

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES IN NEPAL'S FORESTRY SECTOR PUBLIC DISCOURSES

Jailab Kumar Rai

*Lecturer, Central Department of Anthropology, Kirtipur, TU.
Corresponding author: jailabrai@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to unfold Nepal's forestry sector discourses from the perspectives of the presence and contribution of indigenous peoples in forestry sector public discourses. The paper deals with five dimensions of indigenous peoples as part of public discourses. They include: (a) policies and legislations; (b) physical presence in the forestry sector government institutions; (c) number of publications; (d) number of authors; and (e) presence in the public events. The qualitative information, derived from the participation and observation of the public events, is complemented by quantitative information compiled from the relevant reports and publications. I found that participation and contribution of indigenous peoples in Nepal's forestry sectors public discourses is relatively less. I argue that inadequacy of Nepal's forestry sector policies and practices is a replication of the overall situation of Nepali society that has fostered the exclusion of indigenous peoples.

Keywords: forestry sector discourses - indigenous peoples - participation - public events - upper caste groups.

INTRODUCTION

In Nepal, forest covers approximately 40 percent (nearly 5.5 million hectare) which is managed under six categories: Community Forest (CF), Leasehold Forest (LF), Collaborative Forest, Religious Forest (RF), National Forest (NF), and Protected Forest (PF) (GoN/MoFSC 2013). Of these, CF, in terms of the conservation and management of forestry resources, is considered as one of the most successful program and hence this has become government's priority program since 1990s. A total of 29 percent (over 1.7m. he.) forest area in Nepal, reaching over 1.6 million household, is managed as CF (GoN/MoFSC 2013). However, the CF policies and practices are criticized from different perspectives such as

it is benefiting mostly to the state authority (Chhetri 2006) and wealthier households (Malla, Neupane & Branney 2003; KC 2004). Moreover, its successful participation is only a rhetoric (Chhetri 1999) since it is limited to just a symbolic presence (Nightingale 2002) and vehicles for elites to legitimize their interest by the unconscious consent of the users (Timsina 2002). Numbers of forestry sector policies and regulations have been formulated and enacted and number of programs have also been developed and implemented in Nepal. Now a question would be what forms of public discourses have been developed and who are the key actors in terms of creating these public discourses as well as the policy opinions?

After the political changes in 1990s, previously marginalized social groups including indigenous peoples became assertive for the forestry sector policy making processes in Nepal (Adhikari & Dhungana 2011). However, a question is to what extent the marginalized communities including indigenous peoples have become able to participate and influence the policy making processes. The study by Ojha, Timsina and Khanal (2007) concluded that despite the functioning of multiparty political system, most of the forest policy decisions made during the study period (1998-2004) involved limited democratic deliberations for two main reasons: continued dominance of the role of forest science and state's forestry administration in forestry sector policy making; and weak linkages between civil society and elected political leaders in the legislature and the government. It is also argued that the forest-related policy-making process in Nepal is non-transparent (Blaikie & Springate-Baginski 2007). A question would be whether Nepal's forestry sector public discourses represent socio-political and economic inequalities. In this context, this paper attempts to answer this question by attempting to unfold the presence and contribution of indigenous peoples in Nepal's forest sector discourses as a part of public discourse.

STUDY CONTEXT AND METHODS

According to the international legal framework, indigenous peoples are "*those who have continuity of pre-colonial histories and consider themselves as distinct from other sectors of societies*" (Mertinez Codo 1986 cited in Merlan 2009, p. 305). The ILO 1989 defines it on the basis of three characteristics: (a) tribal people whose social, cultural, and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of national community; (b) people decedent from populations that inhabit the country, or parts of it, at time of conquest or colonization; and (c) people retaining some or all of their own institutions (Merlan 2009). The article 2(a) of

the National Foundation for the Development of Indigenous Nationalities (NFDIN) Act 2002, as the first legal instrument of the country, defines the term as "*Indigenous nationalities means a tribe or community having its own mother language and traditional rites and customs, distinct cultural identity, distinct social structure, and written or unwritten history*" (HMG/MoLJPA 2002). Based on this act, five features are considered as basis to distinguish indigenous peoples from others. They are: (a) distinct collective identity; (b) own language, religion, culture, tradition, and civilization; (c) traditional homeland, written or oral history; (d) lack of decisive roles in the politics and government; and (e) who declare itself as indigenous, are defined as indigenous (Bhattachan 2008; HMG/MoLJPA 2002).

Based on these definitions, indigenous peoples are group of people having five basic characteristics: (a) distinctiveness, (b) marginalization, (c) historic continuity, (d) self-governance, and (e) self-identity. However, its application is primarily focused on addressing socio-economic marginalization of indigenous peoples (Dove 2006; Merlan 2009). A study commissioned by the Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology (CDSA) concluded that socio-political and economic status of Hindu upper caste groups (Brahmin, Chhetri, Sannyasi and Thakuri-BCST) is relatively better than other groups including indigenous peoples in Nepal.

Table 1: Socio-political representation of social groups in Nepal

SN	Broad Social Groups		Number of Social Sub-Groups	Population (%)	Representation in (%)		
	Social Groups	Social Sub-Groups			Political Parties	Council of Minister	Civil Service
1	Hill	Brahman	1	12.2	24.3	32.1	39.2
		Chhetree	3	19.1	18.1	21.2	22.3
2	Madhesi	Brahman	4	0.8	4.1	4.7	3.3
		Other Castes	36	13.8	13.4	11.0	9.7
3	Dalits	Hill	5	8.1	2.8	1.9	0.9
		Madhesi	10	4.4	2.7	0.3	0.5
4	Adivasi/Janajati	Newari	1	5.0	6.4	7.1	7.9
		Mountain/Hill	48	22.2	15.6	12.1	9.0
		Tarai	14	8.6	7.0	6.0	4.6
5	Mushalman		1	4.4	4.4	2.7	0.7
6	Others		1	1.4	1.2	0.9	1.9
Total			124	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Tamang & Gurung 2014a, 2014b

Lower presence of indigenous peoples in Nepal's socio-political sectors means weak presence and influence in the state's decision making processes. The social inclusion index of indigenous peoples (Mountain/

Hill Janajati 0.5586 and Tarai Janajati 0.5500) is also lower in compare to the Hindu high caste groups (i.e. Hill Brahman 0.7403 and Madhesi Brahman 0.6936) and the national average (0.5815) (Tamang & Gurung 1014b) which may be due to many reasons. One of the arguments is beliefs on fate rooted from the Hindu religion and caste based hierarchies (Bista 1991; Gurung 2007). As argued that it is important to understand Hindu state's influence and integration of ex-tribal within a Hindu state to know social inequality in Nepal (Allen 1997). Caplan (1970), by analyzing the interrelation between Limbus and Brahmans in eastern hill Nepal, argued that indigenous peoples (Limbus in eastern Hill) are marginalized (particularly the loss of land) due to their interaction with clever and tactful Brahmins. It is also argued that the land confiscation policy adopted right after the expansion of modern Nepal weakened the political power of indigenous peoples (Limbus in eastern hill) at the local level (Regmi 1972). Christian McDonough (1997) also illustrated about socio-political marginalization of Tharu indigenous peoples due to the newly migrated Hindu high caste groups in their homeland in South plain in west Nepal. These forms of ethnographic accounts have developed a kind of negative image on Hindu high caste Brahmans migrated and settled in different parts of Nepal, especially those who came to interact with the non-Hindu or tribal peoples. According to Sharma (1997), many of the ethnographic studies have portrayed Brahmans in Nepal as key players to subjugate and exploit ethnic groups in their traditional homelands. He writes that,

Each time an ethnographic study is made the ethnic groups will change, but the Bahun, playing his various social roles, everywhere remains the same. This has produced a common stereotype of the Bahun, which portrays him as a greedy priest, a crafty village moneylender, a stealer of the people's land, who shuns rough and dirty work, carries with him an air of haughtiness, and is presumptuous and patronizing. This is an image which sticks to all Bahuns. It is an image which is most often sold to the outside audience (Sharma, 1997, p. 492).

This paper, in the given context, is primarily based on the discussions and analysis of the observation of national events on forestry sector issues during 2008 and 2014. I have participated and observed dozens of national and local gatherings as a researcher associated at Forest Action Nepal (FAN). So, the analysis is relied upon the personal experiences and reflection of the participation and observations of the local and national events, sometime as organizer and sometime as participants. However, the analysis, further, is complemented by the review of the related literatures

and the quantitative information obtained from the assessment of the relevant publications and reports. The quantitative information include; (a) caste and ethnic composition of the government officials/employees in forestry sector government institutions; (b) number of journal articles on Nepal's forestry issues; (c) number of authors appeared in the selected journal articles; and (d) number of participants in the selected events.

In this study, all the departments and divisions of the Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation (MoFSC) and the Ministry of Forest and Environment (MoFE) are considered as forestry sector government institutions. There are six administrative divisions and five thematic departments including dozens of sections and sub-sections under MoFSC and MoFE. In addition, there are five Regional Forest Directorate (RFD) offices, 77 District Forest Offices (DFO) and hundreds of Area Forest Offices (AFO). However, the officials in three departments i.e. Department of Forest (DoF), Department of Forest Research Survey (DFRS), and Department of Plant Resources (DPR) (GoN/MoFSC 2015) as well as three departments of MoFE i.e. Department of Forest and Soil Conservation (DoFSC), DPR, and Forest Research and Training Centers (FRTC) (GoN/MoFE 2020) are selected as sample institutions. The selection is based on the accessibility and availability of the information.

The journals selected for this study include: "*Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*" (in English language) and "*Hamro Ban Sampada (HBS)*" (in Nepali language) published by FAN since 2001, and "*Banko Jankari (BJ)*" (in english language) published by MoFSC since 1987. These journals are selected for three main reasons: focus of the journals on forestry related issues; regularity of the publications; and wider recognition of the publications among the forestry sector professionals.

The number of individuals participated (in terms of caste ethnic groups) in the national and regional consultation meetings organized for the establishment of the National Forest Entity (NFE) is analyzed in order to understand the participation by caste ethnic groups. Establishment of REF was a part of the deliverable of Multi Stakeholder Forestry Program (MSFP) of the Government of Nepal (GoN) implemented between 2012 and 2016. Similarly, this analysis is also complemented by the analysis of the number of individuals participated in the national level gatherings organized by ForestAction Nepal (FAN) between 2010 and 2014. These meetings and gatherings were selected on the basis of the availability of the information as well as participation of the author of this paper as an invitee

in the RFE related meetings and participant as well as organizer for the gatherings organized by FAN.

RESULTS

Policies and legislations

Number of legislations, in line with the Constitution of Nepal 2015, are formulated and enacted and many of the others are in the process of drafting. The legislations formulated and enacted include: (a) *Forest Policy 2014*, which has aimed at balancing conservation and national economic growth through the management and utilization of available forest resources; (b) *Forestry Sector Strategy 2016-2025*, with a vision for economic prosperity through fully optimizing sustainable management of forest ecosystems, biodiversity and watersheds; (c) *National Forest Policy 2019* aiming to the contribution of economic, social and cultural prosperity by ensuring balanced forest ecosystem; and (d) *Forest Act 2019*, with a provision of autonomous economic rights to CFUGs for decision on pricing and earning by selling the forest products available within their jurisdictions. Regarding forest resources, a prime concern of the indigenous peoples is legal recognition of the customary system of forest management, ownership and utilization. Nepal is a signatory to ILO 169 and a party to the UNDRIP and hence it is state's responsibility to comply all the national policies and legislations with the international legal frameworks. However, forestry sector policies and legislations have neither addressed the primary concerns of the indigenous peoples nor these policies comply with the international legal frameworks. It is because of the three main reasons: lack of scientific evidences, lack of adequate policy advocacy, and lack of influencing policy makers in place. Due to these reasons, previous policy provisions that consider all the forest resources dependent peoples as homogenous entities are reinforced in the recent policies.

Forestry sector government institutions

Hindu upper caste groups (Brahman, Chhetree, Sannyasi, and Thakuri – BCST) are significantly dominant in forestry sector government institutions in Nepal. Clearly seen in the Table 2 is that the number of Hindu upper caste group has increased by 78.2 percent from 67.46 percent between 2020 and 2015; while it is decreased by 17.0 percent from 21.43 percent for indigenous peoples.

Table 2: In the service by caste and ethnic groups in three departments of MoFSC

Data accessed in 2015							
Departments	In the Service by Caste Ethnic Groups					Indigenous Peoples	
	Total	BCST	Others	Indigenous Peoples		Newars	Others
				Number	%		
DoF	60	45	7	9	15.0	7	2
DFRS	32	19	5	8	25.0	6	2
DPR	34	21	3	10	29.4	8	2
Total	126	85	15	27	21.4	21	6
Total (%)	100.0	67.5	11.9	21.4	21.4	77.8	22.2
Data Accessed in 2020							
DoFSC	76	62	2	12	15.8	11	1
DoPR	35	24	3	8	22.9	7	1
FRTC	36	29	2	5	13.9	3	2
Total	147	115	7	25	17.0	21	4
%	100.0	78.2	4.8	17.0	17.0	84.0	16.0

Source: GoN/MoFSC 2015 and GoN/MoFE 2020

Among the indigenous peoples, number of Newars is significantly high (77.78% in 2015 and 84.01% in 2020). These means Hindu upper caste groups and Newars are highly privileged caste ethnic groups to get employed in the forestry sector government institutions in Nepal. There may be some reasons. First would be lesser number of enrolments and graduation in the forestry sciences due to the competitiveness in getting admission. Second would be those who are graduated in the forestry sciences have no social networks for accessing information about government services which according to the Bista (1991: 89-94) is access and capacity for "Chakari system" in Hindu dominant society. Third would be cultural barriers due to which they are not socio-culturally motivated for the employment in government institutions. Findings of study by Central Department of Anthropology (CDA) at Tribhuvan University also complements this claim as a total of 61 percent of the civil service is from among the Hill Brahman and Chhetri groups while it is only 19.9 percent from the indigenous peoples in Nepal (Pokharel & Pradhan 2020). The conclusion is that the lower number of indigenous peoples in the forestry sector government institutions obviously becomes one of the important reasons for less influence in the forestry sector public discourses in Nepal.

Number of journal articles on indigenous issues

Publications of journal articles are one of the important sources of public debates. So, I have quantified the articles published in three journal publications in order to contextualize the extent of priority and coverage of indigenous issues.

Table 3: Number of publications (volumes, issues, articles) in three journals

Journal and Date Covered	Total Volumes	Total Issues	Total Articles	Articles on Indigenous People's Issues	
				Number	%
BJ (1987 to May 2014)	24	52	425	9	2.1
JFL (2002 to June 2014)	12	17	148	1	0.7
HBS (2002 to April 2015)	12	20	248	2	0.8
Total	48	89	821	12	1.5

Source: *FAN 2002-2015 and FRTC/MoFE/GoN 1987-2014*

Table 3 clearly shows that very few articles were published on the issues related to indigenous peoples (only 12 articles which is 1.46%). Of the total 12 articles, majority of them have focused on the importance of indigenous knowledge on forest resources management and utilizations (Messerschmidt & Hammett 1993, Tiwari 1994, Rayamajhi & Pokharel 1995, Kuwar & Pokharel 1998, 2000, Shrestha 2002, Adhikari & Devkota 2005, Barakoti & Shrestha 2008, Bhattarai, Pant & Upadhyaya 2011) while some articles have focused on the rights of indigenous peoples for implementing Reducing Emission from Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) (Rai 2010, Sherpa & Rai 2013), and indigenous people's knowledge for biodiversity conservation (Rai 2011). Similarly, number of studies and findings on issues related to the indigenous peoples were published in different forms including as journals articles outside of the selected journals. Some of these publications argued about the prior existence and significance of indigenous knowledge and practices for the sustainable conservation, management and utilization of forest resources in rural Nepal (Messerschmidt 1992, 1995, Saul 1992, Chhetri 1993, 1994, Fisher 1994, Gurung 1999; Thapa 1999); while some studies have focused on the importance of integrating knowledge on biophysical sciences and human culture for making the concept and practice of CF a success (Messerschmidt 1992, 1995, Fisher & Gilmour 1999). Some other publications argue the indigenous knowledge as source of common property resources management (Fisher 1994). However, the

number of articles published in journals selected for this study indicates that the studies and publication on indigenous issues are not adequate in terms of the number that could be counted as part of public discourses. The less number of publications is mainly due to the less number of researchers interested on the issue. The reasons are: inadequate public policy debates on the issue; lack of adequate scientific evidences about indigenous issues; and less number of indigenous peoples in policy making positions and institutions.

Number of authors appeared in the journal articles

The total authors appeared in the selected three journals was 1535 individuals and of them only 198 (12.88%) persons were indigenous peoples. In its contrast, a total of 948 individuals (61.68%) were BCST. This means Hindu high caste groups are significantly dominant in producing scholarly evidences on Nepal's forestry sector discourses. Among the indigenous ethnic groups, Newars are highly dominant since a total of 139 individuals (70.20%) out of the total of 198 individuals (100%) appeared as authors from among the indigenous peoples were Newar ethnic groups.

Table 4: Number of authors appeared in published journal articles

Journals	Total Articles	Total Authors	Authors by Caste Ethnic Groups			Indigenous Peoples		Indigenous Peoples	
			BCST	Foreigners	Others	Indigenous Peoples		Newar	Others
						Number	%		
BJ	425	808	418	187	81	122	15.1	106	16
JFL	148	362	237	70	18	37	10.2	21	16
HBS	248	367	293	24	15	39	10.6	12	27
Total	821	1537	948	281	114	198	12.9	139	59
%		100.0	61.7	18.3	7.4	12.9	12.9	70.2	29.8

Source: FAN 2002-2015 and FRTC/MoFE/GoN 1987-2014

Hindu upper caste groups are significantly dominant among the authors appeared as lead authors since only a total of 95 articles (11.57% out of the total 821) were led by the authors from the indigenous peoples. Similarly, of the total 95 articles, the authors from Newar ethnic groups were appeared as lead authors in a total of 75 articles (78.95%). So, the authors from among the Hindu upper caste groups and Newar ethnic groups are highly dominant in terms of appearing as lead authors. This means Hindu

upper caste groups and Newars are key opinion makers in Nepal's forestry sector discourses. The persons appeared as lead authors on the indigenous issues is primarily due to their personal interest on the issues developed through different means such as academic engagements and personal encounters with the concerned communities and knowledge networks.

Number of participants in the forestry sector public events

Establishment of National Forest Entity (NFE) was one of the deliverable of Multi Stakeholder Forestry Program (MSFP) of the Government of Nepal (GoN) implemented between 2012 and 2016. So, a study team prepared and submitted the recommendation for the establishment of NFE in early 2015 to MoFSC. This recommendation was prepared through series of consultation meetings among the forestry sector stakeholders from local to the national levels, supplemented with the review of relevant literatures and reports (ETA 2015).

Table 5: Participants by caste ethnic groups in the regional consultation meetings for NFE

SN	Place of the Event	Date of the Event	Participants by Caste Ethnic Groups				
			Total	BCST	Others	Indigenous Peoples	
						Number	%
1	Hetauda	30, Nov, 2014	43	34	5	4	9.3
2	Pokhara	2, Dec, 2014	47	33	7	7	14.9
3	Biratnagar	5, Dec, 2014	47	32	6	9	19.2
4	Dhangadhi	8, Dec, 2014	40	28	5	7	17.5
5	Kathmandu	9, Jan, 2015	48	34	8	6	12.5
Total			225	161	31	33	14.7
%			100.0	71.6	13.8	14.7	14.7

Source: ETA 2015

Participation of the indigenous peoples in the consultation meeting for REF was very less (13.78 %) in comparison to the Hindu high caste groups (71.56%). It also becomes very less when it is compared with proportion of the national population occupied by indigenous peoples (35.81%); while the participation of Hindu upper caste groups was more than double in comparison to the proportion of its national population (31.25%).

Table 6: Participants by caste ethnic groups in the events organized by FAN

Year	Total Events	Participants of the Events Focused on Indigenous Peoples' Issues					
		Number of Events	Total	BCST	Others	Indigenous Peoples	
						Number	%
2010	10	1	46	22	3	21	45.7
2011	12	1	47	29	1	17	36.7
2012	13	5	166	83	7	77	46.4
2013	17	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
2014	9	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	61	7	259	134	11	115	44.4
%	100.0	11.5	100.0	51.7	4.3	44.4	44.4

Source: FAN 2010 to 2015

Participation of indigenous peoples in the public events focused on indigenous issues was relatively high. For example, table 6 shows that the average participation of indigenous peoples in the public events focused on indigenous issues was 44.4 percent. It is due to the reason that the participation of indigenous peoples was prioritized in these events. This means, organizations of the events focused on the indigenous people's concerns is very important in order to increase the participation of indigenous peoples; which obviously increases the participation and contribution of indigenous peoples in the forestry sector public policy discourses.

DISCUSSION

For Pire Bourdieu (1989, p. 23) "*symbolic capital*" is "*symbolic power*" that transforms individuals, groups or institutions. This transformation often rests upon two conditions: *performative discourse* and *symbolic efficacy*. For him, possession of *symbolic capital* is a power to impose upon other minds a vision, granted power with sufficient recognition, power to make things with words, and knowledge founded in a reality. For him, it is also a power to manipulate objective structure of society and hence social discourse is created by the performance or the roles played by the actor in its environment. Seen from this theoretical perspective, I have analyzed Nepal's forestry sector discourses from five dimensions as part of social processes that produce *social capital* as *symbolic power* in a given situation. So, it is important to identify and locate the actors according to the capital possessed and its relative weight (Bourdieu 1989) in order to increase its relative strengths that may influence public discourses.

In this study, I have attempted to unfold the presence and contribution of indigenous peoples in forestry sector discourses from five dimensions. Five dimensions, as I explained in the previous headings, could be analyzed by putting them into three categories: (a) *formal realm* which includes policy provisions and inclusion in the government institutions; (b) *knowledge realm* that includes the number of articles and the number of authors; and (c) *public realm* that includes number of participation in the public events as part of public discourses. Borrowing a theoretical framework of Bourdieu's (1989) *symbolic capital* and *symbolic power*, it would be argued that individuals as government employees in the government institutions, authors in the publications, and participants in the relevant events play roles to influence forestry sector public discourses.

In reference to the theoretical argument of Pire Bourdieu (1989), I have considered five dimensions as part of social processes and capitals through which indigenous peoples would become able to contribute and influence forestry sector public discourses. The studies shows that the indigenous peoples in Nepal, having knowledge on forest resources management (Kuwar *et al.* 2005, Bhattarai, Pant & Upadhy 2005, Barakoti and Shrestha 2008, Shrestha 2002), have knowledge about the sustainable management and utilization of natural resources (Messerschmidt 1992 and 1995, Saul 1992; Chhetri 1993 and 1994; Fisher 1994; Gurung 1999; Thapa 1999). They are also contributing to the conservation of biodiversity through their customary rules and practices (Rai 2011, 2012a, 2012b). This means indigenous peoples with a historical continuity of resource use practices often possess a broad knowledge base of the behavior of complex ecological systems in their own localities (Gadgil, Berkes & Folke 1993) that can serve as the basis for successful development interventions (Sillitoe 1998). For that reasons, legal rights of the indigenous peoples over natural resources have steadily been gaining recognition throughout the world (Lynch 2011). But modern global development activities are causing the loss of local knowledge (Scott 1998), including knowledge of environment (Dove 2006). This means participation of indigenous peoples in Nepal's forestry sector discourse is important for constructive debates as like as argued by Arturo Escobar (2007) on the importance of the "*politics of difference*". However, I, based on the data on five dimensions in this paper, argue that the state of presence and influence of the indigenous people in formal realm, knowledge realm and public realm of the Nepal's forestry sector discourses is relatively weak and inadequate. This means the symbolic capital and symbolic power of the indigenous peoples in Nepal's forestry sector discourses is very weak.

CONCLUSION

Nepal's forestry sector discourses is a form of the replication of social inequality prevailing in different aspects such as political, social, economic dimensions of Nepali society. This means the prevailing inequality between indigenous peoples and Hindu upper caste groups on forestry sector discourses is a replication of the inequality rooted from the history of caste based inequalities. I conclude that increasing number of presence and little contribution of indigenous peoples in Nepal's forestry sector discourses is a prerequisite for the transformation of overall social, cultural and economic life of Nepali society for some reasons. *First*, it would become a means to contribute in developing inclusive forestry sector governance. *Second*, it helps promote dialogic and vibrant public discourses on Nepal's forestry sector governance that ensure the interaction among diverse knowledge pools at local to national levels. *Third*, it helps promote social solidarity through promotion of 'social dignity' (Silver 1995 & 2007) of historically marginalized ethnic groups.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Central Department of Anthropology (CDA), Tribhuvan University at Kirtipur, Nepal for providing me a faculty grant received from the University Grant Commission (UGC), Nepal.

REFERENCES

- Adhikari, J., & Dhungana, H. (2011). The state and forest resources: An historical analysis of policies and affecting forest management in the Nepalese Terai. In: Arjun Guneratne (ed.) *The tarai: history, society, environment*. Kathmandu: Himal Books, pp. 101-131.
- Alan, N. J. (1997). Hinduisation: The experience of the Thulung Rai. In: D. N. Gelner, J. Paff-Czarnecka and J. Welpton (eds.) *Nationalism and ethnicity in a Hindu kingdom: the politics of culture in contemporary Nepal*. Hardwood Academic Publishers, Netherland, pp. 303-324.
- Barakoti, T. P., & Shrestha, K. P. (2008). Commercial utilization of *Allo* (*Girardinia diversifolia*) by the Rais of Sankhuwasabha for income generation. *Banko Janakari*, **18**(1): 18-24.
- Bhattachan, K. B. (2008). *Minorities and indigenos peoples of Nepal*. Kathmandu: National Coalition Against Racial Discrimination (NCRC).

- Bhattarai, S., Pant, B., & Upadhyaya, C. P. (2011). Dependency of tharu communities on wild plants: A case study of Shankarpur, Kanchanpur district. *Banko Janakari*, 21(1): 35-40.
- Bista, D. B. (1991). *Fatalism and development: Nepal's struggle for modernization*. Orient Longman, Kolkata.
- Blaikie, P., & Springate-Baginski, O. (2007). Understanding the policy process. In: O. Springate-Baginski and P. Blaikie (eds.) *Forests, people & power: The political ecology of reform in South Asia*. Earthscan, UK, pp. 61-91.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and Symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1): 14-25.
- Chettri, R. B. (1993). Indigenous system of forest protection and management in far western hills of Nepal. In: D. Tamang, G. J. Gill and G. B. Thapa (eds.) *Indigenous management of natural resources in Nepal*. His Majesty of Government (HMG), Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and Winrock International, Kathmandu, pp. 323-342.
- Chettri, R. B. (1994). Indigenous and community forestry management systems: reviewing their strengths and weaknesses. In: M. Allan (ed.) *Anthropology of Nepal: Peoples, problems and processes*. Mandala Book Point, Kathmandu, pp. 19-35.
- Chhetri, R. B. (1999). The rhetoric and realities of people's participation in conservation and development: An anthropological perspective. In: R. B. Chhetri and O. Gurung (eds.) *Anthropology and sociology of Nepal: cultures, societies, ecology and development*. SASON, Kathmandu, pp. 192-211.
- Chhetri, R. B. (2006). From protection to poverty reduction: a review of forestry policies and practices in Nepal. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood*, 6(1): 66-77.
- Dove, M. R. (2006). Indigenous people and environmental politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35: 191-208.
- Dove, M. R. (2006). Indigenous people and environmentla politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 35: 191-208.
- Escobar, A. (2007). An ecology of difference: equality and conflict in a globalized world. *European Journal of Anthropology*, 47: 120-37.
- ETA (2015). *Process for the establishment of the national forest entity (NFE)*. The report submitted by Engineers' and Trainers Association (ETA) to the MSFP, Program Coordination Office, Babarmahal, Kathmandu.

- FAN (2002-2014). *Hamro Ban Sampada*. Nepali Journal Published by ForestAction Nepal (FAN).
- FAN (2002-2015). *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*. English Journal Published by ForestAction Nepal (FAN).
- FAN (2010-2015). *Annual reports*. Published by Forest Action Nepal (FAN).
- Fisher, R. J., & Gilmour, D. A. (1999). Anthropology and biophysical sciences in natural resource management: is symbiosis possible? In: R. B. Chhetri and O. Gurung (eds.) *Anthropology and sociology of Nepal: cultures, societies, ecology and development*. SASON, Kathmandu, pp.169-191.
- Fisher, B. (1994). Indigenous forest management in Nepal: Why common property is not a problem? In: M. Allan (ed.) *Anthropology of Nepal: peoples, problems and processes*. Mandala Book Point, Kathmandu, pp.64-81.
- FRTC/MoFE/GoN (1987-2014). *Banko Jankari*. English Journal Published by Forest Research and Training Centre (FRTC), Ministry of Forests and Environment (MoFE), Government of Nepal.
- Gadgil, M., Berkes, F., & Folke, C. (1993). Indigenous knowledge for biodiversity conservation. *Ambio*, **22**(2/3): 151-156.
- GoN/MoFE (2020). Ministry of forest and environment (MoFE), Government of Nepal (GoN). <http://www.mfe.gov.np>, Accessed: 15.11.2020.
- GoN/MoFSC (2013). *Persistence and change: review of 30 years of community forestry in Nepal*. Government of Nepal (GoN), Ministry of Forest and Soil Conservation (MoFSC), Kathmandu.
- GoN/MoFSC (2015). Ministry of forest and soil conservation (MoFSC), Government of Nepal (GoN). <http://www.mfsc.gov.np>, Accessed: 14.07.2015.
- Gurung, H. (2007). *From social exclusion to inclusion: socio-political agenda for Nepal*. Social Inclusion Research Fund (SIRF), Kathmandu.
- Gurung, O. (1999). Local institutions, cultural practices and resource management in a mountain village of west Nepal. In: R.B Chhetri and O. Gurung (eds.) *Anthropology and sociology of Nepal: Cultures, societies, ecology and development*. SASON, Kathmandu, pp. 251-274.
- HMG/MoLJPA (2002). *National foundation for the development of indigenous nationalities act 2002*. Kathmandu: His Majesty of

- Government/Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs (HMG/MoLJPA), Nepal.
- KC, A. (2004). Extraction of NTFPs from the community forest: Analysis of benefit distribution pattern in household level. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*, 4(1): 38-54.
- Kunwar, R. M., Adhikari, N., & Devkota, M. P. (2005). Indigenous use of mistletoes in tropical and temperate region of Nepal. *Banko Janakari*, 15(2): 38-42.
- Lynch, O. J. (2011). *Mandating recognition: indigenous law and native/aboriginal title*. Rights to Resources Initiatives (RRI), Washington DC.
- Malla, Y. B., Neupane, H. R., & Branney, P. J. (2003). Why aren't poor people benefiting more from community forestry? *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*, 3(1): 78-90.
- McDonough, C. (1997). Losing ground, gaining ground: Land and change in a tharu community in Dang, West Nepal. In: D. N. Gellner, J. Pfaff-Czarnecka, and J. Whelpton (eds.) *Nationalism and ethnicity in a Hindu kingdom: The politics of culture in contemporary Nepal*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, pp. 275-298.
- Merlan, F. (2009). Indigeneism: Global and local. *Current Anthropology*, 50(3): 303-333.
- Messerschmidt, D. A. (1992). People and forests, anthropologists and foresters: Recent research at Nepal's institute of forestry. In: M. Allan (ed.) *Anthropology of Nepal: Peoples, problems and processes*. Mandala Book Point, Kathmandu, pp.82-96.
- Messerschmidt, D. A. (1995). Local traditions and community forestry management: A view from Nepal. In: D. M. Warren, L. J. Slikkerveer and D. Brokensha (eds.) *The cultural dimension of development: Indigenous knowledge systems*. Intermediate Technology Publications, London, pp. 231-244.
- Messerschmidt, D. A., & Hammett, A. L. (1993). Indigenous knowledge of alternative forest resources extraction and marketing: Significance for community forestry planning and management. *Banko Janakari*, 4(1): 32-36.
- Nightingale, A. J. (2002). Participating or just sitting in? The dynamics of gender and caste in community forest. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*, 2(1): 17-24.

- Ojha, H., Timsina, N. P., & Khanal, D. R. (2007). How are forest policy decision made in Nepal? *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*, *6*(1): 1-7.
- Pokharel, B., & Pradhan, M. (2020). *State of inclusive governance: A study on participation and representation in Nepal*. A study report, Central Department of Anthropology (CDA), Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu.
- Pokharel, R. K. (1998). Indigenous technical knowledge of people on fodder tree management. *Banko Janakari*, *8*(2): 10-13.
- Pokharel, R. K. (2000). Indigenous forest management practices in some community forests of Nepal. *Banko Jankari*, *10*(1): 36-49.
- Rai, J. K. (2010): REDD ra adibasi janajatika sawalharu (English: REDD and concerns of indigenous peoples). *Hamro Ban Sampada*, *8*(2): 98-106.
- Rai, J. K. (2011). Nepalka samrachit chhetraharuko digo vyavasthapanaka lagi paripakkwa tatha sambhawit vikalpaharu (English: promising alternatives for sustainable management of conservation areas in Nepal). *Hamro Ban Sampada*, *9*(1): 40-49.
- Rai, J. K. (2012a). *The roles of indigenous and community conserved areas (ICCAs) in biodiversity conservation in Nepal* (in Nepali). ForestAction Nepal, Kathmandu.
- Rai, J. K. (2012b). Shifting biodiversity conservation paradigms and a promising alternative in Nepal. In: D. Dahal, L. Upreti, and B. Acharya (eds.) *Readings in anthropology and sociology of Nepal*. Sociological/Anthropological Society of Nepal (ASON), pp. 330-370.
- Rayamajhi, S., & Pokharel, R. K. (1995). Indigenous knowledge of the Chepang of khoriya cultivation. *Banko Janakari*, *5*(3): 134-137.
- Regmi, M. C. (1972). *A study in Nepali economic history 1768-1846*. Delhi: Adroit Publishers.
- Saul, R. (1992). Indigenous forest knowledge: Factors influencing its social distribution. In: M. Allan (ed.) *Anthropology of Nepal: peoples, problems and processes*. Mandala Book Point, Kathmandu, pp. 136-144.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Sharma, P. R. (1997). Nation-building, multi-ethnicity, and Hindu state. In: D. N. Gelner, J. Paff-Czarnecka and J. Welpton (eds.) *Nationalism and ethnicity in a Hindu kingdom: the politics of culture in*

- contemporary Nepal*. Hardwood Academic Publishers, Netherland, pp. 471-494.
- Sherpa, P. D., & Rai, T. B. (2013). Experience of Nepali indigenous peoples on free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*, **11**(2): 82-86.
- Shrestha, R. K. (2002). Various patterns of retaining trees in indigenous agroforestry practices in the mid-hills of Nepal. *Banko Janakari*, **12**(1): 36-41.
- Sillitoe P. (1998). The development of indigenous knowledge: a new applied anthropology. *Current Anthropology*, **39**(3): 223–52.
- Silver, H. (1995). Reconceptualizing social disadvantages: Three paradigms of social exclusion. In: G. Rodgers, C. Gore and J. Figueiredo (eds.) *Social exclusion: Rhetoric, reality, responses*. International Labor Organization, Geneva, pp. 57-80.
- Silver, H. (2007). *The processes of social exclusion: The dynamics of an evolving concept*. Department of Sociology, Brown University.
- Tamang, M., & Gurung, O. (2014a). *The Nepal multidimensional social inclusion index: Diversity and agenda for inclusive development*. Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Kathmandu.
- Tamang, M., & Gurung, O. (2014b). *Social inclusion atlas of Nepal: Ethnic and caste groups*. Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Kathmandu.
- Thapa, M. B. (1999). Indigenous management systems of natural resources in Nepal. In: R. B. Chhetri and O. Gurung (eds.) *Anthropology and sociology of Nepal: Cultures, societies, ecology and development*. SASON, Kathmandu, pp. 224-233.
- Timsina, N. (2002). Empowering or marginalization: a debate in community forestry in Nepal. *Journal of Forest and Livelihood (JFL)*, **2**(1): 27-33.
- Tiwari, B. N. (1994). Indigenous techniques for propagation of fodder tree in the western hills of Nepal. *Banko Janakari*, **4**(2): 180-183.