

Response

Response to: 'Traditional Knowledge in Social–Ecological Systems'

[Ellen J. Woodley](#)

This issue (Traditional Knowledge in Social-Ecological Systems), is a much-needed initiative, focusing on traditional knowledge systems. However, the following statement by Folke (2004) (followed by others as well) is confusing: “These articles reflect on the difficulties, but also the potential to be found, in combining knowledge, institutional arrangements, and cultural foundations of traditional and local societies with contemporary society.” Are not traditional and local societies contemporary? If not, what are they? By definition, contemporary means ‘at the same time’, so to suggest, as this statement does, that traditional and local societies are not contemporary is saying that traditional societies are stagnant, a piece of the past and not co-evolving with industrial societies. Holders of traditional/indigenous and local knowledge and those involved in studies of this nature have long realized that this kind of knowledge, as practiced, is very dynamic and reflects societal and ecosystem changes in values, beliefs, biophysical factors, etc. Local, traditional, and indigenous knowledge is contemporary knowledge.

Responses to this article can be read online at:
<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss1/resp1/responses/>

LITERATURE CITED

Folke, C. 2004. 2004. Traditional Knowledge in Social-Ecological Systems. *Ecology and Society* 9(3): 7. [online] URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol9/iss3/art7/>