

EXPERT SEMINAR ON CULTURAL PLURALISM KNOWLEDGE, BIODIVERSITY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Theme: Exploring new knowledge arising from potential synergy between Cultural Pluralism Knowledge, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development

Venue: Center for African Development Studies, Mountains of the Moon University, Lake Saaka Campus, Fort Portal, Uganda

Date: 2nd and 3rd April 2012



Background

From the Ugandan experience, traditional and modern knowledge systems of conserving biodiversity contradict each other rather than compliment. This is because pluralism in knowledge systems has largely been ignored by conservationists, policy makers and managers at the expense of sustainable development.

One of the emerging insights in the PKP is a special interest in approaching pluralism from the angle of indigenous knowledge, bio-cultural diversity and sustainable development. It is hoped that an investigation on this approach will inevitably lead to “new meaningful and innovative connections between the perspectives of cultural pluralism and sustainability concerns.” A pilot initiative has been conceived consisting of two “expert seminars” one of which was held at the Kosmopolis Institute in Utrecht, Holland on 14th December, 2011. As a follow up, the second expert seminar was held at Mountains of the Moon University in Uganda on 2nd and 3rd April 2012.

Theme

Exploring new knowledge arising from potential synergy between Cultural Pluralism Knowledge, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development

Objectives of the seminar

- I. Exploring the value and potential to generate new knowledge on pluralism by focusing on its link with bio-cultural diversity and sustainable development through a collaborative initiative by the Kosmopolis Institute, Pluralism Knowledge Programme partners in Uganda, and MMU-Center for African Development Studies.

2. To create possibilities for knowledge sharing within the Pluralism Knowledge Programme network, with other Knowledge Programmes and partners in the broader Hivos Alliance, exchange views, ideas and experiences on issues of Cultural Pluralism Knowledge, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development.

3. To chart a way forward for further collaboration on projects and/or studies.

Program

DAY 1

Process facilitator for Day 1: MMU

TIME	SUBJECT	FACILITATORS
12:00	Arrival in Fort Portal; check-in in hotel/guest house	Participants
1:00 pm	Lunch	Saaka Campus, Mountains of the Moon University
2:00-2:30 pm	Registration Welcome remarks and introductions	 Evarist Ngabirano, Lecturer in Ethics, Mountain of the Moon University
2:30-3:00 pm	Background on the Pluralism Knowledge Programme in Uganda Origin and objectives of the pilot programme and 2 nd Experts' Seminar	Emily Drani, Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda Caroline Suransky / Henk Manschot, Kosmopolis Institute
3:00-3:30 pm	Key note address: "Engaging with different perspectives on natural resource management"	Prof. John M. Kasenene, Vice-Chancellor, Mountains of the Moon University
3:30-4:00 pm	Sharing experiences (group work): Dealing with diverse perspectives on sustainable development	John De Coninck, Cross-Cultural Foundation of Uganda (key questions)
4:00-4:30 pm	Plenary session	Evarist Ngabirano
4:30-5:30pm	Preparation for field study session: "Case study: Understanding different local perspectives and their management, in relation to land, other natural and cultural resources in and near the Rwenzori National Park" Background: "Competing interests in the management of natural and cultural assets in the Rwenzori National Park – the story so far"	 Moses Muhumuza, Lecturer and Head of Postgraduate Studies, Mountains of the Moon University

	<p>Interview process and constitution of 4 groups</p> <p><i>Possible Stakeholders and groups</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Local farmers/hunters/pastoralists/ medicinal practitioners... (Group 1, near Kasese)</i> 2. <i>Institution of the Obusinga (Group 2, Kasese)</i> 3. <i>Cultural activists/NGOs (group 2, Kasese)</i> 4. <i>Rwenzori National Park managers (Group 3, Park HQ)</i> 5. <i>Local government (Group 3, Kasese)</i> 6. <i>Conservationists (Group 4, MMU, UPU)</i> 7. <i>Tourists and tourism industry (Group 4, Fort Portal)</i> 	Evarist Ngabirano, Mountains of the Moon University
5:30pm	Evening Tea	

DAY 2

TIME	SUBJECT	FACILITATORS
8:00 am	Departure for field study to Rwenzori National Park	MMU: Evarist/ Moses
9:00 am	Arrival at various interview sites	
9:00-12:00 am	Field interviews 4 groups	MMU/translators/guides Group rapporteurs
12:00-1:00 pm	Return journey, prepare presentations	MMU: Evarist/ Moses Group rapporteurs
1:00 pm	Lunch	Saaka Campus
2:00-2:40 pm	Feedback from 4 field groups	Group Rapporteurs
2:45-3:15 pm	Presentation on Climate Change and sustainable development (+ 10 minutes discussion)	Moses Muhumuza
3:15-3:45 pm	Cultural Values and Conservation Project in Uganda. (+ 10 minutes discussion)	Dr. Arthur Mugisha, Flora and Fauna International
3:45-4:45 pm	Plenary: Points of convergence and	Evarist Ngabirano

	disparity; propose how these can be addressed (<i>working tea</i>)	
4:45-5:15 pm	Synthesis of emerging issues	Kosmopolis/Cross-Cultural Foundation
5:15-5:30 pm	Closing remarks / way forward	Kosmopolis Institute/ Mountains of the Moon University

List of participants

No.	Name	Organization	E-mail address
1.	Richard Tooro	Kabarole Tours	rtooro@yahoo.com
2.	Festus Kahiigwa	NGO Forum	f.kahiigwa@ngoforum.org.ug
3.	Moses Muhumuza	MMU	musacot@gmail.com
4.	Prof. John M. Kasenene	MMU	vc@mmu.ac.ug
5.	Patrick Mutegeki	KIU	mutegeki@alumni.ntnu.no
6.	Habib Maliamungu	IUIU	maliamunguhabib@gmail.com
7.	Patrick Mulindwa	Nkumba University	pmulindwa@nkumbauni.ac.ug
8.	Emily Drani	CCFU	ccfu@crossculturalfoundation.or.ug
9.	Prof. Henk Manschot	Kosmopolis/UvH	h.manschot@uvh.nl
10.	Prof. Caroline Suransky	Kosmopolis/UvH	c.suransky@uvh.nl
11.	Fulgencio Kayiso	IRCU	fkayiso@yahoo.co.uk
12.	Theresa Auma Eilu	LEMU	eiluterez@yahoo.com
13.	Patrick Tumwine	HURINET-U	advocacy@hurinet.or.ug
14.	Dr. Arthur Mugisha	FFI	mugisha.arthur@gmail.com
15.	Godfrey Rugumayo	JESE	godfreymulinda@yahoo.com
16.	Eriah Byaruhanga	KRC	eriahbya@krc.ug.org
17.	Ferestus Kyomugisha	MMU	kferestus@yahoo.com
18.	Clovis Kabaseke	MMU	kabasekeclovis@yahoo.com
19.	Kule Walyuba	OBUSINGA	kulewalyuba@yahoo.co.uk
20.	Julius Biryabagaruka	CVCP-RNP	julieomeg@yahoo.com
21.	Patrick Rubagyema	CVCP-LMCA	patrickrubagyema@gmail.com
22.	John De Coninck	CCFU	john@crossculturalfoundation.or.ug
23.	Evarist Ngabirano	MMU	ngabirano2002@yahoo.com

SEMINAR REPORT

DAY 1

Welcome Remarks

The director Center for African Development Studies Evarist Ngabirano, welcomed the participants on behalf of Mountains of the Moon University and on his own behalf to the Second Expert Seminar on Pluralism, Bio-Cultural Diversity and Sustainable Development.

He informed the participants that the first Expert Seminar took place at the Cosmopolis Institute, Utrecht in Holland in December 2011. He in a special way welcomed Professors Caroline Suransky and Henk Manschot with whom this pilot initiative was conceived during the Summer School on Pluralism Knowledge in South Africa at the University of Free State, Bloemfontein.

He welcomed the CCFU team who coordinates the Pluralism Knowledge Program (PKP) in Uganda acknowledging the presence of Emily Drani, the Executive Director and Mr. John De Coninck. In addition, he welcomed the PKP steering committee members who include; Mr. Fulgencio Kayiso of Inter-religious Council of Uganda, Ms. Maliamungu Habib of IUIU, Mutegeki Patrick of KIU and others and thanked them for turning up to participate in this event.

He also welcomed participants from HURINET, LEMU, KRC, JESE, RNP management, the Obusinga, the Kabarole district Local Government, the Elders Association, Nkumba University and Mountains of the Moon University.

In a special way he acknowledged the presence of Dr. Arthur Mugisha of Flora and Fauna International and initiator of the Cultural Values Project in the Rwenzori and Lake Mburo National Parks. Dr. Arthur also championed the Community Conservation approaches when he was chief Warden at Kibale and Lake Mburo NP and when he became Executive Director of Uganda Wildlife Authority. He informed the members that Dr. Arthur would make a presentation on cultural pluralism and biodiversity conservation- Cultural Values and Conservation Project in Uganda.

He welcomed Mr. Moses Muhumuza, Director of Postgraduate Studies at Mountains of the Moon University and informed participants that he (Moses) would make a presentation on indigenous knowledge. Moses has done extensive research on indigenous knowledge with the RNP and is currently pursuing a PhD in Natural Resources at the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa.

He recognized the presence of Professor John M. Kasenene, the Vice Chancellor MMU and informed participants that he (Prof. Kasenene) would deliver the key note address. Professor Kasenene is a botanist who has long experience in teaching at Makerere University and managing the Makerere University Biological Field Station. This profile gives him a personality that blends biodiversity with humanism.

He finally appreciated the donors for sponsoring the seminar and thanked everybody for the positive response to the invitation and wished everyone active participation.

Background on Pluralism Programme in Uganda (Emily Drani)

She extended her vote of thanks to the participants for turning up for the event. She explained that pluralism is all about appreciating differences and tolerating different identities, knowledge systems, ideologies, religions, ethnicity and political affiliations. It is about engaging with different forms of knowledge. These raise the question of cultural diversity which sometimes leads to exclusion, lack of access to information and inevitably affecting the management of resources. In addition, she elaborated that much as we appreciate negative things involved in culture, there is need to interrogate its usefulness. This is important for the summer school alumni and explains why they are here. She explained how the Summer school draws participants from Uganda, India, Indonesia and South Africa. These participants come together to discuss issues of human rights, identity etc. In Uganda the summer school alumni formed a network with a steering committee to look into that. The program started in 2009 drawing participants from Nkumba University, KIU, IUIU, MMU, UMU, Gulu University, and Civil Societies. The question was how is pluralism understood in Uganda? They decided to break it down in order to understand the differences.

She further informed participants that research work has been done on pluralism in the family, schools and universities focusing on issues of religion, ethnicity, human rights and other elements of marginalization. The research aims at addressing the issues of marginalization and differences.

It is in the summer schools that a new initiative started that focuses at pluralism from another dimension; i.e. looking at pluralism in terms of managing resources. The focus was on understanding the synergy between pluralism and sustainable development. The question is, how do we manage differences in the management of a particular resource? She then explained that this was the reason behind the pilot initiative in the two expert seminars held at Cosmopolis Institute in the Netherlands and Mountains of the Moon University.

Origin and objectives of the pilot programme and 2nd Expert Seminar (Caroline Suransky)

Caroline informed participants about the need for international knowledge on development. She said that there is need for multiple knowledge to achieve development. She explained how she was going to say some thing about the knowledge program. Then the idea of diversity, not in the sense of merely having different cultural habits of eating or dancing but to look at diversity in terms of different people who often have different interests and don't have same powers to access these interests. Then she would talk a little bit on how we want to motivate our interest bringing together cultural values and cultural diversity values and the ideas of sustainable development. Then finally say a little bit a bout the pilot project.

Emily described the steering committee in Uganda. However, the same kind of structure exists in other participating countries, India, Indonesia, South Africa and the Netherlands. She explained

that the idea was to bring different ideas together. Academic knowledge and practice knowledge. And often we find that people in practice will say that in academics all they can do is to develop nice and fancy ideas which don't work. The academicians may often say that practitioners on the other hand look for bullet points. They are not interested in deep issues and are not reading enough. So, we find that in the academics and people who work with NGOs have a lot of knowledge but it does not come easily together and that's a pity. Hence there is a lot to learn from the different kinds of knowledge. But from a global level you also have things like this sitting in Indonesia talking about different issues. In Indonesia the main issue of diversity in difference is about differences within Islam i.e. different groups within Islam. In India it may be between different caste groups (cultural ethnic groups). We also bring together international experiences and the summer school is an example of this. It becomes very interesting because we are immersed in our daily practice in our own countries, it becomes very interesting to find out how people are doing in different countries with different ideas, circumstances, questions, histories etc. and it is not easy to share with people who are different from one's self. One of the things we do at the global context is the PhD program.

There are always differences in the world but some of them may not be important and others may be important basing on circumstances. Therefore, different differences matter in different circumstances. The idea is that by bringing these people together, new knowledge can be generated. For some countries may be gender can be important for correcting a gender injustice in others it can be something else. Different perspectives also mean different interests and also unequal opportunities. The one group has much more access than others to make their wishes known, to further their interests. Their knowledge has more power than other people's knowledge. So, we talk about managing diversity but often we forget to understand what it means in different circumstances. We can manage differences by keeping every body quiet and ensuring there is no violence etc. but there is little effort to often understand where these differences come from.

The way we started this aspect of pluralism program and sustainable development came initially through this understanding of the human development index. The way the quality of life is measured in each country every year. There are a lot of differences between the countries. The rich countries have high index. When we think of development we tend to aspire for social justice that happen in all countries that happen to be at such a level.

However, there are other ways of measuring what happens in the world which I think all of you are aware of; this is the ecological foot print. It looks at how much each country takes out of the earth. It raises a lot of interesting questions. The higher you get the more you take from the earth e.g. USA has a high index but takes so much from the earth. If you look at it this way, it means that African countries are doing very well in terms of foot prints. Because the developed countries use so much, that it brings disaster in the world in form of floods. Perhaps Europe can learn from Africa on how we can live well with nature with out asking for so much in the American or European way. We are in fact underdeveloped here. This paradigm of development is unsustainable. The human development index however good it was does not put into consideration the ecological consequences of human development. It is likely that the whole index will fall a part.

How can we rethink development? What needs to be done? It is difficult to give up privileges. But, we do know that things need to change and partly may be through technological innovations but also in terms of values, living, ethics of people etc. There are two questions: 1) We do want to improve people's quality of life because most people still live miserable lives. 2) How are we changing the assumptions and production paradigm? These are not questions that individual countries can solve by themselves. It is a global challenge. It will involve a lot of negotiation and dialogue going on. For example, there is a global campaign by UNESCO that people should switch off lights for one hour as to create awareness but that does not take into account that some people do not have electricity to switch off. So, it means different things in different circumstances. The challenge is everywhere but the problems and aspirations are different.

So we look at diversities or pluralism in many aspects but in particular we found that cultural values and sustainable development is an interesting concern in all participating countries especially in Uganda. So, then we went to HIVOs and told them this is what we want to pilot in and they gave us small money to begin with. To find whether there are ways of collaborating. So, this is the idea of today and tomorrow.

Key note address: Engaging with different perspectives on natural resources (Prof. John M. Kasenene)

He first talked about Mountains of the Moon University and its web ranking by international standards. It is a community University. It started in 2005 by community and is supported by the community and the major objectives are research, training and community service. Community service is emphasized because that is why it was started in this part of the region. Though still young it has been ranked 4th in Uganda, 77 in Sub-saharan Africa, 3019 world wide.

He welcomed and recognized efforts put in by Professor Carolina and Henk and the CCFU team, Emily and John to make this seminar a reality. He also acknowledged the efforts put in by MMU Centre for African development Studies team.

He talked about Uganda as a pearl of Africa and elaborated on its bio-cultural-diversity. We range from tropical to integrate even desert, savanna, mountain etc. Then, he posed a question; how can you treat Uganda as a single ecosystem functioning with all its components intertwined and I think that is why we are discussing diversity at local national and is that a risk at the global? The knowledge base is different.

Since the colonialization and partitioning of Africa, all natural resources management decisions and methods became influenced by practices from the western world. These were introduced wholesale by colonial masters into the 3rd world countries of Africa. The total destruction (exploitation) or depletion of natural resources in Europe and America, as a result of industrial revolution led to the so called "Fortress Conservation" as a resource management practice that was eventually exported to the 3rd world (now developing) countries in Africa. The creation of

Protected Resource Areas in Uganda (e.g. National Parks, Game reserves, Forest Reserves, hunting areas and sanctuaries) was simply a British colonial invention. It was a western style of natural resource management derived out of their own experience i.e. fear of resource depletion and loss as at home and of course competitive greed. In 1932, Kibale Forest was gazetted as a “Crown land.” In this arrangement, resource ownership automatically shifted from the King (or Crown) of Tooro to the Queen (or Crown) of England. National Parks and Nature reserves were strictly protected from local human activity. It was a strictly a hands off and even eyes off affair for the local people. But the local people were strongly connected, interdependent and actually part of Natural dynamics of the existing wildlife resources. After all, the abutting local communities and their Traditional King had “Conserved” the forest wildlife resources in abundance and sustainable manner, therefore also the rightful owners.

So, it is important to note that earlier efforts to protect the natural environment in Africa did often sacrifice the interests of the Africans for foreign interests (Wilson 1992).

The African experience of natural resource management was and still is far different from that of Western worlds. Africans lived in plenty with rudimentary means of survival. They naturally, sustained ecologically viable human populations in balance with existing natural resources. They practiced selective hunting, gathering/harvest and logging of trees. They hunted, gathered in small bands of people seasonally. They practiced shifting cultivation which was extremely sustainable. They lived a nomadic life which had minimal impact on their environment.

So Africans lived in harmony with nature. But, the introduction of western styles of natural resource management created imbalance/disharmony resulting into the human-nature antagonism. These western styles introduced the gun to protect resources and hunt, commercial farming and lumbering on large scale leading to degradation and deforestation. They introduced sedentary life with urbanization and industrialization thus leading to pollution. In addition improved feeding and health care, disturbed natural balance and led to disease outbreak and increased/unsustainable human population. This also increased resource demand/needs and thus pressure on environmental resources (a vicious cycle).

Through Fortress conservation, the Africans had to become uprooted from their natural environment and the Wildlife became protected by force of Arms. This was quite unfortunate as the Africans did not understand the reasons behind these “untouchable enclaves” or “terrestrial islands” called Protected Areas, Parks or Reserves. These were their Godly given traditional hunting grounds, worshiping sites (shrines), sacred (burial, ancestral) forest, training grounds for war and female/manhood initiations, sources of valued wild foods and beverages, crafts materials, decorations, traditional medicinal plants and other valuables on which their livelihoods largely depended.

The foreign perspective constituted an irreconcilable conflict of interest as far as the purpose and future of natural resource conservation was concerned.

The two divergent experiences of natural resource management have therefore been a constant source of conflict leading to failure of many development projects and conservation efforts. It is my strong belief, that effective conservation for sustainable development will only be achieved when efforts are made to engage with different perspectives on natural resource management.

So, the new strategies for conserving biodiversity in Africa should emphasize the following:

Respect of African values, knowledge systems, priorities and practices: Values can be at different levels and for different benefits. These can be ecological, economic, spiritual, aesthetic, political, cultural and scientific. These values also differ at local, national and international levels. At the local level, conservation of biodiversity is very relevant to the local people because biological resources are a source of livelihood, medicines and spiritual values, hunting and food etc. At the national level, consumptive values like hunting, logging, or non-consumptive values like tourism, recreation and research etc occur. Values of international or global concern include maintenance of existing species richness on earth as a common heritage of humans. These values can therefore be hard to reconcile.

Indigenous Knowledge: Lack of recognition, understanding and use of African indigenous knowledge, technology and practices or failure to incorporate it in conservation programs have greatly contributed to environmental degradation and general biodiversity loss or conflicts. It is important to combine the best indigenous knowledge and modern knowledge systems to develop a deeper understanding of the full range of biodiversity conservation concerns.

Involvement of local people in management and use of biological resources: Community development has changed from top-down to more bottom-up approaches. Local cooperation, participation in management and control are crucial to achieving both short and long term objectives. In order to facilitate community participation at all stages, existing community institution must be strengthened or new ones established where need be. In our recent study of plants for Malaria treatment (Segawa and Kasenene 2007), three tree species including *Hillea rubrostipulata*, *Warburgia*, *Ugandensis* and *Syzygium guineensis* were found to be highly valued in the treatment of malaria. They are therefore, selectively/highly used by the local people. However, and surprisingly these species exhibited an inverse J-shaped curve in their demography indicating viable regenerating populations. Therefore the recognition of the use of traditional resources by the local communities as an integral and essential part of their health care system is vital in the conservation and sustainable use of these plants.

Control or even reversal of the loss of biodiversity in the country in every region: A country should have a natural strategy for conserving its natural resources e.g. in NPs, Forest reserves etc complete with functional structures to manage them (UWA, NEMA, NFA, WID etc). all

biodiversity even that on land and in waters outside PA systems should come under conservation efforts.

Treating or linking biodiversity conservation and sustainable economic development as an integral aspect of the same process of sustainable development.

Recognition of poverty (and Greed!) as the prime forces eroding biodiversity in Africa: This means that economic growth and development of all members of society can be a major force in conservation.

Create a policy environment which is conducive and encourages land use systems that conserve biodiversity: Land tenure, ownership and land use should have policies which are less destructive to landscape. Currently, the high population growth rates in Uganda are leading to land pressure, high need for *forex* and high levels of poverty which often conflict with biodiversity conservation.

Research, Monitoring and Evaluation: Incorporate into biodiversity related projects effective research, monitoring and evaluation. Components which should measure progress in terms of conservation and community well being should be covered. For most Africans, ecosystems (forests, savanna, wetlands, lakes and rivers) there is generally lack of natural resource inventories or baseline data. Yet these are crucial for monitoring biodiversity trends. We need regular monitoring of changes in biodiversity, ecological relationships and the social-economic changes of local residents affecting the resources. It is important to measure the success of projects and provide adequate feed back for making corrections and refinements. Among objective, monitoring recognizes changes in direction, size, abundance, rates and quality of ecosystem resources. We must find reasons for the various changes in order to predict the future consequences. So, baseline inventories of biological, ecological characteristics, human conditions and needs and other factors should allow comparisons over time. As it is difficult to inventory all living organisms in any ecosystem, indicator species are selected which can help identify both positive and negative trends in the conservation of biodiversity. Actual monitoring should be made easy, regular and standardized. It could involve just getting into the field, walking and looking around, making measurements and recording, talking and collaborating with the local people (barefoot researchers). Local/indigenous participation is quite useful in research, monitoring and evaluation and should be encouraged. The local people, because of their closeness and regular interaction with the resources, are quick to detect changes e.g. changes in habitat boundaries, disappearance of formerly common plants, animals, physical resources or the invasion of alien species.

Education, Training and Networking: Awareness building and understanding of biodiversity conservation issues need to be improved and expanded to cover the population, government officials, the policy matters and the lender/donor agencies. Awareness raising, training and

human resource development can be done through formal and non-formal education, in-service workshops, seminars, study tours etc for updating information. Field training is a must and good for all cadre of staff development.

It is on this note that I applaud Professor Carolina Suransky, Professor Henk Manschot, the Cross Cultural Foundation of Uganda (CCFU) and MMU Center for African Development Studies for organizing this expert seminar. It is poised to culminate in research collaboration on Cultural Pluralism Knowledge, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development. Linking humanism and biodiversity conservation is indeed an exciting academic venture we should all look forward to giving unreserved support. Thank you for listening to me.

Dealing with diverse perspectives on sustainable development (John De Coninck)

I just happened to be in the vicinity where the 1st expert seminar was taking place, so I walked in to the room and said a few words. I was not representing Uganda but I think I should just share a little about what I said because it is connected to the program for the rest of our time here for the day and a half. As you were told, this is the second sub seminar, so I thought may be it is good idea to share a few things about what happened during the first one, so that we can make that connection and see why we are going to the field and what is expected us at the end of tomorrow.

When I was given a few minutes to talk in Utrecht, the question was, in the Ugandan context, is the question about different bodies of knowledge and natural resource management, is it a question that worth while to ask? Is there any mileage in thinking about natural resource management from different perspectives, different pluralistic view or knowledge? And I took two examples that I was a bit familiar with. I took the example of the national land policy that may be you are familiar with where different types of knowledge are actually still competing with each other to try and establish legitimacy at policy level. For instance there is a draft policy that recognizes existence of four different types of land regimes. Several of them are actually based on the piece of paper that we call land title and there are different ways in which you can get it and you can sell your land title, you can put it in the bank vault and get some credit and so on and is a certain type of culture around the fact that because I have a piece of paper that is called a land title, I own a piece of land and I can sell it. But actually in most of our country, that is not the system that prevails, what prevails is the customary land tenure where you do not have a piece of land or piece of paper but you are still some how the owner of the piece of land because of your ancestry, because you belong to a particular clan, family, therefore you have access to a particular piece of land and in some ways you are the owner although you don't have a piece of paper called a land title. That was one of the example I gave, about whether it makes sense to think about different bodies of knowledge and different cultural values in relation to natural resource management.

The other one I took by chance may be was the issue of the Rwenzori mountains here (illustration). How do people look at the Rwenzori Mountains? What are the different perspectives? And I addressed to four examples: What is the perspective of the Uganda Wild life Authority on the Mountains? How do they feel about this natural resource? How does a Mukonjo look at it? And how does he look at the issue of climate change and the fact that the snows are

disappearing and where are the gods going to go in case the snow goes. Then there were also the perspective of the tourists and the tourism industry. They are looking at it from a different perspective. And the fourth group was the global environmental activist and the local government and there may be some more groups. That was one point of departure in thinking about the event we are having here today and tomorrow.

The second point that I wanted to share with you which I thought was interesting was a presentation from the Dutch lady who works with the Dutch government who also put on the hat of spiritual-eco researcher. She talked about how spiritual values inform, how do they inspire or not inspire indigenous forest management. For me personally this was very interesting because I was coming from a rather naïve perspective i.e. the perspective that spiritual values are in line with ecological development. That if we think about indigenous knowledge and the spiritual values around it, if we could somehow go back to that situation and if this could inform natural resource management, then we would be on the path towards a more sustainable form of development. (that Caroline was showing us on the diagram).

This was explained by this lady as the only one possibility and that one possibility could be accidental or intentional but in this particular case study, there is an overlap between spiritual values and sustainable development. I thought of what example could exist here in Uganda to make this a bit clearer and I remembered some years ago travelling in Karamoja and Kotido and coming across sacred forests. When you come across these sacred forests, you realize that the vision or the idea of what Karamoja must have been 100 years ago. And the spiritual values of the people around there are such that those sacred forests are kept and contribute to a more sustainable development of the local area. That point I could understand very well because it linked with my experience. And I think a lot of what Prof. Kasenene talked about in his key note address is about this one. But what was interesting me was that there was others and the other one was when spiritual values, may be indigenous knowledge have an ambiguous effect on conservation, the two do not necessarily come hand in hand and actually spiritual values can have negative effect on conservation. So, I thought about are there some examples in Uganda and I thought yes, in Busonga I remember visiting what is called sacred groves and those were pretty miserable places. The sacred groves just had a few three or two trees remaining. They still stalked about as sacred groves but they were being exploited completely unsustainably and they were on the brink of disappearing altogether. So, that was one of the cases where the two did not seem to come together. Another case that she mentioned was where there is a disconnection between the spiritual values of the individual and the one that is practiced may be by the institutions. The example here in Uganda may be that of the fishermen on Lake Victoria. Traditionally, there times of the year that people would go fishing based on spiritual events and spiritual values. Then the government started to try and regulate the fishing industry and to allow commercial fishing trimming off all the fish in the lake and these traditions were abandoned. So there must be some individual fishermen who individually will observe those spiritual values and in that way contribute to a more sustainable use of fishing resources but in the wider context is disregarding them altogether.

Lastly was the case where there is a reconnection between the individual and those institutions. I can't think of an example in Uganda. The only example given was in Zimbabwe where spiritual mediums and other spiritual related individuals were spearheading a drive towards reforestation

as a way of showing gratitude to the gods. So, there is some kind of reconnection there after a particular part of the country had been depleted from the trees. So, this to me was interesting because it gives rise to the possibility of a much more complex web of relationships between culture, spiritual values and the management of natural resources. So, we thought that as we prepare to explore this a little more that it might be good to keep it at the back of our mind that it not necessarily a very easy relationship to analyze. That was also our point of departure for what we are supposed to do here and that is to explore this relationship between culture, different values systems, knowledge systems, and the management of natural resources. So, if we look at that, may be we can ask some other perspectives and if you look at your program, we came up with seven perspectives and these include the following: however it is not an exhaustive program and can therefore add more perspectives.

Plenary Session

Background: “Competing interests in the management of natural and cultural assets in the Rwenzori National Park – the story so far” (Mr. Muhumuza Moses)

Moses explained that he was going to present on competing interests in reference to the management of RNP. RNP has good characteristics which attract conservationists. It Covers 996 km² and has a rich biodiversity which makes it a botanist paradise. It is at the same time a fragile ecosystem being mountainous. It is a world heritage site surrounded by approximately 2million people, Bakonzo and Baamba being the dominant tribes. The literacy rate among these people is 37%.

Before it was gazetted, testimonies of people have indicated how it was managed. Access to resources was free but well regulated. Only ridge leaders and chieftains had access and others had to seek for permission. Some places were completely reserved for gods (e.g. Kitasamba’s headquarters). Those are the ones they call SACRED SITES or in India sacred groves. Some trees were protected as homes of gods (e.g. Omuhati – *Afrizian afraizio*). Trees surrounding shrines and sacred sites were never to be cut (over 100 sacred sites exist in RM). The chieftains and ridge leaders would access a resource but the others who include clan leaders, native doctors and house hold members would seek for permission. The structure was hierarchical in that nature.

The mountain was a clinic, a church, a cultural symbol and a basis for survival. Even before the name Mountain of the moon was given by Stanley, the mountain had a local name with a meaning. It was called *Orusozi Rwenjura*, (literally the mountain of the rain) that is where the name Rwenzori comes from because of pronunciation. In the traditional understanding we look at resources managed by god (Nyamuhanga). Nyamuhanga created Nzururu - the father of the spirits Kitasamba. Kitasamba is responsible for human life, its continuity and its welfare. Kitasamba fertilises the land with his sperm (snow). Kitasamba controls the natural environment

and the lives of all the mountain people. To the people what mattered were offering sacrifices to gods, cleansing ridges from time to time, following traditional rituals of harvesting resources as stipulated by chiefs, chieftains and mediums. All this was done to avert natural calamities and appease gods.

He elaborated on foreign based /external/exported conservation as follows:

Prior to 1941- Rwenzori Mountains was freely available to the local people. After 1941 a forest reserve was created and some rules were put in place. In 1991 part of the mountain was declared a national park. In addition to the rules put in place in 1941 stringent ones were added. People were stopped from accessing the resources. In 1994 it was declared a world heritage site which is different from a cultural heritage site under the classification by UNESCO. Despite the fact that the mountain having been a cultural symbol defending the identity of the mountain people, that was not recognized to the present day. After 1994, the literature tells us this exclusion of people from protected areas in different parts of the world started raising some concern. So around 1980, some people sat somewhere not in Africa and thought of engaging communities. However, for RNP to start thinking of engaging communities was when UWA was put in place in 1986 replacing the department of National parks. That is when they started engaging the community using different approaches. However, all these were from outside. One of the examples of these approaches is the resource use agreement whereby people sign agreement to access some of the resources in the National Park. But when we critically analyse these attempts made, there are still some problems. Some one looks at the mountain as a clinic and we decide to construct a school from the twenty 20% collection or you decide to construct a road. So what is given as an alternative is not a direct alternative. In addition, it is still very small. Also there are some places of gods which cannot be replaced. Looking at the cultural values of this mountain there are a number of attempts which have been made and Dr. Arthur will tell us about the cultural values conservation project and how it is attempting to address some of these issues. So, in the establishment of the Park, the other traditional structure was overridden, meaning that now there was a new structure of the government. There was a parallel structure which was created and the traditional structure was no longer respected. The traditional understanding of the people was challenged based on what we call logical reasoning. We find that in the knowledge systems there is a lot of construction of knowledge. However, different people view the world differently. For example rain making, if you want to use logical reasoning, you will find that it will not fit there.

He outlined the impact of foreign conservation as follows:

Ritual sacrifices were last performed in 1980s and therefore incantations and songs are no longer known. Hunting and resource gathering practices are no longer followed. Conservation is now discussed in meetings, radio programs and through music and cultural dances composed in the English language. Technical words like meteorology, biodiversity, and species etc. which are used today do not have the equivalent in local languages. Formal education which has been

provided to the people is more responsible for threat to language culture and Traditional Ecological Knowledge. It has not tapped from the existing knowledge of the local people.

He gave the conflict between foreign based conservation practices and traditional understanding as illustrated in the table below.

Concept	Traditional understanding	Understanding from formal education
Solid water at the peak of the mountain	Kitasamba's sperm	snow
Receding glaciers	The mountain god is annoyed with human intrusion	Climate change and global warming
How to address the problems	Appease the spirits	Plant more trees
Why not to harvest some resources	Avoid punishment from gods	Sustainability
Availability of resources	Resources are available and provided by the gods	Resources are reducing based on scientific studies

Now we can integrate different understanding of natural resource management. Looking at how local people understand things it can help us interpret in order to put in context some of the practices and to build on what they already know in order to be able to engage with them.

Interview process and constitution of 4 groups (Evarist)

1. Rwenzori National Park managers (Park HQ)
Clovis Kabaseke, Evarist Ngabirano, Fulgencio Kayiso, John De Coninck
2. Institution of the Obusinga (Kasese)
Theresa Auma Eilu, Habib Maliamungu, Prof. Henk Manschot
3. Local government (Kasese)
Patrick Mutegeki, Richard Tooro, Dr. Arthur Mugisha

4. Local farmers/hunters/ medicinal practitioners/tourists and tourism industry
Ferestus Kyomugisha, Caroline Suransky,

DAY 2

Feedback from 4 field groups (Group Rapporteurs)

Sustainable development amidst climate change: How does African indigenous ecological knowledge come in? (Mr. Muhumuza Moses)

He started by explaining the concept of sustainability. He defined sustainable growth (SG) as growing in tandem with the regenerating capacity of earth and posed a question; is it possible? He defined Sustainable consumption (SC) as ensuring that the basic needs of the entire global community are met, excess is reduced and environmental damage is avoided. He understands Sustainable development (SD) as development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

He gave the action oriented variance of Sustainable Development as protecting nature, thinking long-term, understanding systems within which we live, recognizing limits, practicing fairness and embracing creativity.

He elaborated on the indicators of sustainable development as follows:

Gross National Happiness (GNH) which is an attempt to define quality of life in a more holistic and psychological terms, Human Development Index (HDI) as the measure of life expectancy, literacy, education, and standard of living in countries worldwide and Ecological Footprint (EF) which compares human consumption of natural resources with Earth's ecological capacity to regenerate them. He also explained the Happy Planet Index (HPI) as an index of human well-being and environmental impact. The index challenges other well-established indices such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and the Human Development Index (HDI).

He linked Climate change with Sustainable Development. He said that Climate change is a global concern as records show there is a change in climate patterns worldwide. Consequently, a number of protocols at Montréal, Kyoto and Denmark have discussed the concern.

He went on to elaborate that Climate change creates both risks and opportunities worldwide and that Africa was highly vulnerable. The Rwenzori region gives an indicator of an African local region that is already affected by climate change.

He gave reasons why climate change is a concern for the Rwenzori region as follows:

People rely on agriculture which is rain fed. The region is in a fragile environment with a limited use and adaptation of advanced technologies, untimely and unreliable weather forecasts.

He outlined observable climate change indicators in Rwenzori region as drought/extended dry seasons, unreliable and unpredictable rainfall, changes in planting seasons, reduction on water volumes in rivers, disappearance of many wetlands and streams, the reduction of snow cap on top of Mt. Rwenzori, crop failure, reduction in yields, crop drying in the field, and pests and diseases (Both frequency, forms and scale has increased e.g Banana Bacteria Wilt, Coffee wilt, pineapple wilt, cassava mosaic).

He elaborated on the diversity of opinion, perception and appreciation in relation to climate change. There is a perception that climate change is human induced or a natural phenomenon. The question here is who takes blame? Developed/industrialized nations or underdeveloped/poor nations? Is climate change becoming propaganda? Doesn't climate change have any positive effects? These influence climate change adoption, adaptation and mitigation strategies for sustainable development.

He talked about the science of climate change. We carry out forestry, gas emissions, and wetland degradation to create more land to build more houses and for agricultural output to sustain human welfare of increasing human population. What results from all these is an increase in greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxides, water vapor etc. However, the most important gas is carbon dioxide which eventually accumulates in the atmosphere thus depleting the environment through ultra violet rays. There is a certain concentration which is required in the atmosphere and beyond that; we shall have more enhanced warmth known as the greenhouse effect thus global warming. Then there are other effects such as climate change, natural ecosystems, agriculture, fishing and forests. Other changes include, high temperatures result, the speed of the water cycle increases, more rains in the middle latitudes, soil moisture evaporates, polar ice caps melt, shifts in patterns of rainfall, storm patterns change, soil moisture evaporates. All these affect the natural ecosystems, the micro climates of different organisms, e.g. the sex of a crocodile is determined by temperatures, if it lays eggs at 31 degrees centigrade, then the result is female and at 32 it is a male. So the difference can cause a very big difference. So all this is the effect of climate change. These human activities such as deforestation can cause climate change, if you cut trees, which would absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere; you burn charcoal which increases carbon dioxide in the atmosphere which results in the melting of ice caps leading to over flooding of rivers etc. these are a few examples, otherwise there many indicators.

He focused on the question: Can African Traditional Ecological Knowledge help: Pros and Cons.

In the past, people were living in harmony with the environment and someone indicated that it could have been because of low human population especially in Africa. However, when we talk

about population it cannot be divorced from life style and technology used e.g. one person using a tractor can clear a forest while 100 people using pangas might fail. So, traditionally, population was low; life was simple, and the technology used was simple using what we may call rudimentary tools. But then when you relate it to the management of the environment, how does it come; was it intentional or it was something which came up by accident. For example before the industrial revolution (1940s), the population was low and there was high mortality rate and the life expectancy was high; so was this intentional? Was this issue of simple life style intentional? When you analyze issues concerning African history you find that in Africa, we are more concerned with having many children as security in future. So, this might not have necessarily been intentional to manage a resource. Then we have high mobility, as a way to show how people in Africa tradition managed resources but were that a traditional conservation strategy or it was aimless wandering? Then there is what we call customary rules and regulations? But are these rules still applicable in our current context? Are they still there? Another example is the traditional religious beliefs linked to conservation where people believed that there is a god and people do not go to this place because it is for the gods. That could have been a conservation strategy either intentional or un intentional but there are a few places where you find that these stories can still be told which you find in the Rwenzori mountains. In other places they have been replaced by modern religions. Where there was a shrine, now there is a church. Then there is technical understanding of the environment. Here we mean if you understand the environment, does it mean that you conserve it?

In his conclusion, he listed down questions for reflection as follows:

- Is traditional ecological knowledge of the local people adequate to effect sustainable development amid climate change challenges?
- What is the source of knowledge about the environment that local people have? Is it researched or acquired through experience?
- Does traditional ecological knowledge lead to sustainability?
- For how long will traditional beliefs and structures be sustained in African communities in the face of modernity?

Potential synergies - cultural pluralism and biodiversity conservation- Cultural Values and Conservation Project in Uganda (Dr. Arthur Mugisha)

He started by explaining that what he was going to share with the participants is not from an academic point of view. I am going to share with you from the practical perspective what the cultural values and conservation project has achieved since 2005 (about 7 years) of

implementation. I think you have heard all this and I think people must have talked to you a number of times about the protected areas and the key note speaker yesterday Prof. John Kasenene dwelt on this issue of the colonialist having made fences and protected some areas and he gave a number of things, how things changed from the perspective of the long know how of the indigenous of the local Africans to the know how of science and ecology group, the people who were not Africans and did not understand the Africans and these were colonialists. They looked at people who were trans-humus in their use of nature and said you guys you are destructive, stop, have small pieces of land, get land titles and live sedentary lives and now we are stark within our confines. In a protected area, such as Bwindi or Rwenzori there is a straight line such that where the boundary stone is next is a complete desert and you have got the forest in the Rwenzori NP. As if the trees in the National park are the ones that matter and the trees beyond the boundaries are non issues. After understanding that we had failed in what we started building, we came up with another approach and this is the approach we called the integrated conservation and development approach and basically it is talking about sustainable development, development and conservation, the same page but with two different faces. Yes, I agree with Moses, everything that is started has its pros and cons. The ICDPs brought the biggest contributed, it brought about dialogue, people who were facing different ways now faced each other or at least the managers of nature faced the backs of the people though the people continued to face the other way and tried to find ways to turn around and have a dialogue. The dialogue that happened, happened and the results that came out still continued tilting the balance and without understanding the wisdoms, the attitudes, the perspectives of the local people and we are still scratching our heads to find out what works and what does not work and then we are talking of the global climate change which is the symptom of human activities on the ground. But Moses is saying that it may not be human activity but it calls for scientific approach. Considering the mode of the green house emission, I think we may not escape the fact that it is human activities to blame.

The cultural values approach is grounded on that background. According to 2000 IUCN's red list, species extinction rate is on increase. 25% of mammal species and 12.5% of birds are threatened. The biggest threat to species survival is habitat loss and degradation. We assert that protected areas approach has largely failed to conserve biodiversity. The overall goal of the Cultural Values project was to demonstrate how the integration of cultural values in management of two PAs could build local interest in and support for these Pas. The purpose was to strengthen capacity of local institutions and UWA management to integrate cultural values in PA management. Rwenzori Mountains and Lake Mburo National Parks were selected. These had different social, cultural and historical environments but, similar design and management history of protected areas and similar conflictive relations.

There was need for social construction of nature in order to harmonize competing world views of nature. The project was designed as follows: firstly, compatible values would be identified and agreed on. Secondly, institutions to manage these values would be established and finally park management plans would be revised to include cultural values. This would provide a link between people and nature

In Rwenzori we found that the mountain is a spiritual landscape – a home for gods, a source of communal well-being through practices based on sacred sites. Sacred sites are symbols of ethnic

and identity values of the *Bakonzo* and *Bamba* peoples. These values had largely been ignored in the design and management of National Parks.

In L. Mbuuro we found that it was a historical grazing area of beautiful cow (*enyemibwa*) of Ankole kings. Long-horned Ankole cows are a source of ethnic identity, defining being *Muhima*. Grazing *Enyemibwa* created an exclusive pastoral landscape including L. Mbuuro

Some of the achievements of the project include undertaking participatory research in the role of cultural values in conservation. Secondly, we have been able to understand the main causes of bad relations; as conflicting interests between people and PA managers. Thirdly, we have been able to identify mechanisms to integrate cultural values in the management of protected areas to address underlying conflicts.

Through out the project, we have learnt the following:

- There are common threats to both biodiversity and culture
- People are more concerned about their cultural values they understand than biodiversity
- Non-monetary cultural values are critical in interesting and engaging local people in NRM and protected areas
- Discussing cultural values is exciting for neighboring communities and increases their interests in PA management
- Building capacity of local and government institutions is a slow and expensive process
- Institutional cultures and norms are impediments to integration of people's cultural values in PA management
- Because of interest in cultural values, there is increased dialogue between PA managers and communities
- Increased dialogue promotes genuine engagement and interest in PA management
- There is remarkable positive attitude change towards PA management by communities
- PA managers have also come to appreciate and accept communities contribution to PA management
- Cultural values influences attitude and behavior
- Results in improved relations
- More effective PA management, e.g. reduced poaching and uncontrolled bush fires
- Denying people their cultural 'rights' makes them look for coping mechanism that are detrimental to their environment – Benet, Basongora examples
- Conventional religion beliefs and modernization conflict with cultural values

- There are positive lessons learned on how culture contributes to effective protected areas management.
- We need to further test these findings at a regional and global levels
- Cultural values could play a vital role in the design, planning and management of protected areas

In conclusion, we can say that there are positive lessons learned on how culture contributes to effective protected areas management. Hence, cultural values could play a vital role in the design planning and management of protected areas. However, we need to further test these findings at regional and global levels.