



Voices from Madagascar's Forests Improving Representation and Rights of Malagasy Forest Peoples

*A Conference held on the 5th & 6th June 2010
at the School of International Development,
University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK*

**Final Report
September 2010**

Executive Summary

Many scholars conducting research in Madagascar have demonstrated that the livelihoods of Malagasy people have been negatively impacted by various natural resource conservation and extraction interventions which have burgeoned over the last two decades. This may be manifested through the imposition of western concepts of protected areas and alternative livelihoods or the imposition of externally driven resource use restrictions. Almost no mechanism exists enabling the voices of communities living in or near protected or mined areas to be properly heard, and at the same time conservation organisations and mining companies provide little publicly available information which is evidence based about the claims of the social impacts of their activities. The meeting which this report is about was organized to discuss what can be done by scholars and conservationists to improve the representation and rights of Malagasy forest people.

On the weekend of the 5th and 6th June 2010, forty three scholars, conservationists and activists from Madagascar, North America and Europe gathered in Norwich, England to take part in the meeting “Voices from Madagascar’s Forests – Improving Representation and Rights for Malagasy Forest Peoples”. The weekend included thirty formal presentations on topics dealing with subjects from mining to REDD and tourism to the politics of conservation policy, a *writeshop* which was running throughout, and two discussion sessions devoted to tackling three main questions:

What do we believe are the flaws/weaknesses in the conservation system in Madagascar?

What could scholars do to improve the situation?

What could conservation organizations do to improve the situation?

Reforms to the Conservation System in Madagascar (pages 38-39)

Nine recommendations have been made about how the conservation system in Madagascar might be improved. These fall into the categories of: 1. Ensuring coherence between protected areas and private land tenure policy; 2. Structural Reforms of the Aid system; 3. Broadening Knowledge Systems used to Inform Policy; 4. Livelihoods First – a Conceptual Reordering of the Implementation of Conservation; 5. Proper application of ‘Participation’, ‘Consultation’ and ‘Community Based Conservation’ by using the concept of Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) & 6. Establishing mechanisms of Transparency, Accountability and Information Provision.

Actions by Scholars (page 40)

A total of fifteen recommended actions for researchers were identified, grouped under the headings of: 1. Improving Research Practice; 2. Partnership Working; 3. Publishing and Communicating Research & 4. Promoting Action on Specific Issues and Connecting with Activism.

Actions by Conservation Organisations (pages 41-43)

A total of twelve recommended actions for conservation organisations were identified, grouped under the headings of: 1. Facilitating the Rights and Representation of Forest People; 2. Conception and Design of Conservation Programmes; 3. Communications, Knowledge Sharing and Information Provision; 4. Improving Working Relationships with Scholars and Small NGOs.

Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR) (pages 48-52)

The CIHR was discussed and welcomed by many participants at the meeting and others observing from afar. A series of recommendations has been drawn up encouraging the CIHR members in Madagascar (CI, WCS, WWF) to apply the Conservation and Human Rights Framework (CHRF) to all their activities in Madagascar as soon as possible. These recommendations are included in this report.

Rio Tinto/QMM—Fort Dauphin (pages 44-45)

A side meeting was held to discuss issues around the Rio Tinto/QMM mine in Fort Dauphin. A number of recommendations were made, including the publication of the reports from the International Advisory Panel and a suggestion to Rio Tinto that a public response to the oral testimonies published by the Andrew Lees Trust/Panos would be a positive action.

A bibliography of literature relevant to these debates has been compiled and is shared in this report. Actions already being undertaken by scholars are reported on, including the establishment of the Madagascar Environmental Justice Network, the preparation of a special issue of the journal Madagascar Conservation and Development, and the existence of a number of pre-existing scholarly and activist networks.

Foreword

We will undoubtedly look back on *Voices from Madagascar's Forests* as a milestone in our understandings of conservation in Madagascar, and natural resource management more widely. The papers, discussions, write-shop and recommendations reveal a wealth of knowledge and expertise on conservation and on Madagascar, but they also raise a series of important and challenging issues for us all. Firstly, the papers reveal how local voices are persistently 'scripted out' and made invisible in conservation. *Voices from Madagascar's Forests* provides an important platform for those who are silenced to be heard. While the conference participants have carefully and skilfully challenged stereotypes of Malagasy people and natural resource use practices, it is clear that unhelpful and negative approaches remain embedded amongst donors, NGOs government agencies and some academics. The portrayal of Malagasy people as 'the enemy' of the environment legitimates and perpetuates approaches which deny local communities an opportunity to voice their concerns and offer alternative approaches. Furthermore, the papers also demonstrate that the Western framing of conservation is ultimately counter productive. The assumption that Western experts 'know best' leads to serious social injustices, exclusions, marginalisations and conservation failures. This raises a question for us as researchers, practitioners and activists: do we need a complete shift in how we think about conservation, or can we reform the existing system to make it more socially just, more sustainable and more effective? The papers contained in this report are divided on this – we need further discussion of how we can move forward in conservation. Part of this needs to include the issue of rights, which also appears as a major theme of the conference – how rights can be established and how conservation can intersect with human rights.

These critical discussions are especially important as forests in Madagascar get linked to international markets in carbon via REDD and initiatives by conservation NGOs such as the Wildlife Conservation Society. The danger is that these new initiatives merely serve to cement and deepen global inequalities and to reinforce social injustices on the ground. They also indicate the expansion of neoliberal approaches towards natural resource management. The papers provide examples such as bio prospecting, carbon markets, payments for ecosystem services, and of course mineral extraction (especially the Rio Tinto/QMM ilmenite mine), as current examples of the neoliberalisation of nature. As these processes accelerate, there is an urgent need to design better mechanisms to facilitate genuine participation and partnerships with local communities who rely on natural resources to meet their livelihood needs. Finally, one of the great strengths of *Voices from Madagascar's Forests* is that it not only offers a critique of conservation, it provides us with clear recommendations about how we can engage in better practice in research and in conservation. The challenge to us all now is to take those recommendations and implement them in our own work, and then to get conservationists to listen.

Professor Rosaleen Duffy
Politics
Manchester University

Contents

- 2 Executive Summary
- 3 Foreword by Professor Rosaleen Duffy
- 4 Contents
- 5 Abbreviations
- 6-8 Preface “Mivarotra rivotra ny vazaha”

Part 1 – Presentations

- 10-11 List of Presentations and Authors
- 12-35 Abstracts

Part 2 – Recommendations from Writeshop & Discussions

- 37 Objectives and Methods of Workshop
- 38-39 Recommendations for Overall System Reform
- 40 Recommendations for Scholars
- 41-43 Recommendations for Conservation Organisations
- 44-45 Side meeting about Rio Tinto/QMM in Fort Dauphin
- 46-47 A Note on Agreeing to Differ (Alison Jolly and Eva Keller)
- 48-50 Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR)
- 51-52 Conservation and Human Rights Framework

Part 3 – More Information

- 54-64 A Bibliography of Critiques of Conservation in Madagascar
- 65 Participant/Presenter/Co-author Details

Part 4 – Follow-up Actions

- 67 Establishment of the Madagascar Environmental Justice Network
- 68-69 Call for Papers, Madagascar Conservation and Development Special Issue
- 70 Acknowledgements

Appendix : Transcripts from Writeshop & Discussions

- 72-73 Transcripts Part A: What are the flaws in the system?
- 74-75 Transcripts Part B: What could researchers do to improve the situation?
- 76 Transcripts Part C: What could conservation organisations do ?

Abbreviations

ALT—Andrew Lees Trust
BINGO—Big International NGO (in this report generally refers to CI, WCS & WWF).
CHRF—Conservation and Human Rights Framework (of CIHR)
CI—Conservation International
CIHR—Conservation Initiative on Human Rights
COBA – Communauté de Base (Basic Local Community—associations for forest management)
COP15—15th Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC
CPALI—Conservation through Poverty Alleviation
DEV—School of International Development
FPIC – Free Prior Informed Consent
GCF—Gestion Contractualisée des Forêts (Contracted Forest Management)
GELOSE—Gestion Locale Sécurisée (Secure Local Management)
IAP—Independent Advisory Panel
MEJN—Madagascar Environmental Justice Network
MFM—Money for Madagascar
NEAP—National Environmental Action Plan
NGO—Non Governmental Organisation
NTFP—Non Timber Forest Product
ONE—Office Nationale de l'Environnement (National Environment Office)
ONESF—Observatoire Nationale de l'Environnement et de la Secteur Forestiere
PNF—Programme Nationale Foncier (National Land Programme)
PPNT—Proprete Privee Non Titree (untitled private property)
QMM—Qit Madagascar Minerals
REDD—Reduced Emissions for Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SAPM—Systeme des Aires Protegee a Madagascar (Madagascar Protected Areas System|)
TAMS—Tetik'asa Mampody Savoka, (Andasibe Forest Carbon Project)
UEA—University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom
UNFCCC—United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNDRIP—United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
VOI—Vondron Olona Ifotony (Local Community Association—associations for forest management).
WCS—Wildlife Conservation Society
WWF—World Wildlife Fund

“Mivarotra rivotra ny vazaha”#

I thought it would be helpful to start this report by describing how and why the idea for holding the meeting emerged. Copenhagen in the middle of winter is perhaps an unlikely place for ideas about rights and representation of Malagasy forest people to crystallise. However the much anticipated 15th Conference of the Parties (COP15) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was expected to mark a historical moment when a new agreement on global climate change regime post 2012 would be signed. The ‘*post Kyoto*’ convention which was under negotiation in Copenhagen included an addition to its predecessor, namely REDD. REDD is the concept for a mechanism which could allow wealthy countries whose forests are already largely cleared to offset their excessive CO₂ emissions by paying less wealthy but forested countries to reduce their deforestation rates. Among the arguments justifying this is that it is cheaper to stop a peasant farmer in the global south from slashing and burning forest to create new farmland, than it is to stop pollution or capture carbon emissions in the industrialised north. The REDD mechanism was certainly one of the hot topics of the Copenhagen meetings, and it had attracted thousands of activists and indigenous and forest peoples representatives from the global south to express their opposition to ‘*Carbon Imperialism*’. The efforts by the agents of global capitalism and neoliberal international conservation organisations at promoting REDD in Copenhagen were seen by their opponents as a further assertion of control over tropical forests. During the few days I spent there I encountered activists and representatives from Latin America, South East Asia and Africa as well as many from industrialised nations. These activists were handing out pamphlets, manning stalls, attending side events, posing for photo opportunities and attending public demonstrations. I was dismayed that in contrast to these representatives of forest people lobbying for their peoples rights, that the only Malagasy in attendance seemed to be representatives from international conservation NGOs such as Conservation International and the World Wildlife Fund, accompanied not by forest peoples representatives but by senior employees from the



forest administration, national environment office (ONE) and the transitional government. I met some familiar Malagasy collaborators, and for the first time various REDD officials inside the conference centre where delegates were busy extolling the virtues of REDD initiatives through presentations and side events publicising and promoting REDD. In one such side event which I attended the representative of Conservation International described their new Conservation Growth Poles approach and how through carbon marketing and other approaches they would translate ecosystem services into economic opportunities for local people*. However when the presenter was asked by a representative of a Congolese Pygmy group about how indigenous rights were being respected, the response was to downplay any suggestion that rights were being compromised by the REDD activities in Madagascar, by saying that only one group in Madagascar qualified for the label 'indigenous' (that group being the Mikea of the southwest), and that they weren't that numerous or widespread anyway. No mention was made of the hundreds of thousands of Malagasy people whose customary farmlands and forests have been subsumed into new protected areas since 2003, nor of the restrictions which international NGO designed conservation policy has imposed (or tried to impose) on rural Malagasy whose livelihoods depend on the forest or on clearing new land from forest for subsistence agriculture. No mention was made either, of the fact that CI in partnership with WCS had already sold quantified CO₂ offsets from the Makira Forest to prominent rock stars such as the [Dixie Chicks](#) and [Pearl Jam](#) as well as multinational corporations such as Mitsubishi and Dell. CI and WCS had facilitated these 'goodwill carbon deals' [at \\$10 a ton](#) despite no consent having been given by the communities of Makira to sell the forest carbon on their customary lands. Meanwhile, back in Madagascar, researchers working in the Makira region are routinely forbidden by WCS from even mentioning carbon or REDD to rural communities, lest it cause unrest, unrealisable expectations or requests for a share of the proceeds. Inevitably the word has got out in Makira about what all the measuring of trees and introduction of conservation rules means on the other side of the world, and local *Betsimisaraka* people express this latest innovation of conservationists quite aptly, *mivarotra rivotra ny vazaha*, literally translated this means: the strangers, they're selling the wind.

The juxtaposition in Copenhagen of a body of activists from the south defending the rights of indigenous and forest peoples against REDD, beside the representation from Madagascar being only by NGOs and government officials with a vested interest in REDD was to me striking, and somewhat concerning. The realisation of how much Madagascar really is an island, and a special case hit home. In conversations with several scholars of Madagascar on the periphery of the COP15 meetings in Copenhagen, a number of central questions emerged: Why were there no representatives of Malagasy forest people there? Are there actually any such representatives or activists for Malagasy forest people's rights who could counterbalance pro-REDD and conservationist tendencies which currently prevail among the elites in Madagascar? And if there aren't any such activists, why not, what can be done to remedy this, and who should be doing it?

So the idea to hold a meeting to explore these questions was born. Initially the idea was to bring together a small group of likeminded scholars who had experienced difficulty in getting their concerns about these kinds of issues heard by the powerful actors of conservation. Ten months later things have moved on a little, the meeting made many of us realise that there is a great diversity of views on these issues. The original questions remain only partially answered, but we have at least identified some ideas about who might like to consider doing what.

Representatives from international conservation organisations invited the participants in the ‘Voices from Madagascar’s Forests’ meeting to prepare a white paper to feed in to the ongoing debates and reviews about where the future of conservation policy in Madagascar should head to. I am sorry to say that this report is no such white paper, I am under no delusions about my own ability or availability to complete such a project, but I do hope that this report can provide the activists, scholars, practitioners, policy makers and donors who do need to deal with these issues, with an insight into what those who assembled in Norwich in June 2010 had to say on these matters. It also provides some leads as to where else to look for inspiration and advice.

Since acronyms and abbreviations still seem to be all the rage in Malagasy conservation circles I’ll finish by highlighting two acronyms which I think are particularly important. Both represent sets of principles which I enthrall all Malagasy conservationists and conservation organisations to adopt as soon as possible. Activists, scholars and anybody else concerned by inadvertent negative impacts of conservation on rural Malagasy might also like to evaluate, critique and publicise the successes and failures of the operationalisation of the CHRF and FPIC in the field.

Firstly, the Conservation and Human Rights Framework (CHRF) is part of a global initiative endorsed by a consortium which includes the three major international conservation NGOs active in Madagascar (CI, WCS, WWF). The full text is included on pages 51 and 52 of the report. The CHRF lays out a comprehensive set of principles to improve accountability and safeguards for human rights in conservation interventions, it is awaiting an agreement to implement it on the ground in Madagascar.

Secondly, the concept of Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) is one which will help to avoid any misuse or abuse of the notions of consent, consultation and participation which have too often undermined conservation in Madagascar. If applied for the first time in Madagascar, FPIC will require significant national level policy reform to enshrine customary law in the legal system. It will need to allow Malagasy farmers and custodians of the land, real free choice as to whether conservation or farming and logging are more desirable ways of making a living. Part of this would also require conservation policy to ensure that customary land owners living within new protected areas can take advantage of the new land laws in Madagascar and obtaining private land certificates under the *Propriété Privée Non Titree (PPNT)* system, something which is not currently possible. The challenge is for conservation to shift from its current model of restriction, enforcement and undelivered/inadequate livelihood alternatives and compensation, to a model of democratic conservation policy, a right to free choice and the provision of *real* incentives and compensation before restrictions are enforced upon Malagasy forest people. They are after all the rightful custodians of Madagascar’s globally important forests, and have voices which I hope will be better heard in the future.

Barry Ferguson

September 2010

Ben Vista, Baile Nua na hArda

Mivarotra rivotra ny vazaha – The strangers, they’re selling the wind

* Rakotoniaina Pierrot, 2009, Lessons Forest Carbon Project Experiences in Madagascar, Presentation at Side Event of COP15, Copenhagen 12th December.

Part One

Presentations



Presentations and Authors

Bruno Ramamonjisoa	Improving management of forest resources in Madagascar by reinforcing the roles of peasant communities by a paradigm shift in modes of knowledge production	12
Eva Keller	Reactions to Critical Voices	13
Amber R. Huff	Representation, rights and securities in the Mikea Forest region of south-western Madagascar	13
Catherine Craig	Economic returns from Community Forestry Activities	14
Theresa Haine	The Betampona Project	14
Luke Freeman	Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), Inclusion of Forest Peoples from the Congo Basin in Forestry Policy Processes	15
Jacques Pollini	Policy shocks, disease outbreaks and vulnerable communities: the case of Ambodilaingo, Eastern Madagascar	15
Joana Borges Coutinho	Mind the Gap: Same forest, different stories...	16
Paul Hanson	Forest Voices in a Time of Abnormal Justice: Building Global Democratic Institutions in Madagascar	17
Ben Neimark	Hotspot Discourse in Africa: Making Space for Bioprospecting in Madagascar	18
Alison Jolly	Rio Tinto in Fort Dauphin	18
Ian Colquhoun, Alex Totomarovario, Andrew Walsh, Laurent Berger, Benjamin Freed, Lisa Gezon	Voices from Ankarana: Collaborative Research on Conservation and Development in Northern Madagascar	19
Jennifer Talbot	Local Perceptions of External Conservation Efforts in Tsitongambarika	19
Catherine Corson	How High Profile Politics Impeded Community Consultation in Madagascar's New Protected Areas	19
Yvonne Orengo	Oral testimony and the role of Communication in the development matrix	20
Christel Mattheeuws	Believing	21
Antonie Kraemer	Whose Voices, Whose Forests? Exploring knowledge production in the context of mining, conservation and development in Fort Dauphin, Madagascar	22
Frank Muttenger	Conservation, culture and the question of rights: prospective carbon trading and historically constituted property in Madagascar	23

Aziza Rqibate	Socio-economic perspectives on rural households in a REDD Project	24
Vahinala Raharinirina	How to improve Malagasy Local Communities' Involvement in the Biodiversity Governance: Lessons learned from the Mikea's Deforestation Conflict, the Manjakatempo's forest management and the Ranomafana Bioprospecting Contract.	24
Gabriel Lefèvre	Can external interventions in the field of traditional medicine help conserve natural resources and enhance ancestral heritage?	25
Nadine Fritz-Vietta	A legitimate vote for local people's voice: Socio-cultural considerations for conservation policies in Madagascar	26
Fabiola Mancinelli	Toward forms of shared encounter? Tourism, heritage and conservation practices in the sacred mountain of Ambondrombe, Madagascar,	27
Thorkil Casse	A critique of the purist approach (the anthropologists?) with a reference to the experience of local management of forests in Madagascar	28-29
Patrick O. Waeber, Nadine Fritz-Vietta, Suzi Malan, and Erik R. Patel	Proposing 'Independent Forest Monitoring' as a new system in Madagascar to improve social justice in the context of forest governance	30
Zoe Cameron	Feedback Madagascar's work with Communities	31
Shirley Smith	Large Scale Mining in Madagascar: The Impact of Local Governance Issues on Community Representation	32
Caroline Seagle	Inverting the "offset" ideology? Analysing new regimes of neoliberal environmental governance near the Rio Tinto/QMM ilmenite mine in Southeast Madagascar	33
Barry Ferguson	Bridge Building or Bunker Reinforcement? Understanding the Place and Potential of Critical Social Science in Madagascar's Conservation Arena	34
Mijasoa Andriamarovololona	Journey into Conservation	35



Abstracts of Presentations

Improving management of forest resources in Madagascar by reinforcing the roles of peasant communities by a paradigm shift in modes of knowledge production

Bruno Ramamonjisoa, Head of Forest Department. School of Agronomy, Antananarivo

The importance of the richness of terrestrial and marine biodiversity in Madagascar has been highlighted for many years. Despite the implementation of a number of public policies, and significant assistance from bilateral and multilateral development agencies, forest resources continue to disappear. The established formal systems, which experience variable levels of enforcement, are unable to ensure sustainable use of the resources. Complex interactions between different actors are very important, and lead to such conflicting individual priorities and rules, that in the end the sustainability of management systems is effectively mortgaged.

The main findings from a meso-economic analysis in Madagascar between 2003 and 2005 shows that the governance of natural resources is increasingly tending towards a power struggle for the control of the use of the resources. The strategic players are the central state, donors, international NGOs, peasant communities and business operators. The state, despite its commitment to increase the coverage of protected areas across the nation, has developed a grid map system for allotting land use, and has issues, on top of proposed future biodiversity protection zones, mining permits for oil exploration and nickel and cobalt production.

Enthusiastic since the start of the environmental programme, donor agencies have more recently withdrawn, advocating autonomy and financial sustainability. Conservation has become a priority on paper and in discourse, but is no longer so in practice as the development of destructive practices within forested areas has increased over the last five years. Unauthorised deforestation continues to be practiced, as does illegal logging and small scale mining operations. With the practice of these degrading activities, communities don't even manage to generate the necessary revenue to survive, because it is above all the private sector operators who draw most of the available profits. These practices contribute more and more to migration from famine struck zones (such as the south of Madagascar) towards forested area with both higher economic potential and levels of biodiversity.

Solutions which can be found at two levels will be described in the presentation. Firstly, the reinforcement of the role of peasant communities by the increasing of their participation in discussions and decision-making regarding policy (for example a conference hosted by the author in July 2008 where representatives of rural communities presented their perceptions of community management as well as scientists). Secondly, a paradigm shift is needed in the ways economic approaches have been applied to knowledge production for informing local level management of forest resources. Studies base on concepts of rationality and social positioning could serve as a basis for future research collaborations.

Reactions to Critical Voices

Eva Keller, University of Zurich, Dept. of Social Anthropology

This talk aims at reflecting on why critical voices about the impacts of conservation initiatives in Madagascar are met with such resistance by conservation organisations. Reactions may involve simply ignoring these voices or attempts at stigmatising scholars both professionally and personally. What is it about conservation in Madagascar that brings about this kind of stalemate? Based on my personal experience with WCS and the zoo in Zurich, I suggest a number of possible aspects.

Representation, rights and securities in the Mikea Forest region of southwestern Madagascar

Amber R. Huff, The University of Georgia, Athens

Rural Malagasy living in the Mikea Forest region of southwestern Madagascar are culturally and materially dependent on natural resources derived from the dry deciduous and spiny forest within the boundaries of the gradually emerging but troubled *Parc National Mikea*. Despite locals' long dependence on these resources, neither they nor their interests have been represented in the development and implementation of regional conservation policies, nor have programs been established to disseminate information or ease transitions for people whose livelihoods are significantly impacted by park plans and accompanying socio-political realities. Despite promises of participatory conservation and attention to human material and cultural needs in conservation contexts, locals have been excluded from participating in policy discussions or exercising claims over territory and resource use.

Dominant discourses of indigeneity and rurality are important cultural phenomena that functionally exclude villagers from processes of policy production and from the dissemination of information. Mikea people are represented as a population of indigenous, culturally and materially primitive forest hunter-gatherers. Their neighbors and kin, rural Masikoro, Vezo, Tandroy, Mahafale and others, are often represented in terms evoking imagery of invasive species, impoverished and irrational resource users who are seen to make environmentally destructive choices. Framed in this way, locals are viewed as incapable of contributing to policy, and their livelihoods become morally subordinate to the values of forest preservation and national economic development. "Local" voices that are heard are invariably those of regional administrators and politicians whose interests and experiences contrast sharply with those of people who live in or otherwise derive primary benefits from the Mikea Forest.

Mikea Forest protection policies center around reducing deforestation associated with swidden maize production (*hatsaky*) and wood harvesting. Most people affected by the new protected area are aware of its existence in an abstract sense, but are frustrated by the lack of specific information available to rural villagers, the uneven enforcement of rules, and lack of access to legal protection against exploitation. Ultimately processes of exclusion leave rural resource users more vulnerable to crime, including armed banditry and extortion of bribes by those claiming state authority, and less able to legally cope with economic and environmental shocks, including those related to prolonged national political crisis and drought.

Researchers who maintain contact with diverse communities of local resource users, conservation professionals, and administrators are well positioned to advocate for more socially just procedures. Some of the most potentially significant action can take place locally and within small administrative regions. Such action includes sustained public advocacy for the establishment of formal but flexible means of sharing information between local people and organizations involved in forest governance in specific locales. Scholars can also work with such organizations, regional legal bodies, and rural villagers to help ensure that people experiencing violence or receiving extortive demands from outsiders can seek legal recourse without risk of retaliation. This advocacy can be conducted with the spirit of productive collaboration on a local or regional scale, and with the goal of improving the representation and security of forest-dependent people.

Economic returns from Community Forestry Activities

Catherine Craig, Conservation through Poverty Alleviation International (www.cпали.org), Research Associate at the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University.

Community managed forests (COBA) that edge protected areas must generate economic returns that are high enough to replace income lost from the protected area use. Conservation through Poverty Alleviation International (CPALI) is teaching farmers who have been economically displaced from the Makira Protected Area (MPA), how to raise endemic species of silk producing moth larvae. Instead of engaging in additional slash and burn, CPALI farmers plant trees that will provide forest protection, help mitigate climate change and retard local soil erosion while earning discretionary income that can be used for health care, education or to purchase commodities. To make this program sustainable we are developing new markets specifically for the products farmers produce.

The Betampona Project

Theresa Haine, Money for Madagascar

Betampona was set up in 1927 - the first Reserve to be created in Madagascar. It is an integral Reserve which means that entry is restricted to scientists and researchers. It is small – 22 miles across and consists of species-rich, and increasingly rare, lowland rainforest. There was only one village, which was relocated by the Colonial Administration, and no important ancestral site in the area.

In 1988 the lack of a clear boundary and increasing population meant that local people were encroaching on the Reserve with tavy agriculture. WWF, the Malagasy Government and SAF/FJKM (the Development Department of the Protestant church), funded by Money for Madagascar, agreed to collaborate to protect the Reserve. The two former undertook the fencing and security of the Reserve and SAF worked with the people of 5 surrounding villages to increase their food security and family income.

Tavy is more than an agricultural practice – it is also closely linked with traditional land ownership. The SAF team have developed an “ideal land use profile” which places irrigated rice cultivation in the valley bottoms. Bordering the ricefields they recommend the growing of vegetables. Further up the slope are such things as coffee, vanilla and fruit trees, and at the top are trees for timber. Thus the land is cultivated and ownership is secured without needing to destroy it by repeated use of tavy. Whilst not yet widespread, this pattern of cultivation is increasingly evident in the area surrounding the Reserve.

Twenty years on, the influence of the SAF team has spread to 73 villages over an area of at least 600 square km. The improved diet has resulted in better health. Advice on hygiene and family planning given by the team has also contributed to an improved health status. Increased family income has led to the establishment of at least six new primary schools and one secondary school where before there was only one primary school. The more successful farmers have seen a dramatic improvement in their standard of living and the majority of the Betampona population is able to withstand shocks such as cyclones without too much disruption.

Is the project a success? Yes, if the criterion is improved well-being for the population, and yes again if the criterion is protection of the Reserve. Tavy has not disappeared, but it is diminished because irrigated rice cultivation using SRI or SRA methods gives greater yields for similar input of labour. Incursions into the Reserve have almost entirely ceased due to improved food security

and a lot of environmental education, and it is considered sufficiently secure for there to have been several successful releases of captive-bred lemurs in recent years.

Why is it a success? There are no minerals (as far as we know), there are no tourists so no outsiders wanting to profit from those tourists and the road/bridge infrastructure is non-existent or in an appalling state, all of which means that there is no interference from outside.

At present MfM has no exit strategy. We fund a team of agricultural/forestry advisors to the tune of £20,000 a year. With the infrastructure in its present state there is no possibility for the majority of the people to get their produce to a wider market and therefore no possibility of them being able to afford a realistic price for the advisory services they currently receive. We therefore accept that MfM is there for the long term.

Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), Inclusion of Forest Peoples from the Congo Basin in Forestry Policy Processes

Luke Freeman, University College London, UK

My talk was about how the mechanism of Free, Prior and Informed Consent is being applied in logging concessions in the Congo Basin as a means to create equitable and sustainable social forest management. FPIC is a mechanism that is now becoming inscribed in national and international law to the extent that it is obligatory for industrial activity (such as logging and mining) in areas where local people will be affected. It has not yet extended to conservation.....

Policy shocks, disease outbreaks and vulnerable communities: the case of Ambodilaingo, Eastern Madagascar

Jacques Pollini, Hendrix College, Arkansas

This article will relate a series of economic shocks that stroke a community of peasants living on the forest frontier of Eastern Madagascar. The first shock occurred in July-August 2002: an influenza epidemic killed about 30 persons, out of a population of 1200, revealing the high vulnerability of the community. The second shock occurred the following year: the Malagasy government, with support from the international community, conducted a campaign against forest clearing and the practice of slash-and-burn cultivation. Many families, fearing arrest, did not grow rice this year, or sowed it late in the season or on degraded land, resulting in a very low harvest. Those two years are remembered by most families as among the most difficult of the last decade, with acute food shortage. Rural development projects working in the area to increase food security and develop more sustainable land uses collaborated with the government for the implementation of the repression campaign, despite its unethical character and its counterproductive impact, while their intervention against the epidemic was null or came too late. These stories illustrate the deep ignorance of field realities that most conservation and development actors achieved. In the second part of the paper, I will discuss the causes of this ignorance and suggest a few strategies for remedying to it. One avenue could be the reorganization of projects according to modalities that allow more initiative from field staff in direct contact with realities. Another avenue would be to suppress the many incentives that encourage experts and project managers to construct false “realities” where buzzwords (agroforestry, agro-ecology, participation, gender, capacity building...) matter more than facts.

Mind the Gap: Same forest, different stories...

Joana Borges Coutinho, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Despite the occasional attempt at stimulating representation of local people and their interests, the design and implementation of major conservation/carbon projects such as TAMS have failed to develop sustainable livelihood alternatives to the traditional practise of “tavy” and other undesirable forms of land use that are designed and led by the local communities. There is an absence of a consistent strategy for direct participation and representation of people living in and around the forests, resulting in a major gap between on-the-ground reality and that which is perceived by large NGOs, their funders and the Malagasy Government.

Research carried out within the TAMS project area shows that forest conservation projects bear locally high opportunity costs for forest communities, and that no adequate provision is being made to ensure that the burden of socioeconomic trade-offs is shared. These results were complemented by several months of field work carried out directly with forest margin communities and across governance scales of the carbon and conservation project. Work towards developing sustainable livelihood activities (SLA) had to be funded through efforts from a large conservation NGO, as it did not form part of the central project budget. The SLA programme was nevertheless implemented in marked top-down fashion. Observed activity pointed towards growing tension between the needs of the project and those of the local people. This experience does not echo the discourse adopted by major conservation NGOs, the Malagasy Government or any of the larger organisations involved, signalling a degree of misconception among key players in the Malagasy forest conservation and carbon debate.

We believe it is necessary to adopt a change of discourse towards a more transparent and socially responsible paradigm of forest conservation in Madagascar. We suggest that this disconnect is related to a deficit in development professionals in forest conservation project teams, resulting in a lack of sensitivity and technical rigour in identifying the nature and specificities of social issues in natural resource management. Short funding cycles and expensive “institutional middle-men” combined with scarce expertise in effective, locally-led rural development make the best efforts of well-meaning conservationists look thin on the ground.

We call for greater openness and integration between conservation NGOs, development practitioners and academics working on rural Madagascar. It is urgent to acknowledge the full opportunity costs of conserving forests, and to provide funding to put in place locally determined alternatives to the loss of productive land and of forest access and use rights. We also call for a consistent approach to localised capacity building as a fundamental step towards leaving projects in local ownership. If the price of the ton of carbon cannot pay for this, if the finance is not enough, then the market approach to climate change mitigation and its promises for conservation and development need revisiting, as they seem to survive only on the back of wishful thinking and through continued denial.

Forest Voices in a Time of Abnormal Justice: Building Global Democratic Institutions in Madagascar

Paul Hanson, Cuyahoga Community College, USA

In their Call for Papers, the organizers of the “Voices from Madagascar’s Rainforest” conference assert that many Malagasy communities tied to protected areas and/or areas of intense resource extraction may have rights to resources and livelihoods that are not being acknowledged. In my reading, the primary argument here is that the “voices” of these Malagasy people, when called upon to enter into resource management decisions by a diverse array of organizations, enter an “arena” of policy deliberation with questionable normative legitimacy and political efficacy. The organizer’s call to “improve” the efficacy and legitimacy of these processes is (again, in my reading) largely a call for deliberative democratization. In other terms, many of this conference’s participants are engaging a call for some version of a public sphere wherein participants can assume and expect equality among actors/claimants and the substantive attention of policy makers.

In a time of “normal justice” the ontological assumptions concerning the who, what and how of such heterogeneous “stakeholder” claims would be, for the most part, broadly shared. Correcting injustices facing Malagasy communities would thus be *relatively* straight forward (although surely not easy). However, we should not labor under any illusions about the nature of justice claims in the present historical conjuncture. We are in a state of what Nancy Frazer (2009) (building on the work of Richard Rorty) calls “abnormal justice”. Assuming the Malagasy context, we might consider the following questions: [1] Is there widespread agreement on precisely who the claimants should be in the face of the actions and existence of mines and protected areas? Is it an entire *tanana* (hamlet), a *fokontany* (district), a *karazana* (lineage group), a *mpanjaka* (lineage chief) or an influential family that should be the agent of claims? [2] To whom should such claims be addressed? Are resident Malagasy “voicing” to the Malagasy state, local NGOs, transnational NGOs or such entities as the United States Agency for International Development? [3] Who is it that should be entitled to justice? At what scale do we frame the entitled – as Malagasy citizens or human beings in general? [4] To what realms should justice claims be allotted – the economic, political or cultural? Finally, [5] is there an agreed upon language of deliberation? Should ritual communication and technological demonstrations be included? Also, should eyebrows be raised when hybrid state actors, hired as translators in such urban centers as Antananarivo and Fianarantsoa, are relied upon to move not only between the various dialects in the country (and the power relations embedded therein), but also between French, English and other European languages? My presentation will begin by surveying the Malagasy scene for examples of such unruly contentions and contexts.

Frazer (2009) correctly reminds us that many versions of “normal” deliberative justice presuppose a delimited political community operating within an equally delimited sovereign nation state territory. Processes of colonialism, post-colonialism and neoliberalization (with their attending legions of transnational development, conservation, and business interests now fanned out across Madagascar) long ago displaced this earlier conception of the public sphere imagined via the nation-state.

Surely the expanded forms of contestation brought about, in part, by such abnormal times are to be nurtured and protected. However, the institutional contexts of address suffer dearly. I will conclude my presentation with suggestions on how to build (and build upon) novel global democratic institutions (transnational public spheres) that can work, among other things, to reduce the obstacles to the economic, political and cultural facets of voicing.

Hotspot Discourse in Africa: Making Space for Bioprospecting in Madagascar

Ben Neimark, Temple University, USA

The biodiversity hotspot strategy initially pinpointed ten tropical forest regions for conservation protection. It has since mushroomed to include 34 global regions spanning six continents and accounting for nearly 16 percent of the earth's surface area. In this paper, we analyze the coincidence of biodiversity protection efforts and the extraction of biological specimens for drug development within African hotspot regions. We also discuss the work that the hotspot concept does to order and enframe specific locations for the dual purposes of resource conservation and extraction in Madagascar. We maintain that hotspot science has done a great deal to facilitate the bioprospecting industry's access to genetic resources in some of the most well endowed ecological settings in the world. Ultimately, this begs the question of what sort of relationship exists between hotspot conservators and actors whose involvement with hotspot ecologies is geared explicitly toward the extraction of plant and other biological materials for commercial gain.

Rio Tinto in Fort Dauphin

Alison Jolly, University of Sussex

The impact of Rio Tinto's ilmenite sands mining in Tolagnaro (Fort Dauphin) is still disputed. The company itself is proud of its record: millions of dollars invested in environmental and social projects, consultations at great length with villages and region, some jobs created, roads and health facilities improved, and a new port which opens the prospect of serious increase in the local economy. Forest conservation zones have been set up with extensive consultation and approval by village councils. However, people are still poor; the conservation zones exclude use unless there is payment to the village council, and there are many voices of discontent, as for instance collected by the Andrew Lees Trust and Panos publication: *Madagascar, Voices of Change* (2009). Development for some has inevitably increased social inequality.

This is everyone's pilot project: for Rio Tinto as its lead attempt bring improvement to a region both socially and environmentally, for the Malagasy government as its first big mine to monitor, and for the watching NGO's as a crucial test case of development. One's attitude crucially depends on the counterfactual. Without the mine, would village life continue relatively unchanged, and relatively tolerable? Or without the mine would environmental degradation, population growth, and loss of livelihoods bring even more painful changes—perhaps even environmental and social collapse to a Haiti-like landscape?

Several points arise as of May 2010, 1) With the coup government and the freezing of foreign aid, QMM is the only functioning development agency in the region. People blame it for ills and ask it for help that should be the province of a functioning and well-funded government. This is dangerous for both company and region. 2) The unequal distribution of mining revenues (*ristournes*), with the lion's share to two rural communes, is potentially highly destabilizing. This results from a mining code drawn up long before QMM, and now very difficult to change. 3) Individual grievances and more general results need impartial monitoring, but ONE, the Office Nationale de L'Environnement which is responsible for technical monitoring is itself underfunded and under threat from the donor's freeze. One useful change would be the strengthening of ONE nationally and regionally to provide an impartial voice both regarding QMM, the much larger Sherritt nickel concession at Ambatovy, and regarding the 3,000 other demands for mining concessions which have been made since the 2005 investment decision of QMM.

Voices from Ankarana: Collaborative Research on Conservation and Development in Northern Madagascar

Ian Colquhoun (University of Western Ontario), Alex Totomarovario (Universite d'Antsiranana), Andrew Walsh (University of Western Ontario), Laurent Berger (Musee Quai Branly), Benjamin Freed (Eastern Kentucky University), Lisa Gezon (University of West Georgia)

The authors were in the field near Ankarana in the Diego region running a research and field course with Malagasy and Canadian students. The paper, which was submitted remotely reported on an ongoing research project, a collaboration between Canadian and Malagasy Researchers and Students, a collaboration between Canadian and Malagasy Researchers and Students, with additional participation by American and French Researchers. A new development at the Universite d'Antsiranana arising from this collaborative research is a plan to establish a Centre for Social and Environmental Research there. We encourage all researchers who are active in northern Madagascar to consider contributing to a planned electronic archive of reports on research in the region, to be housed in the Centre for Social and Environmental Research.

Local Perceptions of External Conservation Efforts in Tsitongambarika

Jennifer Talbot, University of Cambridge

My current research in the forest of Tsitongambarika in southeast Madagascar is indicating that external conservation efforts have received mixed reception by villagers. External protection of this forest is locally perceived as altering villagers' access to land and livelihood strategies. Conservation and development projects have strived to offer alternatives, but these have mostly been insufficient to sustainably modify local livelihood and production systems. My research is also suggesting that external and local concepts of the importance, use, and ownership of the forest strongly diverge, with the exception of agreement surrounding forest conservation for watershed protection.

While both field program officers and academics have considered local voices and perceptions in their conservation work, they have often heard (and been told) different stories. Strengthened collaboration between the practitioner and academic communities could lead to more comprehensive understanding of the varied local voices and points of view and ensure their increased representation in future conservation policies and practice in Madagascar.

How High Profile Politics Impeded Community Consultation in Madagascar's New Protected Areas

Catherine Corson, University of Sussex, UK

At the 2003 5th World Parks Congress, Madagascar's former president, Marc Ravalomanana, announced his intention to triple the country's parks in five years, bringing the total surface area under "protected status" to six million hectares, or approximately ten percent of the country's territory. He underscored that the new protected areas would encompass parks ranging from those that prohibit human entry to those that allow sustainable use; encourage consultation with potentially affected local populations; and promote co-management with local communities. Donors and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have since touted the program's commitment to community involvement. However, research in Madagascar's eastern rainforest revealed a disconnect between this rhetoric and the initial establishment of the Ankeniheny-Zahamena and Fandriana-Vondrozo protected areas. This paper/presentation will trace how a series of political decisions at multiple scales impeded village consultations in the process. I contend that, while the high-profile announcement successfully mobilized biodiversity conservation funds, it also drew attention toward meeting the demands of Antananarivo-based politicians, foreign donors and international NGOs and away from effectively engaging rural communities, thereby reinforcing non-local decision-making power. Ultimately, I argue that successful forest management in Madagascar will entail enabling people affected by conservation policies to participate in decisions about how to structure the management of natural resources, as well as the actual management of resources.

Oral testimony and the role of Communication in the development matrix

Yvonne Orenge, Director, Andrew Lees Trust

This paper is submitted from the point of view of a practitioner working directly on the front line of communications for development in southern Madagascar and based on the experience of collecting and disseminating oral testimonies from coastal communities in the southern littoral Zones of the island.

It will explore how the Andrew Lees Trust project (ALT HEPA - (**H**etahetam-**P**o Ambara-*"Proclaim what is in your heart"*)), was conceived, designed, and executed in collaboration with Panos London in order to enable local people to take control of the communications process and maximize opportunities for them to give 'voice' to their concerns, knowledge and ideas about poverty and the environment within their local community and region. The process highlights the importance of introducing innovative and alternative mechanisms and tools for working with populations that are largely illiterate and marginalized and

Communications is particularly important in fragile environments where the most poor, typically rural producers and women, remain isolated and disenfranchised; where governance mechanisms are weak, and where low literacy skills exacerbate feelings of powerlessness and exclusion.

In Madagascar, local debate and information sharing is usually confined to village meetings where traditional hierarchies are prevalent, and women in particular are excluded or dismissed as un-knowledgeable. Fear and taboos also play a part in restricting the flow of debate, especially where opinions are dissonant with the status quo.

The paper will explain how the oral testimony approach was developed and delivered in order to navigate cultural and social barriers, create a more inclusive and fair platform for participation and expression, and reduce anxieties about 'sharing' information. It will also investigate some of the problems and challenges encountered throughout the process, and lessons learnt.

I will provide an example of the oral testimony work focused on forest communities and will also explore how the testimonies, collected in Anosy and Androy regions, have provided an unprecedented media opportunity for local people to speak directly to decision makers at local and international levels about their difficulties in the face of climate change, food insecurity, and rapid development due to mining.

The paper will draw on the perspectives and insights of the practitioner gathered over ten years of delivering communications for development with local populations and partners in the south of Madagascar, and on research undertaken with UNDP about the importance and role of communications where it is recognised that opportunities for local people to express their views are extremely limited and invariably do not enter the public domain through national or local media.

I will advocate for the increased use of communications for development to improve the quality and appropriateness of development initiatives. In particular the use of oral testimony to help inform donors, decision makers, and development actors about the reality for local communities - how policy and practice can then be influenced and appropriately benefit local populations by listening to and respecting the values and priorities they have determined for themselves.

Believing

Christel Mattheeuws, University of Aberdeen, UK

There are plenty of human and other voices in Madagascars forest. There are plenty of reasons why concerned scholars of different background believe that these voices should be heard. I will defend the argument that ‘local voices’ can only be heard, understood and taken seriously if we believe what we hear. This belief can only grow within a dynamic learning process by which perceivers develop, change and move in and along with what is perceived and experienced. This is the way Malagasy people understand the world and all its voices. And this should also be the way we study the Malagasy world, if we want to learn this world as to give it voice.

I plead for the development of a Malagasy science as a human approach to life that does not only focus on knowledge but also on the becoming of the researcher and the target groups (observers of any kind) in relation with the object of study. The forest people do not only suffer from substantial loss of the basic means of survival and self esteem, but also of a loss of bodily, mental and spiritual skills that open up dimensions and perspectives of life that are lost since a long time in our way of living (generally speaking). Malagasy science is the name I give for a common ground in which Malagasy particularities appear. There are many indications that landscape and weather play an important role in the processes of diversification. I do not consider Malagasy science as an example of indigenous knowledge, but as an example of a holistic way of seeing that has its counterparts in other regions of the world across cultural and disciplinary boundaries. Tim Ingold’s ecology of life in anthropology and the Goethean sciences in biology are approaches that converge with Malagasy science in many respects.

From experiences I learned that pleading for a Malagasy science is not equal to giving local communities unconditionally voice. The present policy in Madagascar has already introduced the understanding of development, progress and sustainability in the conventional way along many paths. Supported by the streams of all kinds of funding and organisations in the different levels of society, local people start to believe that following the conventional way of progress and development is the only way to live or to survive. It is therefore very challenging to promote a policy arena in Madagascar and abroad that is driven by the Malagasy way of understanding life as a paradigm for progress and development. We need to create room for this way of understanding within the country and supported by similar movements abroad as a common ground where human scientists, life scientists and local communities can practically collaborate in addressing the problems of environmental change and development. This is only possible when we, Malagasy and foreign scholars, are willing to learning to see in a Malagasy way.

Whose Voices, Whose Forests? Exploring knowledge production in the context of mining, conservation and development in Fort Dauphin, Madagascar

Antonie Kraemer, Department of Anthropology, School of Oriental and African Studies

This paper explores how regimes of knowledge production have come to influence access to natural resources around Fort Dauphin, south eastern Madagascar. Based on a year's ethnographic research in the area, it explores how various actors justify, experience and interpret changes in natural resource access related to the current nexus of multinational mineral extraction and conservation/development schemes. In particular, I will focus on certain key concepts in conservation and development, how they influence programme implementation, and their unintended social and environmental effects.

The key concepts I explore include notions of “community”, “participation”, “culture” and “environment”. First, I assess how policies based on notions of “community” obscure particularities of local history and hierarchy, articulated in my fieldsite around issues of landowners and migrants, descendants of slaves, gender, age and enacted forms of ethnic identity. In this context, I also explore the notion of “participation”, how this fashionable concept when enacted in the messy encounters of policy implementation leads to unintended effects such as elite capture, neo-liberal peer surveillance and commoditisation of natural resources, and how this translates into new forms of social differentiation and environmental degradation. I will refer to fieldwork data assessing the varied capacity of people to position themselves as “worthy” beneficiaries through appropriate “participation” and thereby access new benefits linked to the mining, conservation and development nexus. Concurrently, my findings show that those less able to perform this role experience new forms of marginalisation as livelihoods options are reduced, with appropriate resource management becoming equated with corporate-led extraction and conservation.

Second, I investigate the policy dichotomy of “culture” and “environment”. I argue that policies are formulated on the presumption that Malagasy people have “culture”, whereas foreign social and environmental “experts” do not. This is also based on a presumed dichotomy between people and “environment”, with Madagascar's environment considered threatened due to local people's cultural practices of landscape management, and in need of rescue from “expert” outsiders. This obscures the reciprocal impacts of nature and culture and how the concept of “nature” is a by-product of human conceptualization, activities, and regulations. As dominant definitions of environmental issues contain potent images of local practices and justify particular development interventions, local knowledge and access to resources tends to be discounted, and the “environment”, based on visual tropes of biodiversity and forest coverage, becomes a territory distilled of human inhabitants – either for mineral extraction or for “biodiversity” conservation benefiting foreign scientists and tourists. I explore how negative results for both human well-being and environmental management result.

Finally, I will propose some ways to overcome this. I propose that we anthropologists need to stop asking the conventional questions of “what is culture and how does it work?”, and conservationists those of “what is nature and how does it work?” and ask instead “When do people invoke the notions of culture and environment, and what do they exclude?”. When these concepts are no longer considered as self-evident, we can investigate what the appeals to culture and environment do to the world of those doing the understanding and attribution – and what happens to people and places being understood and attributed with these concepts. This may open up new avenues for understanding the links between natural environment and human culture, with changes in landscape and resource access impacting local and transnational identities, cultural practices and aspirations for the future in unintended ways, for actor networks including human, non-human and historical actors, and spanning multiple sites within local, national and international contexts. This might help lead to development and conservation policies that value both cultural and environmental diversity, and find inclusive ways of managing both.

Conservation, culture and the question of rights: prospective carbon trading and historically constituted property in Madagascar

Frank Muttenter, Seminar für Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie, University of Luzern

In Madagascar, prospective carbon markets are being set up by global actors trying to get more land under protected area status by promising the government a certain amount of project funds. In exchange the government commits to sell carbon arguing that the state is the only rightful owner of the land. At the same time, the local populations claim that they are the rightful owners of forest reserves they intend to convert to agricultural lands rather than giving them to the government or international conservation NGOs who control access to international carbon markets. It is not surprising that local populations resist providing environmental services. Neither the government nor NGOs have seriously analysed the conditions under which customary owners could be expected to change existing land use patterns. A recent attempt in this direction is the reflection on so-called “historically constituted use rights” in view of identifying prospective beneficiaries of direct payments.

A just distribution of the prospective benefits of carbon trading would require that legitimate claimants – such as people with “historically constituted use rights” – can be identified and illegitimate claimants excluded. Conservation critics have argued that direct payments for avoided deforestation encroach upon fundamental values and aspects of Malagasy culture which they say are beyond economic loss or gain but based on “growth on ancestral land”, “autochthony” or “religious and social practices other than ancestor-based ones”. Conservationists dismiss these critical statements as ideological pronouncements about carbon markets which would ultimately deprive deforestation-dependent populations of a much needed economic alternative to slash-and-burn cultivation.

What is one to make of the claims that ancestral land has a value beyond economic loss or gain or that the risk of economic loss and gain is more effectively managed by traditional institutions? The paper contends that the cultural critiques of conservationist efforts to recognise rights are themselves part of the universalistic rights discourse, which includes the right of particular cultural groups to assert their difference and to do so on their own terms. Rural Malagasy do not think of themselves as having rights that exist independently of cultural practice of harnessing fertility for economic and political purposes. They exert legitimate, ritually based authority over other rural producers while thinking of themselves as practising a life-enhancing activity. Meanwhile it seems clear that if local populations keep on converting forest as usual, there will be no forest carbon to sell. In a sense, then, what is happening at present has hardly anything to do with setting up a carbon market. International NGOs and government pretend they are setting up a prospective market while in fact they engage in yet another unrealistic attempt to exclude local people from their lands and livelihoods.

Socio-economic perspectives on rural households in a REDD Project

Aziza Rqibate, University of Hamburg

During an empirical study led in the scope of a project under the REDD concept (regarded as “the” solution to address global warming) interviews took place in three regions which differ in their characteristics. The interviews served to collect socio-economic data of smallholder farmers, also called “agents of deforestation and forest degradation”. The collected data were used for analyzing incomes and to determine the social and economic functions/advantages of the deforestation and forest degradation, as well as the rural households’ needs that are covered through . For each function the actors involved, the time period, the localization, the inputs for realizing the considered function, the relationship with other functions, its amount (if quantifiable) and the reasons to do it were examined. Field results were compiled in a comprehensible requirement book for the stakeholders. Furthermore, numerous discussions during the field work held with other scholars, NGOs and villagers which expressed their wishes, fears and discontent on a wide spectrum of topics helped to understand the failure of conservation policy and development aid projects in general. Indeed, while for the Malagasy rural population forest conservation is an essential topic pertaining to the threat to their traditional way of life, for researchers and scholars it is mainly a fascinating field of study and for consulting offices it is a lucrative business. Unfortunately, decisions/alternatives for forest users are often proposed before, if at all, they are consulted. However, participation of the forest users is of highest priority in order to prudently develop adapted and viable solutions for slowing the deforestation and forest degradation while respecting the rights, desires and needs of the Malagasy population.

How to improve Malagasy Local Communities’ Involvement in the Biodiversity Governance: Lessons learned from the Mikea’s Deforestation Conflict, the Manjakatompô’s forest management and the Ranomafana Bioprospecting Contract.

Vahinala Raharinirina, Université de Versailles Saint Quentin-en-Yvelines

Despite publicly stated intentions since 1990 to include local communities in natural resource management, and subsequently in the governance of biodiversity, it has been shown that in Madagascar, communities are not truly represented in the processes of developing environmental policies, and that they continue to unfairly suffer negative impacts of these policies.

The reasons often cited by the experts and/or the public servants to legitimise this absence of local communities in decision making processes is an inability to manage their natural resources, their weak capacity to consider long term views, as well as their disinterest in environmental policy.

Through three cases studies, namely deforestation in the south-west of Madagascar (the Mikea forest), management of the Manjakatompô forest (Ambatolampy), and the bioprospection contract of the ICBG in Ranomafana, the paper will show how communities can, under certain conditions, get involved in social processes and become real “partner” in Malagasy environmental governance. The paper also discusses the creation of an interface between local and scientific knowledge in the facilitation of the process.

Can external interventions in the field of traditional medicine help conserve natural resources and enhance ancestral heritage?

Gabriel Lefèvre, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales (INALCO), France

For several years, in Madagascar development and conservation projects have formed around the notion of traditional medicine. These well-intentioned attempts take as their general objectives to both document a patrimony of knowledge thought to have been in existence for many centuries, protect natural resources and natural habitats, and at the same time contribute to development including the improvement of living conditions. Anthropological perspective shows that unfortunately the definition of these goals and how they are supposed to articulate with each other is often done in a naive and inadequate way. Consequently these projects don't lead to the intended results and even discourage the people associated with them. These observations do not mean, however, that no action is possible, but simply that if actions are built on inaccurate and inadequate definitions, and if the propaganda that is made is so schematic that recipients perceive it to be false, they can only be counterproductive.

First, I will therefore briefly examine the expectations of both parties, the Conservatives-developers on the one hand and local people on the other as I observed them during my fieldwork of 13 months in southern Madagascar in the early 2000s. This will highlight the parallels that exist in their representations but also some inconsistencies. In particular, there arises the question of discourse on identity and rights and duties there under. A second objective of my talk is to show how the goals of development agents might be usefully questioned. The first point concerns the traditional medicine as the object and the means of preservation and development. In other words, how can the definition of traditional medicine suggested by anthropology be brought in line with the vision of conservatives-developers? After, I will try to show how the call for using certain aspects of Malagasy culture to conserve species and the environment can be both naive and contrary to the idea of development in these programs. Finally, beyond anthropological reflections on the programs, it appears that the concrete realities of putting these programs into action may often contradict the theoretical underpinnings. In fact, international experts, by their own lifestyle, often themselves adopt the model of what they denounce.

In conclusion, given the complexities of the situation, a question arises concerning the very theoretical justification of the intervention. Is it actually possible to combine development with conservation? To answer that, one can advocate that preliminary studies be less concerned with immediately evaluating the possibilities of a proposed action, but be more concerned with the understanding local lifeways and thinking of people, in order to avoid the risk of hearing voices from "the people" that may be only echoes of ones already present in the heads.

A legitimate vote for local people's voice: Socio-cultural considerations for conservation policies in Madagascar

Nadine Fritz-Vietta, University of Greifswald, Germany

Madagascar is well-known for its natural uniqueness but at the same time faces a tremendous habitat loss because of anthropogenic threats. As global initiative governments are encouraged to nominate protected areas in order to either stop or reduce biodiversity loss. While decisions on conservation activities are mainly based on epistemic grounds, the role of local people and their socio-cultural context in its complexity remains to be left out. Although conservation organisations demonstrate their willingness to cooperate with local people, cultural discrepancies are still too vast and yet inhibit a well-balanced and constructive collaboration.

In a social science study using participatory rural appraisal and semi-structured interviews in two biosphere reserves in the north of Madagascar we collected qualitative data from local people, local authorities and biosphere reserve management.

The aim is (1) to contrast local value perceptions with western epistemic based understanding of forest resources and (2) to elaborate on local social organisation in the two Malagasy biosphere reserves. Results show on the one hand that by far not only provisioning services are conveyed as could have been expected, but also values that can be assigned to one of the three other categories: regulating, cultural or supporting services. On the other hand local people support a grouping in thematic associations, which foster their recognition and potential social movements towards collectively defined goals in the conservation debate. These facts encourage dialogue between apparently differing positions on forest ecosystems that provide services to both the local and the global community.

Toward forms of shared encounter? Tourism, heritage and conservation practices in the sacred mountain of Ambondrombe, Madagascar,

Fabiola Mancinelli, Universitat de Barcelona

This paper is based on a case study of “community based tourism” in the village of Ambohimahasina, in the Ambalavao district of Madagascar. For centuries, the mountains of this area were protected by a great number of taboos, due to the consideration of the peak of Ambondrombe as the home of the *razana*, the spirits of the ancestors. The sacred character of Ambondrombe has preserved the mountain as a place of memory and identity for all the Malagasy, as well as an exceptional “biodiversity chest” (Rabetaliana & Schachenmann, 2000). Nevertheless, since 2005, the FIZAM, a local association, has begun to attract tourists to this still relatively unspoilt region. The initiative, initially began within the framework of the GELOSE law, propose Ambondrombe as eco-touristic and community based touristic site: a proposal that offers tourists a different form of encounter and exchange with local communities, with the possibility for these latter to benefit, without intermediaries, of tourism as a resource for development.

The aim of my paper is to reflect upon the actual role played by the host community in the construction of her own touristic image, arguing that hosts are acting with intention and strategy (cf. Silverman, 2001: 205) thus exercising a form of collective agency. In Ambondrombe tourism could be not only a goal, but also a mean, to reflect upon tradition and conservation through the “gaze of the Other”, the tourist. The sacred mountain represents a field of symbolic confrontation between an indigenous logic of heritage, oriented to the control of the land, and another, moved by foreign intention, addressed to preservation and conservation (cf. Moreau, 2002; 2005). If for the first one the forest, home of the spirits, is a space of mutual belonging between men and nature, an ambiguous relationship that ratifies the eventual transformation of the wild space in a domesticated one, for the latter it is a resource to preserve and transmit to the descendants (Moreau, 2005). In this difficult balance between opposed visions, the FIZAM is intervening to promote an endogenous process, centred on the core values of traditional spirituality, valorisation of a local heritage and community based tourism. On one hand, tourism can be a way to reconcile the two apparently opposite logic of heritage; on the other, the keys of success of this example of “community based tourism” are to be found in a model of development based on the direct and active implication of local leaders in the decision process and a long slow implementation, elements that are increasing the level of community awareness and hence made conservation strategies more effective.

A critique of the purist approach (the anthropologists?) with a reference to the experience of local management of forests in Madagascar

Thorkil Casse, Roskilde University, Denmark

The presentation is based on a three-four year long project looking at how the implementation of local management of forest in Madagascar has affected economic (higher income?), social (less tension between forest authorities and locals?) and ecological (protection of forest?) objectives. A total of nine studies were conducted in eastern, north-western and south-western of Madagascar. The authors of the various studies disagree on the main conclusion, namely as to whether GELOSE/GCF should be regarded a success or a failure story. First and foremost, because authors did apply different concepts of success or failure, the overall conclusion was far from clear cut. In general, however, all the authors look upon the future perspectives of community as rather bleak.

Questions to the presenters and this author's answers:

What does this lack of representation mean for livelihoods, and the way of life of the villages?

We cannot confirm that villages signing a transfer of management contract have experienced a decrease in income compared to villages without a transfer contract.

We can confirm a discrepancy between the oral, initial contacts made by the facilitator and the village on one hand and the final written agreement: In terms of restrictions on forest use and in terms of the lack of monitoring, and lack of sanctions against violators of the restrictions.

We also confirm the appearance of discrepancies between the limits of the traditional territory and that of the new village land after the transfer of management (zoning of land). Lineages in the villages were treated differently, in some cases their claimed land had become gazetted as protected area; other lineages faced less constraints (part of their land is now included a user rights zone). Finally the rest group of lineages could see themselves totally left out in the transfer schemes, a no recognition situation which they did not necessarily were favouring, despite the absence of restrictions on access to the forest.

Why is the situation like this?

Because we tend to regard the villagers as passive stakeholders, in case of outsiders imposing restrictions on forest use, and because the focus has been excessively privileged finding solutions to the question of a single village representation without a proper understanding of the power struggles within a village and between villages and the outside world.

One contributor to our study is claiming that conflicts between villagers and the forest authorities are inferior to the conflicts between migrants and residents, and between villagers and the service providers, like the economically powerful collectors. In this sense the transfer of management can be seen as an asymmetric management tool.

What evidence do we have of this mismatch between discourses ?

Despite concerns raised by both conservationists and developmentalists (though for different reasons), the expansion of transfer of management contracts has continued throughout Madagascar. A clear distinction between conservationists, developmentalists and donors is required in order to understand the process of the transfer of management contracts.

Why does the disconnection exists?

Conservationists tend to regard community forestry projects as second-best to pure reserves. Developmentalists (later purists) tend to agree (community forestry is not an ideal situation), but for other reasons (restrictions on forest use is not fair to poor villages). Donors tend to be favourable of increasing number of community forestry projects, mainly because of the low financial costs.

Conservationists tend to disregard the opportunity costs of restricted use of forests. Developmentalists neglect the hard choices (biodiversity has no use value, among others meaning no respect for the economic value of non-timber wood products), but a minority of them is increasingly acknowledging the indirect benefits (improved relationship between stakeholders) or even see community forestry as a means to achieve regional development (where tenure security is only the first stage). Donors are too concerned about number of contracts only.

What should scholars consider doing to improve this situation?

Increase the awareness that the community forestry solution cannot solve all challenges (the economic, the social, the environmental plus the financial (cost-effectiveness compared to the establishment of new national parks) objectives). Trade-offs are likely to be present, with or without transfer management contracts.

Convey the finding that local people in the short-term still may be supportive of protection, if plans of regional development are likely to materialise

In the long-term, however, better local representation is not a sufficient condition for success, if alternatives to slash- and burn agricultural practices are not included in the transfer programs.

Raise the issue of 'new' trade-offs becoming more and more relevant in the Malagasy context.

Trade-offs tending to go beyond the pure conservation-development trade-off:

Bias in favour of residents in the transfer contracts (more interested in conservation of the forest compared to the migrants), whereas a political arena dominated by the purists (anthropologists ?) give priority to the migrants' wish to transform the forest. The trade-off is then who has finally the legitimate right to decide upon the transformation or the conservation of the forest.

The purists insist on the respect for human rights. In reality this means respect for the poor vs. the government and the conservation NGO. When it comes to respect for the human rights of the karana, the purists are much less concerned (= stay mute). So the trade-off could well be between a genuine respect for human rights and a proper representation for all stakeholders, and the risk that the powerful minority of the karana will define the development agenda, not the poor.

Respect for human rights does not lead us very far, if the long term objective is economic growth. So if the purists focus exclusively on seeking the government's and the conservation NGOs acknowledgement of the respect for human rights of the poor, the economic growth criteria is compromised. In several Asian countries, the economic growth has increased together with an increase in forest cover, but without the governments displaying much respect for human rights. So we ought to ask the poor Malagasy, if they want respect for human rights or economic growth.

Proposing ‘Independent Forest Monitoring’ as a new system in Madagascar to improve social justice in the context of forest governance

Patrick O. Waeberⁱ, Nadine Fritz-Viettaⁱⁱ, Suzi Malanⁱⁱⁱ, and Erik R. Patel^{iv}

ⁱ*Africa Forests Research Initiative on Conservation and Development (AFRICAD), Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, Canada, V6T-1Z4v* ⁱⁱ*Ernst - Moritz - Arndt - Universität Greifswald, Friedrich-Ludwig-Jahnstr. 16, 17487 Greifswald, Germany* ⁱⁱⁱ*Forest Resources Management, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, 2424 Main Mall, Vancouver, Canada, V6T-1Z4* ^{iv}*Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14853 USA*

Forest governance aims both to safeguard forest resources while balancing stakeholders’ interests, values, and rights. The livelihoods of many rural communities in Madagascar are often directly dependent on forest resources and therefore vulnerable to habitat degradation. In addition, traditional cultures frequently have a close spiritual connection to sacred places, such as forests. Habitat disturbance can therefore conflict with local belief systems. One timely example is illegal logging of precious hardwood (i.e., rosewood and ebony), which has become very widespread, particularly in northeastern Madagascar. Local residents have suffered as foreign and domestic elites have corrupted the forest service, leading to losses of sustainable employment in tourism, research, and conservation. In some cases, community life has suddenly changed as gambling, prostitution, and crime have increased in rural communities. Moreover, the risks mount of local food shortages and nutritional deficiencies when farmers abandon subsistence agriculture for temporary, physically dangerous illegal logging work. These problems for local communities and their forests (which are among the most biologically diverse in the world) stem from the Government’s weak control of forest activities and can become completely absent during political instabilities.

Independent Forest Monitoring (IFM) could improve these long-standing deficiencies in forest governance. IFM was initially developed in Cambodia and Cameroon to combat illegality, corruption, and fraud in the timber industry. It is similar in principle to unbiased international election observers. Monitoring teams operate independently but with the consent of the host government. Independent forest monitors are strictly observers, law enforcement remains the responsibility of local officials and governments. Local and foreign logging companies are issued permits to extract timber from the forests against paying specific taxes. Ideally in so doing, the companies contribute to the social and economic development of the country by providing jobs for the local population and revenue for the state. To be successful in combating illegality the monitor must establish a clearly defined mandate with the host government. The government contracts the monitor with active support by external donors like World Bank or European Union. The monitor must be given access to all necessary official documents such as logging titles, permits, maps, production statistics, tax collection documents, records of fines and court decisions. IFM provides authoritative information and helps all stakeholders make the necessary improvements. Through the support of local communities, independent monitors could assist community-based natural resource management associations (COBA/CLB) to regulate equitable forest use. IFM could also provide civil societies with procedural rights to bring companies and individuals to court. In this paper we seek to integrate reasoning from both a natural and social science perspective to establish a coherent and effective IFM for which local people’s voice is indispensable. In doing so, we analyze the current forest state in Madagascar, highlight current challenges for forest governance, and discuss the potential of several different types of IFM to improve social justice in the context of forest governance.

Feedback Madagascar's work with Communities

Zoe Cameron

Feedback Madagascar (FBM) was founded in 1993 in direct response to frustrations felt with the way conservation was approached. For the last 13 years the charity has supported integrated projects in healthcare, education and the environment working in SE Madagascar biodiversity "hotspots" along the Ambositra- Fandriana rainforest 'corridor' (COFAV) as well as the tapia forest in Amoron'i Mania.

Projects supported include well-drilling, public health and family planning training, literacy, malaria treatment, agriculture, healthcentre and school infrastructure. Areas in which Feedback works have seen an improvement in health and education.

In 2002 Ny Tanintsika ('Our Earth') was set up to be locally accountable, through which FBM now implements its work. We have a staff of 50, of which only 2 are non-Malagasy. Fieldstaff are generally recruited from within the project areas. All work starts from the village level up and project management is integrated into local governmental structures to encourage long-term success.

In response to this Symposium's specific issues of conservation and development we believe that local management, agricultural improvement and sustainable income generating schemes are key. Projects addressing this are basketry in the Ambalavao area (including promoting alternative reeds to the overexploited 'Pandanus' wild forest tree, and new design training for women's groups), and silk in the Ambositra area (including reintroducing the wild endemic silkworm to the tapia forest).

Ny Tanintsika is the manager of Conservation International's "NODE" programme for the Ikongo district, providing small grants to fund conservation & development mini-projects. These are identified, developed and implemented by community-based forest management associations (COBAs). Result: a reduction in forest degradation and increase in income for communities bordering the rainforest.

We work with COBAs for both the sustainable management of wild yams and their domestic cultivation for greater food security as well as conservation. All our work related to support COBAs is carried out in close collaboration with the Environment & Forestry Authorities (DREF). Due to current lack of government funding to carry out assessments, we are supporting evaluations of several COBAs, required after 3 years of commencing their contracts.

Some observations on existing defined protected areas:

The "COFAV" has had little action since "local consultations" a year ago. Some immediate results have been negative, including triggering a more rapid land "grab" by locals who have rushed to plant crops to protect traditional ownership.

Factors impeding regulation include massive understaffing of government forestry services (for example, just one agent is responsible for the whole of the Ikongo district, covering 100s of kilometres) so controls are rare.

The political situation ("crisis") has led to increased corruption and illegal logging. Local authorities (mayors, etc) feel powerless to take action. Court cases have failed through corruption.

Suggestions:

We are keen to give more of a voice to communities bordering these forests. This could also be helped by working through the Federations of COBAs established in each district. Further improvements are needed on agricultural techniques, alternative income generating activities, health and education to benefit local communities and ease the pressure on the forest.

Large Scale Mining in Madagascar: The Impact of Local Governance Issues on Community Representation

Shirley Smith, University of Reading, UK

This paper examines the issue of community representation in interactions between the varied stakeholders in a mining context. Based on detailed semi-structured interviews in the communes of Fort Dauphin (FD) and Brieville in 2009, the aim is to better understand functional relationships and their constituent hierarchies; identify disconnects within civil society; and determine means of strengthening links within communities and with other stakeholders.

The argument advanced here is that although strategic objectives (GoM 2007) and international standards (EITI 2003) require citizen consultation regarding extractive projects, civil society engagement can be contrived, thus reducing community input and influence. This position is based on the major finding from this study that the equivocal legitimacy of certain civil society leaders, created by state manipulation or business dominance, contributes to community disempowerment.

Governance roles such as Head of Region (HoR), Mayor and Head of Fokontany which constitutionally require universal suffrage are, in some locations, appointed with political motive, disregarding election results. To date, HoRs have been appointed by the State, ostensibly with an objective to ensure that mining projects progress with minimum disruption. In FD, the HoR, through chairing various forums (such as the CLL) is the *de facto* focal point for issue resolution. In Brieville, the community is dependent on the mining company for employment, housing and services. As a consequence, communities' ability to negotiate successfully is limited and mediation processes are easily biased towards the government or mining company, creating a lack of community trust in governance systems. It is noted that powerful vested interests pose significant challenges to governance reforms regarding mineral resources, particularly in the context of inadequate government transparency and weak individual accountability (World Bank Group 2008).

A Civil Society Platform (CSP), with representatives from NGOs, community groups and associations, was initiated by the Presidency to provide a central forum for the consideration of a wide range of societal issues including government service delivery. In FD, the CSP, with a contrived evolution, struggles to retain members' motivation and has a low profile in wider society. Lacking grass roots links, the platform fails to gain authority for its actions from its base, thus is unable to reflect multi-level views. This disconnect is significant as CSP members represent civil society on the EITI multi-stakeholder group which, with foundations set in good governance, aims *inter alia* to examine host benefits.

In conclusion, this exploration of functional relationships between stakeholders identifies disconnects that impact on civil society representation. Moreover, significant institutional changes and governance reforms are required to strengthen Malagasy civil society, particularly with regard to engagement in initiatives like the EITI which aim to reduce corruption, increase transparency and improve benefits in host communities.

Inverting the “offset” ideology? Analysing new regimes of neoliberal environmental governance near the Rio Tinto/QMM ilmenite mine in Southeast Madagascar

Caroline Seagle, VU University Amsterdam

The 1990s “Global Mining Initiative” was launched in partial recognition of mounting land access barriers faced by multinational mining companies operating in the global South. A strategic overhaul of the industry's image accompanied and mining companies increasingly positioned themselves within a global “transition” to “sustainable development.” Sustainability has become an inextricable part of global market capitalist competition, with mining companies competing for land access through global and local ‘performances of sustainability’. This paper analyses the discursive strategies of legitimization, land use and access surrounding Rio Tinto/QMM's ilmenite mine near Tolagnaro, Southeast Madagascar. It considers how remediation strategies such as “biodiversity offsets” may contribute to Rio Tinto's broader “apparatus” of neoliberal conservation and “sustainability” by silencing and providing opportunities for key actors who could otherwise threaten mining operations: international conservation NGOs. Offsets sever “nature” from “culture” by conserving biodiversity extra-locally in “exchange” for *in situ* impacts on biodiversity, forests and people. Mining-conservation partnerships form a new, powerful type of neoliberal environmental governance that categorically neglects local uses, valuations, ontologies, and conceptions of forests and biodiversity whilst generating new regimes of multi-scalar land dispossession and inequalities. This paper considers how the ideology of “offsets” manifests in Rio Tinto's global performances of sustainability, as evidenced in the “bixi bike” programme in Montréal. These initiatives divert attention from negative mining impacts whilst reifying Rio Tinto's global façade of “sustainability.” The text concludes with possibilities for inverting the “offset” ideology by critically re-examining the nature/culture dialectic.

Bridge Building or Bunker Reinforcement? Understanding the Place and Potential of Critical Social Science in Madagascar's Conservation Arena

Barry Ferguson, University of East Anglia, UK

This paper presents the culmination of various experiences I have had over the last twelve years while working in and researching about Madagascar. My insights reflect issues that I have become concerned by, while on a personal and professional journey between 1998 and 2010. Over this period I have had spells as a student carrying out research for an honours thesis on lemur ecology, as the founder and field coordinator of a small community conservation and development project in Ifotaka, as teacher and advisor of university level students in southern Madagascar, as a consultant carrying out consultations and technical studies for a potential new UNESCO Biosphere Reserve and as a interdisciplinary doctoral researcher examining the local traditions and livelihoods of Tandroy forest communities who are the 'beneficiaries' (or targets of restriction to forest resources) of forest conservation projects in southern Madagascar. My eclectic experiences and current activities certainly put me into a dangerous category of 'activist researcher' or at least as an 'active participant observer' within a small part of Madagascar's conservation arena. Understanding and accounting for the biases to my own thinking on these issues is in itself a challenge as I undoubtedly influence some of the processes, places, interventions and people that I am now researching, and which this paper discusses.

I started my current research in 2006 with a core interest in better understanding the politics and processes behind conservation policies in Madagascar, particularly wondering what role researchers played in this area, and how policies are played out on the ground in the Tandroy communities with whom I work in the south of the island. My perspectives on how these things function comes from a diverse set of 'data' derived from the literature, extensive networking and organization of conferences, workshops and projects. I have surveyed scholars to understand their perspectives on research-policy linkages and over the last decade or so I have inadvertently been collecting on an *ad hoc* basis 'off the record testimony' of scholars and practitioners as to what the problem really is with conservation. I have taken part in numerous 'conservation workshops' in Madagascar at local, regional and national levels, maintained a productive ten year collaboration with both Malagasy and International conservation NGOs, I have interviewed specialists on REDD Policy and have spent extended periods in villages primarily in the Androy region. Such methodological anarchism, (cf Paul Feyerabend), is risky, but I think the account it allows me to give of what I have seen of conservation is worth telling.

Put together these different experiences as a conservationist, a scholar, and maybe latterly as a rights activist lead me to conclude that there are various things about conservation in Madagascar which need rethinking. Where the elusive and magical "Win Win" of equitable and effective conservation hasn't been achieved, the practice continues to have negative impacts on local livelihoods and ways of life where it is actually enforced. Where it isn't actually enforced (or enforceable), there is an almost theatrical performance of charades by local communities engaged in everyday forms of peasant resistance, periodic recitals and performances for visiting conservationists and donors, and the production of incessantly misleading narratives and publicity by conservation organizations who specialize as purveyors of opaque terminology like 'participation', 'consultation' and 'community based conservation'. These charades are only exposed outside the small talk of workshops and bars frequented by conservationists by what is referred to elsewhere as a form '*disobedient knowledge*' or the production of the '*tetes errants*', that is knowledge which has a documented track record of being rejected, dismissed, censored and marginalized by the powerful actors of Malagasy conservation. Its time to move on from this.

It isn't all bleak however, despite the current political circumstances in Madagascar, an important opportunity has now been afforded to all the stakeholders and interest groups concerned by conservation in Madagascar to wipe the slate clean, and design a more equitable and effective plan for the next phase of conservation activity. Scholars need to get out of the bunkers a little more, and the Malagasy, anglophone and Francophone scholarly communities need to reinforce the bridges between their varying traditions. Conservations too, need to be more open to dealing with diverse and critical voices, because it is only by genuinely listening to these many voices, from small NGOs, critical social scientists and from forest peoples themselves that policies which are likely to work will emerge.

Journey into Conservation

Mijasoa Andriamarovololona, University of Copenhagen

Born and raised in a rural Commune in Alaotra-Mangoro region, I grew up in a middle class family: my father is a farmer and my mother a (now retired) primary school teacher. By *middle class* I mean that there were those more and less well off than we were who I was privileged to be able to interact with. Our parents were open minded and encouraged us to interact with the lower class and instilled manners and understanding of respect and protocols enough for the higher class to also accept us. I experienced from an early age that (rural) Malagasy society hides many different Worlds within and between hamlets. One-size-fits all solutions to deal with such diverse settings leaves me with a rather sceptical view.

I chose to pursue my higher education in agronomic sciences, later specialising in forestry. ESSA (Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques) is dominated by students from cities, and “rural middle class” like me were rather an “endangered species” in the school. Good command of French is often a hindrance for students from rural backgrounds. However, it turned out that it was easier for me to master foreign languages than for students from cities and to understand the rural way of life, also an important part of the learning.

My next step was a 3 year internship (for both my Engineering and Masters degrees) with Vokatry ny Ala, then a British research project working in the eastern rainforest (Fianarantsoa). Our team, led by two British PhD students, was always introduced as: “we are students, we know nothing, and we are here to learn”. I thought that was only valid for foreigners but that was forgetting my earlier lessons: extreme diversity of Malagasy society. I had a lot to learn (if not everything) and this learner’s attitude has been key in the development of my career.

At the end of our studies, Vokatry ny Ala decided to become an Association, responding to bitter comments by local communities regarding students coming and leaving when they had what they needed in terms of data collection. We were new to the world of contracts and quick deliverables and as we hesitated to compromise on the quality of our work, we chose to spend more time than allocated - at our own cost-on fieldwork. We gained valuable experiences with setting up and the evaluation of community forest management. However, coordinating projects under such a tight budget was challenging and our team suffered as a result.

In 2005, my British colleagues introduced me to the international arena and since then I have enjoyed the privilege of travelling and studying abroad under scholarships. These experiences greatly enhanced my islander’s perspective of the world and I strive to encourage more students to apply. However, most students are very insecure and do not believe that these opportunities are for them. Our society has been so successful to convince us that certain things are reserved for certain social classes, as the expression lasan’ny manam-bola ny tsara captures quite nicely, literally translated it means ‘the good things are for those with money’).

“Ny hevitra ny maro, hono, mahataka-davitra” (Those with many ideas, they say, will have the zeal to go far) and stakeholders of conservation in Madagascar could benefit from diversifying their team (academic but also family background) and by opening up to some learning attitude. Personally, along with my efforts to circulate opportunities among students, I also decided to attack the problem at its root. Saving from my scholarship went to the building of a primary school in my home village with a vision to raise some of the grassroots elites of tomorrow. This also illustrates that big organisations and complicated bureaucracies are not the only way of achieving results on the ground.

Part Two

Recommendations from *Writeshop* & Discussions



Objectives and Approach

Among the objectives of the meeting presented in this report was to move beyond the standard formula for academic conferences where a group of academics present their research to each other, discuss it briefly and the group assembled goes home better informed and wiser. The aspiration of the organizers was to facilitate a gathering which allowed the sharing of experiences and discussion among critical scholars about the impacts of conservation on Malagasy people, about the marginalization of disobedient knowledge and its producers and the lack of representation of forest peoples rights. The discussions ended up providing more of a diverse range of views than some of us initially imagined. What was positive however, was that real, practical ways that the rights and representation of Malagasy forest people might be improved were identified. The formal presentation of participants work was of course an important aspect of how this was done, and the next section of the report provides recommendations which emerged from those discussions for three different audiences. Two methods were used to capture as many of the ideas, opinions and suggestions of the assembled group as possible:

i) A “*Writeshop*” ran over the whole two days of the meeting. This provided participants the opportunity to put their comments into the public domain at any time during the event. Comments were organized by the three main themes for which space and *post it notes* were made available on the walls of the meeting room. See the following websites for some information on the full ‘Writeshop’ concept: <http://www.mamud.com/Docs/outofheads.pdf> and http://www.iirr.org/images/uploads/IIRR_Writeshop_Description_2010.pdf

ii) Two ‘*small group discussion sessions*’ were held, one during each afternoon of the meeting where the meeting participants split up into three groups and discussions were facilitated and reported back on during a short plenary session (the Saturday 5th June session dealt with questions one and two below and the Sunday 6th June session with question three). These discussions allowed more time to explore issues in depth and gave more participants an opportunity to voice their ideas and opinions than full plenary discussions.

Results from the two approaches have been combined and presented as raw *transcripts* which are included as an appendix to this report ([any text in square brackets denotes editors annotations]; only minor grammatical/spelling alterations have been made). The transcripts were then translated into recommendations for action to reform the system (pages 38-39), for actions by scholars (page 40) and for actions for conservation organizations (pages 41-43), the latter category being a catch-all for diverse NGOs, donors and para-statal bodies. The source of the recommendations is indicated by referring to specifically to elements of the transcripts (eg A51, B29, C13) and the presentations (P). Some specific recommendations for the WWF, CI & WCS are also made on pages 48-50 in respect of the Conservation and Human Rights Framework (CHRF).

Chatham House Rule:

The meeting was held under the Chatham House Rule when reporting the discussions and in the preparation of this final report in order to stimulate free speech but to allow participants to maintain their anonymity. "When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the Chatham House Rule, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed" <http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/about/chathamhouserule/>

The Questions...

1. What do we believe are the flaws/weaknesses in the conservation system in Madagascar? What evidence is this based on?
2. What could scholars do to improve the situation?
3. What could conservation organisations do to improve the situation?

Recommendations for Overall System Reform

1. Coherence from Policy Reform for Land Tenure and Conservation/Forestry

Incompatibilities between SAPM, Forestry and PNF laws are not resolved—recognition of customary private land ownership (PPNT) seems to be prevented by COAP. **Action 1a: Crosscutting legal reforms to recognise all customary land claims.** Supposed ‘Win-Win’ policy scenarios are tenuous and misleading. **Action 1b: Negotiation and reporting of conservation should be based on greater-transparency on tradeoffs** (see section 5 below for sets of principles such as FPIC, CHRF which should guide work on what “tradeoffs” may be acceptable and which are as they impinge on the rights of local people).

Sources: A1, A9, A7, A23, A34, A44, A46, A50, A55, P’s.

2. Aid System Reform—Removing Structural Constraints of the Conservation/Aid System

The structure of the aid system funding much of conservation in Madagascar is what constrains success. Three features in particular which constrain the systems are: i) ‘short termism’ preventing adequate periods of support being given to communities to give interventions a chance of sustainability; ii) output based monitoring and evaluation systems (rather than an impacts based system); iii) Preference for systems favouring *elite capture* means the proportion of conservation investment spent at the community and household level is miniscule (it is an inverted pyramid). **Action 2a: Consider broad system wide reforms for longer term investments, higher proportions of spending at community and household levels and more impact oriented monitoring and evaluation systems.**

Sources: A8, A7, A15, A27, A30, A34, A35, A45, A52, A59, C22, P’s.

3. Broaden Knowledge Systems Which Inform Policy and Recognise Customary Law

There are cross-cultural policy misfits because of the difference between languages, concepts and terminology of conservation and of local communities. Conservation uses western technical concepts, and when applied in Madagascar often results in disempowering/overpowering/contradicting indigenous, local and customary systems of rights, beliefs and knowledge. **Action 3a: Increase integration of diverse forms of knowledge and opinion into policy development processes; Action 3b: embed more flexibility into the system by recognising in law customary rights as an uncodified set of norms and practices.**

Sources: A2, A6, A12, A21, A25, A35, A49, A55, A58, A4, A11, A15, A22, A33, A37, A54, A56, P’s.

4. Livelihoods First—Minimise impacts to vulnerable natural resource dependent communities

State forest policy often works at crossed purposes with locally legitimate everyday livelihood practices and customary law of Malagasy peasants. As the state is ill resourced, state law is actually rarely enforced, and customary law prevails. This is unless conservation action is underway in a given region which often leads to natural resource or land use restrictions for local communities. There is an urgent need for more empowering and better resourced efforts to providing communities with operational livelihood solutions as it is not currently practiced. **Action 4a: Ensure that livelihood activities are provided BEFORE communities are restricted from using natural resources, and enshrine this principle in law through legally binding social safeguards applied to all activities of conservation organisations.**

Sources: A1, A7, A20, A44, A46, A47, A48, A50, A51, C3, P’s.



Recommendations for Overall System Reform continued...

5. Pseudo Participation, Pseudo Consultation & Pseudo Community Based Conservation

Conservation in Madagascar uses all the right buzzwords in terms of conservation being participatory, consultative and community based. Analyses of these processes indicate that in the absence of democracy at most levels in Madagascar, these processes typically reinforce existing elite dominance and are often nothing more than token exercises in which the outcomes are pre-determined by the elites of the conservation system. ***Action 5a: Immediate and universal application of Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and the Conservation and Human Rights Framework (CHRF) in all conservation activities.***

Sources: A10, A18, A15, A19, A20, A27, A28, A34, A56, A57, B39, P's.

6. Improve & Increase Mechanisms for Transparency, Accountability & Information Provision

The level of transparency and accountability in Madagascar's conservation sector is questionable. Access to information is not as easy as it should be and mechanisms to ensure accountability through public questioning of performance are weak and for some sectors it is non-existent. ***Action 6a: Mechanisms to ensure sharing of reports, publications and conservation project information are publicly available should be established. Action 6b: Existing independent observatories should be strengthened (Environment/Forest; Land), and additional independent observatory functions should be established for sectors where they are inadequate (mining, forest peoples, farmers and fisherfolk rights) and access to MECIE information and consultations via the ONE improved. Application of the standards of Independent Forest Monitoring (IFM) should be applied.***

Sources: A14, A35, A36, A37, A38, A39, A40, A41, A52, A61, P's.



Recommended Actions for Scholars#

1. Improving Research Practice

- a. More integrative forms of research (multi/inter/trans-disciplinary, action research).
- b. Iterative research, allowing subjects of research ‘right to reply’.
- c. Long term commitment to specific issues and sites, allows long term observation, depth of knowledge.
- d. Tolerance and realism—conservationists and conservation policy makers often don’t anticipate the perverse outcomes which their interventions produce (i.e. intentions are honourable), researchers should realise constraints which conservationists face while striving to candidly provide advice to support better policy making.

Sources: B2, B6, B8, B29, B33, B25, P’s.

2. Work in Partnerships

- a. Cross disciplinary projects, cross scale projects considering the broader political economy.
- b. Collaborative research—with Malagasy scholars, with conservation organisations, with Malagasy organisations.
- c. Anglophone, Francophone, Malagasy collaborations to be reinforced—improve exchanges between Anglophone and francophone scholars.
- d. Network—form novel and innovative epistemic communities addressing issues of social justice and conservation.

Sources: B8, B10, B14, B20, B21, B23, B25, B27, P’s.

3. Publishing and Communicating

- a. Continue to document findings of impacts of conservation, deepen scholarship of specific cases.
- b. Make sure the people who could use it have access to your research findings and publications—too often practitioners and policy makers tell of being unaware of important research.
- c. Target multiple audiences: academic, activism, policy makers, general public.
- d. Use multiple communication forms: writing, film, policy briefs, news stories, blogs.

Sources: B5, B9, B15, B16, B17, B18, B19, B25, B26, B27, B30, B31, B34, B37, B38, P’s.

4. Promoting Specific Issues, Activism

Consider promoting and working actively (beyond research) on specific issues as well as being aware of (and connecting with) activism which could use informed guidance/information from your kind of research:

- a. Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC)
- b. Conservation and Human Rights Framework (CHRF)
- c. Deepening definitions—public critiques of challenging opaque terminology (eg consultation, participation, collaboration, management rights transferred).

Sources: B3, B12, B13, B16, B21, B23, B31, B34-38, P’s.

- PANOS have produced an excellent series of publications to guide researchers working in the developing world in the communication of their research ([2006-Getting into the Kitchen](#); [2006 Working with the media a Guide for Researchers](#); [2008 Reporting research—using evidence for effective journalism](#); [2010 Strengthening media engagement with research to influence policy](#)).



Recommended Actions for Conservation Organisations

1. Rights and Representation of Forest People*

- a. Conservation NGOs and Donors are encouraged to *apply the Conservation and Human Rights Framework (CHRF)* to all their interventions in Madagascar with immediate effect, and to make a public statement in this regard.
- b. Natural Resource dependent communities are very poorly (often not at all) represented in policy discussions. *Proactive efforts by NGOs and Donors need to be made to facilitate representation* ('voice') for these marginalised groups. This must go beyond token participation in workshops by representatives of committees and associations set up in communities by the NGOs themselves, rural people have rarely been well represented by such mechanisms.
- c. Accountability mechanisms must be established. By the admission of senior BINGO employees it is a reality that at present many actors in conservation in Madagascar are barely accountable. To remedy this situation the established observatories which oversee these issues need to be expanded and supported significantly more than at present. This may mean establishing new observatories, or significantly enhancing and broadening of remit of existing observatories (ONESF, Observatoire de Foncier...), and the principles of IFM adopted.
Sources: C4, C13, A9, A18, A30, A34, A52, A56, B39, CIHR, P's.

2. Conservation Programme Conception and Design

- a. *Focused, long term commitment, and maximising trickle-down of funds to specific communities* (cf Money for Madagascar—Betampona) has not often enough been characteristic of the patterns of working of many conservation organisations in Madagascar. Stop-start interventions, premature abandonment of support to communities, and excessive institutionalised elite capture by NGO administration and staff costs are realities which need to be reversed in Madagascar.
- b. *Livelihoods first, then restrictions*—Conservation interventions over the period of the NEAP have often been based on the concept of natural resource use restriction being accompanied by the provision of livelihood alternatives. Unfortunately delivery has not met the promise of the concepts, and in numerous documented cases, natural resource restrictions have been brought in, but the promises of livelihood activities are either completely undelivered, or not delivered to the necessary scale or to all members of the community who they should. Conceptual reordering of conservation intervention implementation is needed—this should be livelihoods first, only then followed by restrictions to avoid extra hardship among vulnerable and marginalised communities.
- c. *Food Security and Food Sovereignty must be paramount and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC†) must be universally adopted and independently verified* - Diverse restrictions on community access to natural resources are imposed by conservation organisations. Typically this includes banning practices such as *tavy/hatsake* for establishing new agricultural lands, and restricting/banning the hunting of wild animals for food and the collection of certain other wild foods. When conservation has been implemented without providing alternative or intensified means of food production, it has removed the food sovereignty of Malagasy forest people. In a country where many people are dependent on food aid and imported staples (such as rice, maize and oil) the impacts of such actions impinges further on food security if food production capacity is not increased elsewhere. Furthermore it shows disrespect for customary land and resource use rights which it impinges on, and has other cultural impacts on rural peoples' sense of being and autonomy. The application of Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) should be adopted immediately and universally for conservation interventions in Madagascar. Pseudo-consultation, pseudo-consent, pseudo-collaboration and pseudo-participation have characterised conservation far too often in Madagascar—and these terms are vulnerable to misuse due to their opacity and they need to be carefully deconstructed by all concerned. Independent verification of the application of FPIC is also essential if it is to be considered as robust and thorough.

d. **Conservation Organisations as Dominant Policy Lobbyists—Need for cross-sectoral responsibility for policy coherence:** The dominant role afforded international conservation organisations in shaping conservation policy in Madagascar is well documented[§]. This unusual level of influence for non governmental actors and the resulting high profile and powerful position brings with it responsibility for these international conservation organisations to consider rights and resources issues with policies of other sectors, or other public policies competing with conservation in terms of land claims. The current lack of clarity (indeed complete incompatibility as perceived by many stakeholders) of new conservation policies under SAPM with new national land reform legislation (under PNF) means that in the absence of new protected areas established since 2003 peasant farmers could have had their customary land claims certified. Unfortunately the establishment of new protected areas seems to have prevented farmers from accessing such vital land tenure security, leading to a situation where conservation organisations have been unintentionally engaged in a mass programme of disenfranchising communities from the progressive land rights programmes of the PNF. Conservation organisation influence and power in the policy domain in Madagascar should be treated as having a parallel responsibility to ensure the policies they promote are in coherence with rights agendas and the complete respect of legitimate customary laws—conservation organisations in Madagascar urgently need to take responsibility and action to remedy this situation and make public statements to that effect.

Sources: A1, A8, A19, A23, A27, A30, A44, A46, A47, A48, A49, A50, A51, A57, C1, C2, C3, C5, C8, C10, C11, C18, C26, CIHR, P's.

* The term 'Forest People' is used here as shorthand to refer to people living in or near forests who depend on the land/resources to some extent for their livelihoods (i.e. This includes recent migrants and long established communities), and the arguments broadly apply to many other natural resource dependent Malagasy groups, such as marine and freshwater fisher folk, and transhumant or extensive pastoralists.

† Excellent publications presenting practical application of the concept of FPIC include: [Lewis J, Freeman L and Borreil S, 2008, Free, Prior and Informed Consent and Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin A Feasibility Study conducted in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo and Gabon regarding the Operationalisation of FSC Principles 2 and 3 in the Congo Basin](#) or Rights and Resources Initiative 2010 [Application du consentement libre, préalable et éclairé en République Démocratique du Congo](#)

§ See Duffy R, 2006, Non-governmental Organisations and Governance States: The Impact of Transnational Environmental Management Networks in Madagascar, *Environmental Politics*, Vol. 15, No. 5, 731 – 749; Corson CA, 2008, Mapping the Development Machine: the US Agency for International Development's Biodiversity Conservation Agenda in Madagascar, PhD Thesis, Berkeley; Brockington D, Duffy R & Igoe J, 2008, *Nature Unbound*, Earthscan



3. Communications and Sharing Knowledge and Information

Poor communication, information availability and secrecy by conservation organisations is a gripe of many stakeholders, and was discussed at length in Norwich. The following actions are recommended:

- a. ***Establish Public Information Mechanisms:*** Conservation Organisations need to become more accountable and establish publicly accessible facilities for accessing reports, project documentation, maps and factual information on conservation projects (libraries, websites).
- b. ***Provide Evidence Based detailed information on conservation's success stories and models of best practice:*** Opinion is starkly divided between many scholars/activists and conservationists on the performance of conservation on issues such as rights, livelihoods and governance. Scholars have already published hundreds of accounts of their critiques. It is now time for conservation organisations to move beyond the dissemination of simplified narratives, unrepresentative good news stories and positive conservation propaganda, and start examining and publicly disseminating detailed evidence based accounts of their success stories and to be less bashful in admitting failures. Analysis and admission as to the reasons for conservation failures will actually provide arguments for some of the reforms in the aid/conservation which are necessary to become effective.
- c. ***Openness about tradeoffs***—When communicating with local communities the application of FPIC is a must, and this obliges much more transparency with communities on the restrictions on their lives which conservationists wish to impose, and the compensation/alternatives actually being offered.

Sources: C23, C22, C25, A15, A29, A33, A35, A37, A39, A40, A41, A44, A46, A50, CIHR, P's.

4. Working Relationships: Scholars and Small NGOs

- a. ***Improved and new ways of working with scholars:*** It seems that many of various critiques evidenced by the content of this report and in the literature are not easily available to conservationists, and are on occasion contested. One way to move forward from the adversarial or uncommunicative situation between knowledge produced by the academy, and accounts produced by conservationists would be for conservation organisations to be more proactive in working with more diverse scholars from the outset of projects, and in more stages of policy and knowledge production. Practical actions could include: i) Establishing advisory groups and panels with scholars and other actors from diverse backgrounds and disciplines. ii) Organising multi-stakeholder dialogues, workshops and conferences integrating conservationists, scholars, activists and communities—moving beyond the ongoing closed shop and circular conversations to fully open, inclusive and accountable processes.
- b. ***Small NGOs—Integrate and help stabilise their interventions:*** Small NGOs complain of being marginalised in Conservation Planning Processes and never being provided with longer term support (leading to 'stop start interventions oriented by the whims of big conservation organisations). The role of small NGOs requires greater support, integration and continuity by the larger conservation NGOs than has been the case in the past.

Sources: A4, A14, A35, A37, A39, A40, A41, A58, A55, B2, B10, B15, B16, B19, B20, B25, B21, A59, C6, C16, C19, C21, C23, C24, C27.

Side Meeting: QMM/Rio Tinto Fort Dauphin Mine

As the Norwich meeting was a rare occasion when such a concentration of people working on issues around the QMM/Rio Tinto mine in Fort Dauphin were gathered in one place it was suggested during Sunday 6th June that the researchers/practitioners presenting about Anosy could meet during the lunch break to continue with questions and discussions. One researcher sits on the Independent Advisory Panel (IAP) to QMM so it also provided an opportunity to clarify and discuss issues around the QMM project in Anosy. Eight conference participants attended this side meeting. Although there were several presentations on various aspects of QMM's impact on the Anosy region, in the formal sessions, the sub-meeting focused largely on relations between QMM and the Andrew Lees Trust. A more general discussion of the costs and benefits of mining development in Anosy has yet to be researched and written. There was no formal agenda for the meeting. However at the start of the meeting all agreed that the Chatham House Rule would apply.

One item that arose quickly was the issue that there had been no joint meeting of the QMM IAP with NGOs in Fort Dauphin since 2002. In particular it was noted that the IAP had never extended an invitation to meet and discuss issues with Andrew Lees Trust (ALT), though it had done so with other NGOs locally in the region e.g. Azafady. Furthermore, it was noted that the reports written by the IAP for QMM are not available publicly and several of the researchers present complained they could not readily access these or other documents/information pertaining to the QMM project. Although it was clarified that the reports were sent to all those interviewed, following submission to QMM. It was suggested that past and future reports should be made available on a public website.

The group revisited the theme of oral testimonies collected in Anosy that had formed part of the Andrew Lees Trust (ALT) presentation at the conference (1). During this presentation, ALT shared quotes from Anosy Villagers' testimonies that highlighted there had been insufficient information and communications in relation to land appropriation and forest access restrictions imposed by the QMM Rio Tinto mining operation. It was also stated in the presentation that there had been 'no response' to the oral testimonies by the mining company.

A question had been posed from the floor as to whether it was true what the company (QMM) was claiming: *that ALT had only interviewed people (during the testimony collection) who were against the mine.* This question was further explored in the side meeting and Andrew Lees Trust welcomed the opportunity to publicly clarify the testimony collection process to the group:-

Testimonies were collected by Village interviewers who were selected by their community following a clear criteria (given in 2007 to Anosy village elders in four communities by our then Project Manager): they needed to be good listeners/communicators; respected by their community; available to carry out all the days of work involved in the project; ideally one man and one woman from each community. Literacy skills would be appreciated but were not necessary (Note: for training purposes).

Village interviewers were then trained by Panos in Ft Dauphin using their oral testimony guidelines and methodology. When the mining theme came up in training sessions, village interviewers were asked not to focus on the mine and were steered towards focusing on open questions around broader themes to do with people's life stories: How people earned their living, how they feed themselves, do they have children, how has life changed, and about their food and natural resources etc. (Note: an IDRC intern was present at the training, alongside Yvonne Orenge and the Panos trainer, and recorded the process).

Village Narrators therefore talked about many aspects of their lives in their testimonies (Note: each testimony is approx 12 pages long before edit). Interviewers only asked questions about QMM when the narrator raised this subject themselves – sometimes to speak about the positive gains of QMM presence such as schools or clinics. (Note: All the original material that was recorded is available on CD and in original language/translated full transcriptions of the testimonies in word documents).

Ten months before publication, in January 09, ALT met with Manon Vincelette, Head of Rio Tinto (RT) Social and Environmental Programme, to discuss the testimonies and ALT's intended publication of the material, and asked for an 'informal dialogue'.

ALT shared some preliminary raw material with members of the Rio Tinto (RT) social team and met with them and Rio Tinto Mg Head of Communications in March 2009 to discuss matters arising. The RT team thought the testimonies could be useful; they also said that the testimonies reflected similar findings from their own research on forest issues. They discussed the idea of using the testimonies to launch a regional debate – which ALT would have welcomed. They also wanted ALT to give recommendations on how to address communications gaps and ALT were ready to do that on an 'informal dialogue' basis, with strict terms of engagement.

One participant observed that there had, therefore, been 'a response' to the testimonies. But this was contested – the meeting mentioned took place *before* publication of the testimony collection and in any case was instigated by ALT. There has been no *public* response from QMM/Rio Tinto since the publication of the Anosy testimonies (in 'Voices of Change') in October 2009, only an unofficial, rumoured repudiation of their integrity.

ALT has not challenged or confronted the company about their accusations in regard to the testimony collection process as this could lead to possible questions and embarrassment for a leading member of the QMM team, but she added that ALT would welcome a public debate with Rio Tinto where ALT could openly defend the integrity and authenticity of the testimonies (2), and ALT's professional reputation.

It was discussed how other people working in Anosy, whose work challenged the claims or the public relations image of the QMM local operation, had also experienced this type of denigration or dismissal of their integrity/work.

ALT then explained that further dialogue with QMM had been suspended in June 09 when it was discovered that Rio Tinto had breached the agreed terms of engagement and sent out a press release claiming Andrew Lees Trust were a Rio Tinto 'biodiversity partner' without ALT's permission or knowledge after it had concluded just one 'informal dialogue' meeting.

There was insufficient time to discuss more issues or in more depth than those that had been raised.

Note: There was no suggestion of a further meeting of those present, however a smaller meeting did take place informally between Alison Jolly and Yvonne Orenge and Antonie Kraemer in London where more information about the testimony process and related issues were shared.

1. *Oral testimony and the Role of Communications in the Development Matrix*
 2. *ALT feels there is a risk that undermining the testimonies content could risk to lose much needed interest and investment into the area, especially for those poor not benefitting immediately from QMM social programmes or PPP Alliance funding around the project.*
-

The testimonies referred to in this section are available for free download from

English : <http://www.andrewleestrust.org/Reports/Voices%20of%20Change.pdf>

French : <http://www.andrewleestrust.org/Reports/Voix%20du%20Changement.pdf>

Malagasy : <http://www.andrewleestrust.org/Reports/Feon'ny%20gny%20Fiova.pdf>

A Note on Agreeing to Differ

Eva Keller and Alison Jolly very kindly submitted the following email exchange which they had after the meeting in Norwich for inclusion in the report. The content is interesting, and provides a very useful insight into some of the fundamental issues being debated. The emails are included in this report in an effort to communicate something reflecting the tone and substance of discussions held in Norwich on the 5th and 6th June to a broader audience. It should be noted that this is an email exchange and not an academic paper!

Email from Eva Keller to Alison Jolly

Dear Alison,

it's been really good to meet you again in Norwich. I was impressed with your honesty the first time I saw and heard you back in 2007, and the same is still true. I am writing to you today just to add something to our conversation over dinner in Norwich. You mentioned at the beginning of your talk the following day that I did not consider biodiversity to be intrinsically valuable but that you, in contrast, do. Let me just tell you very briefly what my problem is.

I, personally, do value biodiversity very much and try to support green issues whenever I can. However, that does not give me the right to enforce that particular value of mine onto other people and especially not on much poorer people in the South (without wanting to imply that the Malagasy do not value the diversity of life forms). If I understood you correctly, your view is this: *Biodiversity is intrinsically valuable for humanity and we therefore have a duty to conserve it. If that means that we must take away land from people such as those who live in rural areas in Madagascar, we have to do this but we need to compensate these people properly for their loss.*

I respect such a view. My problem is, however, that it means that the rich can go more or less anywhere they want and impose their view of things onto the rest of the world, quite simply because we can pay for it. That is what to me is unacceptable. Not only because it privileges the power of the North but also because it so much is a continuation of colonial history. Thus for me the issue is not whether or not biodiversity IS valuable, the issue rather is about power and global inequality. To me personally, these concerns have absolute priority. If respecting Malagasy people's right to self-determination should mean – which is however far from clear – that we should lose most forests in Madagascar, well, then so be it, as I said to you in Norwich (which doesn't mean I wouldn't care). I didn't mean for that to imply that I don't value biodiversity but that I rank the self-determination of the Malagasy even higher.

Thanks for being so open to discussion and hope to meet you again.

very best, Eva

Response from Alison Jolly to Eva Keller

Dear Eva,

Thank you very much for your heartfelt email. I think you have put your position so very clearly.

And you are right, I do believe that biodiversity is intrinsically valuable, beautiful, wonderful. I object to the loss of species and ecosystems much as I would object to burning down the Louvre--

or for that matter, the Queen's Palace with its weight of Malagasy history. Only more so, because people can create new art, and we cannot create new lemurs or rosewood trees or even giraffe-necked weevils.

And I also believe that people of wider experience are more able to see this, as well as to see the long term consequences of destroying the environment on peoples' own welfare. That gets all mixed up with the fact that people of wider experience are also likely to be richer, more powerful, and more colonial. But I think if one has the privilege of wide experience and long view, one has some obligation to act on it.

Of course we (conservationists) may not be right about the environment. Maybe it is possible that local people with local views can actually live a sustainable lifestyle. (Certainly they are more sustainable than western carbon-guzzlers). However, my fear is that many places in Madagascar are tending toward the situation that Jacques Pollini described: malnourished, stunted people who fall victim to any passing epidemic. And who scrape away at the forest higher and higher until they reach an edge: the ridge where the next clan has rights, or the ridge where there just isn't any more forest. That is the scenario where Madagascar turns into Haiti.

Yes, trying to save forest as intact reserves, and other forest as lightly used, community managed reserves, does hasten the process of people turning to more intensive agriculture, and away from tavy--but it would happen anyhow when the tavy reaches the ridge top.

To me, one of the happiest talks at the conference was Theresa's of Money for Madagascar. The long-term infusion of a very little money and expertise to help people to improve their land and income seems right, for anyone trying to promote forest conservation. Theresa said, "They don't WANT to do tavy--it is too high and steep and too hard work." In other words, that Betampona community had reached as high up the hills as they wanted to go, and they had an alternative.

One of the conference participants did remark to me in the corridor, "Suppose we came back in a hundred years, and there was no more forest. Perhaps people would say to us, "You knew this could happen. Why didn't you tell us?"

All best wishes,
Alison

Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR)

During the period leading up to the Norwich meeting a group of international conservation NGOs made an announcement of the public launch of the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR), an initiative which had been under development for four years. The CIHR site states:

“The Conservation Initiative on Human Rights (CIHR) is a consortium of international conservation NGOs that seek to improve the practice of conservation by promoting integration of human rights in conservation policy and practice. CIHR members have come together because of a common interest in promoting positive links between conservation and rights of people to secure their livelihoods, enjoy healthy and productive environments and live with dignity. CIHR membership is comprised of the international conservation organizations that participate in the Conservation CEOs Forum. These organizations include IUCN, Birdlife International, Conservation International, Fauna & Flora International, The Nature Conservancy, Wetlands International, Wildlife Conservation Society, and WWF.”

(IUCN, 2010, http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/social_policy/scpl_cihr/)

Official information on the CIHR is available on the following [link](#)—of particular importance is the Conservation and Human Rights Framework. Shortly after the launch of the CIHR a group of 32 scholars and activists working on Madagascar signed a joint letter encouraging the CIHR to use Madagascar as an



early implementation location for the initiative, and inviting them to engage with scholars and diverse stakeholders to advance the stated principles and commitments of the initiative. The contact person for the CIHR at the international level, Jenny Springer (WWF-US) wrote back to the group and passed on the suggestions to the representatives of the CIHR in Madagascar. Subsequently a series of email exchanges took place with Lisa Gaylord (WCS) and Jenny Springer discussing in general terms what approaches could be considered as potential ways of integrating the research community into efforts by CIHR members in Madagascar to implement the initiative. In the interests of brevity for this report the full text of the exchanges is not included here, but has been made available online at the following [link](#). The most important elements of the discussions are: that there is potential for the CIHR members in Madagascar to draw on the extensive bibliography and knowledge of critique and analysis of conservation in Madagascar (see later in this report for a preliminary bibliography) and secondly to establish a process to integrate, more meaningfully than in the past, more diverse stakeholders and types of knowledge into conservation policy making in Madagascar.

The CIHR correspondence was circulated in hard copy at the start of the Norwich meeting (and had been electronically immediately upon its receipt), and the initiative was discussed during several presentations, as well as in the periphery/breaks/meals during the meeting. The next two pages of this report aims to synthesise and translate what was discussed into four broad recommendations to the CIHR, particularly to CIHR partners in Madagascar as to how they could engage with these issues, in particular strengthening existing and forging new working relationships with the whole research community.

Recommendations to CIHR Members in Madagascar: Conservation International, World Wildlife Fund, Wildlife Conservation Society

1. Putting the Conservation and Human Rights Framework principles into practice in Madagascar:

The Conservation Initiative on Human Rights is very much welcomed. *The CIHR Members in Madagascar are encouraged to put all four common principles and six commitments of the Conservation and Human Rights Framework into practice in their projects, field sites and protected areas as soon as possible. Implementation should consider both indigenous rights (cf UNDRIP (2007)) and fundamental human rights of other peoples not formally labelled as indigenous.*

2. Sharing of knowledge and factual evidence based information on conservation interventions:

Contemporary critiques of large international conservation NGOs frequently identify their relentlessly positive publicity and media coverage as a challenging trend for improving the social impacts of conservation[#]. Such public communication efforts often provide oversimplified accounts of what is happening in conservation, and they drown out many important details and critiques. The public websites of the CIHR members with a permanent presence in Madagascar (CI, WCS, WWF) make it evident that there is a great focus on providing such publicity and good news stories, while there is a dearth of detailed evidence based information about the social impacts of conservation interventions, something which is well documented in the academic literature. Claims about positive social impacts of NGO conservation projects and protected areas are made, but little by way of detail is provided, nor are project reports and documents adequately shared. By reviewing the literature it is evident that such positive accounts by NGOs are often contradicted, undermined and questioned by the findings of many researchers active in this field. *It is recommended that the CIHR members in Madagascar undertake a significant programme of work to improve public access to detailed information on their work, by making reports and evidence of the impacts of their interventions more easily available, this being in line in particular with principles four and nine of the Conservation and Human Rights Framework.* Closer collaboration with diverse partners, including researchers and journalists, also holds potential for ensuring more accessible, transparent processes and dialogues.

[#] Dowie M, 2009, Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples, MIT Press.

Brockington D, 2009 Celebrity and the Environment: Fame, Wealth and Power in Conservation, Zed Books.

MacDonald C, 2008, Green INC: An environmental insider reveals how a good cause has gone bad, The

3. A comprehensive review of the state of knowledge of social impacts of conservation in Madagascar through new and improved partnerships with the research community:

A great deal of academic research, contracted consultancy work and project and/or institutional reviews have been conducted on the conservation activities carried out in Madagascar over the last two decades. It is evident however that many of the different sorts of publications are not easily accessible to those involved in the sector, particularly between those involved in conservation practice and those in the academy. Furthermore, the great volume of the material, its wide disciplinary diversity, and its publication language makes it highly challenging for any individual or organisation to be in full command of the diversity of knowledge and opinion which exists. *It is recommended that the CIHR partners in Madagascar recruit and finance an independent team of specialists (whose credentials command the respect of conservation organisations, Malagasy authorities, the academic community and Malagasy civil society organisations) to undertake a comprehensive review of the state of knowledge to inform future policy making in conservation.* Given that the future strategic directions for conservation policy in Madagascar are currently under consideration **NOW** is an opportune moment to undertake such reviews in collaboration with as many stakeholders as possible, and for CIHR members in Madagascar to proactively and fully involve the academic and research community. Recent policy reviews of the kind published by the [World Bank](#) and [USAID](#) and the academic bibliography of conservation critiques presented in this report will all serve as useful references, but the review advocated for here should cast its net wider and not exclude *a priori* any possible sources of information, opinion or knowledge. Proactively soliciting the input and collaboration of the academic and research community should take advantage of such established networks as the Malagasy Academy, Hevitra List, Madagascar Conservation and Development Google Group, Justice et Droits de l'Homme Group, The Journal Madagascar Conservation and Development and the Madagascar Environmental Justice Network. Special efforts to include Malagasy scholars should be made, and in building capacity of Malagasy academic institutions to increase its activities in such forms of critical and cross disciplinary reviews of the sector.

4. Multi stakeholder dialogues to promote more inclusive conservation policy processes and more equitable conservation policy in Madagascar:

There are a great deal of stakeholders in Madagascar (and others internationally whose work deals with Madagascar) whose knowledge, experience and opinions could contribute to more socially equitable conservation policies. However in the past community representatives, civil society and the research community have not been as involved as they should have been in contributing to conservation policy processes and policy implementation, as this has been characterised by elitism affording privileged access to BINGOs, donors and a small number of allied researchers, principally from natural sciences. *It is recommended that the CIHR members in Madagascar, and other ongoing policy review processes be used as an opportunity for conservation organisations to engage with a much broader constituency (and in more a more participative manner) than in the past.* This could include the establishment and facilitation of various issue based forums/specialist panels; the organisation of broad and inclusive dialogues across sectors, scales and interest groups, and should take advantage of both face to face meetings and internet technology (such as that recently established by the World Bank to examine issues around the global land grabs phenomena: <http://ediscussion.donorplatform.org/>).

Conservation and Human Rights Framework

Conservation Initiative on Human Rights

Actions to conserve nature and natural resources are closely related to the rights of people to secure their livelihoods, enjoy healthy and productive environments and live with dignity. The pursuit of conservation goals can contribute positively to the realization of many human rights, and realization of rights can enable more effective conservation outcomes. However, conservation activities may also generate negative impacts if their links with human rights and well-being are not sufficiently understood or addressed.

As conservation organisations, our objective is to maintain and enhance the long-term benefits of nature for all, including future generations. Our work is motivated by belief in the intrinsic value of the diversity of life, recognition of the responsibilities of people to the Earth and to other species that share the Earth with us, and understanding that the well-being of people everywhere is intimately dependent upon ecosystems and the biodiversity that underpins them.

At the same time, we recognize that conservation activities affect the relationships of people to lands and vital resources, and that many people in high-biodiversity areas are among the world's poorest and most vulnerable. As organizations involved in supporting the design and implementation of conservation programmes, we also recognize that we have a responsibility to address and be accountable for the social effects of our work. Furthermore, we believe that there are benefits to articulating clear principles for action and accountability on human rights as they relate to conservation, as a framework and guide for implementation actions, partnerships and shared learning.

Therefore:

WE, the undersigned international conservation organizations reaffirm our commitment to:

1. Respect human rights

Respect internationally proclaimed human rights¹; and make sure that we do not contribute to infringements of human rights while pursuing our mission.

¹ As contained in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and other applicable international instrument

2. Promote human rights within conservation programmes

Support and **promote** the protection and realization of human rights within the scope of our conservation programmes.

3. Protect the vulnerable

Make special efforts to avoid harm to those who are vulnerable to infringements of their rights and to support the protection and fulfilment of their rights within the scope of our conservation programmes.

4. Encourage good governance

Support the improvement of governance systems that can secure the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities in the context of our work on conservation and sustainable natural resource use, including elements such as legal, policy and institutional frameworks, and procedures for equitable participation and accountability.

To implement these principles, according to individual governance structures and operating partnership models, the undersigned organizations commit to work to achieve the following:

5. Further develop these principles and implementation measures in consultation with our constituencies

Discuss and develop the principles and implementation measures with our constituencies and with support as needed from individuals and networks that have relevant experience and expertise.

6. Establish relevant institutional policies

Establish our own institutional policies to ensure that these principles are fulfilled; communicate our policies internally and externally and periodically review and revise them as needed.

7. Ensure implementation capacity is in place

Determine the competencies needed within our organizations to implement these policies and principles and ensure that the necessary capacity is in place.

8. Address conservation-human rights links in the design, implementation and monitoring of our programmes, including by:

- **Undertaking impact assessment and consultation in advance of conservation interventions:** Conduct prior evaluation of the scope of proposed conservation policies, programmes, projects and activities, so that the links between human rights and conservation are identified, and ensure that potentially affected persons are informed, properly consulted, and able to participate in decision making about relevant interventions. This includes respect for the right of indigenous peoples and local communities with customary rights to lands and resources to free, prior, informed consent to interventions directly affecting their lands, territories or resources.
- **Reflecting local concerns in design and implementation:** Ensure that the design and implementation of conservation interventions reflect such prior evaluation and the participatory decisions that were made.
- **Monitoring and adapting:** Monitor and evaluate interventions and their implications for human rights, as a basis for ongoing improvement.

9. Establish accountability measures

Establish processes to monitor and evaluate compliance with our policies and principles on a regular basis, and effective, accessible and, transparent procedures to receive and resolve complaints.

10. Apply the policies and principles in agreements with subcontracting organizations and implementing partners

Include appropriate provisions on compliance with these policies and principles in subcontracts, partnership agreements and capacity-building activities with other implementing organizations



Part Three

More Information



Bibliography of Critiques of Malagasy Conservation

The following represents a preliminary bibliography of Social Science Publications providing critical comments or analysis of conservation in Madagascar, or providing information of importance to the conservation community. It is neither complete, nor does it present a judgment on the position or validity of the contents, it is simply intended to provide a list for interested parties to explore further themselves.

Amelot X, 2007, Cartographie et environnement a Madagascar: Une histoire de représentations entre mythes et réalités, PPT of Paper Presented to Conference of Alliance Franco-Malagache, Antsiranana 22 Mai 2007.

Amelot X, 2008, 'évaluation par télédétection de la déforestation a Madagascar : comparer ce que est comparable, PPT of Paper Presented to XI^e JS du Réseau Télédétection de l'AUF, Antananarivo 4 Novembre 2008.

Amelot X, André V & Mellac M, 2006, Jeux d'échelles, jeux d'acteurs, jeux de mots : Approche comparée des politiques forestières en Guinée, à Madagascar et au Viêt Nam : de la colonisation à la globalisation. "Colloque international GECOREV Gestion concertée des ressources naturelles et de l'environnement - du local au mondial - : pour un dialogue entre chercheurs, société civile et décideurs, Université de Versailles, Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, 26-27-28 juin.

Amelot X, Carriere S & Moreau S, 2008, Les justes territoires de la conservation : la délimitation du nouveau réseau d'aires protégées à Madagascar, Présentée au Colloque : Justice et injustices spatiales, Nanterre 2008.

Anderson G, 2005, Madagascar on My Mind: Ground-Truthing Some Conventional and Unconventional Wisdom, online blog www.krazykioti.com

Andrew Lees Trust & PANOS London, 2009, Madagascar Voices of Change: Oral Testimony of the Antanosy People.

Andriambelo LH, 2008, La Gestion des ressources forestières par la Population locale dans une nouvelle formule d'Aire Protégée, cas du Menabe Central, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.

Andrianandrasana ,O., Erdmann, T.K, Freudenberger, M.S., Raharinomenjanahary,V., Rakotondrazaka, M.,Ratsisompatrarivo,J.S, 2008, Le Transfert de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles pour la sauvegarde des corridors forestiers: la vision du Programme « Ecoregional Initiatives », à travers son expérience dans les écorégions de Fianarantsoa et Toamasina, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.

Andriananja H & Raharinirina V, 2004, Quels enjeux pour la durabilité et la gouvernance des ressources naturelles et forestières a Madagascar, Revue Monde en Développement.

Antona M, Bienabe E M, Salles J-M, Pechard G, Aubert S & Ratsimbarison R, 2004, Rights transfers in Madagascar biodiversity policies: achievements and significance, Environment and Development Economics 9:825-847.

Astuti, R., 1995. "The Vezo Are Not a Kind of People": Identity, Difference, and "Ethnicity" among a Fishing People of Western Madagascar. American Ethnologist, 22(3): 464-482.

Aubert S, Razafiarison S & Bertrand A, 2003, Déforestation et systèmes agraires a Madagascar: Les dynamiques des tavy sur la cote orientale, CITE-CIRAD-FOFIFA.

Ballet, J. 2007. 'La gestion en commun des ressources naturelles : une perspective critique'. Développement durable et territoire.

Bertrand A & Ratsimbarison R, 2004, Deforestation and Fires : the example of Madagascar, in Babin D (Ed) Beyond Tropical Deforestation : From Tropical Deforestation to Forest Cover Dynamics and Forest development, UNESCO-CIRAD.

Bertrand A, 2004, The spread of the Merina people in Madagascar and natural forest and eucalyptus stand dynamics, in Babin D (Ed) Beyond Tropical Deforestation : From Tropical Deforestation to Forest Cover Dynamics and Forest development, UNESCO-CIRAD.

Bertrand A, Montagne P & Karsenty A, 2006, L'Etat et la gestion locale durable des forets en Afrique francophone et a Madagascar, CIRAD-Karthala.

Bertrand A, Ribot J & Montagne P, 2004, the historical origins of deforestation and forestry policy in French-speaking Africa: From superstition to reality? Babin D (Ed) Beyond Tropical Deforestation : From Tropical Deforestation to Forest Cover Dynamics and Forest development, UNESCO-CIRAD.

Bertrand A, Serpantie G, Randrianarivelo G, Montagne P, Toillier A, Karpe P, Andriambolanoro D & Derycke M, 2008, Une gestion locale durable et porteuse de développement ou un retour aux barrières : quelle place pour le transfert de gestion dans la construction des nouvelles aires protégées malgaches ?, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.

Bertrand A., Rabesahala Horning N., Montagne P., 2009 Gestion communautaire ou préservation des ressources renouvelables : histoire inachevée d'une évolution majeure de la politique environnementale à Madagascar. VertigO Vol9 no3.

- Bidaud CR, 2009, Science's role in the application of ecosystem service in Madagascar, Abstract from Diversitas Conference, Cape Town, South Africa October.
- Blanc-Pamard C & Fauroux E, 2004, L'illusion participative: Exemples ouest-malagaches, *Autrepart* (31)3-19.
- Blanc-Pamard C & Ramiarantsoa HR 2010, Pour un développement durable des communautés locales, TALOHA, numéro 19, 20 janvier, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=784>.
- Blanc-Pamard C., Milleville P., Grouzis M., Lasry F. Razanaka S., 2005 "Une alliance de disciplines sur une question environnementale : la déforestation en forêt des Mikea (sud-ouest de Madagascar), *Natures Sciences Sociétés*, 13 : 7-20
- Blanc-Pamard C., Thomas Bassett et Jean Boutrais 2007 Constructing locality : The terroir approach in West Africa, Special issue « Nature as Local Heritage in Africa », *Africa* 77 (1)
- Blanc-Pamard C. & Rakoto Ramiarantsoa H., 2007, Normes environnementales, transferts de gestion et recompositions territoriales en pays Betsileo (Madagascar). La gestion contractualisée des forêts. *Natures Sciences Sociétés*, 15, 253-268
- Blanc Pamard C. & Rakoto Ramiarantsoa H., 2008 La gestion contractualisée des forêts en pays betsileo et tanala (Madagascar). Les effets biaisés d'un modèle universel, *Cybergeo, Revue Européenne de Géographie*, www.cybergeo.presse.fr/revgeo.htm
- Blanc-Pamard C., 2009 The Mikea Forest Under Threat (southwest Madagascar) : How public policy constructs conflicting territories. *Field Actions Science Reports FACTS* <http://factsreports.revues.org/index341.html.webloc>
- Blanc-Pamard C., Ralaivita M., 2004 Ambendrana : un territoire d'entre-deux. Conversion et conservation de la forêt (corridor betsileo, Madagascar), GEREM IRD-CNRE, CNRS-EHESS CEAF, UR 100, 86 p. et annexes
- Blanc-Pamard C., Rakoto Ramiarantsoa H et Andriantseheno D., 2005 Foncier et territoires entre pouvoirs locaux et politiques publiques environnementales. Pratiques, acteurs, enjeux (corridor betsileo, Madagascar). GEREM IRD-CNRE, CNRS-EHESS CEAF, ICOTEM Université de Poitiers, UR 168, 166 p. et annexes
- Blanc-Pamard C., Rakoto Ramiarantsoa H., 2006 La légitimité en questions. Recompositions territoriales et politiques environnementales. Pratiques, acteurs, enjeux (corridor betsileo-tanala, Madagascar). GEREM IRD-CNRE, CNRS-EHESS CEAF, ICOTEM Université de Poitiers, UR 168, 160 p. et annexes (en collaboration avec H. Rakoto Ramiarantsoa)
- Brinkerhoff DW, 1996, Coordination Issues in Policy Implementation Networks: An Illustration from Madagascar's Environmental Action Plan-World Development, Vol. 24, No. 9, pp. 1497-1510
- Carrière, S., Dominique Hervé, Fano Andriamahefazafy, Philippe Méral 2008. 'Les corridors, passage obligé? L'exemple malgache' in Aubertin, C. (ed.). Paris.
- Casse T, Rakoto Ramiarantsoa H & Ramamonjisoa BS, 2010, Forest on Contract, Success or Failure Lessons from the local forest management systems in Madagascar, pp. 253, in review Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Casse T, Milhoj A, Ranaivoson S, Randriamanarivo JM, 2004, Causes of deforestation in southwestern Madagascar : what do we know?, *Forest Policy and Economics* 6:33-48.
- Casse T, Neilson U, Ranaivoson S & Randriamanarivo JM, 2005, Farmer strategies and forest conservation: a case study from south-western Madagascar, *International Journal of Social Economics*, Vol 32, No 8: 704-716.
- Chaboud C, Froger G & Meral P, 2007, Madagascar face aux enjeux du développement durable: Des politiques environnementales à l'action collective locale, Karthala.
- CHABOUD C., FROGER G., MERAL P. (Eds) (2007), Madagascar face aux enjeux du développement durable. Des politiques environnementales à l'action collective locale. Edition KARTHALA, 308 p.
- Chantal Blanc-Pamard, 2008, La Gestion Contractualisée des Forêts (GCF) en pays betsileo et tanala (Madagascar) : Un dispositif dissymétrique, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Cinner, J., Fuentes, M.M.P.B. and Randriamahazo, H., 2009. Exploring Social Resilience in Madagascar's Marine Protected Areas Ecology and Society. *The Resilience Alliance*, pp. 41.
- Cinner, J.E., 2007. The role of taboos in conserving coastal resources in Madagascar. *SPC Traditional Marine Resource Management and Knowledge Information Bulletin*, 22: 15-23.
- Cooke A 2007, le Transfert de gestion et les défis de son application, in Tanteza Book on 10 years of Transfer de Gestion.
- Cormier-Salem M.-C., J.-B.D., Boutrais J., Roussel B. 2002 (ed.) Patrimonialiser la nature tropicale. Dynamiques locales, enjeux internationaux.: IRD editions. (Various Chapters by Babin et al ; Aubert; Goederoit; Blanc-Pamard)
- Corson C, 2004, The implications of shifting cultivation for decentralized natural resource management in Madagascar, Conference Abstract.

- Corson CA, 2008, Mapping the Development Machine: the US Agency for International Development's Biodiversity Conservation Agenda in Madagascar, PhD Thesis University of California, Berkeley.
- Dahl, Ø., 1993. Malagasy Meaning - An Interpretive Approach to Intercultural Communication in Madagascar. Misjonshøgskolens forlag, Stavanger, Norway, i-xi + 1-237 pp.
- Dahl, Ø., 1995. When the future comes from behind: Malagasy and other time concepts and some consequences for communication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 19(2): 197-209.
- Dirac C, Andriambelo L & Sorg J-P, 2006, Scientific Basis for a Participatory Forest Landscape Management, Madagascar Conservation and Development Vol 1 Issue 1:31-33.
- Dirac Ramohavelo C, 2009, Strategies villageoises pour la gestions des paysages forestieres du menabe central, Madagascar, These Doctorale No 4400 de l'Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Dominique H, Thierry G & Randriamahaleo S, 2008, Contraintes et dynamiques institutionnelles des transferts de gestion (Fandriana-Vondrozo), in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Duffy R, 2005, Global Environmental Governance and the Challenge of Shadow States; the Impact of Ilicit Sapphire Mining in Madagascar, *Development and Change*, 36(5): 825-843.
- Duffy R, 2006, Global Environmental Governance and the Politics of Ecotourism in Madagascar, *Journal of Ecotourism*, Vol 5 Number 1&2:128-144.
- Duffy R, 2006, Non-governmental Organisations and Governance States: the Impact of Transnational Environmental Management Networks in Madagascar, *Environmental Politics*, Vol 15, No 5:731-749.
- Elmqvist T, Pyykonen M, Tengo M, 2009, Spontaneous Regeneration of Tropical Dry Forest in Madagascar: The Social-Ecological Dimension, in Nagendra H & Southworth J (Eds), *Reforestation Landscapes: Linking Pattern and Process Landscape Series 10*, Springer Netherlands.
- Elmqvist T, Pyykonen M, Tengo M, Rakotondraso F, Rabakonandrianina E & Radimilahy C, 2007, Patterns of Loss and regeneration of Tropical Dry Forest in Madagascar: The Social Institutional Context *PLoS ONE*, Issue 5, e402 (May).
- Erdmann, Thomas K.(2010) 'Eco-regional conservation and development in Madagascar: a review of USAID-funded efforts in two priority landscapes', *Development in Practice*, 20: 3, 380 — 394. DOI: 10.1080/09614521003709999
- Evers SJTM, Haak Mvd, Lingnau I, Lokhorst N & Pronk C, 2006, National Legislation and Local Practices: Competing Jurisdictions in Land Management in Madagascar, *Taloha* No 16-17, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=336>.
- Feeley-Harnik, G. 1995. Plants and people, children or wealth? Shifting grounds of 'choice' in Madagascar. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 18, 2: 45-64. (doi:10.1525/pol.1995.18.2.45)
- Ferraro P, 2002, The Local Costs of Establishing Protected Areas in Low-Income Nations: Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar.
- Freudenberger MS 2008, Ecoregional Conservation and the Ranomafana - Andringitra Forest Corridor : A Retrospective Interpretation of Achievements, Missed Opportunities, and Challenges for the Future, Unpublished DAI Report to USAID Madagascar for PE3 Stocktaking Exercise.
- Fritz-Vietta NVM, Ferguson HB, Stoll-Kleemann S & Ganzhorn JU, in review, Conservation in the Madagascar Biodiversity Hotspot: A Case for More People Oriented Policy, in Zachos F & Habel JC (eds) *Biodiversity Hotspots*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Froger G, Meral P & Herimandimby V, 2004, The expansion of participatory governance in the environmental policies of developing countries: the example of Madagascar, *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol 7 No 2:164-184.
- Gade DW, 2008, Considering Madagascar's Deforestation Story in Paradigmatic and Reflexive Terms, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Gezon LL & Freed BZ, 1998, Agroforestry and Conservation in Northern Madagascar: Hopes and Hinderances, *African Studies Quarterly*.
- Gezon LL, 1997, Institutional Structure and the Effectiveness of Integrated Conservation and Development Projects: case Study from Madagascar, *Human Organization*, Vol 56 No 4:462-470.
- Gezon LL, 2000, The Changing face of NGOs: Structure and Communitas In Conservation and Development in Madagascar, *Urban Anthropology* Vol 29 No 2: 181-215.
- Gezon LL, 2004, Finding the Global in the Local: Environmental Struggles in Northern Madagascar in, Paulson & gezon (eds) *Political Ecology across Spaces, Scales and Social Groups*, Rutgers University Press.
- Gezon LL, 2006, *Global Visions, Local Landscapes: A Political Ecology of Conservation, Conflict, and Control in Northern Madagascar*, Alta Mira Press.

- Gezon, L L, 1997, Political Ecology and Conflict in Ankarana Madagascar, *Ethnology* Vol 36 Issue 2 :85-100.
- Ghimire KB, 1994, Parks and People: Livelihood Issues in National Parks Management in Thailand and Madagascar, *Development and Change* Vol. 25:195-229.
- Ghimire, K. B., 1991, Parks and People: Livelihood Issues in National Parks Management in Thailand and Madagascar. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Discussion Paper 29, UNRISD, Geneva.
- Goedefroit S & Reveret J-P, 2007, Quel developpement a Madagascar? *Etudes Rurales* No 178, Editions EEHESS.
- Goedefroit, S. 2002. 'Stratégies patrimoniales au paradis de la nature. Conservation de la biodiversité, développement et revendications locales à Madagascar' in Cormier-Salem M.-C., J.-B.D., Boutrais J., Roussel B. (ed.) *Patrimonialiser la nature tropicale. Dynamiques locales, enjeux internationaux.*: IRD editions.
- Haak Mvd, 2005, A Voice to the Villagers: A case study on the local perspective on co-management of natural resources in the commune rurale Ambohimahamasina, Madagascar, Masters Thesis, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.
- Hanson P 2009, Engaging Green Governmentality Through Ritual: The Case of Madagascar's Ranomafana National Park, *Etudes de l'Océan Indien*, Vol 42-43: 85-114
- Hanson P, 2000, Women in Action, Councils in Change: The Productivity of Womens Speech Style in Madagascar's Ranomafana National Park, *Taloha* Vol 13 Special Issue: Rethinking 'La Femme Malgache'.
- Hanson, P, 2007, Governmentality, Language Ideology and the Production of Needs in Malagasy Conservation and Development, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 22, Issue 2, pp. 244–284.
- Hardenbergh SHB (n.d.) Historic and recent natural resource use, deforestation and human health in Madagascar, and assumptions in conservation-development. Widely circulated manuscript submitted to *Human Ecology*.
- Hardenbergh SHB (1997) Why are boys so small?: child growth, diet and gender near Ranomafana, Madagascar. *Social Science & Medicine* 44 (11): 1725-1738.
- Hardenbergh SHB (1996) Behavioral quality and caloric intake in Malagasy children relative to international growth references. *The American Journal of Human Biology* 8(2):207-223.
- Hardenbergh SHB (n.d.) Incorporating people, health and natural resource use issues into conservation management for Madagascar: Praxis in medical and biocultural anthropology. Widely circulated manuscript originally prepared for H. Baer and M. Singer (eds.): *A Dialogue Between Critical Medical Anthropology and Bioculturalism: Toward a Political Ecology of Health*.
- Hardenbergh SHB (1993) *Undernutrition, Illness and Children's Work in an Agricultural Rain Forest Community of Madagascar*. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Hardenbergh SHB (1992) Realizing conservation-development in Madagascar. *The Valley Optimist* 1(8):8-9,38.
- Kightlinger LK, Paine SHBH¹, Boohdoo Kightlinger M (n.d.) Man and the Malagasy Rain Forest: An Integrated Conservation Project, Human Health Survey. Completed RNPP manuscript, October 1990.
- Harper J, 2002, *Endangered Species : Health, illness and Death Among Madagascar's People of the Forest*, Carolina Academic Press.
- Harper J, 2008, The Environment of Environmentalism: Turning the Ethnographic Lense on a Conservation project, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Henkels DM, 1999, Une vue de pres du droit de l'environnement Malgache, *African Studies Quarterly*.
- Hockley NJ & Andriamarivololona MM, 2007, The economics of community forest management in Madagascar : is there a free lunch ? An analysis of Transfert de Gestion, Report to USAID Madagascar (5th June).
- Hockley NJ, 2008, Cost-benefit analysis for global environmental issues with a case study of biodiversity conservation in Madagascar, DPhil Dissertation, Bangor University.
- Horning NR, 2000, Explaining Compliance with Rules Governing Common-Pool Forest resource Use and Conservation: Dynamics in Bara Country, Southwestern Madagascar, Paper Presented at the Meeting of the International Association for the Study of Common Property, Bloomington Indiana May 31-June 4.
- Horning NR, 2003, The cost of ignoring rules: How Madagascar's biodiversity and rural livelihoods have suffered from institutional shortcomings, Paper Presented at the International Conference on Rural Livelihoods, Forests and Biodiversity 19-23 May, Bonn, Germany.
- Horning NR, 2004, The Limits of Rules: When Rules Promote Forest Conservation and When they do not – Insights from Bara Country, Madagascar, PhD Thesis, Cornell University.
- Horning NR, 2005, The Cost of Ignoring Rules: Forest Conservation and Rural Livelihood Outcomes in Madagascar, *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods* Vol 15:149-166.
- Horning NR, 2006, Strong Support for Weak Performance: State and Donors' Mutual Dependence in Madagascar, Paper Presented at the 11th Biannual meeting of the International Association for the Study of Common Property, Bali, Indonesia June 19-23.

- Horning NR, 2008, Madagascar's biodiversity conservation challenge: from local to national level dynamics, *Environmental Sciences* 1-20 DOI: 10.1080/15693430801912246
- Horning NR, 2008, Strong Support for Weak Performance: State and Donors' Mutual Dependence in Madagascar, *African Affairs*, 107(428): 405-31.
- Hufty M & Bukobero S, 2008, Les déterminants institutionnels de l'accès aux ressources naturelles : De la gouvernance environnementale globale aux transferts de gestion à Madagascar, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) *Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits*, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Hufty M & Muttenter F, 2002, Devoted friends: The Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Madagascar, Chapter 13 (279-309) in Lepesttr Ph (ed) *Governing Global Biodiversity*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hufty M, 2005, Interdisciplinarity in practice: a research project in Madagascar, *Desenvolvimento e Meio Ambiente* n11-12:23-40.
- Hufty M, 2007, Between Analysis and Advocacy: Action-Research and Transdisciplinarity in Protected Areas, Paper Presented at the 48th Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago 28th February. [Abstract Only].
- Hufty M, Razakamanantsoa A & Chollet M, 1995, Neocolonialisme vert a Madagascar? In Sabelli (ed) *Ecologie contre nature: développement et politiques d'ingérance*, Enjeux, Paris.
- Hume DW, 2006, Swidden Agriculture and Conservation in Eastern Madagascar: Stakeholder Perspectives and Cultural Belief Systems, *Conservation and Society*, Volume 4, No. 2, Pages 287–303.
- Hume DW, 2006, Tanim-bary Rituals among the Betsimisaraka in Andasibe Taloha, Numéro 16-17, 2 novembre, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=324>.
- Ingram JC, nd, Questioning simplistic representations of environmental change in southeastern Madagascar: an assessment of forest change, condition and diversity of littoral forests, unknown publication.
- Jacoby, H. and Minten, B., 2005. Is Land titling in Sub-Saharan Africa Cost-Effective? Evidence from Madagascar, The World Bank and Cornell University, Cornell.
- Jaros L, 1993, Defining and Explaining Tropical Deforestation: Shifting Cultivation and Population Growth in Colonial Madagascar (1896 – 1940), *Economic Geography*, Vol 69 No4:366-379.
- Jones, J.P.G., Andriamarivololona, M.M. and Hockley, N., 2008. The Importance of Taboos and Social Norms to Conservation in Madagascar. *Conservation Biology*, 22(4): 976-986.
- Kaaristo M, 2008, The reluctant anthropologist: An interview with Maurice Bloch <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2008-02-28-bloch-en.html>
- Karpe P & Randrianarison M, 2009, La Regulation Des Ressources naturelles a Madagascar: Théorie et Pratique de Régime de la Sanction dans la loi GELOSE, *Revue Juridique de l'Environnement*, Vol3 : 301-316.
- Kaufmann JC & Tsirahamba S, 2006, Forests and Thorns: Conditions of Change Affecting Mahafale Pastoralists in Southwestern Madagascar, *Conservation and Society*, Volume 4, No 2:231-261.
- Kaufmann JC 2008 *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Kaufmann JC, 2001, Introduction: Recolouring the Red Island, *Ethnohistory* Vol 48 Nos 1-2:3-11.
- Kaufmann JC, 2006, The Sad Opaqueness of the Environmental Crisis in Madagascar, *Conservation and Society*, Vol 4 No 2:179-193.
- Kaufmann JC, 2008, Agency in a Mahafale Pastoralist Landscape, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Kaufmann JC, 2008, Lemurs and the People Without History, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Keller E, 2007, People in history, People outside history, Paper presented at the Madagascar Symposium Society Natural Resources and Development: Recent Contributions by the Research Community, 30-31 March 2007, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK
- Keller E, 2008, The banana plant and the moon: Conservation and the Malagasy ethos of life in Masoala, Madagascar, *American Ethnologist* Vol 35, No 4:650-664.
- Keller E, 2009, The danger of misunderstanding 'culture', *Madagascar Conservation and Development*, Volume 4 Issue 2:82-85.
- Keller E, 2009, Who are "They"? Local Understandings of NGO and State Power in Masoala, Madagascar, *Tsantsa* #14:76-85.
- Keller, 2009, Shadows over the Masoala National Park in Madagascar: Why the park jeopardizes local people's basis for life, 24th June, *die Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (NZZ).

- Klein J, 2002, Deforestation in the Madagascar Highlands – Established ‘truth’ and scientific uncertainty. *GeoJournal* Vol 56:191-199.
- Klein J, 2004, Fiddling while Madagascar burns. Deforestation discourses and highland history, *Norwegian Journal of Geography*, Vol 58: 11-22.
- Klein J, Reau B & Edwards M, 2008, Zebu Landscapes: Conservation and Cattle in Madagascar, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Klein J, Reau B, Kalland I & Edwards M, 2007, Conservation, Development, and a Heterogeneous Community: The Case of Ambohitantely Special Reserve, Madagascar, *Society and Natural Resources*, Vol 20:451-467.
- Korhonen K, 2006, *The Rocky Road of Social Sustainability: The Impact of Integrated Biodiversity Conservation and Development on the Local Realities in Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Helsinki, Finland.
- Korhonen K, 2008, Exploring the Malagasy Environment as a Battlefield of Multiple Interests, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Korhonen, K. (2005). Local People and Benefits in Integrated Biodiversity Conservation – A Case Study from Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. In: Ros-Tonen, M. and Dietz, T. (eds.) *African Forests Between Nature and Livelihood Resources. Interdisciplinary Studies in Conservation and Forest Management*. African Studies Vol 81. Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press. Pp. 129-157.
- Korhonen, K. (Forthcoming 2007b) A Life Asset Analysis – Conservation and Life Security of Local People in Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. In: Raumolin, J. (ed.) *Natural Resources and Development-Perspectives from Asia and Africa*. Helsinki: Interkont Books.
- Korhonen, K. and Lappalainen, A. (2004). Examining Children’s Awareness on Environment and Environmental Problems in Ranomafana Region, *Madagascar Environmental Education Research* 10 (2):195- 216.
- Korhonen, K., Rahkonen, O. and Hemminki, E. (2004) Implications of Integrated Conservation and Development on Human Reproductive Health-A Case Study from Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. *Development Southern Africa* 21 (4): 603-621.
- Kottak CP, Gezon L & Green G, 1994, *Deforestation and Biodiversity Preservation in Madagascar: The View from Above and Below* [Ankarana & Amber Mountain Paper – unknown publication].
- Kramer, nd, *The Benefits and Costs of Establishing a National Park in Madagascar (Mantadia)*, unidentified publication.
- Kull CA 1999, *Observation on Repressive Environmental Policies and Landscape Burning Strategies in Madagascar*, *African Studies Quarterly*.
- Kull CA 2002 *Madagascar’s Burning Issue: The Persistent Conflict over Fire*, *Environment* [volume and page numbers to be confirmed].
- Kull CA, 2000, Deforestation, Erosion and Fire: Degradation Myths in the Environmental History of Madagascar, *Environment and History* Vol 6:423-450.
- Kull CA, 2002, Empowering Pyromaniacs in Madagascar: Ideology and Legitimacy in Community-Based Natural Resource Management, *Development and Change* Vol 33:57-78.
- Kull CA, 2002, Madagascar aflame: landscape burning as peasant protest, resistance or a resource management tool? *Political Geography* Vol 21:927-953.
- Kull CA, 2004, *Isle of Fire: the Political Ecology of Landscape Burning in Madagascar*, University of Chicago Press.
- Kull CA, 2005, Historical landscape repeat photography as a tool for land use change research, *Norwegian Journal of Geography*, Vol 59:253-268.
- Kull CA, 2008, Saving Land with a Spade: Human Landscape Transformations in the Madagascar Highlands, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Kull CA, Ibrahim CK & Meredith T, 2006, Can privatization conserve the global biodiversity commons? Tropical reforestation through globalization, Paper presented at the 2006 IASCP meeting Bali Indonesia.
- Langlois M, nd, *Space Control and Natural Resources Management in Rural Areas (Southwest of Madagascar)*, Paper Presented to unknown meeting of the IASCP.
- Lappalainen A, 2002, *Combining Conservation and Development: Views and opinions of the resident population of villages nearby to Ranomafana national Park, Madagascar*, Masters Thesis, University of Helsinki.
- Larson BA, 1994, Changing the Economics of Environmental Degradation in Madagascar: Lessons from the National Environmental Action Plan process, *World Development*, Vol 22 No 5:671-689.
- Lillette V, 2006, Mixed Results: Conservation of the Marine Turtle and the Red-Tailed Tropicbird by Vezo Semi-Nomadic Fishers, *Conservation and Society*, Volume 4 No 2: 262-286.
- Marcus RR & Kull C, 1999, *Setting the Stage: The Politics of Madagascar’s Environmental Efforts*, *Africa Studies Quarterly*.

- Marcus RR, 1999, Governing Conservation from Below, *African Studies Quarterly*.
- Marcus RR, 2000, *Cultivating Democracy on Fragile Grounds: Environmental Institutions and Non-elite Perceptions of Democracy in Madagascar and Uganda*, PhD Dissertation University of Florida, USA.
- Marcus RR, 2001, Seeing the Forest for the Trees: Integrated Conservation and Development Projects and Local Perceptions of Conservation in Madagascar, *Human Ecology* Vol 29, No 4: 381-397.
- Marcus RR, 2007, Where Community-Based Water Resource Management has Gone Too Far: Poverty and Disempowerment in Southern Madagascar, *Conservation and Society*, Vol 5, No 2:202-231.
- Marcus RR, 2008, Tokana: The Collapse of the Rural Malagasy Community, *African Studies review*, Vol 51, No: 1: 85-104.
- Marie, C., Sibelet, N., Dulcire, M., Rafalimaro, M., Danthu, P. and Carrière, S. 2009. 'Taking into account local practices and indigenous knowledge in an emergency conservation context in Madagascar'. *Biodiversity and Conservation*.
- Marshall K, 2010, Environmentalists as missionaries: FAITH IN ACTION, *Washington Post* January 26th.
- Martin, E., Ratsimisetra, L., Laloë, F. and Carrière, S. 2009. 'Conservation value for birds of traditionally managed isolated trees in an agricultural landscape of Madagascar'. *Biodiversity and Conservation*.
- McConnell WJ & Sweeney SP, 2005, Challenges of forest governance in Madagascar, *Geographical Journal*, Vol 171 No 2:223-238.
- McConnell WJ, 2002, Madagascar: Emerald Isle or Paradise Lost? *Environment*.
- McConnell WJ, Sweeney SP, Mulley B, 2004, Physical and social access to land: spatio-temporal patterns of agricultural expansion in Madagascar, *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, Vol 101:171-184.
- McConnell, W.J., 2002. Misconstrued land use in Vohibazaha: participatory planning in the periphery of Madagascar's Mantadia National Park. *Land Use Policy*, 19(3): 217-230.
- Medley KE, 2004, Measuring performance under a landscape approach to biodiversity conservation: the case of USAID/Madagascar, *Progress in Development Studies*, Vol 4 No 4:319-341.
- Méral P., Requier-Desjardins D. (2006), « La gestion durable de l'environnement à Madagascar : enjeux, opportunités et contraintes », *Revue Economie Rurale*, n°294 – 295, juillet-octobre, pp. 1-5.
- Méral, P., Vahinala Raharimirina 2006. 'En attendant les zébus... Ou les enjeux de la gestion durable de la forêt des Mikea'. *Etudes Rurales* n°178: 161-180.
- Mercier J-R, 2006, The Preparation of the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP): Was it a False Start?, *Madagascar Conservation and Development* 1(1): 50-54.
- Montagne, P-, Ramamonjisoa, B. 2006 Politiques forestières à Madagascar entre répression et autonomie des acteurs, *Économie rurale* 294-295.
- Moreau S, 2008, Environmental Misunderstandings, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Muttenzer F & Hufty M 2002a..Devoted friends: The implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Madagascar. In: Ph. Leprestre (ed.), *Governing Global Biodiversity. The evolution and implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity*, Aldershot, Ashgate, pp. 279-309.
- Muttenzer F & Hufty M 2006. Normes, transactions et régimes dans la gestion environnementale: contribution à une méthodologie interdisciplinaire et réaliste. In: Charlier, J.-E. and Moens, F. (dir.), *Observer, décrire, interpréter : un état des méthodes en sciences sociales*. Lyon, INRP, 2006, pp. 35-48.
- Muttenzer F 2000. La mise en œuvre de l'aménagement forestier négocié : stratégies foncières, régime de la biodiversité et gouvernance locale à Madagascar. *Mémoire préliminaire de thèse*, Genève, IUED, août 2000, 108 p.
- Muttenzer F 2001. La mise en oeuvre de l'aménagement forestier négocié. *Bulletin de liaison du LAJP* 26: 91-129.
- Muttenzer F 2002b. La mise en oeuvre de l'aménagement forestier négocié, ou l'introuvable gouvernance de la biodiversité à Madagascar. In: E. Le Roy (dir.), *Retour au Foncier, Cahiers d'Anthropologie du Droit* 2002, Paris Karthala, pp. 135-188.
- Muttenzer F 2006a. Fiscalité, corruption et culture de l'Etat forestier à Madagascar. In: G. Froger (dir), *La mondialisation contre le développement durable ?* Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, PIE Peter Lang, Coll. Ecopolis, pp. 235-256.
- Muttenzer F 2006b. The folk conceptualisation of property and forest-related going concerns in Madagascar. In: Benda-Beckmann, K., Benda-Beckmann, F. and M. Wiber (eds), *Changing Properties of Property*. New York, Berghahn Publishers, pp. 269-292.
- Muttenzer F 2006c. Le 'droit en action' dans la politique malgache relative aux paysages forestiers: une ineffectivité légitime de l'action publique? In: E. Le Roy (dir.), *Le droit en action. Cahiers d'Anthropologie du Droit* 2006. Paris, Karthala, pp. 49-74.

- Muttenter F 2006d. Déforestation et droit coutumier à Madagascar: l'historicité d'une politique foncière. PhD Dissertation in Development Studies, November 2006, Université de Genève, IHEID, 564 p. Available online: <http://doc.rero.ch/lm.php?url=1000.40.3.20070829085555-RM/these-MuttenterF.pdf>
- Muttenter F 2007. L'exception malgache: communautarisme politique et gouvernance en Afrique postcoloniale. In: Hufty, M., Dormeier Freire, A., Plagnat, P. and V. Neumann (dir.), *Jeux de gouvernance : regards et réflexions sur un concept*. Paris/Genève, Karthala/IUED, Collection DéveloppementS, pp. 213-229.
- Muttenter F 2008. 'Integrated fortress conservation' in the buffer zone of Ankarafantsika National Park: Malagasy narratives of conservation, participation and livelihoods. In: Galvin M, Haller T, editors. *People, Protected Areas and Global Change: Participatory Conservation in Latin America, Africa, Asia and Europe*. Perspectives of the Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) North-South, University of Bern, Vol. 3. Bern: Geographica Bernensia, pp. 253-286. Available online: <http://www.north-south.unibe.ch/content.php/publication/id/2157>
- Muttenter F 2010. in press. Déforestation et droit coutumier à Madagascar. Les perceptions des acteurs de la gestion communautaire des forêts. Paris: Karthala.
- Muttenter F, 2010, Politiques foncières et pluralisme juridique à Madagascar, TALOHA, numéro 19, 20 janvier, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=755>.
- Neimark, B. (in preparation) "Global goods: A study of Third World nature and its importance in the bioprospecting industry?" Proposed submission November 2009, *Geoforum*.
- Neimark, B. (under review) "At the 'Pharm.' Gate: The Mann-Dickinson thesis and the 'natural' barriers of bioprospecting production in Madagascar," *Journal of Peasant Studies*.
- Neimark, B. (under review) "Finessing access to natural commodities: A case study of *Prunus africana* in Madagascar," *Development and Change*.
- Neimark, B. (under review) "Industrializing nature, knowledge, and labour: A case study of bioprospecting in Madagascar," *The Professional Geographer*.
- Neimark, B., and R. Schroeder 2009 "Hotspot discourse in Africa: Making space for bioprospecting in Madagascar," *African Geographical Review* Vol 28.
- Olson, S., 1984, The robe of the ancestors Forests in the History of Madagascar. *Journal of Forest History*.
- Ormsby & Mannle (2006). Ecotourism Benefits and the Role of Local Guides at Masoala National Park, Madagascar. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 14, 271-287.
- Ormsby A, 2008, Perceptions on the Park Periphery: Resident, Staff and Natural Resource Relations at Masoala National Park, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Ormsby A, Kaplin BA, 2005, A framework for understanding community resident perceptions of Masoala National Park, Madagascar, *Environmental Conservation* 32 (2): 156-164
- Pascal, B. 2007. "Ecopolitiquement" correct, localement contestable? Construction des enjeux de conservation de la biodiversité marine à Madagascar' *Environnement et Politique-s*. Toulouse.
- Perchard G, 2002, Biodiversity Management: An Example of Interaction Between External Demand for provision of a Global Public Good and Institutionalisation of Local Rules. [date and publication type to be verified].
- Peters DH, 1995, Human Dimensions of Natural Resources Management: A Case Study of the Ranomafana National park, Madagascar, PhD Thesis, North Carolina State University Raleigh.
- Peters J, 1998, Transforming the Integrated Conservation and Development Project (ICDP) Approach: Observations from the Ranomafana National Park project, *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 11: 17-47.
- Peters J, 1999, Understanding conflicts between people and parks at Ranomafana, Madagascar, *Agriculture and Human Values* 16: 65-74.
- Petit M, c2007, L'Homme la Foret a Madagascar : Quatre siecles d'evolution du paysage forestier, *Travaux & Documents* No 28, Institut de Civilisations-Musee d'Art et d'Archeologie, Antananarivo.
- Pollini J, 2007, Slash and Burn Cultivation and Deforestation in the Malagasy Rain Forests: Representations and Realities, PhD Thesis, Cornell University, USA. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/26790856/Deforestation-in-Madagascar>
- Pollini J, 2009 Carbon Sequestration for Linking Conservation and Rural Development in Madagascar: The Case of the Vohidrazana-Mantadia Corridor Restoration and Conservation Carbon Project, *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 28:322-342.
- Pollini J, 2010 (in press), Trapping farmer communities within global environmental regimes: the case of the GELOSE legislation in Madagascar, *Society and Natural Resources*.
- Pollini, J. 2010. Environmental degradation narratives in Madagascar: from colonial hegemonies to humanist revisionism. In press, *Geoforum*.

- Pollini J, in press (2011), The difficult reconciliation of conservation and development objectives: the case of the Malagasy Environmental Action Plan, Human Organisation
- Rabetaliana H & Schachenmann P, 1999, Coordinating Traditional Values, Scientific Research and Practical Management to Enhance Conservation and Development Objectives in the Andringitra Mountains, Madagascar: Lessons Learned, Africa Studies Quarterly.
- Radidisoa N, 2008, L'importance de l'accompagnement dans le cadre des transferts de gestion des ressources naturelles - Le cas des 7 Lacs, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Raharinirina V. & Andriananja H. (2004), « Institutions, acteurs et modalités de coordination : quels enjeux pour la durabilité et la gouvernance des ressources naturelles à Madagascar ? », Revue Monde en Développement : « Relations Nord-Sud et Environnement », Tome 32, 2004/3, n°127, pp.73–87.
- Raharinirina V. & Meral P. (2006), « En attendant les zébus...ou les enjeux de la gestion durable de la forêt des Mikea », in Goedefroit S. et Réveret J-P, (Eds), Quel développement à Madagascar ? Revue Etudes Rurales, Juillet - Décembre 2006, n°178, pp. 161-180, Edition EHESS.
- Raharinirina V. (2005), « Les débats autour de la valorisation économique de la biodiversité par les accords de bioprospection en Afrique : cas de Madagascar », in Réveret J.P. et Weber J., (Eds), Economie de l'environnement et des ressources naturelles, Revue Liaison Energie-Francophonie (LEF), 2005, n°66-67, pp.82-92.
- Raharinirina V. (2007), « La valorisation économique des plantes aromatiques en huiles essentielles: Pratique viable ou mythe pour les communautés locales à Madagascar ? », in Chaboud C., Méral P. et Froger G. (Eds), Madagascar face aux enjeux du développement durable. Des politiques environnementales à l'action collective locale, Edition KARTHALA, pp. 277–302.
- Raharinirina V., (2009), La valorisation économique de la biodiversité par les contrats de bioprospection et la filière huiles essentielles. Le cas de Madagascar, Thèse de doctorat en Sciences économiques, Université de Versailles St Quentin-en-Yvelines, 424 p.
- Raharinirina V., Meral P., Andriamahefazafy F., Andrianambinina D. (2006), « La valorisation économique des forêts : entre filière et territoire », Revue Economie Rurale, Juillet-Octobre 2006, n°294–295, pp.74–89.
- Rahelimalala M & Velonantenaina JW, 1991, Homme ou Nature, Matoy No 59-10 (People friendly critique of Mananara-Nord).
- Raik DB 2008 Governance in Community-Based Forest Management: The Case of Madagascar, PhD Dissertation, Cornell University.
- Rakoto Ramiarantsoa H, 2000, Connaissance du Milieu (Understanding the Living Space of Rural Peoples), Report to Intercooperation : Programme Foresterie et Developpement Paysans.
- Rakotoniaina LJ, Andrianandrasana H, Rasolonjatovo BJ, Ratsimbazafy JH & Lewis R, 2008, Gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : De la nouvelle aire protégée lac Alaotra, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Rakotoniaina N, 2008, La gestion communautaire des forêts sclerophylles de moyenne altitude à uapaca bojeri d'Arivonimamo, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Rakotoson, L.R. and Tanner, K., 2006. Community-based governance of coastal zone and marine resources in Madagascar. Ocean & Coastal Management, 49(11): 855-872.
- Ralalarimanga HCS, 2010, De l'oralité à l'écrit : droit et gestion durable des ressources naturelles renouvelables de la forêt de Merikanjaka, TALOHA, numéro 19, 20 janvier, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=789>.
- RAMAHATRA O. (2001), Gouvernance et participation pour la conservation de la biodiversité, Rapport réalisé pour l'USAID Madagascar, 36 p.
- Ramamonjisoa BS, 2004, Origines et impacts des politiques de gestion des ressources naturelles a Madagascar, Swiss Journal of Forestry, Vol 155 No 11 :2-10.
- Ramamonjisoa BS, 2008 Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Document de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Rambeloarisoa G & Razafy FL, 2008, Transfert de gestion des ressources naturelles auprès des Communautés de Bases, les leçons apprises (cas des TGRN de WWF : 1997-2007), in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Ramiarantsoa Herve Rakoto, 2009, "Géopolitique et environnement à Madagascar" Colloque du Centre IRD d'Orléans, du 03 Décembre 2009 à 04 Décembre.
- Randriamampianina M, 2009, " Il faut soutenir la cause paysanne " Entretien avec Mijasoa Andriamarovololona, les Nouvelles 17th December.
- Randrianarisoa A, Raharinaivosoa E & Kollf HE, 2008, Des Effets de la Gestion Forestiere par les Communautes Locales de Base a Madagascar: cas d'Arivonimamo et de Merikanjaka sur les hautes terres de Madagascar, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.

- Randrianarison M & Karpe P, 2010, Le contrat comme outil de gestion des ressources forestières, Taloha, numéro 19, 20 janvier, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=887>.
- Randrianarison M, Karpe P, Efficacité et équité des contrats de conservation à Madagascar. Cas de Didy. Mondes en développement. 2010, sous presse
- Randrianarison M, Karpe P, Guignier A, La protection de l'environnement à Madagascar. Enjeux de la gestion contractuelle de l'environnement. In Joseph P (Eds), « Écosystèmes forestiers des Caraïbes », Karthala, Paris, 2009. pp. 631-644.
- Randrianarison M, Karpe P, Montagne P., Bertrand A. La réalisation du développement durable à Madagascar: le contrat de transfert de gestion n'est pas une fin en soi. Revue internationale de droit et politique du développement durable de McGill (RDPDD), 2010. sous presse
- Randrianarison M, Karpe P & Montagne P, 2008, Le contrat de transfert de gestion n'est pas une fin en soi : le cas des transferts de gestion de la forêt d'Ambohilero, région Alaotra Mangoro, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Ranindriana R & Karpe P, 2004, Analyse et delimitation de la nature et de la protection des droits économiques sur les ressources de la diversité biologique malgache: le cadre juridique de la valorisation, Paper presented at the XXth Day ATM-CREDES, Nancy 25-27 May.
- Rasolofoharinoro, 1994, Politiques économiques a Madagascar et leurs Impacts sur le Developpement et l'Environnement dans le Sud, ONE (Juillet) Report no : CR 2125MAG.
- Rasolonandrasana B, Ranalisofo N, Fenn M & Rakotomalala J, 2008, Le transfert de gestion, un outil pour développer le système de co-gestion des aires protégées : cas du parc national de Tsimanampesotse, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Ratsimbazafy J & Kaufmann JC, 2008, An Experiment in Lessening Cultural Distance, in Kaufmann JC (ed) Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Ratsimbazafy J, Rakotoniaina LJ, Durbin J, 2008, Cultural Anthropologists and Conservationists: Can We Learn from Each Other to Conserve the Diversity of Malagasy Species and Culture? in Kaufmann JC (ed) Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Razafindrabe M. 1997 Les aspects humains de la gestion des ressources naturelles à Madagascar. Antananarivo, CERG.2R,14p.
- Razafindrakoto E, 2008, Vers une pérennisation de la gestion communautaire de la forêt de Tapia d'Arivonimamo, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Razafintsalama V, 2008, Le transfert de gestion des ressources naturelles aux communautés villageoises : cas du village de Manometinay-Morondava, région du Menabe, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Razakamarina N, Ford R, Sodikoff GM, Wood S, Toto E & Laris P, 1996, Negotiating Conservation: Reflections on Linking Conservation and Development in Madagascar (Andasibe-Mantadia), Clark University USA & APAM Madagascar.
- Razanaka S, Grouzis M, Milleville P, Moizo B & Aubry C, 2001, Societes paysannes, transitions agraires et dynamiques ecologiques dans le sud-ouest de Madagascar, Actes de l'Atelier CNRE-IRD, Antananarivo 8-10 Novembre 1999, IRD-CNRE Antananarivo.
- Reau B, 2002, Burning for zebu : the complexity of deforestation issues in western Madagascar, Norwegian Journal of Geography, Vol 56:219-229.
- RESOLVE-PCP-IRD, 2004, Evaluation et perspectives des Transfertys de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles dans le cadre du programme Environnemental 3 : Analyse Qualitative (Octobre ; 100pp).
- RESOLVE-PCP-IRD, 2004, Evaluation et perspectives des Transfertys de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles dans le cadre du programme Environnemental 3 : Analyse Qualitative Annexes (Octobre ; 139pp).
- RESOLVE-PCP-IRD, 2005, Evaluation et perspectives des Transferts de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles dans le cadre du programme Environnemental 3 : Rapport Final de Synthese (31 Janvier ; 81pp).
- Rioux Paquette S, Ferguson HB, Lapointe F-J & Louis EE, 2009, Conservation Genetics of the Radiated Tortoise (*Astrochelys radiata*) Population from Andohahela National Park, Southeast Madagascar, with a Discussion on the Conservation of This Declining Species, Chelonian Conservation and Biology, 8(1): 84-93
- RODARY E., CASTELLANET C., ROSSI G. (Eds) (2003), Conservation de la nature et développement : L'intégration impossible, Gret et Karthala, 305 p.
- Sandroy F, 2008, Population rurale et enjeux fonciers a Madagascar, CITE-Karthala.
- Sandy C, 2006, Real and Imagined landscapes: land Use and Conservation in the Menabe, Conservation and Society, Vol 4, No 2: 304-324.

- Sarrasin B. (2002), Elaboration et mise en œuvre du plan d'action environnementale à Madagascar (1987-2001) : construction et problèmes d'une politique publique, Thèse pour le doctorat en Science Politique, Université Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne.
- Scales IR, 2008, Forest Frontiers: The Political Ecology of Landscape Change in Western Madagascar, PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Seagle CW, 2010, Deforestation and impoverishment in rural Madagascar: Links between state governance, land degradation, and food insecurity over time, TALOHA, numéro 19, 20 janvier, <http://www.taloha.info/document.php?id=859>.
- Serpantie G, Rasolofoharino & Carriere S, 2007, Transitions agraires, dynamiques ecologiques et conservation: Le "corridor" Ranomafana-Andringitra, Madagascar, Actes du Seminaire GEREM, Antananarivo 9-10 novembre 2006.
- Serpantie G, Toillier A, Ratojanahary M, Ratsimisetra L & Carriere S, 2008, Mieux négocier les règles techniques de la gestion contractuelle des forêts. Cas d'une filière bois artisanale dans le corridor Ranomafana-Andringitra, in Ramamonjisoa BS, (Editeur) Les parties prenantes de la gestion communautaire des ressources naturelles : coopération, contradictions, conflits, Actes de Colloque, Ecole Supérieure des Sciences Agronomiques, Université d'Antananarivo, 1 - 3 juillet.
- Shyamsundar P & Kramer R, 1997, Biodiversity Conservation – At What Cost? A Study of Households in the Vicinity of Madagascar's Mantadia National Park, *Ambio* Vol 26, No 3:180-184.
- Simsik MJ, 2008, The Roles of Power and Conventional Wisdom in Biodiversity Loss on the Malagasy Highlands, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Simsik, MJ, 2003, Priorities in Conflict: Livelihood Practices, Environmental Threats, and the Conservation of Biodiversity in Madagascar, Doctor of Education Thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Simsik, M J. 2002 The Political Ecology of Biodiversity Conservation on the Malagasy Highlands. *GeoJournal* 58:233–242.
- Sodikoff GM, 2004, Land and languor: ethical imaginations of work and forest in northeast Madagascar, *History and Anthropology*, 15:4, 367 – 398.
- Sodikoff GM, 2005, Reserve Labor: A Moral Ecology of Conservation in Madagascar, PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.
- Sodikoff GM, 2007, An Exceptional Strike: A Micro-history of 'People versus Park' in Madagascar, *Journal of Political Ecology* Vol 14:10-34.
- Sodikoff GM, 2008, Forest Conservation and Low-Wage Labour, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Sommerville, M., et al., 2009, The role of fairness and benefit distribution in community-based Payment for Environmental Services interventions: A case study from Menabe, Madagascar, *Ecological Economics*, doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2009.11.005
- Tengo M, Johansson K, Rakotondraso F, Lundberg J, Andriamaherilala J-A, Rakotoarisoa J-A & Elmqvist T, 2007, Taboos and Forest Governance: Informal Protection of Hot Spot Dry Forest in Southern Madagascar, *Ambio*, Vol 36 No 8:683-691.
- Toillier A & Lardon S, 2009, Farmers' adaptation capacities in the eastern rainforest of Madagascar From forest-clearers to environmental managers, *Outlook on Agriculture*, Vol 38, No 2.
- Toillier A, 2009, Capacités d'Adaptation des Agriculteurs a la Conservation des Forêts dans le Corridor Ranomafana-Andringitra (Madagascar) Perspectives Pour un Amenagement Integre des Territoires, These de Doctorat, Paris Agro Tech.
- Toillier A, Lardon S & Hervé D, 2008, An environmental governance support tool: community-based forest management contracts (Madagascar) *IJSD* Volume 11 (2 & 3).
- Toillier A, Serpantié G, Hervé D & Lardon S, 2009, Livelihood Strategies and Land Use Changes in Response to Conservation: Pitfalls of Community-Based Forest Management in Madagascar, *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*
- Tsirahamba S & Kaufmann JC, 2008, Absence of Shade: deforestation in Mahafale Forest-Pastures, in Kaufmann JC (ed) *Greening the Great Red Island: Madagascar in Nature and Culture*, Africa Institute of South Africa.
- Tucker B, 2007, Applying Behavioural Ecology and Behavioural Economics to Conservation and Development Planning: An Example from the Mikea Forest, Madagascar, *Human Nature* Vol.18: 190–208. DOI 10.1007/s12110-007-9017-x.
- Walker WM, 2001, Defending the Environment, Conserving Social Life : Global Visions and Local Values in Southern Madagascar, PhD Dissertation, John Hopkins University.
- Walsh A 2005. The Obvious Aspects of Ecological Underprivilege in Ankarana, Northern Madagascar. *American Anthropologist*, 107(4): 654-65.
- Wood D, 1995, Conserved to death Are tropical forests being overprotected from people? *Land Use Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 115-135, 1995
- Yount JW, 2004, Reconciling Conservation and Development in the Mikea Forest of Southwestern Madagascar: Background for the Next Phase in Madagascar's Conservation Experiment, PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Participant/Presenter/Co-author Details

Alison Jolly	University of Sussex, UK	ajolly@sussex.ac.uk
Allesandro de Matteis	UEA Norwich	alex_dematteis@yahoo.com
Amber Huff	University of Georgia, Athens, USA	amber.rosalyn@gmail.com
Andrew Walsh†‡	University of Western Ontario, Canada	awalsh33@uwo.ca
Antonie Kraemer	School of Oriental and African Studies	a.kraemer@soas.ac.uk
Au Yong Hoi Wen	UEA Norwich	h.au-yong@uea.ac.uk
Augustine Rapa	PNG/UEA Norwich	A.Rapa@uea.ac.uk
Aziza Rqibate	University of Hamburg	aziza_rqibate@hotmail.com
Barry Ferguson	University of East Anglia, UK	ferguson.barry@gmail.com
Ben Neimark†‡	Temple University, USA	bneimark@temple.edu
Benjamin Freed †‡	Eastern Kentucky University	benjamin.freed@eku.edu
Bruno Ramamonjisoa	Universite d'Antananarivo, Madagascar	bruno.ramamonjisoa@gmail.com
Caroline Seagle	Free University of Amsterdam,	orchidcaroline@yahoo.com
Catherine Corson	University of Sussex, UK	catherine.corson@gmail.com
Catherine Craig	CPALI (USA)	ccraig221@gmail.com
Christel Mattheeuws	University of Aberdeen, UK	christel.mattheeuws@gmail.com
Daniel Serre	Jangal Productions, France	contact@jangal.fr
Luke Freeman	University College London, UK	luke.freeman@ucl.ac.uk
Emma Gilberthorpe	UEA Norwich	e.gilberthorpe@uea.ac.uk
Erik Patel†‡	Cornell University	patel.erik@gmail.com
Eva Keller	University of Zurich, Switzerland	E.S.Keller@bluewin.ch
Fabiola Mancinelli	University of Barcelona, Spain	fabiolamancinelli@yahoo.it
Frank Muttenger	University of Luzern, Switzerland	fmuttenger@gmail.com
Gabriel Lefèvre	INALCO, Paris, France	gabriel.lefevre@gmail.com
Ian Colquhoun †‡	University of Western Ontario, Canada	colquhou@uwo.ca
Jacques Pollini	Hendrix College, USA	pollini@hendrix.edu
Jamie Spencer	Feedback Madagascar	mrjamesspencer@yahoo.com
Jennifer Talbot	University of Cambridge, UK	talbotmg@yahoo.com
Joana Borges Coutinho	University of Lisbon, Portugal	simplyjoana@googlemail.com
Laurent Berger†‡	Musee Quai Branly	laurent.berger@quaibranly.fr
Lisa Gezon†‡	University of Western Georgia,	lgezon@westga.edu
Mal Mitchell	Azafady, London, UK	mal@azafady.org
Mariona Roses	University of Barcelona, Spain	mionart@hotmail.com
Mijasoa Andriamarivololona	University of Copenhagen	mijasoa@yahoo.com
Nadine Fritz-Vietta	University of Greifswald, Germany	nadine.vietta@gmx.de
Naima Besta Abdallah	Tanzania/UEA Norwich	naima_best@yahoo.com
Patrick Waeber†	University of British Columbia, Canada	powaeber@gmail.com
Paul Hanson	Cuyahoga Community College, USA	pwhanson@hotmail.com
Paul Hopcraft	England	
Rafael Calderon-Contreras	Mexico/UEA Norwich	R.Calderon-Contreras@uea.ac.uk
Richard Jolly	Institute of Development Studies	R.Jolly@ids.ac.uk
Sara Pena	Goldsmiths College, UK	sarapena@hotmail.co.uk
Shirley Smith	University of Reading, UK	shirley.smith@reading.ac.uk
Sophie Borreil	Anthroscap	sborreill@free.fr
Sophie Bremner	England/UEA Norwich	sophie.bremner@uea.ac.uk
Suzi Malin†‡	University of British Columbia	suzimalan@gmail.com
Theresa Haine	Money for Madagascar, UK	info@moneyformadagascar.org
Thorkil Casse	University of Roskilde, Denmark	casse@ruc.dk
Totomarovario Alex †‡	Universite d'Antsiranana	marovalex.02@gmail.com
Vahinala Raharinirina	Université de St Quentin de Versailles	vahinala@gmail.com
Yvonne Orengo	Andrew Lees Trust, UK	yorengo@andrewleestrust.org
† denotes coauthors on multiple author papers ‡ denotes a presentation given <i>in absentia</i> or non participant author.		

Part Four

Follow-up Actions



Establishment of the Madagascar Environmental Justice Network (MEJN)

One of the ‘actions for researchers’ identified during the discussions at the meeting in Norwich was the need to build and strengthen networks of scholars, activists and professionals working on issues of social justice and the environment in Madagascar. Following the meeting the Madagascar Environmental Justice Network was established, as a network to provide a space for information sharing and discussion. The network is free to join, doesn’t provide any of the members details to the public, and is not engaged in activism or lobbying—indeed there is no spokesperson for the network, and nobody may speak on its behalf without unanimous backing from the full membership. The network is being administered by a small group of volunteer moderators.



The network uses a ning site which is found on : <http://madagascarenvironmentaljustice.ning.com> MEJN is not a list server (although periodic email updates are sent out to members to advise them of new postings and new discussions). Anybody who is interested in joining the network can subscribe by clicking on [this link](#) or an invitation can be requested by emailing mejn.moderator@gmail.com

In the three months since its establishment the network has attracted almost one hundred and forty subscribers/members, and almost fifty discussions have been started dealing with subjects as diverse as Foreign Land Grabs, Mining Activities (QMM and others), How to communicate REDD to forest communities, conservation organisation strategies of dealing with criticism, Rosewood Trafficking and the commoditisation of nature.

OTHER MECHANISMS FOR COMMUNICATION AND NETWORKING

For anybody keen to sign up to email list servers to get hold of information, news, reports and new publications on Madagascar there are 3 other email lists which exist where much information can be found, and where peripheral news can be obtained.

Pier Larson, Johns Hopkins University, manages the 'Hevitra-L' group for mainly academic information exchanges on social, political and historical issues about Madagascar, but quite often news is part of that.

Jacques Pollini, Hendrix College established and manages the Madagascar Conservation and Development GoogleGroup for information exchanges and discussions between diverse actors in Madagascar's conservation and development sectors (NGO's, Scholars, Private Individuals etc) click on <http://groups.google.co.uk/group/madagascar-conservation-and-development> to register.

Rhett Butler has established Mongabay (<http://www.mongabay.com/>) and Wild Madagascar (<http://www.wildmadagascar.org/>) which regularly distributes information about biodiversity and conservation issues on Madagascar.

The Journal Madagascar Conservation and Development also regularly publishes information on this theme and more: <http://www.mwc-info.net/en/services/journal.htm>

ORIGINAL CALL FOR PAPERS

Voices from Madagascar's Forests: Improving Representation and Rights for Malagasy Forest Peoples

An academic meeting hosted by the School of International Development, University of East Anglia, in Norwich, Saturday 5th & Sunday 6th June 2010



Many scholars conducting research in Madagascar have demonstrated that the livelihoods of Malagasy people have been negatively impacted by various natural resource conservation and extraction interventions which have burgeoned over the last two decades (forest and marine protected areas, mining projects). This may be manifested through the imposition of western concepts of protected areas and alternative livelihoods or the imposition of externally driven resource use restrictions. Almost no mechanism exists enabling the voices of communities living in or near protected or mined areas to be heard, and at the same time conservation organisations and mining companies provide little evidence based publicly available information about the social impacts of their activities.

There is therefore a need for the voices of Malagasy people to be more heard and taken into account in the design and implementation of natural resources policies, program and projects at all scales. The meeting to be held in Norwich in June 2010 is being organised to share the experiences of scholars and practitioners involved in or studying conservation and mining activities in Madagascar. We will discuss what can be done to better inform and influence the policy arena and the general public in order that voices, needs, aspirations and rights of rural Malagasy communities are better considered and properly addressed.

We are requesting abstracts for empirically grounded papers that examine the impact of forestry, conservation and mining activities on the livelihoods and traditions of Malagasy forest people, the remedies to these negative impacts, and/or the means by which the voices of impacted communities could be better listened to and considered, and their needs better addressed. The authors can be scholars, professionals, or stakeholders directly concerned by these issues. They will make short presentations (10 minutes) and the rest of the meeting being devoted to discussion sessions that will explore thematic and cross-cutting issues in more detail. While the event is primarily intended for participants who will give presentations, a few additional places may be made available for scholars engaged or starting work in this field. The discussions will be structured in such a way as to share expertise, identify an agenda for action by scholars and to advance plans for subsequent academic publications.

MEETING QUESTIONS/THEMES

Malagasy rural people and their interests are not properly represented in the current policies and practice of conservation and mining activities in Madagascar.

What does this lack of representation mean for livelihoods and way of life at the village and individual levels?

Why is the situation like this? What should be done to improve it?

What role should scholars play to improve this situation?

There is a disconnection between the knowledge and discourses produced by conservation and natural resource management experts and their donors and the findings of scholars who study the nature-society interface in Madagascar.

What evidence do we have of this mismatch between discourses?

Why does this disconnection exist and what should be done to make connections?

What should concerned scholars consider doing to improve this situation?

Scientific Committee: Barry Ferguson, University of East Anglia (Chair); Jacques Pollini, (Hendrix College, USA), Eva Keller, (University of Zurich, Switzerland), Nadine Fritz-Vietta (University of Greifswald, Germany).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROSPECTIVE PRESENTERS

Please submit paper proposals of up to 500 words outlining your ideas and experience related to one or more of the meeting questions described above. This should be accompanied by a short biography of up to 150 words, your contact telephone/email and institutional affiliation and a list of up to five of your most relevant publications and/or media coverage. Please send this to Barry Ferguson (ferguson.barry@gmail.com) by April 30 2010. Formal confirmations and more detailed information on the event will be issued by May 7 2010.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR NON PRESENTING PARTICIPANTS

Scholars wishing to participate but not intending to make a short presentation during the meeting should submit a short biography including a statement of why they are interested in participating in the meeting as well as a list of up to five of their most relevant publications. N.B. The same deadline and submission address applies, and the submissions will be included in the abstract book.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REMOTE (SKYPE-CONFERENCE) PRESENTERS

A number of people will be unable to attend the event in person due to geographical and personal constraints. Therefore we have decided to hold one e-conference session (on skype or similar). Authors willing to present a short paper via this e-conference should submit an abstract like other participants but will mark their submission as '*remote presentation*'. The same deadline applies and the submissions will also be included in the abstract book.

LOGISTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

Thanks to the financial support from the School of International Development, the local organisation committee will arrange the provision of meeting rooms in the University of East Anglia, Meeting information packs (abstract book etc), as well as coffee/tea and sandwich lunches for all participants over the two days. Participants should however make their own travel and accommodation arrangements. Anybody requiring an invitation letters to help with funding and/or visa applications will be provided with these quickly upon request.

Organization Committee: Barry Ferguson, Sophie Bremner, Rafael Calderon-Contreras School of International Development, University of East Anglia.

Special Issue 2011 Madagascar Conservation & Development

The organisers of the meeting have started the process of editing a special issue of the journal Madagascar Conservation and Development, to bring together in more detail a selection of the best papers from the meeting and some more papers by additional scholars and practitioners in Madagascar. The special issue will be published in the early summer of 2011.

The Journal Madagascar Conservation and Development also regularly publishes information on this theme and more: <http://www.mwc-info.net/en/services/journal.htm>



The screenshot shows the Madagascar Wildlife Conservation website. At the top left is a logo featuring a black silhouette of a lemur on a branch, with the text 'MADAGASCAR WILDLIFE CONSERVATION' below it. The main content area is divided into two columns. The left column contains a vertical list of navigation links: 'ABOUT MWC', 'PROJECT ALAOTRA', 'PROJECT TAMPINA', 'MWC SECTIONS', 'JOURNAL MCD' (with a sub-link 'Contact Information: Volunteers'), 'NEWSLETTER', and 'ABOUT MADAGASCAR'. The right column features a section titled 'JOURNAL MADAGASCAR CONSERVATION & DEVELOPMENT' with a 'Call for contributions for Volume 6/Issue 1: Please submit your papers, essays or reviews before end of December 2010.' Below this, it states 'MWC and the Jane Goodall Institute Switzerland present the peer-reviewed open access Journal Madagascar Conservation & Development, dealing largely or exclusively with conservation and sustainable development in Madagascar.' At the bottom of this section, it says 'The aims of the peer-reviewed journal are to provide a forum for exchange of information about'. To the right of the text is a thumbnail image of the journal cover, which shows a group of lemurs.

Acknowledgements: First and foremost I'd like to thank the co-organisers and committees of the meeting, Jacques Pollini, Eva Keller, Nadine Fritz-Vietta, Sophie Bremner and Rafael Calderon-Contreras. Without their intellectual guidance, moral and practical support the meeting would never have happened. I should also acknowledge Cecile Bidaud, Romuald Vaudry, Tiana Ramahaleo, Maminiaina Rasamoelina, Fenosoa Andriamahenina and Jacques Pollini for valuable discussions held on the periphery of the COP15 meetings in Copenhagen and from where the ideas for this meeting were born. And Cecile especially deserved acknowledged for passing on the *Betsimisaraka* folk description of REDD 'mivarotra rivotra ny vazaha'. Although it is perhaps not the norm to do so, I'd like to highlight those responsible for some initiatives which were part of the inspiration for the whole process. Rosaleen Duffy and Dan Brockington's explorations of [Conservation and Capitalism](#); Jim Igoe and Sian Sullivan's [Conservation and Displacement Group](#) (aka the Disobedient Knowledge network), Eva Kellers efforts to promote [human rights issues in the villages on the border of Masoala National Park](#), and the [Voices of Change work](#) of Yvonne Orenge and colleagues from the Andrew Lees Trust and Panos London. Thanks to Nicholas Sohl for the photographs on pages 66 and 71. Many thanks to Yvonne Orenge for drafting the notes on the Anosy/RioTinto/QMM discussions and to Jennifer Talbot, Shirley Smith, Antonie Kramer, Alison Jolly, Mal Mitchell and Caroline Seagle for adding comments and providing clarifications on that text. Thanks to Nick Winer and Jenny Springer (WWF-US) for providing additional information and insight into the Conservation Initiative on Human Rights and to Lisa Gaylord (WCS) and Nanie Ratsifandrihamana (WWF Madagascar) for providing information on the ongoing conservation strategy work in Madagascar (which was circulated to conference delegates) and the invitation to prepare a white paper (I'm sorry—this report isn't that white paper you were looking for, but maybe it will inform whoever you hire to write it! My deepest gratitude to Bruce Lankford the Head of School in DEV for agreeing to provide financial and institutional backing for the event and to Penny Joy, Karen Morley, Abby Dalglish and Lynn Jacotine in DEV/Social Science Faculty of UEA for all the administrative, website and financial support to make the event a success. Thanks to Sian Sullivan for encouragement and advice in the lead up to the event, and to Robert Harvey, family and staff at the Marlborough House Hotel for the great Norwich hospitality provided for all those staying there during the conference. Last but not least thanks to all the participants at the meeting—travelling from across the UK, Europe, and North America, many of the forty plus delegates came to the meeting at their own expense and spent two long days during a summer weekend listening, thinking and talking hard to provide the material contained within this report, this goes to demonstrate how seriously people take these issues of rights and representation of Madagascar's Forest People—we are not a bunch of nutcakes and raving loonies!!

Citation: Ferguson H.B. 2010, *Voices from Madagascar's Forests: Improving Representation and Rights for Malagasy Forest Peoples*, Final Report of the Conference held on the 5th/6th June 2010 at the School of International Development, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK

Cover Photographs (from top downwards): Presentation at conference by Dr Thorkil Casse (Roskilde University); View of Norwich meeting participants; Tandrody Family Building a House from Forest Timber in Southern Madagascar; "No agriculture here" sign on border of Verazanantsoro Parcel of Mananara-Nord National Park; Chameleon in Ankarana National Park.

School of International Development
University of East Anglia
University Plain
Norwich, Norfolk, England
NR4 7TJ

Telephone +44 (0)1603 591472
Fax: +44 (0)1603 451999
<http://www.uea.ac.uk/dev>
Email: dev.general@uea.ac.uk



Appendix

Transcripts from the Writeshop & Discussions



Transcripts Part A

What do we believe are the flaws/weaknesses in the conservation system in Madagascar? What evidence is this based on?

- A1. Trying to stop people being farmers is inherently disempowering and the classic alternatives of honey, silk and ecotourism are not enough.
- A2. Languages: Barriers to understanding peoples motivations.
- A3. Is neoliberal conservation a “sustainable” solution?
- A4. Need deeper anthropological approaches.
- A5. Development in human terms \neq GNP
- A6. Accept people are part of nature (co-dependency)- cultural diversity alongside biodiversity.
- A7. Restriction of traditional livelihoods and lack of support for alternative livelihoods.
- A8. Increase in corruption benefitting local elites.
- A9. Poor people alienated along forest corridors.
- A10. Politics of intervention are imposed and not agreed with locals.
- A11. Language: Not ‘conservation’ rather natural resource management.
- A12. Look at the bibliography put together by conference organisers for extensive evidence.
- A13. Land is not just an economic asset > it has cultural, social, existential, historical importance (*tanindrazana*)
- A14. Three main themes to organise problems : Power; Information-Knowledge; Economic Realities
- A15. Unclear definitions
- A16. What do we understand conservation to be, and what is the reasoning.
- A17. Diverging
- A18. Governance Structures
- A19. Who has power and where does it lead - at different scales /economic power
- A20. Fundamental problem of perception of “local people” and local livelihoods.
- A21. Exotic concepts that don’t fit in to local conditions.
- A22. (difference) nature/culture divide?
- A23. PNF and SAPM are mutually exclusive
- A24. The examples of Costa Rica and Belize – where BINGOs buy land and give conservation contracts (PES Style) are not possible in Madagascar!
- A25. Claims & Rights are western concepts so already using these terms makes it hard to get on in debate.
- A26. Transfer of all the power to communities isn’t the solution
- A27. Disempowered Malagasy government
- A28. Power – today’s power is information, and BINGOs are secretive with their reports.
- A29. Propaganda messages are opaque or oversimplify (like themes of the Barcelona WCC – Healthy Environment Healthy People (Reality in Madagascar – Healthy Environment, Unhealthy People).
- A30. Too many decisions taken by Big NGOs – because of Malagasy government dependency on aid money [and influential position of US based BINGOs with donors].
- A31. All intervention is more or less neo-colonial.
- A32. But to avoid an environmental disaster who should make claims?
- A33. There is a dependence on success stories, wanting +ve stories for donors, but ultimately this doesn’t help the cause because its the weaknesses which expose what needs to change.
- A34. Political decisions for conservation are taken without the agreement of the stakeholders (and often Malagasy stakeholders are unable to freely take decisions because of power and legal systems).
- A35. Conservationists tend to produce their own information – and exclude ‘disobedient knowl-

edge' and stakeholder views which are not convenient for their cause.

A36. There are different kinds of players in conservation – the big players use the media, leaving the smaller organisations invisible. (Scale)

A37. Support intellectuals in Madagascar to deal with this issue

A38. We don't know who is in charge – who is coming to do research + what can we do to use the research

A19. Access to information

A40. Information is often not there – improve education an information

A41. Access to reports from BINGOs is impossible – they preach good governance and transparency to communities but don't do it themselves.

A42. Culture of Sacredness – taboo ≠ conservation ethic – integrating culture cannot be a pick and mix exercise!

A43. GAP BETWEEN VISIONS There is a disconnection between visions of: Conservationists; Communities; Government Private sector

A44. Neglecting of “Trade-Offs”

A45. Financial Sustainability – Transfers for the Long term

A46. If there is a trade-off – if the community don't want to save biodiversity who has legitimacy to contradict them?

A47. There are no incentives in conservation practices for local communities - Business as usual without project

A48. There just isn't enough economic development

A49. Politics wants to see things in terms of €\$m³ (i.e. in terms of quantifiable units) How can social science deal with that ? [Maybe political decision makers need to open up to alternative (qualitative?) views.]

A50. No recognition that it [conservation] is not a win-win situation

A51. Compensation isn't compensation [in local people's eyes!].

A52. No accountability [BINGOs and Donors systems are rarely transparent, and monitoring systems don't consider impacts – (i.e. Log Frames look at outputs).

A53. Selective Scales – sometimes global, sometimes local [intervention strategies are not implemented comprehensively across scales].

A54. Justifying action with emotional/crisis narratives

A55. Lack of Expertise in social issues among conservation practitioners.

A56. Assuming ignorance of Malagasy and patronizing – need to be educated by the west.

A57. “Participatory Top Down” Approach

A58. Parallel Conversations [Conservation propaganda; Practitioners Disillusionment; Scholars Critical and Disobedient knowledge)

A59. Lack of Coordination: Who does what ? has to be defined.

A60. Fear of making mistakes...

A61. So many things need to go together – knowledge of the interdependence of man and environment. [failure is due to interventions across sectors and scales not being tied together—or being absent]

Transcripts Part B

What could researchers do to improve the situation?

- B1. Type of knowledge considered valid : Oral vs written; Visual vs spiritual
- B2. Actually give other actors a right to response as part of the research process
- B3. Scholar = Scientist? Activist? Both?
- B4. Definitions : Tavy≠Swidden Agriculture; Conservation = What?
- B5. Scholars should try to communicate in a way that practitioners/policy makers actually understand.
- B6. Dialogue, Listen, Persistence, Rephrase
- B7. Training Indigenous People in Development Theoretical Perspectives; Even those considered critical – is NOT a viable solution. It implies 2 assumptions: i) A new form of colonisation.. academic colonisation. ii) Problematizing “the others” – indigenous groups.
- B8. Being involved at the start of projects.
- B9. Be more precise whether we look at human rights, agricultural practices or economics (livelihoods). Is de agrarianisation a problem?
- B10. Involve Malagasy scholars as much as possible.
- B11. We need to think about fundamentals of the carbon business. North-South relations?
- B12. FPIC & International Law
- B13. FPIC and Donors Aid
- B14. Need to look at the broader political economy.
- B15. Share research with development/conservation and companies involved. Increased communication!
- B16. Make practitioners more effectively aware of critical literature/voices
- B17. Construct/write an overview of the key points raised by us
- B18. Publish beyond academic literature
- B19. Disseminate info/outcomes of this meeting
- B20. Bring in more effectively Malagasy scholars, students, universities.... (& getting funding for them)
- B21. Get in contact with already existing Malagasy organisations.
- B22. Scholars should make it very clear about the trade-offs! & be clear to state our opinions... eg 100 Year disaster vision: Would the local people not ask us why we didn't stop the environmental disaster when it has happened in 100 years time?
- B23. Network – Environmental Justice Madagascar.
- B24. Encourage Malagasy Scholars to Join.
- B25. Working with NGOs and better communication
- B26. Keep documenting the findings we have : How do we get our info out to people...
- B27. Build an Anglophone-francophone bridge
- B28. Read Madagascar Mining Transparency Report (EITI)
- B29. Keep going back to same place and talking about it – and push for long term projects
- B30. Where does interesting info go – place for central resources.
- B31. Engage with policy makers
- B32. Activism-Research is risky but may be a productive area.
- B33. Lack of clarity/social constructionist-postmodern rhetoric [researchers need to learn multiple means of communication].
- B34. Video => Knowledge/power
- B35. Community Workshop => Knowledge/power
- B36. Direct Payment => Economic Realities + Empowerment
- B37. Wiki project => Collective learning [to draft the white paper suggested by Lisa Gaylord]
- B38. Prepare Press release: Media programme \$\$\$; identify areas which media might be interested in

What have scholars tried to do to suggest change/improvement to the system (? =impact unclear; X=unsuccessful; P=Success)

B39. Sign up letter to seek more engagement of scholars on Human Rights (? - still under consideration by CIHR).

B40. Letters written to ANGAP/MNP about bribes demanded from locals X

B41. Wrote informal briefing note to WWF about prelim observations P/X

B42. Sharing research “report” with ANGAP/MNP re: food security & livelihood impacts?

Who is not at this meeting who could make contributions to the debate as we finalise our report/white paper?[i.e. people we need to get in touch with]

B43. More MALAGASY scholars

B44. Janice Harper

B45. Aurelie Toillier

B46. Jeff Kaufmann

B47. Louise Holloway

B48. Bram Tucker

B49. People who depend on natural resources for direct livelihoods

B50. local people

Transcripts Part C

What could conservation organisations and donors do to improve the situation?

- C1. Long term commitment to invest in and support communities shows signs of success (eg Money for Madagascar). Why have the BINGOs not achieved the same level of support for specific communities in many cases?
- C2. The “alternative livelihood” needs to be a choice from different possibilities. BUT choice should be free including the chance to do more tavy!
- C3. Recognise the importance of food security and that export commodities cannot replace food, plus they are highly vulnerable and make people dependent.
- C4. More direct dialogue with local communities. IN their communities (not just leaders in main village in commune).
- C5. Long term implementation.
- C6. Contact scholars at the start of their projects.
- C7. Recognise that schools, hospitals... as good as they are cannot replace land.
- C8. NGOs and Donors should incorporate real community needs into their interventions.
- C9. Try to pay attention to locally salient indicators of well being. Abandon neo-malthusian assumptions re locals.
- C10. FPIC – follow up on this concept and insist on “ Right to say NO”.
- C11. Invest in follow up
- C12. CPALI was up until now the most positive voice – yet are the only ways out external market dependent activities? Is the problem not being set
- C13. Involve traditional leaders; Respect local social hierarchy.
- C14. Can we not talk about population? – Keep family planning available for gender empowerment.
- C15. Present family planning in the right context (avoid livelihoods and population offsets)
- C16. Coordination of NGOs: BINGOs do synergise ; Small NGOs are NOT however coordinating because of defunct/dysfunctional platforms-CRD efforts.
- C17. Donors – get back in there! Don’t blame the people for a bad government.
- C18. Push for long term projects
- C19. We [scholars] need \$\$ to undertake a review of the state of knowledge and for facilitating multi stakeholder dialogues.
- C20. Time lag of donors coming back!
- C21. More relations between researchers and practitioners working together.
- C22. Outputs ≠ Impacts/Outcomes – Inherent weakness of “log frame approach” to conservation.
- C23. Make your grey literature available
- C24. Give more notice to small organisations before cutting their funding.
- C25. Move beyond publicity on BINGO websites – what is needed is factual and detailed information.
- C26. Some farmers want to produce more food themselves. OTHERS would prefer easier things (\$\$) but still maintaining association with land (eg Zebu). [NGOs should conceive interventions with this in mind].
- C27. Why is it a meeting in the UK where we are talking about these issues? Why do the big NGOs not organise an open and advertised follow up meeting on these issues in Madagascar?