Conflict of Subsistence in a Multi-Ethnic Community along the Shore of Lake Albert in Uganda

ウガンダ・アルバート湖畔の漁村における共同性の構築
――多民族混住地域における葛藤と生存戦略――
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Fish and water, the natural resources of Lake Albert in Uganda, attract people from a wide range of areas, such as fishing people from the West Nile and the DRC, pastoralists from Kasese, and refugees from Acholiland and Rwanda. My focus is on a multi-ethnic village called Runga located on the east side of the lake, and I aim to point out the conflicts between peoples sharing the resources, such as fish, water, and land. I will specify the mechanisms underlying the production of social inequalities among these people based on an analysis of these conflicts. Firstly, I will discuss the social background of the research site, and will then point out some conflicts amongst resource beneficiaries in both a global and local context. Finally, I will point out that people who are peripheral in their socio-political status become even more peripheral under a neoliberal political regime. It is possible to say the behaviour of searching for their own interests can attract to create solidarity of peoples in the community.
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1. A Fishing Village in Transition

Lake Albert is a body of inland water covering 5,300 km² and lying across the borders of two countries: Uganda and the Republic of the Congo. There are many fishing villages on the lakeshore (Fig.1), but I will focus on the multi-ethnic village of Runga located on the east side of the lake, where I have carried out fieldwork since 2001.

1.1. Land

Runga is located on the shore of Lake Albert in the northwest side of the bottom of Africa’s Great Rift Valley. The deep escarpment, about 100 m high, isolates the village from other villages located at the top of the escarpment in Hoima District, as it takes two hours to walk by foot to the closest village. The altitude is 621 m, the lowest among other domestic lakes (cf. Lake Victoria, which has an altitude of 1,134 m). The ecological year is divided into the rainy season and the dry season, and the major rainy season is from April to August. The annual precipitation is 800-1,200 mm, which is less than that of
Fig. 1. Fishing Villages Surrounding Lake Albert
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Kampala (1,200-1,600 mm).

Because Runga belongs to Hoima District, which was the centre of Nyoro Kingdom, the major ethnic group of the district is still Banyoro (the singular term is Munyoro). However, in the village of Runga, the major ethnic group is Alur (the singular and plural terms are the same), for there are lake routes from the West Nile and the Republic of the Congo, where a civil war occurred from 1998-2002.

1.2. Political Systems: LC1 and BMU

The social and economic activities of people in Uganda are organised by the Local Government Council (LC) system. There are two kinds of local political systems in Runga, similar to other fishing villages in Uganda. The first is the Local Government Council 1 (LC1), which was introduced in 1995 for the decentralisation of the Uganda Governmental Policy. Runga is an LC1-level village which belongs to Hoima District (LC5), Bugahya County (LC4), Kigorobya Sub-county (LC3), and Kibiro Parish (LC2). LC1 executives consist of a chairman, vice-chairman, secretary general, youth representative, women’s representative, and secretaries for finance, information, defence, environment and production, and the disabled. Unsolvable cases at the LC1 level are to be sent to Kigorobya LC3 executives. The other type of local political system in this village is run by Beach Management Units (BMUs), formerly centre master team since 1983–1984, which deals with fishing matters such as stolen fishing nets and paddles, misuse of boats, and complaints of fish distribution.

1.3. Peoples

Around 1964, people first came to Runga to fish, and then increasingly began to settle in the area. Local administration was introduced in the 1970s, and this landing site evolved into a village. A market was instilled between 1984 and 1987, and the Fishery Cooperative was introduced, leading fish trading to increase as more people gathered from other areas. The Runga Market was tendered in 1991, and as a result, the fish trade was further expanded and churches and parents' schools were established in the early 1990s. From this point, Runga developed from a mere place of work to become a place where people lived. In short, this area was politically organised in the 1970s, regarded as a fishing village in the 1980s, and then economically and socially established by the 1990s.

Most people in this village are immigrants from various places for a number of different reasons (Tahara, 2010). For example, following the cotton and coffee plantation industries in the 1930s to pay tax by cash, people settled in this area on their way back home from the plantation area (often referred to as the Baganda area). Other factors are war-related as many people moved to avoid or escape from, for example, the War of 1964 in the DRC (locally called the Mulele war) and Rwanda, the Museveni Battle of 1984–1985, the Lord Resistance Army of 1986–2003 in northern Uganda, and the Civil War of 1997–2002 in the DRC.

Currently, there are 3,429 people and 781 households in Runga. Table 1 illustrates the ethnic groups and other information in Runga. The Alur make up approximately 70% to 80% of the villagers from
West Nile and the DRC. Most Alur are engaged in fishing activity and they recently started farming cotton. The Bagungu (the singular term is Mugungu, a sub-group under the Banyoro) make up about 20%, and were originally fisherfolk who now keep small daily commodity shops in Runga. There are some pastoralists called Bararoo (the singular term is Muraroo) who moved into the village in search of the water and grass available from the lake. The Bararoo are divided into two groups: the Basongora from Kasese in southwest Uganda, and the Banyarwanda who originated in Rwanda. Since 2002, several contractors, mostly the Baganda (the singular term is Muganda) people, have entered here to purchase small fish, called muziri in Lugungu (vernacular for Bagungu people) and mukene in Luganda (vernacular for Baganda people).

Table 1. Peoples in Runga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Origination</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>First arrival</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Economic Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alur</td>
<td>Congolese from DRC, Ugandan from West Nile</td>
<td>70-80%</td>
<td>ca.1964</td>
<td>Alur</td>
<td>Fishing Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugungu/Bagungu</td>
<td>Bullisa</td>
<td>20% and less</td>
<td>ca.1964</td>
<td>Lugungu</td>
<td>Fishing Retail Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munyoro/Banyoro</td>
<td>Hoima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunyoro</td>
<td>Retail Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muraroo/Bararoo</td>
<td>Basongora from Kasese, Banyarwanda from Rwanda</td>
<td>2 households, 9 households</td>
<td>ca.1984</td>
<td>Luraroo</td>
<td>Pastoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muganda/Baganda</td>
<td>Mostly Kampala and Jinja</td>
<td>10~20 person</td>
<td>ca.2002</td>
<td>Luganda</td>
<td>Fish-Monger Retail Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Acholi, Mugisu, Musoga, Ukebu etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish-Monger Retail Store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locally, Runga consists of five areas: Centre, Mbegu, Agu, Nyamasoga, and Kakoma (Fig. 2). Each area includes elders who are charged with consulting family problems and minor issues. The Alur mainly stay in Mbegu and Agu, most Bagungu stay in the central area, and the Bararoo, the pastoralists, stay in Nyamasoga and Kakoma with their cattle.

Fig. 3 shows the original places of each ethnic group (the black star specifies the location of the village of Runga). The Bagungu are indigenous peoples, while the Alur, Basongora, and Banyarwanda are immigrants. Linguistically, the Alur are Nilotic peoples, while the Lugungu, Luraro, and Luganda are Bantu peoples and communicate in their vernacular. Between the Nilotic and Bantu, Swahili and English are used as the lingua franca for communication.
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2. Conflicts in a Global Context
2.1. Political Economy along the Shores of Lakes

Fish resources are becoming the important means for acquisition of foreign currency. As Fig. 4 shows, the export value of ‘fish and products’ has ranked second under coffee until 2011, when oil became the second export product. Thus, the government has intentionally aimed to keep the waters and fish in good condition for international trade (FAO, 2002).
Fig. 4. Export Products in Uganda (axis: Mt. Us dollars)

Lake Victoria mainly contributed to the international fish trade in the 1980s. The catch of Nile perch peaked in 1990, and thereafter declined by 48% in 1995. To resolve such problems, the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Program (LVEMP) was held from July 1997 to June 2002 with the aim of maintaining a rich biodiversity and resource base. LVEMP is a multi-discipline and multi-sector comprehensive development program that was designed to successfully introduce, through implementation, environmentally and socially sustainable economic development to the Lake Victoria Basin (http://www.lvemp.org/Lprogress/summary.htm).

The East African nations of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda collectively investigated and protected the ecosystem of a lake. Further, in an attempt to improve people's profits and the economy, these countries were financially supported by the World Bank and Global Environment Facility. To realise the LVEMP vision, Uganda removed water hyacinths and prohibited the use of fine-mesh fishing nets under three and a half inches. Moreover, they have taken hard measures to close landing sites in an attempt to keep fishermen out for three or six months since 2002 (Geheb, et al., 2002). Due to these situations, the fishermen and commercial people (mostly the Baganda) began coming to Lake Albert in quest of Nile perch.
In 2002, the direct control of landing sites in Lake Albert was absorbed by the fisheries office in the central government. This control was initiated on 5 August, 2002, when armed Marine soldiers visited each house to search for illegal fishing nets and small amounts of fish. An LC1 chairman escaped from the soldiers to hide in an escarpment, as he was an Alur from the DRC and could have been punished for his long-term stay. Therefore, the LC1 secretary general engaged with and escorted the soldiers, and tried to encourage them to show some mercy towards the villagers. However, the villagers were forced to deliver their illegal fishing nets. Nets such as those made with extra-fine mesh under four inches, trawling nets, casting nets, and some small processed fish (especially Nile perch under eighteen inches) were burned with petrol. In total, more than 200 fishing nets were burned in Runga that day based on illegality reasons (Fig. 5.). From 2002 to 2004, such measures (using armed force to destroy fishing nets) were repeated several times around the Lake Albert landing site.

![Burnt Fishing Nets in Landing Site](image)

One man who has worked in the fishing industry for a long time stated, 'I have never had such a serious experience until now'. Such a statement illustrates how in previous times, the priority was to facilitate people's everyday lives rather than uphold the law. Another man penetrated the contradiction of such a governmental plan by stating that 'The government wants to sell a fish for development of a country, and it starves us'. Following these measures, people relinquished their use of the local net for daily supplies, and shifted to fishing smaller fish for business (Tahara, 2004).

2.2. From Political Issues to Ethnic Reformation

After the LC1 chairman escaped from Runga on 4 August, 2002, the reformation of LC1 executives was performed under the instruction of LC3 on 14 August. The new LC1 chairman, the former LC1 secretary general, was elected by villagers through the cue system, the general election method in rural areas in Uganda. After the election, the LC1 chairman could choose his executives given the agreement of villagers. After the reformation of LC1 executives, a meeting was conducted by the LC3 chairman.
Following, I will describe briefly the LC3’s reflections on Runga at the meeting.

The LC3 chairman pointed out that the Bagungu people have always had complaints against the Alur. For example, he stated that they made comments such as the ‘Alur people come in crowds to carry off all fish from us, so we have no space for fishing’. He also stated that ‘However activity is free, now big room was made for fishing net burned and people have gone’. The chairman emphasised that different people such as the Alur and Bagungu should establish a fishery and cooperate to live in the area together.

It soon became clear that the cooperation emphasised by the LC3 chairman was not fully reflective of true collaboration, but rather showed great limitations. At the LC1 executives’ reformation, only the secretary for information was selected from the Alur, while the other nine executives were all Bagungu, despite the fact that 70% ~80% of the residents are Alur. For the selection of LC1 members, LC2 and LC3 people intend to LC1 chairman recruit exclusively Bagungu and Banyoro at the back. In addition, no Bararoo people were selected for the members. Even at the meeting, participants claimed that their cattle’s movement to the lakeshore is disturbing the village in the morning and evening. For example, cattle eat the straw of houses and cause damage to the town.

In the process of constructing new LC1 executives, the initiative of Runga Village was transferred to the Bagungu and Banyoro people from the Alur people, superficially appealing for cooperation of multi-ethnic groups. After all, the future of this village was to be considered under the LC2 and LC3 systems belonging to the Bagungu and Banyoro people. That is, it was shown vividly who should have the power in the Life-world of this village.

3. Cotton Farming as Alternative Subsistence

Cotton farming began in 2003 in Nyamasoga and Kakoma following the advice of the Fisheries Officer, ‘Do not depend on the only fishery’, after the government forcibly burned nets from 2002 to 2004. The Naymasoga and Kakoma areas are where Bararoo pastoralists live with their cattle. The Bararoo people came to Runga around 1984 during the battle of Museveni, as many of them maintain that the climate during this time (especially from 1985–1986) was beneficial for raising cows since there was enough rain to grow grass.

From 2003, there were a few people engaging in cotton farming. The harvest of cotton in 2010 was so successful that eight people bought a second-hand motorbike after the harvest; this motorbike typically cost UGX 1.6–1.8 million at that time. Following the initial burst of cotton farming, many people rushed into this industry in 2011 (Fig. 6).
Cotton farming is organised by two groups whose chairpersons are Mr. P and Mr. R. They contract with a cotton company named OLAM\textsuperscript{a} that supplies seeds, tractors, wires, and agrochemicals by loan. The land in this area is free governmental land and people are able to utilise it for communal purposes, but they plot the land to lease at UGX 80,000 per acre in addition to requiring an entry fee. After the harvest, people are required to repay the loan and also pay one percent of the profit to the chairperson, and the coordinator monitors conditions every day. The cattle of the Bararoo are roaming everywhere in Runga (Fig. 7., Fig. 8.); thus, wire is necessary to protect cotton farming areas. I can assume that more than 200 households planted cotton, as 91 people planted 740 acres under Mr. R. The scenery of this village has totally changed, and even some people sold fishing gears and boats in order to farm cotton.

Unfortunately, the 2011 harvest was a disaster. The cotton grew well, but it was as if it were a tree with no fruit. Allow me to put this in perspective using my friends’ cases. Mr. B, for example, harvested 128 kg from 4 acres, sold the cotton at UGX 1,200 per kg, and received UGX 153,600. However, it cost UGX 675,000 for wires, seeds, clearing, planting, shaving, and spraying. He even sold his boat for UGX 140,000 to buy agrochemicals. Ms. A’s case was worse: she harvested 16 kg from 4 acres, sold the cotton at UGX 1,000 per kg, and received UGX 16,000. Her expenses, however, totalled UGX 1.6 million. Like

\textsuperscript{a}OLAM: Oxfam-Lanka Agricultural Mission
Mr. B and Ms. A, many people sold their nets and boats to keep their cotton farms, but such measures were all in vain.

3.1. A Case in Cotton Fields

In mid-September 2011, after six days of germinating cotton, an Alur farmer, Mr. J, found a cow with a leg injury in his garden. His neighbours and he urged the cow on, and it died about 100 m away from his garden. Four people including Mr. J were accused and charged with injuring a cow and were forced to move from Kigorobya to Hoima. Although two of them were released by His Majesty, Mr. J and another man were jailed for two months and two weeks in a Hoima prison.

Mr. J was released at the beginning of December. Two weeks later, people discovered that a small cow had died near Mr. J’s cotton garden. The owner of the cow was Mr. K, a Muraroo. Both the Bararoo and the Alur reported to the Officer in Charge (OC) at Runga Police Post as well as to the LC. The OC went to the location and demanded UGX 150,000 to file the report, so the Bararoo and Alur ceased reporting the case and it was never officially submitted to authorities.

Four days after the death of the cow, on Sunday, 11 December, Mr. J’s wife and two children went missing from the garden. Her husband and their neighbours looked for them and their bodies were found three days after their disappearance. During their search, the owner of the dead cow, Mr. K, and his friend Mr. V asked the LC1 chairman, who was unaware of the family’s disappearance, to obtain a permit for the movement of cattle. They then left Runga before the Alur found the wife and children’s bodies. As a result, people suspected them of the murders.

The OC reported the case, and the Hoima police arrived the next day. Before the Hoima police came, however, the Alur burnt the houses and motorbikes of all the Bararoo in Kakmoa. However, all the Bararoo and their cattle escaped from the fire. The Hoima police did not arrest anyone, nor did they question the Alur about the fire. The OC was taken by police and transferred elsewhere. Immediately after the case, the Chief District Officer, LC3 chairperson, and Parish Chief organised a community meeting to address the situation. Security personnel were stationed there for two months after the case.

In 2012, six Bararoo households came back to Runga by July (before the incident, there were eleven households in Runga). Community meetings organised by the LC2 and LC3 levels were held four times through July. At the July meetings, the Bararoo were warned that they should not allow cattle to enter the garden. They are no longer able to go back to their original place in the Kakoma and Nyamasoga areas and must stay in the central area with the Bagungu and Banyoro.
3.2. Concerns of the Case

Mr. J, the husband of the victim, told me, ‘We traced the fallen cotton and the boy’s body on the tree, then searched around and found my wife and girl in the deep bottom of the trench of dry river. The boy’s secret part was cut out, and it seemed that they threw him while he was still alive from the top of the hill. There is no communication between the Alur and the Bararoo, and we still fear each other’.

In addition, a relative of the suspect told me, ‘I lost many things. I did not know anything for three days. One morning, I was on the hill with the cattle, and I saw a fire from there. I went back to look for my wife and found that all of my family had escaped together to Bullisa. As I had left the cattle on the hill, I lost three of them’.

Both sides suffered from the losses that occurred as a result of the case. Following the incident, Mr. J remarried another woman to take care of his small children who were left without a mother. In addition, the father of one suspect died in 2014.

3.3. Witnesses of the Case

One witness said to me, ‘Young boys of Bararoo ran into the centre of Runga and shouted, “We killed three”, but we did not understand them at that time’. He was full of anger and continued to explain that if he had known what they had done, he would have killed them to avenge the victims. His anger was directed toward the suspects, but not the Bararoo in general. Then, another witness who is Mugungu said, ‘While the Alur were looking for the Bararoo, the Banyoro hid them in the house and protected them as they are the same Bantu as we. However, if such a thing occurs again, we will order them to go to Mbegu (an area where most residents are Alur)’.

Both the Bagungu and Banyoro have protected the Bararoo from attacks by the Alur. The motivation for this tendency is based on a sense of common ethnicity, as the Bagungu and Banyoro share the origin and nature of language with the Bararoo. Linguistically, these groups communicate in their vernacular.

I must point out that there are also other social relationships which are constructed through everyday activities among villagers. One such relationship originates in church activities. One Alur woman said to me, ‘I didn’t know this case at that time. Many people went to see dead bodies, but I didn’t go. I didn’t want to see them as a same Christian’. There are six churches in Runga, including those for the indigenous religion and Islam, and people can go to prayer freely with no concern of ethnicity and may even change their church affiliation frequently for several reasons.

Another social relationship in this region is based on economic activities. One woman complained, ‘There was no milk at that time’. Every morning, the Bararoo visit each house in the Mbegu, Agu, and central areas by foot or by bicycle to sell milk. In addition, one Muraroo opens the meat shop in the central area in Runga. Following, I will specify the kinds of neighbourhood feelings which are constructed through the daily activities in this area. Through such neighbourhood feelings, the Bararoo were able to come back to live in Runga, and people of all backgrounds are able to resettle their lives here.
3.4. Statements of the LC

I will now reveal the opinions of some of the administration executives in Runga. The LC1 chairman (Mugungu) told me, 'The Bararoo cut the wire of the cotton to feed cattle. The Bararoo are difficult to cope with'. Further, the LC1 Defence (Alur) recalled the case and stated, 'The police never worked. If a woman killed the cow, she would have never been reported. It means that they were innocent. As I heard from the people at the first meeting in December, the LC3 chairman (Munyoro) ordered the villagers, 'You should stay well. Do not add to the cases'. In a meeting in July, the LC2 Chairperson (Parish Chief, Mugungu) ordered the Bararoo not to enter the cotton garden.

Finally, this case was settled and no one was arrested or accused. The behaviour of the local administration is sympathetic to the Alur people. It is assumed that people have come to calm down and resettle in the village gradually through this kind of local political communication, which involves meso-level meetings.

3.5. Conflicts over Resources Connected to Ethical and Political Issues

The case superficially seemed to be reflective of a conflict between the Alur and the Bararoo. However, if we view this case from the perspective of conflict over resources, it becomes clear that both of these groups are simply protecting their subsistence. Because the Alur are farmers, their fields are their principal foundation of life, and they are simply protecting their fields. Similarly, the Bararoo are pastoralists, and the cattle are their foundation of life; thus, they have a right to protect their cattle. Still, the conflict over resources arose as a result of the differences between the Alur and the Bararoo.

During the battle between these two ethnic groups, the Bagungu and Banyoro protected the Bararoo in the central part of Runga, the same area that is inhabited by the Bantu group. The Bagungu and Banyoro are indigenous peoples and are considered to be the first citizens of local government. Table 2 shows their social and political status. Their nationality and language family make up the differences in their positions of social and political status.

On the other hand, the Alur belong to the Nilote and are immigrants, and therefore recognised as politically peripheral. This is evidenced by the case previously mentioned wherein the Alur people’s chairperson was replaced by a Bagungu. Although the Bararoo are also immigrants from other areas, they have informal connections to the central government as cattle keepers from the Western part of Uganda, and will thus be protected by the government through the Residential District Commissioner (RDC).

3.6. Local Lives in a Global Context

To clarify the problem, I will identify the natural resources in a diagram (Fig. 9.). The horizontal axis is the relation with people’s subsistence and market, from local to global, and the vertical axis is their livelihood of products, from cultivated to wild. As I mentioned previously, fishing has become an important means to acquire foreign currency and more than 200 fishing nets were burned in Runga by
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the government in 2002. People relinquished their use of the local net for their daily supply and shifted to fishing small fish for business. In addition, to prevent dependence on fisheries, cotton and tobacco were introduced in 2003, but these items were already big commodities in the global market. In this way, the livelihoods of the Alur are at the mercy of the market.

Fig. 9. Diagram of Resources

The Bararoo pastoralists must migrate to find water and grass for cattle, and their way of life keeps them local, although they are protected by the government from Museveni through the RDC and profits from cattle. Further, because there are no farms for food crops in Runga, the Bagungu carried their crops to the Runga Market from their garden on the hill, their original place of residence.

From this case, I can say that the drastic development of globalisation has not changed the mode of living in this community. People’s resources are more likely to affect their living situation, which in turn is affected by national policy and economics. We could describe the situation as follows: the Alur, who are peripheral in their socio-economic status, become even more overlooked under a neoliberal political regime.

Finally, I will explain how the background of this case is related to the conflict in a global context. As I mentioned in (2.2. From Political Issues to Ethnic Reformation), the dismissal of the Alur chairperson in 2002 was executed by a higher level of local council. The motivation behind this dismissal was thought to be due to the discovery of oil in 2002 in the Albert Basin of Runga. Further, the indigenous Banyoro and Bagungu have intentions of claiming ownership of the land, although the Alur are settled down in this area, especially since this is now a landing site which is home to a rich oil well. The lake basin was originally communal land, and this enabled the Alur and Bararoo peoples to settle in this area. As indigenous people, the Banyoro and Bagungu own land at the top of the escarpment and use the lake.
and landing site for work exclusively. There was not a significant amount of conflict before the foundation of the oil industry. As immigrants, the Alur settled in this landing site to permanently reside, but accepted their status of secondary citizens as immigrants and people belonging to another language family. Ultimately, this led to their inability to gain rights to participate in local politics.

4. Conclusion

Lake Albert in Runga provided subsistence to the inhabitants in this area until around 2000, when fish resources became a more important means for acquisition of foreign currency for the government. Thereafter, people's livelihoods led to conflicts in the political economy against the nation's profit-seeking from fish resources and the international intention of protecting the lake environment. As a result of the conflicts, people's fishing nets were burned from 2002 to 2004. At the same time, the rediscovery of oil made the indigenous Banyoro and Bagungu rush to the land and chase away the Alur immigrants. After these incidents, fishing people became involved in light fishing and cotton farming. Though different, there are common features between these two industries: the groups living in Runga participating in these businesses are all trying to work independently, manipulating a hard situation to construct their own lives with great imagination.

It seems that people are facing temporary failures and are forced to make inevitable changes to survive, as the Alur began farming in addition to fishing, for example. Such a heterogeneous livelihood is vulnerable to international affairs and national policy, and is further influenced by the global economy. From this case, I can say that people who are peripheral in their socio-political status become even more overlooked with the development of globalisation.

Regional politics attempted to deter the Alur people from participating in the political system, motivated not only by discrimination against immigrants but also due to the discovery of oil. To understand the current transnational social question, Faist points out that migration juxtaposed to mobility is one of the crucial strategic research focuses, stating that ‘It is not only the categorization of people along nationality/citizenship and thus the accident of birth-place, but also their distinctions with respect to economic utility and social adaptation that make a difference to the life chances of many individuals’ (Faist, 2013: 1644).

On the other hand, all of these groups persist in their everyday practices in the hopes that they can improve their own lives, and all of them are pursuing their interests by themselves. It is possible to say that such a behaviour of pursuing individual interests can lead to creating solidarity between the peoples in the community. It may seem contradictory, but each resource including fish, milk, and cassava from the land is necessary for all individuals. Moreover, it is clear that fish and water established this village. In the case of Runga, one reason that people asked the Bararoo to come back was to bring back milk and meat to the area. This kind of activity related to a local market can be regarded as a meso-level strategy between people’s everyday practices and national policy.

Lastly, I remark on the possibility of community meetings organised by the LC and the BMUs. After
the case in the cotton field, several community meetings have been organised, and it seems that the situation becomes gradually calmer through the discussions on related matters. It seems that for all places similar to Runga Village that are multi-ethnic, heterogeneous, and diverse, the role of local government is more important to reach a mutual consensus in order to better manage citizens’ livelihoods. There is the possibility of establishing an interface between different ethnic groups to create a collective consciousness and belonging, which can be defined as neighbourhood feelings.

During Amin’s regime in the 1970s, a type of local administration was introduced and this landing site evolved into a village. Then, Museveni introduced the Resistance Council (RC) for governing, and then the RC was succeeded by the LC, the Ugandan system for decentralisation.

USD 1 = UGX 2200

Olam International was established in 1989, trading cashews from Nigeria into India. Today, it is a leading agribusiness operating from seed to shelf in 65 countries, supplying food and industrial raw materials to over 13,800 customers globally. The team of 23,000 employees has built a leadership position in many industries including cocoa, coffee, cashew, rice, and cotton, and the business consists of 44 different products across 16 platforms [http://olamgroup.com/about-us/in-a-nutshell/, 29 September, 2015].
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ウガンダ・アルバート湖畔の漁村における共同性の構築
——多民族混住地域における葛藤と生存戦略——

田 原 範 子

アルバート湖の自然——水、魚、土壌——は、多様な人びとを魅きほせる。干ばつの西ナイル地域や紛争後のコンゴ民主共和国から漁民、ウガンダ西南部やルワンダ共和国から牧畜民が到来する。本論文は、アルバート湖の東側海岸の多民族が混住する漁村の事例研究である。グローバル化する現在においてネオリベラルな政治経済システムは村落部にも変容をもたらし、湖を共有する人びとのローカルな生活に葛藤が生じている。その葛藤を契機に、政治的経済的システムにおいて周縁に位置づけられる移民は、より周縁部分へと追い払われる。しかし、言葉も生業も異なる多民族の共生を可能にするものの一つは、生業に基づく交換的経済活動——ミルク、魚、キャサバ——によって構築された「隣人意識」であることを、具体的に提示した。