali areas, including in the middle of the conflict, and Burkina Faso, location secret and in a protected nature area in the Central African Republic and another secret location in Congo DR, one town in Kameruun and looking into rolling out support in several other countries in the Horn of Africa and elsewhere in Sahel and West Africa. The organisation, we can say, is territorially active. When asked, he says he thinks all of them are conflict countries, but not necessarily conflict areas. They can be border regions. Corruption, like the host assumes, is there but varies greatly from place to place and department to department, individual to individual. He has come across it also in international organisations and he notes that otherwise you also “...*come across incredible honesty in environments where you would not expect, umm any reliable behaviour from people*”, to which the host adds in the world of conservation, corruption happens.

We can note that not all co-operation has acquiesced to formal goals that organisations have. The expert tells us: Firstly, they have dealt with rangers selling ammunition and poaching. Secondly, usually government official complicity is needed to get contraband abroad. They have come across cases of high-level government involvement in trafficking, which in turn supports extremists. Criminal groups are very interlinked. Ivory, scales, diamonds. Corruption is an enormous problem, he emphasises, saying criminal groups *often* develop into political groups or political groups into criminal groups. (This feels unspecific. “*Often.*” And do political groups develop into criminal groups or branch out into such groups?) Beyond corruption, he says the most important thing is governance.

He adds after a pause: the rule of law and peace and security, which are missing in many of these locations. Concerning Mali he says their partners were very successfully working with the communities until the Mali War, dealing with elephants and avoiding human-wildlife conflict,

an interesting wording in itself. Poachers and traffickers used the momentum to target elephants, he says and in one year, 25% of the population of the elephant died.

He continues that the poachers and traffickers may be fighters from elsewhere, Syria, Afghanistan, but often local people who behave well otherwise who are desperate, or local criminals, they start poaching when there is no good governance or rule of law.

"Drugs, ivory, weapons, explosives as opportunity arises." Desperation, poverty, war, greed, an extremely challenging problem and working environment, the expert describes. His passion is wildlife, "wild areas" and people who live in "those areas". But we can ask what is a wild area?

He was in some military, *"jumped out of planes to get badges"*, says bla bla, I hated being told what to do, this is clearly something he is reluctant to note. He went to *bush* professionally, because had loved it growing up in Zambia, Zimbabwe and Malawi. His first job was cheetah conservation, he liked it, and the second job was "human-wildlife conflict" making sure dangerous animals and humans were not hurting each other, equipped with a land rover and a rifle, watching that crops were not being destroyed. Unfortunately, he was mostly just putting down animals, usually injured ones. He learned what it is like for a family to lose their crop overnight.

Like in the previous case the expert has worked on game farms, also forests. Usually as a reserve officer either for police or parks and wildlife (whether this is department or private is unclear). Later on he criticises the logic of profit-driven conservation. After recovering from a lightning strike (critical instance), started training rangers voluntarily and guides. He found that bushman skills of yore were absent. There was an overreliance on drones in tracking. It is mostly impossible and tracking is about understanding how and where the animals move, not just following them; *"Tracking ... where you need to be and when."*

"I was also writing to raise awareness [of the decline of skills] because I was getting a bit frustrated with what I was reading [about conservation solutions like putting cameras on rhino horns]."

A change of tone ensues: much of the problem is not that the skill is not there, but lack of resources, including in training, because the issue of poaching has grown in size. When the expert started writing, he received a lot of support. Realised it is not just his teaching missing but other ranger skills, community engagement, human rights, standard operation procedures.

They started bringing in volunteers to develop doctrine for parks and wildlife departments and to train rangers and leaders. This grew into an organisation with sociocultural research and education, that also build the capability for those guided to develop practices when the situation demands.

It is noted that cases take place where both the community and wildlife are at risk *from the situation*. An anecdote is given: in Central African Republic, the expert went to an area “probably shouldn’t have” gone into, and there they had all abandoned their posts *or* been forced to flee. Local community, formed something of a militia in their place, kept a record of animals shot, even if *they* had to do it for food. This is an important anecdote regarding the question of whether it is in principle possible that in great need, militarily equipped groups do take care of animals. This anecdote shows it **is**, at least a local collection of people can, but the example lacks specificity. The arms were captured, by whom? Who had driven the formal power away? In a way, this is secondary to the proof.

“Honest truth”, he says, this being a saying and a fact-subjectivity distinction) and goes on to say that if you can make it in such a setting, you can make it anywhere. People have warned them and have been wrong about conservation efforts in difficult environments, like Mali.

After asking what it is like in the ground on Mali the host host notes that in the UK people only hear about it very rarely on news. The expert answers that Al Qaida is also in conflict with a local Islamic state, ethnic sedentary versus nomadic are in conflict and coups happen in the country. It feels sometimes that everyone is fighting everyone. Brutal – especially ethnic groups having done massacres against other ethnic groups. Entire villages can be slaughtered. However elephants are there because local communities, “*same communities*” have protected them, having protected them for centuries. Note that there is an expression of a long

continuity, even in very violent times, inherited through the hardships of other times. But in many other places, elephant is meat and as the biggest animal, the most meat. He gives examples of three different Mali ethnicities revering the elephant with slightly different ideas.

One of the ethnicities think when an elephant comes through, cattle produce more milk. The expert does not disregard this, says it is most likely true because they knock seed pods off trees which the cattle eat. This is something of an indigenous science finding, or generational knowledge. “*Everyone respects elephants*”, a flagship species, which reminds when protected that they have a shared ideal, he emphasises: *remind* because it is their culture.

The experts says that all of these people live closer to nature than people in urban areas of the West. It is a misconception that they need teaching of the importance of nature, they intuit it (but note: this is assuming they have functional nature values, where they are not so likely to have as much biological-ecosystem knowledge as not all traditional societies live ecologically).

The expert tells that when they go in, their partners help and educate communities, as the expert’s organisation focuses on law enforcement, however the rangers themselves are key to reminding people. They provide medical assistance to up to two hundred humans a day. They remind people that they are not there to fight but to help the community.

Bandits and violent extremists will sometimes attack rangers to display dominance and the rejection of government, the expert tells, there have been attacks and attempt to attack the unit, which must defend itself. (Note: thus conservation must get militarised in addition to being territorial.) But the unit is still called l’armée gentille, showing understanding by some, but whom, that it is there in order to protect people and elephants (yet is likened to an army).

We hear from the expert that the rangers do not see those communities as enemy and that the elephants there are a relic population who move a lot based on rain, and in desert move from waterpoint to waterpoint. We hear elephant facts, such as them chasing camels away. Goats follow elephants, believe it or not, he says, following for drops of branches.

The first year in Mali was terribly hard, security deteriorated from the starting point, and the available skill were low. The military provided men to be retrained, which I expand on in 6.2. Poaching went to zero when the unit was fully operational. even though the general situation, fighting, breaking down of the rule of law had escalated. Since then, some elephants killed, one or two at a time, every couple of years, which is different to earlier 25% of population.

Sadly five men killed and many wounded, no one has died in operations, but “*supposedly in safe environment*” like in camp. One incident is described challengingly, a UN officer was killed, so they were helped by rangers. “*all hands on deck*” and the unit is radio operator died. The expert notes killing UN forces is “an actual war crime” which got linked to killings of elephants by way of the ammunition found in both cases.

There are connections also to human trafficking, drug trade and donkey captures, which is a tragedy, says the expert. The host diagnoses this as a convergence of profit seeking crime, to which the expert’s answer is “*Exactly.*” The host prompts the expert to move on to Central African Republic, which the host says has a completely different set of problems, the expert agreeing.

The expert tells forest elephants have not been found dead for nine months, success there as well. I note he enjoys telling success stories as they are empowering. They had a partnership with WWF and the government. Some other hunting and trafficking increased. Many problems: the people there were devastated by conflict and cost of living and availability of commodities, but the solution there has been community engagement and sociocultural research.

In an example case he thought it was about food, but someone said he is talking nonsense – it was about money and lack of traditional hunting opportunities due to other groups using firearms. The actual problem was, he tells us, that there was no way to amass money, no bank and no item that could be kept [for maintaining value].

The expert takes a different example case from Ethiopia of a local people of cattle herders. Says they have vast wealth (in their estimation of wealth) in cattle, but cattle has been weakened when they sell them [during hard times] so they would need to sell them slowly and

have someone manage their finances (note: of course, it should preferably be someone aligned to them, so they control their own assets).

These people are not stupid, the expert emphasises. They are perfectly normal people, he reminds listeners, who do not know this modern system. He tells them to try to understand the dynamics, so that then they have a better starting point. In Guinea, they had learned traditional hunters are doing the poaching. So is this criminal or is there another reason? They sat down with the elders, they denied it. They did not know where the park is, and this was the solution. Here, justice as a theme is brought up.

“If I’m putting myself out of a job then good, that’s what we’re trying to do, but the more we do the more it seems there is to be done.”

He tells the area of operation is something like a 150 000 km² (expression of territoriality) about a thousand rangers, increasing. The host says it is difficult to move from the political environment in Mali, elsewhere ecotourism. The expert says there is tourism in a (more) peaceful area, operating throughout the conflicts. The expert mentions sustainable forestry and non-consumptive use of resources, and speaks of the question of profit-driven conservation, not being likeminded.

Bread and children get mentioned, for rhetoric and an instrumental nature value and he also employs cultural nature values in arguing against not protecting nature. Then he turns to the mismatch of global funds, arguing their conservation uses is something celebrities could spend in a weekend partying. This may not be entirely believable, seeing that they are armed. If it is a broader point, we hear of the costs in the last case, vaccines and animals cost to have.

The expert tells elephants are used in their logo because it is an umbrella and a keystone species, to protect them you have to protect their habitat and they are critical to other species' survival. In one of the cases, maybe he means Mali, 65% of plants lean on elephants to spread them. He has seen parks where absence of elephants has led to loss of biodiversity and carrying capacity. *“We also love elephants and they are an important symbol.”*

The host notes pioneering work, the sacrifices, the people the expert's organisation is working with. The expert says there are proud and sad moments. A successful outcome is the best moment for the team, to see a disappearing elephant population or subspecies get numbers back. He tells the audience they can help either by donating "*but I understand not everyone has money*" and says the most important thing is letting other people know and spread the word. He further tells they do not focus on publicity, sometimes wonders if they should have a selfie taker with them. The host was expecting more militant speech and thanks the expert for their all-embracing work.

5.3. Environmental health: neocolonialism/imperialism, history, iniquity, uncertainty

In the Algerian as well as in the Ukrainian case, the experts likely originate from the countries they operate in and bring voice to that, but it is possible that they are diasporic alternatively.

The environmental health cases are distinct from the others in some ways and this is reflected in my writing, primarily in the results. I have considered removing the Algerian case, since environment and health stay separated and there is no talk of conservation strictly. I decide to keep it in, because it shows a case where these things get causally mixed up in people's comprehension, according to the expert. It is a podcast that places unlike the title of this chapter generalises, politics above experience.

The podcast on Algeria concerns forest fires and human realities. The expert is a London based Algerian researcher-activist, who is among other things also a founding member of an environmental advocacy group concerning North Africa.

Coronavirus's third wave surprised the Algerians. A death in the expert's family, too. What is of interest to him is the collapse of the health systems (which are underfunded for decades due to the neoliberal turn) in Tunisia and Algeria. The mismanagement, he explains, points to a more global problem of health inequality, services have been undermined by national policy inspired by international financial institutions (readjustment, privatisation), some important part of the economy and health intersection is owned in Germany.

The host remembers that the Coronavirus response and vaccine distribution was weak: personal experience of deaths or close calls very common. The expert says vaccine response has been very bad for a self-identified regional power of forty million people. Russian vaccine was promised to be produced in country, but was not. Most vaccines from the COVAX programme. At the same time, the vaccine apartheid of rich countries hogging. Coronavirus quieted the political unrest and the government at that time made use of this and doubled down on the repressive politics of for example arrests, censorship, violence, he tells us. The movement continued after the second anniversary of the original protest of 2019 with calls from civil society and politicians, the expert briefs, some protests took place, but the response was harsh and as of recording the podcast, the movement has become marginal.

The Algerian diaspora, he formulates, is a part of the country, with strong ties. In crisis, they mobilise to help. However, the Algerian government is somewhat opposed and bureaucratically blocks help that they cannot control, the expert says.

They talk about the fires. In Kabylie region, loss of livelihoods, homes and livestock, the expert says, and the government is ineffective in firefighting. Volunteers were not enough, army was dispatched but was not able to reduce cases of death, a death toll of 90 people, a third of which soldiers, he continues, the reason for this is climate change's effect on Algeria facing a lot of climate change hazards, but equipment and personnel is not up-to-date. Planes come from EU, if Algeria had them, he thinks the fires would have been contained.

The host says many felt that there were arsonists. There were also political conspiracy theories. The expert believed these at first, but notes anything can be explained by conspiracy theories, says the Algerian government is capable of covert operations, which caused this paranoia.

The arsonist claims led most people (friend and family) to believe fires were caused by arsonists or separatist. This worsened the effects of the crisis. Note: at this point, no explicit mention of climate neglect.

There was a lynching of a suspected arsonist. This was an artist-activist there to help. He was taken by the police perhaps by a pretense and then robbed from the police because of it. According to the expert, the government was trying to direct blame of the naturally caused fires to groups opposing it, he says this is in the context of the larger political movement, the government is trying to create a division between Arabs and Berbers and target their region.

“I think in a climate of catastrophe, devastation from the pandemic, the wildfires ... repression in the country ... people were overwhelmed, seeing their livelihoods be lost, their houses be burned ... despair, alienation ...”

He says people were willing to believe one person who was lynched *trying to help with all that was innocent*: maybe it is the power of social media, recorded and spread.

“...virtually exporting the water that we do not have.”
“climate debt”
“There are always promises,”
”I fear a new explosion is coming and I hope it is not violent.
Even though I end on a pessimistic note, I’m an optimistic person.”

There is, he notes, some division in social media, but it is exaggerated, or we do not know. The host reminds that he was also an outsider. Other parts of the country have supported Kabylia with the environmental crisis, trips to help. Solidarity has been shown, which the activist-researcher says makes the government displeased.

The host asks about the lack of water in North Africa. (Please note that water hazards are a rising megatrend in non-equatorial Africa and connected to all aspects of development.)

The expert tells that water scarcity is not new in Algeria. *“I remember all my childhood, having some water issues and problems in various parts of the country...”* even in the North near the Mediterranean. He says North Africa is one of the most water-poor regions.

Algeria, he explains, is an arid / semi-arid country which suffers from absolute World Bank defined water poverty. Most water for agriculture comes from rain. There is some groundwater, but using it up would worsen the situation. Climate change worsens the water situation. Algeria relies on international markets for food, and even more so when droughts take place. This he calls dependence. This gets worse in the coming decades, yet Algerian *ruling elites* have only some programmes in the North, costly and energy intensive.

The expert tells us there is no talk of green transition. The country will suffer if gas and oil buying stops. There is thought that the situation will improve on its own. “*It won’t.*”

Government has a policy of using groundwater to try farming in Sahara, which is strongly opposed by the expert. The country has huge agricultural exports, which is “*virtually exporting the water that we do not have*”. Climate change a global issue, caused by industrialised countries with their *capitalist mode of production*, but countries like Algeria suffer.

He mentions equity in relation to Algeria and Global South. He talks of what I call world-systemic issues; *climate debt*, which means that which the industrialised world owes to those suffering from climate change and of support for renewable (solar) power.

He advocates creating a market that works for the country’s people, “*most of the regions of the world work this way*” is said regardless of the world-systemic criticism. This demonstrates how the narrative emphasises North Africa as an especially problematic region, and further the lack of democracy is mentioned, and authoritarianism and elitism.

The expert says Morocco is more advanced in renewable energy, because it does not have oil and gas. Morocco imports most of its energy, and big renewable energy projects are said to happen at the expense of local populations by the expert, being installed on agropastoral lands without acceptance or disclosure, this is mostly private ownership, which is a negative in this narration, and some of it associated with the king and in either case involving debt economy. The energy transition is happening there, but justice is not guaranteed, says the expert.

The host tells of relatives losing olive trees which they rely on to live. Is there government aid? “*There are always promises*”, but few are kept and corruption means bad distribution. There is risk of absolute poverty, the expert tells us, as most people work in the informal sector and pandemic resulted in job loss.

“*The current regime is a nexus between the military and the oligarchy.*” A note by me: Environmental critique can and often has in history been tied to government critique. This is not only because governments have environmental policy, but also because authoritarian countries are more likely to keep environmental discourse open for protest than other things.

The Ukraine episode has three experts, two are interviewed and the third expert is also the writer and co-host of the episode. The podcast opens with a primer mentioning for example besieged communities and an overall sense of despair, intentional civilian targets, nature.

The hosts of the conflict-themed (protecting civilians) podcast refer to the UN’s calls to speak of conflict and natural resources together, starting with instrumental economic points if not values, but choosing a quote about sustainable peace requiring livelihoods, natural resources. The first interviewee is from a Kiev-based organisation that focused on climate change before the war. They contemporarily focus on environmental effects and also food security.

She says it is impossible to estimate the volume of damage. Industrial parts targeted. There has been damage to marine and land ecosystems. Coal mines have flooded. Protected zones in the South have been damaged. Ecosystems and human health, she notes, are intertwined and we can be targeted through environment, although the environment, she says earlier, is not the direct target. She tells us that the environmental harm of attacking industrial targets in the industrial East of Ukraine causes much environmental damage, mentions a nitrogen leak.

Nuclear pollution can happen at any moment due to Russia bombing places where the expert says there are no Ukrainian forces left. A possibility of a second Tšernobyl close to the Black Sea, where it might strongly affect either Europe or Russia, depending. Uncertainty is expressed with a sad tone. “*What happens in Ukraine does not stay in Ukraine.*”

“There is a lot of information that a lot of dictatorship regimes are dependent on fossil fuels”, she says, explaining that reducing fossil fuel consumption can be a driver for peace in Ukraine and elsewhere, having noted that Russia gets massive amounts of money to fund its war from selling fossil fuels to the European Union. This and the accompanying insert from the podcast bring the content here somewhat close to new environmentalism’s urgent anti-fossil message.

An indicator species is mentioned, dolphins in Black Sea. Russia’s Crimea bridge: reconstruction and the bridge in general is said to be unenvironmental, but “of course, nobody listens” the host adds, with the interviewee’s voice, that the destruction caused damage.

“From an environmental perspective”, she says, pollution affects ‘us’ after the war. A historical example: France still has areas not recovered after WWII. *“And impact ‘us’.”*

The second expert talks on human effects from environmental damage, short and long term, saying it is not possible to foresee the rebuilding of a country. It depends on how Ukrainians and the International community can have follow-through. The co-host or the third speaker refers to Viet Nam’s landmines, agent orange and craters. *“It will take around a century.”*

“Ordinary people’s lives.”

“Invisible enemy ... prevents us to use our land.”

“...clogging, military equipment, pollution...”

“energy”

“sewage”

“biodiversity”

(The second expert)

The second expert says attacks on the energy network of Ukraine is especially bad as maintenance of sustainable life for humans and nature gets obstructed.

The host notes other conflicts of the 2020s, and war industry’s effects even in peacetimes, e.g. US and UK. The co-host or the third expert references Ban Ki-moon’s words: environment as a silent casualty of war, which denotes an intrinsic nature value.

The host references Cambodia and Laos landmines continuing to have high annual casualties. In Ukraine, disposal of bombs, asbestos, metal, soil and water quality are talked about by the expert. She makes note of the damage to biodiversity and ecosystems of Ukraine. A functioning power supply, she explains, is needed for clean water. She also mentions micro-organisms. The host asks for information on diseases. A risk or a reality? The answer is a reality, where there may not be access to clean water, or no water, especially children under fifteen fall ill. The expert would want to spread information and to hold Russia accountable and ideally compensate for environmental damage and ecocide. (A desire for international accountability.)

She would like to keep up hope to define a workable ecocide crime that the International Criminal Court can prosecute, which in practice would mean e.g. water pollution through oil spills, loss of biodiversity, ecosystems and then land and soil contamination and air pollution. She notes environment, fossil fuels and conflicts together. Reducing fossil fuel consumption and Russia dependency. This is climate policy, it is said, not only in Ukraine but other regions, too. *“We must think how we live our lives”*, she states.

6. Analysis: narratives and interactions in these podcasts nuanced, yet partial to viewpoints

6.1. Nature conservation, general: balancing

In these cases, balancing takes much place: balancing regarding funding, balancing discourse, balancing a desire to do sustainability and conservation work with local persons' autonomy.

In the Myanmar case, the host says that she wants to bring more nuanced and grounded voices to conservation. She talks about difficulty: work would have been difficult even without the coup and the pandemic. The expert describes the pros and cons of a small scale operation and the host often joins the pondering. The expert often criticises foreign (men) conservationists. She says at one point jovially that seeing women creates a sense of surprise and joy in conservation.

The expert starts her side of the discussion by regretting that they are not on the field, so to speak, more. She has thought what kind of impact she has, is it worth pushing this much for? [Since the coup] the work has become more isolated, because it is harder to discuss about things to outside-the-country instances. The host responds that Global North collaborators should think more closely about how to engage.

They laugh a considerable amount; at many points of the podcast. They are appearing more familiar for the audience and the laughter may also reduce uncomfortableness, but they also say funny things. At some points it feels like the host does most of the talking. There is some humour about hard things, like funding running low continued with *“I do not like writing proposals.”* This is not the only joke in the podcast. There are many others, such as illustrating tiredness by her saying that she feels like a deflated air mattress.

One aspect of the narrative is having to take the initiative. Having to juggle different aspects of the work, go where others do not, the idea that she had to do it herself when others would not. She for example lists things she would like to do if there was a possibility to have a bigger team. The host joins her in criticising arrogant conservationists, even, as I noted in 5.1. with a fact-subjectivity distinction: that a humble person from Myanmar may be better at seeing what is actually going on.

As noted in 5.1. the foreignness of conservation from society and civil society was talked about by the expert. To add to that: she says she did not need to have formal workshops because that's not really how you get information from a community (compare to central african republic methods). And as noted in the examples there, there is a differentiation of local cultures and capital city as well as foreigners, and a small-scale strategic planning presented as good, though also foresight is emphasised. Can we condense this as a form of narrative? I would suggest that the narrative has an element of an arrogant big expert unit using its inflexible methods which does not translate to the local ways leading to incomplete results. The locals are not precisely heroes in the narrative, but they are portrayed positively. Yet also perhaps as passive at least in the way that they are subject to changes and react to intrusions instead of dynamic. *“Lies!”* the expert jokes at one point, expressing how she faced faulty survey results, but this narrative was turned to the favour of locals in this manner, I think: if we

know some way of collecting information will lead to bad statistics, it should be our, responsibility to plan better, which is good planning not contested by me, but also a narrative.

The host, also in the podcast description, says out loud the opposition to the military junta. At this point she says it is the sad anniversary of the coup. She asks about its effects to the expert's work in a country that was already suffering from the pandemic: personally and practically. The having ones person there and doing things practically are not only here on show, but throughout the discussion. The response to this is noting a sudden change both with the situation on ground and lesser availability in communication to the state on conservation. She says that finding funding is difficult and locals cannot be demanded to help as according to the expert they would laugh. The host reminds that conservation is already, in any case difficult in a small organisation.

In 2021, the expert travelled to one site to do a report, because it was the only safe place to work in. She felt it was easier to deal with animals being harmed than humans. Minor laughter here expresses both discomfort and a degree of ease in talking with the host. She says she is proud of the work she has done and has received positive feedback, because the country lacks those reports. Yet, she tells that no one knows she had guns pointed at her and that she stumbled upon an IDP camp accidentally. The scope of work has also been large and she recounts having had a lot of experience(s). This is an expression of pride over overcoming adversity.

To her, *balancing* is hard as is co-deciding what is worth putting funds in. Sometimes third actors are insensitive, she repeats or rephrases her earlier point. She says she forgets she is working in a tense environment and her emotions are building on top of that, not on a blank slate. She says she has to let herself sometimes to sort of lose it. (One of them laughs slightly.) She says she finds herself angry at everything and then looks back and notices that was the week of violence in Myanmar. The host says it must be hard when it is your home country and you are there. She repeats or rephrases that most of the time the third actors do not care about the community, but are in it for the salary. She has seen in the last year some conservation women like the host, who have made sure that it is possible for her to work. Seeing women makes her feel positive.

She says there should be more support from abroad. She says if she can prove to do something with actual impact, the answer should not be this in the aftermath of the coup: “*if we cannot support the government, we cannot support anyone*”. The host says “exactly”. The host says local groups are more important because government is not functional. This is a political narrative and especially interesting. (Of course, these political questions are not straightforward. As often times noted in the podcast, officials from Yangon also attend events. They can seek territorial and international legitimacy. NGOs are important to society and state, which makes this a dilemma. And, taking into account the positive effects of environmental operation; in addition to the borderlessness of the environmental crisis of climate and biodiversity; perhaps also needed for humanitarian reasons – right to nature – if it is allowed to cross political divisions by the unaccepted political leadership, a strong case could be made for funding ecological operation in such situations. This links to the literature on environmentalism’s potential for peacebuilding, which likely cannot be harnessed if environmental funders or actors withdraw.)

She expresses the feeling of envy over a fine office room sometimes. She thinks about her impact on ocean and communities: what is the right way to measure. Every conservationist struggles with their impact. She wants to focus on “*sustained local ... sustainable solutions*” If it makes one person’s life different, is that enough, she asks. Here, she is considering the downsides of living in her line of work, the uncertainty yet the meaningfulness she has.

Helping communities understand motivations is placed above technical skills by the host. In addition, the host says that the expert is inspiring them to care about *their ocean* and coast and environment and teaching them about real problems. The word choice real is of course noteworthy. We can also compare to the narrative of reminding in the Mali case: reminding a community is close to inspiring a community to in this context. In the Namibia case there is also the idea of inspiring locals to get into conservation: in all of these there is the idea of unanticipated causal snowballing.

According to the expert, something that exists as long as the donor money is there is not the solution. (Note: comparable to the distrust of donors in the Namibia case – but profit is not mentioned here, only that is set up so *they can take care of themselves*. The host says that is

something a lot of conservation professionals do not understand and that they do not look long term. The expert says that she has to think about being abandoned in a matter of years. “*What is the structural support you are putting in place?*” she asks rhetorically.

The discussion in the Haiti case starts with the interviewee not going on describing how he is when small-talkishly asked. The host and the expert reminisce about a summit, the interviewee says it is great to be a part of such a wonderful organisation, a great event, wonderful. The host talks about the accessibility and easiness of the event. The host got information about projects around the world, open and honest conversations about hard things. “*People such as myself of course appreciate all of that, to be able to get the word out as well about all the work we are doing*” the interviewee says about the summit. The interviewee expresses a childhood memory, love of beaches. (The host laughs.) “*Before leaving for university...seeing decrease in coral reefs...increase in marine pollution...*” There is also a narrative strand of noticing no one else is caring for this; in my words: who will do it if not him.

After “*all pieces must fit*” and using the rhetorical tool of children and, quite smoothly, employing three of the five nature values (listed in 5.1.) he adds a quick history dive to ground his narratives. Another tool he uses is a hypothetical. In his example there are five thousand people. If five people cut mangrove to make charcoal and living, it puts the other five thousand at risk in case of hurricane or tropical storm. Haitians say they cannot stop someone from making living, “*I agree however*”, he notes, but continues that if it puts family, livelihood and home at risk, can it be acceptable to let people do their thing. He characterises it all as a slow process, needing not only funding but local community understanding. He criticises as a group some, not foreign, but Haiti-originating conservationists that have a top-down approach, and criticises multinational companies using together nature exploitation and nature restoration for profit, saying most locals do not have enough knowledge to assess or acknowledge this.

Especially the host has a laughing voice at some points, one trait of his *enthusiastic* talk style. A rhetoric of future generations or just children – as well as families – is employed by the expert.

6.2. Animal conservation: management

The management in the title refers primarily to management of conservation and land and secondarily to ecological management.

In the case of Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia, the politics of crises are not so much discussed, which sets it apart from all the other podcasts. It is notable for seeking ways to adapt and arguing for adapting to the market in conservation, at least in tough locales.

They bring some familiarity at the start for example by wondering have they only met since ten days. The host reminisces something they said at a dinner table. The expert responds with a quick laughter sometimes, like at the start when the host talks of the supply scale of Kinshasa. I write in my soft transcript at multiple points that they co-discuss together, it is interactive.

There are some either or assortments, at least either reserve or no nature, either profitable protection or no protection. This is criticisable not because it would not have grounding in the realities discussed, but because it leaves out some innovative possibilities such as *conviviality*, *agroforestry*, *supranational programmes*. Still their realism gives valuable challenge to other podcasts and other forms of conservation, especially so in these contexts with major crises. The host thinks that the reality is that the land will be used for something monetarily beneficial eventually, unless there's a national park. (So animals have to make money to exist.) The expert says otherwise a cattle farm will slowly replace wildlife farm, although a big area, the wildlife will be slowly killed to maximise profit. (I think: true as this may be it represents merely an economic rationalist argument. Can there be other ways to use land than maximisation?)

Except for anthrax, the host and the expert do not note zoonoses that are associated with wildlife farming with the point I am making being that they do not see it as any damning thing.

While this diverges slightly, but not fully, from the topic of crises, it is my wish to give my expert opinion for some context on the global situation. Like expressed, charity alone is not enough to change the big global dynamics, but the funding streams that are not tied to profitable use of land can have lasting effects in an era where species / genetic diversity is collapsing and

slowing this is a global imperative. If the other logic is making money by exploiting biodiverse nature, we likely come across an upper limit of how effective we can be. Both avenues are needed in a crisis situation, and when I write on narratives of the next case in line, I contrast its normativity with these very legitimate concerns over funding and possible pauses of it because of conflict as noted in the Myanmar case or economic crises, noted here. Ultimately no one in conservation may have the power to campaign quick systemic change, but the Global North's motivation and moral obligation to support should also not be tied to market ficklenesses.

The host gives an anecdote of having recently seen conservation with "*different principles*" still have lower animal count. The narrative here is that even a struggling safari or hunting conservation, being able to make money and not be restrained by principles, can be more functional than a principled conservation, but the thought is **not** followed with *a principled conservation with some general or specific inadequacies*, although it is added that "*Harsher terrain, to be fair*" where the to be fair implies that indeed the narrative I describe is promoted, as to be fair implies an activity of argument to the other way. Are there ecosystem or resilience differences between well-managed safaris and well-managed nature parks is untackled.

Fortress conservation has a long history in America. The host mentions that their American listeners who are "*about public lands*" struggle to understand safari and hunting conservation. Third ways are less discussed in this part of the conversation. The comparison to America is also limited, since it has much logging-focused private forests which are often not good in maintaining biodiversity especially over long term or with novel technology, although the argument may not be to bring the idea of safaris to America but to expand American thinking.

Towards the end of the podcast, the expert still voices her wish to work in "real" conservation. I suppose these kinds of questions and conundrums are common in the conserving of animals, but here we hear of them in volatile countries. We learn that differences of opinion do not simply dissipate when faced with such circumstances and that national, global and climate conditions give us a certain space to move in using the practices of the ideal and the sufficient.

The expert expresses some amusement-ish sentiment about a lot of manure. She goes on to describe there not being much time for sightseeing on the last days. The host notes an impressive fresh water body in the park and recounts talking to a park keeper. This is a case of geographical bewilderment. There is much talk taking the animals' point-of-view into account.

“So you need these private ... proper management ... that can handle it.” the expert says, the host making an agreeing hum.

The Central African Republic / Mali case lines up the podcast's values at first following the sombre remark on the killing of the expert, saying there is often anger, sadness and desperation about degradation of nature, communities and animals yet balancing it with hope and optimism. The podcast calls for long-term workable solutions to preserve the planet's wilds.

We are an organisation, the expert says at the beginning, a casual unity-stressing word choice. As they help other organisations that have a mandate, the host says other organisations might lead the charge and make their own operation, to which the expert notes they are also on the front line, bullets flying, battle imagery is thus employed. No direct control. I note this is a strategy that gives national or other areal agency, but not by any necessity very local.

Interestingly corruption is noted as the number one issue preventing animal protection efforts, and often notes his second in line reason which is the lack of good governance, law and order. He moves between saying greediness is an issue and saying poaching does not occur because of greed but very often pressure. He might be referring to local communities in saying greed is not the matter.

The expert pauses at some points when he likely feels like he is going too strong. In this way and others he makes changes of tone in his speech. He also reveals that he puts himself out there and can take it: he tells funnily about being seriously struck by lightning. This is also a case of a critical instance, where the response is doing a more principle-aligned job, but in the narrative flow this is only visited quickly, with both humour and some seriousness.

The expert notes elephants are important to different groups, every single group in Mali thinks that elephants are [at least] special. I think that in such a case of hostilities, elephant conservation could be a first step to co-operate to build conditions for positive peace, meaning conditions for sustained peace instead of simply avoidance of conflict. As discussed in 5.2. the expert mentions also the temporality of some groups having protected them for centuries and also that others hunt them, and then expands on local understandings with three Malian examples. He also notes that local knowledges can be correct and in the podcast complements them with knowledge on ecology. The narrative importance in this is less the specific facts and more the positive attitude and a capability to navigate two ways of knowing believably. There is still more talk of local culture being equipped with a relationship to nature, yet the need for external biology information does not get highlighted when this is emphasised, so this might be missing from the narrative as this is sometimes seen as one of the things conservation is supposed to bring to the table, though the expert gives some of this information to the listener of the podcast and admires elephants. Social support on the other hand is noted, by both companion conservation organisations and them themselves as the rangers do not only guard but also interact.

There is as one would imagine an explanation about how conservation is militarised, with the rangers getting nicknamed a gentle or kind army. Sometimes troops are given to be trained by militaries, which in my opinion can be a minus factor on the perceived neutrality of the rangers. While I have no reason to suspect it here, we can note in Namibian history conservation being used by state to justify occupational measures. The reality of doing conservation in conflict area means a need for protection. We can ask if in some situations the protection and the possibility for positive peace may come at odds. All in all, the rangers are defensive, and what I write here is not tackled by the podcast in this way, a missed potential.

The expert voices *respect* to the elephants, saying it was absolutely fascinating the first time he met them. The expert does not fear to be informal, making an elephants sound, offering the fact that those usual loud sounds are not exactly made by these elephants in question, and offers other elephant facts to the listener, too, sounding enthusiastic saying “truly amazing”.

He tells they have anthropologists and sociologists who learn the language and work with community and their leaders figuring out the causes of poaching. *“I’ll give an example and I’m not an expert on this”*, he phrases a sentence, which is a validation of multitude of expertise.

The expert voices disagreement with those who say wildlife must pay for itself! *“Some things should be paid for by all of us.” “Hunting is the only solution for wildlife because it generates income: what nonsense!”* He notes that every country in the world has at some point paid for the protection of its natural heritage, because it was important. *“For the common good.”*

Here, too is not so much talk of global systems of shared responsibility, but then if we compare not to the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case but to the Myanmar case, there was talk that they cannot rely on donors that might just pull away when the conflict situation and governance changes in time.

But we find an apt collision with the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case also in that the host therein raised up the conversational point of American nature park type conservation logic being one that limits thinking. Here, the expert is all for that, made evident by him taking Theodore Roosevelt’s first national park being established *“because it was spectacular”*.

But more than that, he says, it is for the future generations and our future as a species, that we need to protect biodiversity, and the air we breathe, food we eat, water we drink. *“Honestly, the monetary cost for us is small to turn things around.”* (The other question is the locals’ livelihoods.) He says in comparison some of the extravagance in the world of the rich is disgusting, some people work so hard and die even (a whole of humanity narrative). He jokes that it does not make sense to him but he probably spends too much time in the bush (the joke lands). The host agrees, says he never thought of it that way (big statement, probably has); why does something with inherent value have to be equated with financial value.

6.3. Environmental health: great threats

The environmental health cases discuss great adversities that are in motion. They also have adversaries, either the Algerian or the Russian government and everything making the actions of these possible. In general, these cases show how environmental crises and peace can be touched by adjacent podcasts, not just conservation ones. Particularly for the Algerian case, we can note that the tone can be very different when criticism is presented in a social activist framework.

At the start of it, the host asks about fires. The summer of 2021 saw the worst fires of Algerian history. The host starts to build the connection of it to the political issue by mentioning together bodily suffering and conspiracy theories. The expert says there's no stop to predicaments (showing humanity). There is a little bit of laughter in the voice when "even environmental" is added to the list; perhaps either nervousness about getting through to that point or giving more weight to other considerations. The expert lists places of bad fires.

Decoloniality comes when the expert says the French had used the same tactic as the current government to drive a wedge: Almost half of the people speak Berber language, living close to the Algerian capital and centre. Separatists are marginal, he tells, they are used as an enemy.

The expert calls for national unity, which has been sabotaged by government, he says, this being bad for the nation's security. The podcast is very anti-regime narrative driven. He says the government's idea of national unity is the opposite to co-operation of identities, so they blame the fires on a marginal separatist movement to create an image of a greater threat. But according to the expert, the government has overemphasised the tactic or its effect somewhat, evidenced by an anecdote that after a lynching the attacked person's father came public with a reconciliatory speech and it was well received. The host says that in some of the earlier protest, the ethnic and national flags together were not an issue for the protesters.

We do know the aftermath of the Arab Spring was not a stronger democracy for Algeria, and its consequences mixed at best in the region. Algeria does not even show embetterment in academic freedom, so it makes sense that the researcher-activist is not based in Algeria. Had there been instead a podcast with some instance working with the government to stop the fires, we could hear a somewhat different story. We would not expect it to be uncritical, but we

could hear of the technicalities and it would be entirely within the scope of this work. Thus, it is worth comparing to other cases, we can ask if there are parts of those stories we do not hear.

At one point the expert calls the host by his first name, which is notably not the case in other podcasts. The podcast ends with the expert saying maybe short-term future is bad, maybe mid-term is better.

Ukraine. The interview is very matter-of-factly. Small inserts are used to switch the topic and accordingly move between the experts. The experts are not trying to come across as relatable people. Ethos-logos, not pathos. They speak of ecological impacts of the war, which affect the humans. The narrative is the human-nature interdependence and Russian ecocide. From the host side a question is asked on the ways in which the war is fought that harms the environment disproportionately. The answer, from the second expert, is kinds of explosives that cause fire and contaminate water and soil, and a specific example of Russian fire is given. She also talks of her motivation, which she says is primarily to “*convey people quality information*”.

The first expert links power supply to ecosystem damage. She expresses uncertainty with a sad tone concerning pollution and nuclear risks saying what happens in Ukraine does not stay in Ukraine. She notes an indicator species: dolphins in the Black Sea and both she and the host side make historical comparisons on the subjects of pollution and landmines etc. This is meant to extend the time frame of the impact, with France and Southeast Asian [Viet Nam, Laos, Cambodia] cases of explosive pollution [and ecocide, which the second expert says Russia should ideally be charged with]. She also criticises fossil consumerism and war industry. A host expresses sadness over rebuilding’s unforeseeability.

The podcast ends with a narrative return to the main theme of the podcast series, civilian protection: civilians pay the price if environment is damaged. The host says knowledge has spread, but international centralisation of environment-peace-security is needed, likely echoing the second expert’s point of a workable prosecution of ecocides.

7. Results and discussion

In this chapter I first make some general broad strokes about what was discovered based on the categories, then do additional dives to things not so clearly guided by them. I then move on to giving answers to the research questions. Yet I also engage in some additional reflective discussion following my findings in this work.

Before the results I note my process of writing them. I attempted to make a note of how much any podcast has to do with each of the thematic and structural categories on a scale of 1-3. This was in each case followed by a qualitative writing exercise, which, edited, are on show here. It can be noted that the environmental health podcasts resonated less with the categories.

Opposite to that, the device of pathos in the Algerian case or logos in the Ukrainian one were the most pronouncedly present in these cases. The way in which this takes place relates to them having outspoken enemies, which curiously can either make the rhetoric more emotionally appealing, or make it forcefully neutral in tone. Pathos was also noticeable in parts of the Central African Republic / Mali narrative. Ethos, or being in the right expertise or authority to tell the tale, is not overly relied upon in any of the podcasts, an important finding, while other experts were sometimes criticised. Ethos is the least present in the Myanmar case, where formal expertise was not seen as an automatic virtue, though there, too, the contextual expertise is elevated.

Fact and subjectivity distinction making was noted a few times in the analysis, and may have had a limited resonance with the Myanmar case, but it was the only one of the nine categories which I ruled as not descriptive of the contents of the discussions.

All of the podcasts express the theme of belonging, although foreignness is also expressed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case and the Myanmar case and criticised in the Myanmar and Haiti cases. Based on this we can expect podcasts to deal with this theme in most cases and experts to feel belonging, even in foreign contexts, although only 2-3 podcasts show the latter point (DRC / Namibia, CAR / Mali and the host of Myanmar). We can however

expect criticism of the foreignness and associated attitudes of conservationists, from a decolonial starting point. In Myanmar and Haiti, belonging is expressed in contrast to foreign mishandling of local communities and it strongly tied to the on-sitedness. In the Algerian case, criticism is not directed at international humanitarianism. Foreignness remains obscure, as an organisation can be any combination of international, national and local.

Activity and passivity, including politically, and I should add also in relation to the Global North, is relevant to all podcasts. But what do I refer to in each case? In the Myanmar case, the activity of local actors, passive attitude of rich people and what is seen by the expert as unfocused activity by foreign conservation. In the Haiti case, the activity of business and local communities. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Namibia case small-scale actors are active, while large ones in the background and in the Central African Republic and Mali case, local peoples are active in their elephant relations and the expert's organisation and its partners have the role of activity as well. With regard to Algeria, the Algerian government, civil society and international trade relations, are active, while separatists are more passively noted and with regard to Ukraine both Russia and the various forms of resisting Russia are actively worded.

The analysis of the expression of nature value types is workable, perhaps by necessity, to all such podcasts. The narratives in these cases were often multivalued: they skillfully, it seems, combined numerous different nature values. I cannot tell if some of them are strategic tools or if all are heartfelt values. With nature use, it gets often tied to the future as well. The deepest reliance on a love for nature is in the animal conservation podcasts, while the Haiti episode does also express love, for markedly non-animal nature. I wrote in 6.1. on Myanmar that

“the host says that the expert is inspiring them to care about their ocean and coast and environment and teaching them about real problems. The word choice real is of course noteworthy. We can also compare to the narrative of reminding in the Mali case: reminding a community is close to inspiring a community to in this context. In the Namibia case there is also the idea of inspiring locals to get into conservation: in all of these there is the idea of unanticipated causal snowballing”

and discussed this narrative shortly in the analysis of Mali and Namibia as well. The case with Haiti also shares some similarity with the focus on teaching to think future-orientedly on nature but emphasising future nature use. (This is not absent in cases Myanmar and Namibia.)

Interculturality is expressed and criticised in the Myanmar and Haiti cases, that is in both of the general nature conservation podcasts, although in the Haiti case the critique is less cultural. In the Central African Republic / Mali and the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia cases including locals in these multicultural projects is favoured.

On-sitedness and remoteness on the one hand and local reality and positionality corresponded with each other in all four non-environmental health cases except Haiti, where only the latter theme appeared. What is notable about the environmental health cases is that they are cases that included a lot of remote analysis work by the experts, but a big thing is not made out of this. I did note in the analysis on Algeria that

“Algeria does not even show embetterment in academic freedom, so it makes sense that the researcher-activist is not based in Algeria. Had there been instead a podcast with some instance working with the government to stop the fires, we could hear a somewhat different story. We would not expect it to be uncritical, but we could hear of the technicalities and it would be entirely within the scope of this work. Thus, it is worth comparing to other cases, we can ask if there are parts of those stories we do not hear.”

With this I say that on-sitedness can emphasise other things than the desired locally grounded sociocultural context-awareness such as technicalities or a can-do spirit over political analysis.

Local reality and positionality is very relevant as a mode of analysis corresponding to the contents of the general nature conservation cases and very important when it comes to the animal conservation ones as well. The Myanmar case comes from a national positionality and is very aware of local social reality, including making a point about a local hire, but while it separates the expert’s position and the country’s situation, there is no discussion of any possible distrust of her due to having attended conferences etc. in the larger country context.

In the Haiti case, local reality is informed about and the expert tries to be humble with the question of food need leading to unstrategic depletion of resources for a livelihood.

In the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case, too, local hiring is mentioned, as well as concern for the farmers. The podcast attempts to be more localist, though it may not fully acknowledge that it is looking at conservation through a particular lens. With the paramilitary aspect, the Central African Republic / Mali case starts from an understandably difficult relation to local reality, but it partially transcends this by noting the activities by eangers which do not seem colonial but helpful, yet troubled. On the other hand, in the Algerian case the expert does not expreas local reality and positionality except being a connected member to and of Algerian society, while a limited positionality of kinds is brought to the Ukraine case with multivocality.

The idea of critical events, for the most part, resonated with Myanmar and Central African Republic / Mali, and perhaps with Haiti to a small extent. Critical events can make a narrative more personal, but they were of less relevance to this work than they hypothetically could.

I make hereon some further remarks from the findings. Expanding on the findings of my literature review (Bak-Coleman et al., 2024) anxiety over nature creates action, which is good indirectly at getting people to care for the environment, but it is not good directly at getting people to. Out of these podcasts, the environmental health ones are more likely to be listened by people not already interested in environmental protection, but when it comes to the environment, they struggle to create direct hope more so than the others, though make an attempt. This, if something, is a narrative weakness.

As I note in my literature review, Bryant (2005, p. 172-185) argues that NGOs seek territoriality (including safety), legitimacy, moral capital and to not appear capital-city-imperialistic. My cases at no points showed opposition to these goals and to various degrees, all of these were featured in the podcasts, as shown by the preceding results. Thus, I confirm Bryant's view.

The Ukraine case goes the furthest in describing the secondary effect of crisis-caused environmental effects on animals in discussing dolphins, ecocide; and environmental health damage caused by direct (such as war) rather than indirect (such as drought) is not prominent

in the two animal conservation podcasts, but environmental health analysis clearly lends to animal protection and can find future use in animal conservation podcasts concerning crisis areas.

Despite and in light of the many specific features I make note of, it seems the podcast is a form that makes an insightful discussion possible and shareable. Whether on-script or off-script, a podcast is a looser format where nuanced discussions are welcome, instead of a more streamlined narrative. The podcast is after all a flowing conversation, or an imitation of this. The format is however contingent of its guest and hosts being knowledgeable. In the case that they have information, contextual though it is, a podcast can be a way to have a contemplative evidence-based discussion. All the same, a podcast is personal and relies on centring this trait.

All persons, at least the ones not in the environmental health group, are more aligned with so-called old environmentalism that focuses on work to protect nature than newer environmental movements which express the urgency of things, namely opposing the breaching of the planetary boundaries. A characteristic possibly related to this appears at least in the Democratic Republic of the Congo / Namibia case. When livelihoods are discussed with localising conservation, market mechanisms and commodifying nature is seen to work for the benefit of the local actors, a strategy which according to one of my readings dates back to the seventies (Lenggenhager, 2018, p.189). Old environmentalism does not require this, but newer movements might not emphasise such an approach very readily.

I wrote a referate in 2.2. according to which

“Natural resources often form the majority of guerrilla groups' revenue. These, refugees and displaced persons use the natural resources, oftentimes indiscriminately. The writers suggest that a) organisations must be able to function in war situations and b) military, reconstruction and humanitarian aid must have strategies and training to guard biodiversity. (Hanson et al., 2009)”

Guerilla groups', refugees' and displaced persons' use of resources are not discussed in the data although there are cases where it would have been relevant. Continuities and disruptions

in severe crises are discussed in the Myanmar case (organisations pull out funding due to the government) and the small amount of funding to start with in the animal conservation ones, including for war zones in the Central African Republic / Mali case. Reconstruction is discussed in the Ukraine case, but militaries' and humanitarian agencies' strategies are not in any of the podcasts, although co-operation with militaries is discussed in the Central African Republic / Mali case, as is environmental actors fulfilling some humanitarian roles.

A. How do typical structural coding categories describe strengths, limitations and styles of expert narratives on podcasts about conservation in crises?

Although other typical coding categories might have been selected as well, in the end I assume this selection was successful. The results derived from chapter four rely in no small part to the chosen categories, both thematic and structural. There is some tension between the thematic and structural split of the coding categories on the one hand and the eventual structure of the work on the other, since the narrative findings in chapter five do not rely majorly on coding categories. This does not weaken the results, but makes question X one of less relevance to us retrospectively: the coding categories yielded results but they did not so navigatably describe strengths, limitations and styles that this work would have used them to answer this question.

B. In what ways is the expert opinion's relevance in the global discourse justified? Do I concur; how reliable, valid and transferrable (generalisable) is it here?

First of all, the global discourse aspect of this question is the part where the question misses the point. The experts are aware or even proactively cognisant of global questions of conservation, but this is more evident in what is excluded, such as arrogance hard to find, than what is included. It is imaginable though that many of the experts could cross-criticise each other, because they have different criticisms in the narratives and they are broad, so they could be directed at the fellow experts. This makes expertise less reliable, but I believe it is very valid as the discussion grounds claims to either on-site or researched experiences. That said, not all proposed solutions or narrative devices are remotely objective, so this reduces the transferrability of any single expert's podcast appearance which has free-flowing ideation in relation to a case example.

Expertise or its authority is more implicit than explicit in all six podcasts and criticised in some. As this was one of the starting points in this research it is worth a mention that the handling of expertise by the experts, if not surprising in form, seems self-restrained as there are no appeals to authority, and there is an implicit understanding that there is a chain of both expertise and getting things done. The podcasts that were the most relying on expert status in the narrative were Algeria and the animal conservation ones, as the Myanmar case criticised foreign expertise, the Haiti case criticised arrogance and the Ukraine case implied a chain of expertise.

C. Are some themes minimised or underrepresented?

Positive peace is implied, but its role, consequences ignored. The podcasts do not bring strongly forward the thought expressed in readings about a potential for a wide consensus of objectives between environmental organisations and other actors, especially in armed conflict areas, which is hoped for in the academic discussion. There can be common goals, like the protection of elephants or promotion of sustainable livelihoods, but they are not very strongly represented in these narratives.

All in all, podcasts are perhaps due to a limited but relevant spontaneity, often including little pointings to other ways of thinking. Some of them can be favourable, others sharp points, others would in other context be considered bad argumentation. Themes are often minimised if they are in direct opposition to narratives, such as the ones pointed out with the thematic categories of this work.

As noted by Guba & Lincoln (1981) multifactoral discussion is not too much to expect. In these cases there is indeed a very multifactoral discussion. Still this study gives before all the result that peace building through conservation is not straightforwardly discussed and it is the politics, the environment, the local community considerations, the technicalities, the emotions that fill this space instead. A careful listen still gives ideas: I commented on (positive) peace at many turns, thus there can be said to have been some multifactoriality where positive peace may have been a silent knowledge, but one that was even implicitly underrepresented.

D. How is the local human reality given voice to and information about?

We can see differences, cross-criticism and unifying themes in how local human reality is given voice to and information about, as I have discussed. Across the podcasts, something along the lines of *wildlife and the local communities* is often conjoined, which is a strategic conjoinment but also a descriptive one.

As the research questions have been recounted, I wish to discuss one further topic, money talk. Money is discussed both concerning external actors and the funding for conservation. Money talk remains at an ambiguous level. Questions like do individuals and organisations benefit from getting involved in additional tasks, not only monetarily but in resilience, tie back to territoriality as well. Even in cases like the one in the Myanmar podcast where there is little resources to spread around, there seems still to be a dream about expanding the scope of operation.

8. Conclusion

On the state-level nature can be seen as a separatable notion from human life, an exceptionalised and delineated thing, and while that kind of political concept of nature may be implicitly reproduced by environmentalists, the actions they keep afront appear to often work for multivocality, inclusivity and a varying degree of conviviality.

Though the amount of crisis and conflict area podcasts on nature is few, the podcast format is timely, as is conservation and the wider spread of information about environmentalism.

In this work, six podcasts are studied. Their contents are analysed wholistically and with the help of four research questions, nine coding categories and additional content and style discussions featuring in the reviewed literature. Differences are found between three groupings of two podcasts decided in a deductive fashion before the analysis.

A potential for a wide consensus of objectives between environmental organisations and other actors is less emphasised than the literature would suggest it could be, meaning that there

would then be more demand for more awareness with regard to environmentalism and positive peace. In these podcast narratives, positive peace can be said to be nearly missing from the discussion.

In these six podcasts on environmental organisations in crisis and conflict areas, the general nature conservation podcasts emphasise local communities' livelihoods and criticised global connections. The animal conservation podcasts discuss land, territoriality, market mechanisms, local inclusion and spend the highest amount of time expressing love for animals, but otherwise the five nature value types are skillfully combined much more than contrasted in all of the six podcasts. The environmental health podcasts differ from each other but they are more remote rather than on-site in their way of discussion, looking at macro rather than micro reality.

Ethos, or the narrative of being an expert, is not overemphasised. A decolonial but experience-rooted approach includes criticism of top-down conservation while belonging is expressed and local reality emphasised by international conservationists, too. Activeness of various actors in the narratives is more common than representing actors as passive. The experts mostly manage to avoid coming across as arrogant.

Due to the free mode of conversation, the expert opinions seem less cohesive and more narrative-driven than assumed at the start of this working progress, yet they still function as evidence of events as proposed in my epistemology, and the podcast format, as mentioned, still enables a wide and open consideration of the issues at hand.

The limitations of this work include having a single researcher and the lack of other sufficiently similar research to compare to. Another study might have given attention to the podcast series' entireties and creators – we can also ask questions not only about the data, but also about who it is for and how do they react, which could be studied through collaboration with the podcasters. They could provide statistics. Additionally, interviewing either podcasters, or even better the listeners, would help to see how the podcasts truly play with human thought.

Reference list

- Ali, S. H. (2007) (editor). *Peace parks: conservation and conflict resolution*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press
- Amin, S. (2017) *Revolution from North to South*. *Monthly review* (New York. 1949). [Online] 69 (3), 113–.
- Aparna, K. et al. 2023, *Narratology of Paradoxes*. In: Burtscher, A. & Lupo, D. (editors). *AS IF - 16 Dialogues about Sheep, Black Holes, and Movement*. Spector books, Leipzig.
- Apirakvanalee, L. & Zhai, Y. (2023) An ideological square analysis of the podcast discourse in ‘Chinese Dreams’ of the BBC World Service. *Critical discourse studies*. [Online] 20 (4), 379–395.
- Barnwell, A. and Ravn, S. (2023) *Narrative Now: Trends and Tensions*. In: Barnwell, A. and Ravn, S. (editors). *Narrative Research Now: Critical Perspectives on the Promise of Stories*. Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press. p. 1–16.
- Bak-Coleman, J. B. et al. (2024) Addressing climate change with behavioral science: A global intervention tournament in 63 countries. *Science advances*. [Online] 10 (6), article 5778.
- Bergholm, B. (2017) *Ympäristöantropologia, Antroblogi*, 1.6.2017 [Blog]. Available at <https://antroblogi.fi/2017/06/ymparistoantropologia/> (28.8.2024)
- Borrie, W. T. & Armatas, C.A. (2022) *Environmental Values and Nature’s Contributions to People: Towards Methodological Pluralism in Evaluation of Sustainable Ecosystem Services in Misiune*, I., Depellegrin, D. & Egarter Vigl, L. (editors). *Human-Nature Interactions: Exploring Nature’s Values Across Landscapes*. Springer Nature.
- Bryant, R. (2005) *Mapping the Mission*. In: Bryant, R. *Nongovernmental Organizations in Environmental Struggles*. [Online]. United States: Yale University Press. p. 164–.

Bullis, R. K. (2013) *The narrative edge: a guide for social worker expert witnesses*. Alexandria, Va: Council on Social Work Education.

De Moor, J. et al. (2021) New kids on the block: taking stock of the recent cycle of climate activism. *Social movement studies*. [Online] 20 (5), 619–625.

Descola, P. (2013) *Beyond nature and culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Döveling, K., Harju, A. A. & Sommer, D. (2018) From Mediatized Emotion to Digital Affect Cultures: New Technologies and Global Flows of Emotion. *Social media + society*. [Online] 4 (1), article 205630511774314.

Edmonds, R. (2021) Multilingualism and climate justice: The role of linguistic diversity in environmental conservation. *Journal of sociolinguistics*. [Online] 25 (3), 478–483.

Einstein, A. (1918), translation in D. Howard, *Perspectives on Science* 1, 225 (1993).

Elger, T. & Smith, C. (2014) 'Critical Realism and Interviewing Subjects', in *Studying Organizations Using Critical Realism*. [Online] Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Given, D.R. (1995) Forging a biodiversity ethic in a multicultural context. *Biodiversity and conservation*. [Online] 4 (8), 877–891.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981) *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches*. Jossey-Bass.

Hanson, T. et al. (2009) Warfare in Biodiversity Hotspots. *Conservation Biology*, 23(3), 578–587.

Lenggenhager, L. (2018) *Ruling nature, controlling people: nature conservation, development and war in North-Eastern Namibia since the 1920s*. Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien.

Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R. & Zilber, T. (1998) Narrative research [electronic resource]: reading, analysis and interpretation. Thousand Oaks, Calif.; SAGE.

Mertova, P. & Webster, L. (2020) [2007] Using narrative inquiry as a research method: an introduction to critical event narrative analysis in research, training and professional practice. Second edition. Abingdon, Oxon; Routledge.

Rai, N. D. et al. (2021). Beyond fortress conservation: The long-term integration of natural and social science research for an inclusive conservation practice in India. *Biological conservation*. [Online] 254, article 108888.

Sahlins, M. (1981) Historical metaphors and mythical realities: structure in the early history of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom. Ann Arbor (Mich.): University of Michigan Press.

Scammell, M. K. (2010) Qualitative Environmental Health Research: An Analysis of the Literature, 1991–2008. *Ciência & saúde coletiva*. [Online] 118 (8), 1146–1154.

Vienna Poetry Festival (Cave, N.) (1998) The secret life of the love song. [Lecture.]

Yale, R. N. (2013) Measuring Narrative Believability: Development and Validation of the Narrative Believability Scale (NBS-12). *Journal of communication*. [Online] 63 (3), 578–599.