# I affirm.

The UN defines environmental protection:

Glossary of Environment Statistics, Studies in Methods, Series F, No. 67, United Nations, New York, 1997. <http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=836>

**Environmental protection refers to any activity to maintain or restore the quality of environmental media** through preventing the emission of pollutants or reducing the presence of polluting substances in environmental media. **It may consist of: (a) changes in characteristics of goods and services, (b) changes in consumption patterns, (c) changes in production techniques, (d) treatment or disposal of residuals in separate environmental protection facilities, (e) recycling, and (f) prevention of degradation of the landscape and ecosystems.**

Extract is defined by Oxford Dictionary as to "Obtain (a substance or resource) from something by a special method.”

And they define resources as “A country’s collective means of supporting itself or becoming wealthier, as represented by its reserves of minerals, land, and other natural assets”

Aff gets RVIs on counter-interps since a) there is not enough time in the 1 and 2AR for the aff to cover theory and also to win substance, this means that I need RVIs in order to still have a shot at winning this round. Even if they read reasons why RVIs generically are bad, that doesn’t speak to the question of whether or not the aff should get the RVI.

The standard is challenging oppression towards indigenous communities.

There are three reasons.

First, we need to interrogate the nature of society and challenge the relations between the colonized and the colonizer. Dei:

George Dei – 2006. Anti-Colonialism and Education. The Politics of Resistance BOLD VISIONS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH Volume 7. Sense Publishers.

**Power is unequally distributed in every sphere of human social life. The greater the power inequality** (whether racial or sexual, between classes or nations), **the higher social power stands as an obstacle to** peace and human **liberation**. Arguably **the** dominant/**colonizer has power over the** subordinated/**colonized because of the differential positions inherited** through history and social politics. **The colonizer is inclined to perpetuate the cycle of abuse** and coercion at the micro and macro levels in order **to sustain the power base**. In effect, dominating and oppressive relationships that emerge from structures of power and privilege are inherent and embedded in our contemporary everyday social relations (see also Dei and Asgharzadeh, 2001). **What is key to theorizing the connections between** self/other/group/community and **that of the colonized-colonizer relations is a critical perspective that interrogates the nature of society. In the relations** of the self/other, individual/community, inner/outer relations **there is usually an enactment of power relations** (see also Trinh Minh-ha, 2000, p.1211).

This means that we need to use Indigenous knowledge to challenge these power relations. This also means the aff is an epistemological pre-requisite since we need to challenge the dominant epistemologies with Indigenous knowledge. Dei 2:

“RETHINKING THE ROLE OF INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGES IN THE ACADEMY.” George J. Sefa Dei Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. NALL Working Paper # 58 – 2002. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED479137.pdf

Therefore, Indigenous knowledges are appropriately discussed within an anti-colonial discursive framework. **This framework is** both a counter/**oppositional** discourse **to the** denial and repudiation of the **repressive presence of colonial oppression**, and an affirmation of the reality of recolonization processes through the dictates of global capital. Like postcolonial theory, **an anti- colonial framework is a theorization of issues,** concerns and social practices **emerging from colonial relations and their aftermath.** However, **anti-colonialism uses Indigenous knowledge**s **as an** important **entry point.** As a theoretical perspective**, anti-colonialism interrogates the power configurations embedded in ideas, cultures and histories of knowledge production** and use**. It is an epistemology of the colonized**, anchored in the indigenous sense of collective and common colonial consciousness. 'Colonial' is conceptualized, not simply as 'foreign' or 'alien', but rather as 'imposed and dominating'. **An anti-colonial discursive approach would recognize the importance of locally produced knowledge**s emanating from cultural histories and daily human experiences and social interactions. **It sees marginalized groups as subjects of their own experiences and histories** (see Memmi, 1969; Fanon, 1963; and also Foucault, 1980). This approach would point to the relevance of using local languages and indigenous cognitive categories and cultural logic to create social understandings. The approach would also draw upon and combine indigenous literature with politics, culture, history, economic and understandings of spirituality. It draws and builds on work that is being done in communities and by minoritized scholars in reintegrating local and native languages in the education of the young, in the study of language and literature, in publication of texts, in nurturing, supporting and publishing indigenous writers in the academies and indigenous literary circles, encouraging that the work not only be reflective of the cultures but written in local languages (see wa Thiong'o, 1986).3

Second, pedagogy demands that we challenge oppressive power relationships. Giroux:

Giroux, Henry. "Dangerous Pedagogy in the Age of Casino Capitalism and Religious Fundamentalism." *Truthout*. N.p., 29 Feb. 2012. Web. 17 Apr. 2014. <http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com\_k2&view=item&id=6954:dangerous-pedagogy-in-the-age-of-casino-capitalism-and-religious-fundamentalism>.

**An oppositional cultural politics** can take many forms, but given the current assault by neoliberalism on all aspects of democratic public life, it seems imperative that educators revitalize the struggles to **create[s] conditions [where]** in which **learning** would be **[is] linked to social change** in a wide variety of social sites, **and pedagogy would** take on the task of regenerating both a **renew**ed **[a] sense of social and political agency and a critical subversion of dominant power itself**. Making the political more pedagogical rests on the assumption that education takes place a variety of sites outside of the school. Under such circumstances, **agency becomes the site through which power is** not transcended but **reworked**, replayed and restaged **in productive ways.** Central to my argument is the assumption that politics is not only about power, but also, as Cornelius Castoriadis points out, "has to do with political judgements and value choices,"[4] indicating that questions of civic education and critical pedagogy (learning how to become a skilled citizen) are central to the struggle over political agency and democracy. In this instance, critical pedagogy emphasizes critical reflexivity, bridging the gap between learning and everyday life, understanding the connection between power and knowledge, and extending democratic rights and identities by using the resources of history. However, among many educators and social theorists, there is a widespread refusal to recognize that this form of education is not only the foundation for expanding and enabling political agency, but also that it takes place across a wide variety of public spheres mediated through the very force of culture itself. One of the central tasks of any viable critical pedagogy would be to make visible alternative models of radical democratic relations in a wide variety of sites. These spaces can make the pedagogical more political by raising fundamental questions such as: what is the relationship between social justice and the distribution of public resources and goods? What are the conditions, knowledge and skills that are a prerequisite for civic literacy, political agency and social change? What kinds of identities, desires and social relations are being produced and legitimated in diverse sites of teaching and learning? How might the latter prepare or undermine the ability of students to be self-reflective, exercise judgment, engage in critical dialogues, and assume some responsibility for addressing the challenges to democracy at a national and global level? At the very least, **such a project involves understanding and critically engaging dominant public transcripts and values within a broader set of historical and institutional contexts.** **Making the political more pedagogical** in this instance **suggests producing modes of knowledge and social practices** in a variety of sites **that not only affirm oppositional thinking, dissent and cultural work, but also offer opportunities** to mobilize instances of collective outrage and **[for] collective action.** Such mobilization opposes glaring material inequities and the growing cynical belief that today's culture of investment and finance makes it *impossible* to address many of the major social problems facing both the United States and the larger world. Most importantly, such work points to the link between civic education, critical pedagogy and modes of oppositional political agency that are pivotal to creating a politics that promotes democratic values, relations,  autonomy and social change. Hints of such a politics is already evident in the various approaches the Occupy movement has taken in reclaiming the discourse of democracy and in collectively challenging the values and practices of finance capital. Borrowing a line from Rachel Donadio, the Occupy movement protesters are raising questions about "what happens to democracy when banks become more powerful than political institutions?"[5] What kind of education does it take, both in and out of schools, to recognize the dissolution of democracy and the emergence of an authoritarian state? In taking up these questions and the challenges they pose, critical pedagogy proposes that education is a form of political intervention in the world and is capable of creating the possibilities for social transformation. Rather than viewing teaching as technical practice, **pedagogy**, in the broadest critical sense, **is** premised on the assumption that learning is not about processing received knowledge, but actually **transforming knowledge as part of a more expansive struggle for individual rights and social justice**.

Third, culture provides a context in which the multitude of actions we take are given meaning. Kymlicka:

Kymlicka, Will, and Ruth Rubio Marin. "Liberalism and Minority Rights. An Interview." *Ratio Juris* 12.2 (1999): 133-52. Print.

It is difficult to explain in a few sentences. The basic idea is that, for most people, **individual autonomy is bound up with the options available within** their own **culture**. But the sort of “culture” I have in mind is a specific one —namely, a “societal culture,” by which I mean a territorially-concentrated culture, centered on a shared language which is used in a wide range of societal institutions, in both public and private life (schools, media, law, economy, government, etc.). **Participation in** such **societal cultures provides access to meaningful ways of life across the full range of human activities**, including social, educational, religious, recreational, and economic life, encompassing both public and private spheres. Needless to say, not all ethnocultural groups possess such a societal culture. For example, immigrant groups typically do not possess their own societal culture, and have generally integrated into the majority’s societal culture. However, non-immigrant minorities—such as **indigenous peoples** or other groups which have been colonized or conquered—**typically do possess their own societal culture, and have fought to maintain their institutional and linguistic distinctness**. I call such non-immigrant groups “national minorities,” since they often view themselves as distinct “nations” or “peoples,” even if they are a minority within a larger state. Generally speaking, then, it is “national” groups—whether it is the majority nation or a national minority— which possess societal cultures. So my claim is that **societal cultures provide a context within which individual and political choice become meaningful**. Moreover, recent history suggests that **people have a strong bond to their own** national/**societal culture**s, **and view their freedom and equality as tied up with the options it makes available**.

Part 1 is the aff advocacy

I advocate that less-industrialized countries should establish systems of common pool resources. This means that governments give control to local communities. These communities are then permitted to extract resources; however, there are limits enforced to ensure the regeneration of the resources. Rose clarifies the advocacy:

Carol M. Rose, “COMMON PROPERTY, REGULATORY PROPERTY, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: COMPARING COMMON POOL RESOURCES TO TRADABLE ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOWANCES.” http://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstream/handle/10535/337/rosec041200.pdf?sequence=1

The days are long gone in which environmentalists have believed that there is a "nature" or **"[the] natural world"** out there, **[is not] separable from human activity.** Our newspapers are full of stories of the overhunting, overfishing, overgrazing, and polluting activities affecting even the most remote areas of the globe. **Because no corner of the world’s environment is untouched by human activity, environmental protection must be seen in large measure as a matter of human social organization.** But what social organization is possible for dealing with environmental resources? The pessimistic views of Garrett Hardin, and his successor William Ophuls, have been well-known for decades: on Hardin’s analysis, as elaborated by Ophuls, environmental resources are the locus of the "tragedy of the commons," a multiple-person Prisoners’ Dilemma (PD) (Hardin, 1968; Ophuls,1977; Ullman-Margalit, 1977). Here it is in the interest of each resource user, taken individually, to exploit the resource a outrance, while doing nothing to conserve-with the result that otherwise renewable resources instead become wasting assets. On their view, environmental degradation-overfishing, deforestation, overgrazing, pollution, whatever-is only a bleak set of repetitions of the "tragedy," and only two solutions are possible to stave off the tragic decimation: individual property on the one hand, which internalizes the externalities of common pool exploitation, or "Leviathan" on the other, the governmental directives that force individuals to perform in ways that promote the common good.(Hardin, 1968; Ophuls, 1977) The great service of Elinor Ostrom and her colleagues, of course, has been to contest this bleak view, and to offer a powerful set of counterexamples of conservationist social institutions. Ostrom and her colleagues have pointed out that the problem Hardin called "the commons" was rather a problem of "open access," whereas a "common property resource" (CPR) may suffer no such decimation. Indeed, Hardin’s dominating example of the medieval common fieldss was not tragic at all, but was rather part of a sustainable agricultural practice that lasted centuries, if not millennia (Ostrom, 1990; Cox, 1985; Dahlman, 1980; Rieser 1999; H. Smith, 2000). CPRs have by this time been the subject of a growing and rather affectionate literature, including descriptions and analyses of community-based resource management practices all over the world-Turkish fisheries, Japanese and Swiss grazing communities, ancient and modern Spanish irrigation areas, communal forestry in India and Indonesia, medieval English "fen people," northern Canadian hunting and fishing clans, Maine lobstermen.(Berkes, 1995; Bosselman, 1996; Ostrom, 1990) Obviously, there is a great deal to be said simply for setting the record straight about what the commons really mean and have meant over time. But there are larger lessons implicit or explicit in the CPR literature as well, and they are lessons of a somewhat more political nature. First is the lesson that **[common pool resources make] voluntary social action** is **possible**, **and** in particular **is** possible as **a means to solve resource-related problems**. That is to say, contrary to some of the more pessimistic presentations of the dismal science, human beings are not always individual maximizers, getting themselves stuck in the endless repetition of n-person PDs; instead, quite ordinary people have the psychological, social and moral wherewithal to arrive at cooperative arrangements on matters of common interest. The second lesson is that bigger is not always better. More particularly, the CPR literature offers numerous examples in which larger **governmental forays into resource management are distinctly inferior to community-based solutions;** and indeed, governmental intervention may badly damage perfectly workable community systems. In short, the CPR literature argues strongly that smaller, **community-based resource management offers models for** efficient and **sustainable resource use.** Given the surge of interest in CPRs, it is curious that CPR structures do not appear more frequently in legal proposals for the improvement of **[common pool resources can improve] environmental regulation**. This is not because legal scholars are unaware of CPRs. Although CPR scholars for the most part appear to be completely untouched by legal scholarship, the reverse is not true; legal scholars regularly cite major CPR studies in a number of contexts, from intellectual property (Merges, 1996) to the burgeoning literature on informal norms (Ellickson, 1991). But aside from a handful of scholars (Bosselman, 1996; Rieser, 1997; Rose, 2000), few in the legal academy have paid much attention to CPRs as potential engines to drive improved environmental regulation. Instead, the poster children of proposed environmental improvement are tradeable environmental allowances (TEAs). TEA regimes have already been established, to great applause, for the regulation of sulphur dioxide in the United States; they have been used to manage fisheries in Australia, New Zealand and elsewhere; and they are very likely to become a central element of international regimes to control greenhouse gases (Rieser, 1997; Stavins, 1998). Their attractiveness lies in their property-like characteristics: as with conventional property, it is thought that if resource users are confronted with the need to purchase TEAs, they will husband resources carefully and will consider conservation or innovation to take the place of resource use. (Ackerman & Stewart, 1988; Kriz, 1998, Tipton 1995) While TEAs do not entirely vindicate the Hardin/Ophuls view that the choice for governing structures lies either with private property or with Leviathan, TEAs do have a Hardin/Ophuls ring about them. TEAs in effect combine Leviathan with private property; they are state-created private rights, tradeable in a market along with other commodities. Despite their differences, however, TEA and CPR regimes share a basic underlying structure. Neither takes a "hands off" approach to environmental protection. Quite the contrary, both types of regime contemplate some **[common pool resources allow] use** or consumption **of renewable resources**, whether those resources are wildlife, fish, grasses, trees, the air mantle, aquifers, surface water stocks, or whole ecosystems. But while both regimes contemplate consumption, in both **[but] the critical issue is to limit that consumption to** a some "fringe" **amounts that are compatible with the renewal of the underlying core of the resource stocks**. Beyond those basics, however, CPRs and TEAs diverge dramatically. For example, in TEA regimes, as modern legislative programs, there may be an explicit discussion of the appropriate setting for the overall permissible "fringe" usage of the resource in question, that is, the total allowable take or total allowable catch of the resource (Ackerman & Stewart, 1988). **In [common pool resource]** CPR **regimes,** on the other hand, explicit discussions of this sort are less likely to occur, and **the [limit]** total take **is more likely to emerge from traditional practice** (Seabright, 1993). Even more noticeable are the very different ways in which individual entitlements are allocated and enforced. TEA regimes split up the allowable totals into individual allowances, and permit the trade of those allowances among total strangers, leaving enforcement largely to governmental bodies. In CPR regimes, on the other hand, **individual entitlements depend on** longstanding residence, reputation, and **adherence to community norms**-norms that are often very elaborate, and **that are enforced by the community members themselves.**

Empirics confirm that when control is given to communities they prioritize environmental protection. The World Resources Institute:

World Resources Institute ‘05 “The Wealth of the Poor: Managing Ecosystems to Fight Poverty”, United Nations Development Programme, 2005,

Ecosystem Benefits There is also evidence that **community-based resource management** can **create[s] incentives that foster good ecosystem management and contribute to conservation goals as well as economic development**. Experiences in Africa, India, and Nepal demonstrate that **community forestry** management **can result in healthier forests and improved tree cover** (Shyamsundar et al. 2004:13). A notable example is the HASHI program in the Shinyanga district of Tanzania. With help from the central government, **over 800 villages have revived a traditional conservation practice of creating “enclosures” that foster regrowth of** the once-abundant **forest by controlling grazing and harvesting** within the enclosed area**.** Management decisions about the enclosures are entirely a local matter controlled by village councils. So far, creating **traditional enclosures through the HASHI program has reforested some 350,000 hectares of** overgrazed and barren **land**. **Economic benefits distributed to villagers—**in the form of fodder, fuel wood, medicinal plants, and greater water availability—**have made the HASHI program a popular success.** The combination of income and ecosystem benefits made the HASHI program a finalist for the UN’s Equator Prize in 2002, recognizing it as prime example of the conjunction of poverty reduction and conservation. (See the Chapter 5 case study, “Regenerating Woodlands: Tanzania’s HASHI Project.”) Similar ecosystem improvements have also been documented in cases wh­­­ere wildlife management has been devolved to the local level. Wildlife censuses associated with the Selous Conservation Program in Tanzania showed increased animal numbers, and wildlife populations have rebounded impressively in Namibia’s conservancy areas as poaching has fallen and conflicts with livestock have been reduced (Shyamsundar et al. 2004:12).

It is further true that these communities would protect land since a) before European powers came in and imposed their conception of private property, these countries normally had community resources, they didn’t have to destroy the Earth in order to survive and b) it is rational to protect the environment when it is essential to your daily survival.

Part 2 is Offense

The A Point is Income Benefits

My advocacy results in income benefits for the community. WRI 2:

**Income benefits come from** a variety of sources, including greater **access to wage employment as well as to local subsistence goods** like bushmeat and forest products (Shyamsundar et al. 2004:9). **For example, community forestry arrangements often give rise to forest-related enterprises that can provide substantial local employment**; revenue-sharing with the government from timber sales and the like; **and greater control over sources of** woodfuel and other **forest goods in daily use**. The same is true of devolving wildlife management to local communities. When the Namibian government in the late 1990s transferred to rural communities the authority to manage wildlife in certain demarked zones called conservancies, it included the right to regulate the substantial tourist trade in these zones and the right to harvest a modicum of bushmeat as well. Conservancy-related activities have created some 3800 jobs that did not exist before the decentralization took place; entrance fees and trophy-hunting fees have generated public funds for schools and other public investments, and even for cash payouts to conservancy members. Local incomes have risen substantially as a result. (See the Chapter 5 case study, “Nature in Local Hands: The Case for Namibia’s Conservancies.”)

Additionally, common pool resources provide a safety net in the face of famine, provide a source of employment for the poor, and help to empower women. WRI 3:

Even where dependence is not as high, CPRs **[common pool resources] function as an irreplaceable safety net for the poor. When farm** and financial **assets are scarce, the commons can provide secondary income and sources of food and fuel for basic survival**. Researchers in western Africa have found that **common pool resources are of particular importance to the poor during seasonal food shortages and times of crisis**. According to one study, the poorest households rely on “bush” sources to supply 20 percent of their food requirements during the lean time before harvest, when food supplies are low. Wealthier families relied on the bush for only two percent of their food during this period (Dei 1992:67). The dependence of poor households on the commons is typically highest after crop production has finished and when other alternatives for wage labor are unavailable (Jodha 1986:1177). Indeed, CPRs **[common pool resources] can generate significant self-employment opportunities, and often serve as an important** and flexible **source of secondary income** for poor households. Jodha found that collection activities alone provided 36-64 days of work annually per worker in poor households in his study area (Jodha 1986:1175). In Haryana, India, collection of foods and other products, stone quarrying, and livestock grazing in common areas generate an annual average of 88 days of employment per household. Importantly, the numbers break down very differently by socio-economic class, with wage laborers working an average of 213 days per year in the commons, and higher-class households only 25 (Quereshi and Kumar 1998:350). Gender also strongly influences reliance on the commons. **Women head a disproportionate number of poor households, and their reliance on wild income is higher than men,** who often have more schooling and greater wage-earning capacity. Studies show that **women are often the primary gatherers and sellers of non-timber products such as fruits,** medicinals, and handicraft materials (Shackleton et al. 2001:583; Shackleton et al. 2002:135; Shackleton 2005).

And this affirms since a) the common pool resources WRI talks about involves restriction on use meaning that we still prioritize EP over RE and b) if you don’t protect the environment, then the benefits you gain are only temporary, prioritizing EP so that the resources regenerate is key to ensuring that communities are able to have access to these resources in order to combat the poverty and oppression they face due to the neo-colonialist system of control.

The B point is Empowerment

It wasn’t always this way. Until colonialism, countries didn’t have conceptions of private property, it was communal control over land. When colonial powers came, they changed this by giving land to white farmers. WRI 4:

**Property rights regimes** **involving significant communal control over land or resource use have been the prevailing land tenure arrangements in Africa and Asia for centuries.** More recently, however, **European colonial powers introduced the western concept of private, individual property. In colonial Africa, both the British and the French created enclaves of individually owned property** in urban areas **as well as white settler farms, but only cautiously expanded the concept of individually titled property to selected Africans** (Bruce 2000:17). Among West African countries, individualized tenure often appeared in tandem with the introduction of cash crops for export (Elbow et al. 1998:5).

The best way to help these communities is to allow them to engage in traditional methods of coexistence with nature. THE PRE-CONFERENCE OF THE INDIGENOUS, NATIVE, PEASANTS AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS OF BOLIVIA writes:

POSITION OF THE PRE-CONFERENCE OF THE INDIGENOUS, NATIVE, PEASANTS AND SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS OF BOLIVIA ON CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE RIGHTS OF THE MOTHER EARTH WORKING GROUP 14: FOREST, "Pre-conference of Bolivian Indigenous Peoples and Social Organization on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth." World Peoples Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth. N.p., 2 Feb. 2010. Web. 25 Apr. 2014. <http://pwccc.wordpress.com/2010/02/02/pre-conference-of-the-indigenous-native-peasants-and-social-organization-of-bolivia-on-climate-change-and-the-rights-of-mother-earth/>.

1) **For us, the indigenous people**, native and peasants **the forest is our big house, which is the Mother Earth, since plants, animals, water, clean air, human and spiritual beings coexist**. **We were provided with food by hunting**, fishing, gathering wild fruits, **provides shelter and natural medicines** as by the secret of the plants we heal all our diseases, where biodiversity is conserved. **Forests protect us from** floods, erosion, pests and diseases, **natural disasters and give us the opportunity to live in a healthy environment. Consequently we consider important to restore the interaction to reach a balance between nature and humanity, essential to the preservation and conservation of life on the planet.** 2) **Indigenous peoples**, native and peasant **coexist in harmony with nature**, because we are the true owners of the forest from immemorial time, **we respect the components of the forest offering acknowledgments in our own guidelines and procedures, because we are aware that each species has its function in these ecosystems.** For example, species that give the soil fertility (availability of nutrients), plant species are habitat thermostats that regulate temperature, prevent soil erosion; species run the state of forest.

Empowering these communities matters since indigenous communities are shaped by their interactions with the environment after centuries of residence. Dei 3:

“RETHINKING THE ROLE OF INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGES IN THE ACADEMY.” George J. Sefa Dei Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. NALL Working Paper # 58 – 2002. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED479137.pdf

A working definition of **Indigenous knowledges, encapsulates the** common-good-sense **ideas and cultural knowledges of local peoples concerning the everyday realities of living. These knowledges are part of the cultural heritage and histories of peoples** (see Fals Borda, 1980; Fals Borda and Rahman1991; Warren, Slikkerveer and Brokensha 1995). I refer, specifically, to the epistemic saliency of cultural traditions, values, belief systems and world views that, in any indigenous society are imparted to the younger generation by community elders. Such knowledge constitutes an 'indigenous informed epistemology'. **It is a world view that shapes the community's relationships with surrounding environments. It is the product of the direct experience of nature and its relationship with the social world. It is knowledge that is crucial for the survival of society. It is knowledge that is based on cognitive understandings and interpretations of the social, physical and spiritual worlds**. It includes concepts, beliefs and perceptions, and experiences of local peoples and their natural and human-built environments. More specifically, **the term**/notion **'indigenous' refers to knowledge resulting from long term residence in a place** (Fals Borda 1980). Roberts (1998) offers a clear conceptualization of 'Indigenous' as knowledge" **accumulated by a group of people**, not necessarily indigenous, **who by centuries of unbroken residence develop an in-depth understanding of their particular place in their particular world**" (p. 59). 'Indigenous' signals the power relations and dynamics embedded in the production, interrogation and validation of such knowledges. It also recognizes the multiple and collective origins as well as collaborative dimensions of knowledge and affirms that the interpretation or analysis of social reality is subject to differing and sometimes oppositional perspectives (Dei, Hall and Goldin-Rosenberg 1999).