

**Forest dwellers,
indigenous people,
women and local
communities**

29

Indigenous peoples, forest dwellers, women and local communities

Joji Cariño¹

SUMMARY

This World Forestry Congress has for its theme “Forests and Sustainable Development in the 21st Century”. For many indigenous peoples, forest dwellers, women and local communities, this theme finds a deep resonance, because forests and sustainable development are still within the living memory and daily practice of many of us; where forests are being degraded, we are among its staunchest defenders; and our future well-being depends on the regeneration and renewal of the forests and the Earth. The historical and continuing disruption of our local and ecological relationship with the forests and the alienation of our lands is a primary underlying cause of the present forest crisis. The restoration and recognition of our historic relationship with the forests will be a central requirement for sustainable forests in the 21st century.

This paper attempts a global overview of past and present forestry policy and its impacts on indigenous peoples, forest dwellers, women and local communities. It discusses the marginalization of local peoples from forest decision-making and its consequences for these peoples and forests. Such exclusion of local peoples from forest planning and stewardship, breaks up the integral relationships that exist between forests and peoples within living forest communities and bioregions and the spiritual and ecological world views arising from such relationships. Efforts towards sustainable forests in the 21st century must address the rebuilding of these forest relationships - as the self-conscious policy response to lessons learned from the mistakes of 19th and 20th century forest practices.

Keywords: Indigenous peoples, traditional knowledge, land alienation, conflict resolution.

INTRODUCTION

The paper is about indigenous peoples, forest dwellers, women and local communities - those peoples who live, use, surround and have shaped the forests, and yet are the most marginal in forest policy decision-making. Only in very recent years, with the urgent and critical forest crisis, has there been a growing acknowledgement by the global forestry establishment of the central importance of these peoples to sustainable forest management with emerging programmes for community and participatory forestry.

In the wake of massive deforestation and forest degradation following decades of narrow and unsustainable forest policies and programmes, local communities who are most threatened by forest loss are reasserting responsible care for the forests and their own well-being. In many parts of the world, forest dwellers, indigenous peoples, women and local communities have been organizing to

¹ Executive Secretary, International Alliance of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, 14 Rudolf Place, Miles Street, London SW8 1RP, United Kingdom.
Facsimile: (44 171) 70938686; E-mail: morbeb@gn.apc.org

stop the aggressive economic development which has led to the destruction of forests. Today, the most promising examples of ongoing sustainable forest management and regeneration of degraded forest land are in the hands of indigenous peoples and local communities. And I am convinced that this is the way forward in the future.

Increasingly, the forestry establishment is acknowledging the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities in sustainable forest management. But this relationship between the forestry establishment and indigenous peoples and local communities is still early and tentative, coming from a history that has been fraught with conflict. For this partnership to be strengthened, it is necessary for the forest policy-makers to acknowledge this history of conflict, and to put to rights the historical and ongoing reality of social injustice and ecological destruction. The future of the world's forests requires understanding of the environmental history of forests and the social factors causing forest loss, and seriously addressing the issues of indigenous peoples, forest dwellers, women and local communities.

This paper looks at the policy approaches towards local forest peoples emerging from the ongoing forest policy dialogue, looking at ways to bolster an approach that is critical to the future of forests in the 21st century. At the outset, it is necessary to state that it is difficult to give sufficient detailed attention to the issues affecting all these peoples under one broad heading. This paper will focus on indigenous peoples. However, what is required is a differentiated and informed approach appropriate to diverse social conditions.

I have not attempted a highly integrated and coherent approach, but rather one of highlighting certain key issues, problems and approaches learned from experience with a view to sparking off creative approaches or entry-points for action in this broad social arena. I have drawn on much previous research in bringing together in this paper, and these are duly acknowledged in the body of the text.

THE MARGINALIZATION OF FOREST DWELLERS, INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, WOMEN AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES

The present phenomenon of State control over forests has largely been at the expense of forest dwellers, indigenous peoples, women and local communities following a history of incorporation of the forest commons into state forests and the alienation of local control over forest resources towards centralized control. The transformation has been not only in the physical control of the forest lands, but also in the values and outlooks regarding the forests, from a world view of co-sustenance into narrow economic values.

In the 18th and 19th centuries in the wake of colonialism, Western concepts of land ownership and control began to be widely applied with the imposition of land and forestry policies over vast areas of the tropics and the loss of the major part of forest peoples' ancestral lands to newly created government agencies.

In India, many tribal and low caste community lost the majority of their farmlands between 1892 and 1906:

Eighty per cent of the Indian sub-continent was estimated to possess healthy forest cover as recently as 1000 years ago. The nationalization and demarcation of India's forest lands began in the 1860s. Over the next century, forest nationalization continued, with frequent conflicts erupting over forest access among rural communities, private sector interests and the state. Commercial use increasingly dominated forestry objectives and practices. By 1980, one-half of the nation's land area was declared unproductive.

This in a country where 44 million tribal people mainly live in the forest areas, and an additional 250-300 million rural inhabitants have significant biomass dependencies on forest resources.

The picture is even more startling in South-East Asia. Indonesia's Forest Department controls some 74% of the national territory, putting it in conflict with some 30-40 million people who live in or directly from the forests. Special forestry laws, which override the Basic Agrarian Law, criminalize unauthorized occupation or working of official forest areas and prohibit the unauthorized cutting or harvesting of forest products. As the Indonesian Minister for Forestry told journalists in 1989, "in Indonesia, the forest belongs to the state and not to the people . . . they have no right to compensation" when logging destroys the forests on which they depend.

The 7 000 staff of the Royal Forestry Department in Thailand administer 40% of the nation's land area, where there are 8-15 million "squatters". In October 1989, Thailand's Forestry Department chief announced that all these people were to be relocated, drawing special attention to the need to expel the 700 000 hill tribes people living in these areas.

In the Philippines, fully 55% of the country is now classified as forest reserves after the area was greatly expanded in 1975 by Presidential Decree 704, by which all land steeper than 18 degrees in slope was categorized as Forest Land. It has been estimated that these forest reserves are inhabited by some 18 million people, including most of the country's 6 million indigenous people, yet forestry policies until recently have almost systematically ignored these peoples' numbers, welfare and rights.

Martin (1991) has identified the same process at the root of deforestation in Africa:

Actually the destruction began much earlier this century when the original forest inhabitants were stripped of their autonomy and the forest administration was centralized in the interests of commercial timber exploitation. Forest loss is the result of complex interactions between cultural and commercial factors which eventually lead to uncontrolled destruction. But the tropical timber industry plays a key role in the process.

Forestry came much later to Latin America, but the alienation of forest lands to the state was nevertheless almost total. Throughout Central and South America, the vast majority of forest lands were classified as *tierras baldias* "wastelands" - which became the nominal property of the state. Forest dwellers continued to exercise rights in these areas not through legal or administrative sanction but through their isolation and neglect.

One of the main problems with this policy of divesting local people of control of land is that the relatively tiny bureaucracies charged with administering and policing the forests have been totally unable to prevent public access. Moreover, forest policy has leased out the same areas to private industry as logging concessions. The result of these combined pressures has been environmental devastation on an astounding scale.

In sum, besides replacing previously sustainable systems of resource use with extravagant and destructive practices, forestry has created almost insoluble political conflicts between local people and government, which have further "limited the ability of both the state and the community to effectively control forest use, and have contributed to uncontrolled exploitation and mismanagement".

Moreover, the alienation of forest lands from local communities has long-term damaging effects on traditional regulative institutions that control access to resources. The damage may be so severe that, even when local populations subsequently manage to reassert their rights to forest resources, deforestation only accelerates further since traditional controls no longer operate.

The policy bias against local people and in favour of timber-based economies has also severely damaged the evolution of democratic institutions in tropical countries. In Sarawak, for example, the corrupting influence of the timber trade has promoted the domination of the economy by nepotistic,

patronage politics. This has undermined democratic principles and caused an increasing marginalization of rural people, who find they can no longer rely on their political representatives to defend their interests. The practice of dealing out logging licences to members of the state legislature to secure their allegiance is so commonplace in Sarawak that it has created a whole class of instant millionaires. The Commission of Enquiry in Papua New Guinea has revealed a similar decay in standards of public service due to the logging industry and, in fact, the process is very widespread, having formed a crucial component in the “crony capitalism” of the Philippines under Ferdinand Marcos. In Indonesia, logging concessions continue to be one of the perks enjoyed by the ruling military clique. In West Africa, similar systems of patronage politics linked to the timber industry are also prominent and, as Witte notes below, the process is spreading south into Zaire. In Latin America, where large-scale timber extraction is a relatively new phenomenon, the traditional patron-client structures so prevalent in the political economy have readily assimilated the handing out of logging concessions.

Ironically, Western attempts to promote natural resource conservation have also foundered on this unresolved conflict between local communities and state administration. Like forestry reserves, national parks established on indigenous lands have denied local rights to resources, turning local people practically overnight from being hunters and cultivators into “poachers” and “squatters”. The problem is very widespread. One example of many is the Dumoga Bone National Park in Sulawesi, Indonesia, where the indigenous Mongondow people, displaced onto the hillsides from their valley lands by spontaneous and government-sponsored colonization, have found themselves persecuted as “encroachers” when the hillsides were declared a national park. The last community of forest-dwellers in Sri Lanka face an identical problem from the creation of the Madura Oya National Park.

POST WAR DEVELOPMENT AS EXPROPRIATION

The past 40 years have seen a massive acceleration in the rate at which indigenous peoples have been deprived of their lands and livelihoods by imposed development programmes. Large-scale projects such as plantations, dams, mines, military installations, nuclear waste dumps and colonization schemes have been the most obvious causes.

In very many cases these kinds of government-directed development initiatives are justified as being “in the national interest” and the state has thereby exercised its power of “eminent domain” to deny local peoples’ rights. In Indonesia, the Government feels entitled to invoke this prerogative for any project or programme in its five-year plans. In India, it is estimated that as many as two million “tribal” people face eviction from their lands to make way for proposed projects.

The post-war development decades and the accelerated growth in the timber trade has spawned the current forest crisis. In many countries, this crisis was initially defined as the decreasing availability of timber resources to meet development growth. Many forestry plans, such as the Tropical Forest Action Plan, were geared towards industrial tree plantations. Only more recently has the forestry crisis been understood in its fuller dimensions, giving impetus to the formulation of a range of forest strategies.

REVIEW OF FOREST POLICY PROCESSES²

In the 1980', with the emergence of a global forest agenda, there have been many forest programmes of various kinds with the aim of reconciling the conflicting goals of poverty alleviation, private sector development and environment protection. A variety of different approaches have been supported by different agencies with differing emphases, such as National Conservation Strategies (IUCN), National Environment Action Plans (World Bank), National Forestry Action Plans (FAO), Forestry

² Background Papers for the Leticia Meeting.

Master Plans (ADB), Forestry Sector Reviews (World Bank) and Natural Resource Management Projects (World Bank), etc. Almost all these processes have centred around partnerships between international agencies and national government departments, which have promoted and used the exercises in order to further their own development priorities.

The aim of all the planning exercises is to provide a logical framework for the use and management of natural resources by defining clearly the appropriate means for the use of natural resources, establishing legislation and regulations and empowering institutions to enforce these plans and laws. "Ecological zoning" has been a common tool in these planning exercises, the aim being to determine, based on "objective" environmental and geographical criteria, the optimum use for different zones - for example which areas are suitable for "protection forests", which for "production forests", and which may be slated for "conversion" to agriculture, plantations, smallholder crops, and so on.

Indigenous Peoples and NGOs have been extremely critical of these processes because they have often been top-down, commercially oriented exercises dominated by foreign consultancies and development agencies. They have not involved local communities, peasants and indigenous peoples in planning. They have marginalized women, the poor and vulnerable groups. They have failed to address root causes of environmental degradation, such as social inequities and skewed patterns of land tenure. Forestry planning processes in particular have been dominated by the conventional concerns of foresters, focused on promoting and regulating the timber industries, to the exclusion of social concerns.

Many of these criticisms have been found to be valid. International reviews in the early 1990s of the Tropical Forestry Action Plan - a joint programme of the World Bank, UNDP, FAO and World Resources Institute - admitted that the initial plans were not cross-sectoral enough, were too donor-driven, gave too much emphasis to the promotion of forest industries and underemphasized issues of land tenure, the rights of indigenous peoples, women and NGO participation. Attempts to "revamp" the TFAP to accommodate these criticisms were, however, unsuccessful and the WRI, World Bank and UNDP withdrew from the TFAP.

A consensus has emerged that, in order to be effective, these planning processes need to be:

- "Country driven": imposed prescriptions by donor agencies may not take account of national priorities and differences. The need is to give priority to national processes of decision-making"
- "Cross-sectoral": early plans suffered from being focused on the technical aspects of logging, timber production and forest management, they ignored the wider contexts in which forests are set, particularly social and political issues,
- "Multi-disciplinary": technical foresters lack knowledge of these broader issues so experts from other fields need to be brought in,
- providing "capacity building": national institutions are often weak, under-resourced and politically marginal. Their capacity needs to be built up so they can effectively regulate what is happening in forests and ensure the wider issues are addressed,
- "Participatory": in order to capture the concerns of social groups commonly ignored in development planning, new procedures need to be adopted to ensure the participation of marginal groups, like women, indigenous peoples, peasants etc. Mechanisms for direct local participation need to be developed; very often NGOs are asked to speak on behalf of these sectors.

Although these principles have been accepted and many agencies have adopted new guidelines and policies to help ensure that they are put into effect, they have often not been successful. National Planning processes still commonly do not address the issue of indigenous peoples' rights; they avoid addressing issues of land tenure; they dodge the problems of skewed land ownership patterns; they have not allowed real participation. For example, a 1994 review by the World Bank of its own forestry

projects concluded that while social issues received high priority in the Bank's "Forest Policy Paper", they have not yet received effective treatment in Bank forest sector work as compared to technical and economic aspects. A 1996 review of the FINNIDA-funded Forestry Master Plan in Thailand found that it had given inadequate consideration of the special features of the Thai forests, allowed insufficient participation of local people, given too little consideration of the rights of people living in forests and had provided a limited analysis of the causes of forest degradation.

Another example is the FAO's revised National Forestry Action Programme, which has elaborated new norms to ensure the participation of indigenous peoples and other social groups. However, there is no effective mechanism to review the FAO's progress in applying these revised practices.

Indigenous peoples' responses to the forest crisis

In 1992, leading up to the Rio Conference, the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests was established at an indigenous conference in Penang, Malaysia. The Alliance agreed a Forest Peoples Charter as our response to the global problem of forest destruction and its impact on indigenous peoples. Our goal is to secure respect for indigenous rights, territories, institutions and processes, and to promote an indigenous model of socially and environmentally sensitive development and conservation in tropical forest regions.

This inter-continental network of the organizations of indigenous and tribal peoples living in the tropical forests includes the Batwa of Rwanda, the hill tribes of Thailand, the peoples of the Amazon, the adivasis of India, and many more peoples from 30 tropical forest countries. I am an Ibaloi-Igorot from the Cordillera region of the Philippines.

Since its founding, the International Alliance has been a channel for members' direct representation in the various international fora concerned with the issues of indigenous peoples, with particular focus on the post-Rio forest deliberations.

UNCED AND MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENTS

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio in 1992 ushered in several multilateral environmental agreements which now shape the strategies and approaches by governments in relation to the environment and development, including forest policy. These are the Rio Principles, Agenda 21, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Non-Legally Binding Principles for the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests" also known as the "Forest Principles".

Indigenous assessments of the Rio Agreements highlight the recognition of Indigenous Peoples as a major group for the implementation of Agenda 21 as a major achievement. Women, farmers and local authorities are likewise recognized as major groups, and their roles are discussed in Section 3 of Agenda 21. Chapter 26 is entitled "Recognizing and strengthening the role of indigenous people and their communities". The first paragraph acknowledges that indigenous peoples have "developed over many generations a holistic traditional scientific knowledge of their lands, natural resources and environment. Indigenous people and their communities shall enjoy the full measure of human rights and fundamental freedoms without hindrance or discrimination". It also recognizes indigenous rights to lands, intellectual and cultural property and the need to preserve customary and administrative practice, advocates empowerment, promotes participation and proposes involvement in resource management and conservation

The promotion of participation is key for this report and the first paragraph expresses this as follows:

Their [indigenous peoples'] ability to participate fully in sustainable development practices on their lands has tended to be limited as a result of factors of an economic, social and historical nature. In view of the interrelationship between the natural environment and its sustainable

development and the cultural, social, economic and physical well-being of indigenous people, national and international efforts to implement environmentally sound and sustainable development should recognize, accommodate, promote and strengthen the role of indigenous people and their communities.

Chapter 26 contains certain objectives for governments, and intergovernmental organizations to fulfil such as empowering indigenous peoples and communities through national policies and legal instruments and to strengthen the active participation of indigenous peoples in formulating policies laws and programmes concerning resource management. The UN and finance organizations should appoint a focal point within each organization for a coordinated indigenous dimension to policy and programme work. Furthermore there should be annual inter-organizational coordination with governments and indigenous organizations to develop procedures for incorporating indigenous viewpoints in the design and implementation of policies and programmes .

Indigenous concerns about agenda 21 and other Rio agreements

The Rio agreements also contains several features which give indigenous peoples cause for concern: these were drawn up with little indigenous participation and indigenous peoples have been marginal to subsequent decisions. The documents weaken indigenous rights by overemphasizing state sovereignty; by refusing to recognize indigenous peoples as peoples with collective and distinct identities; by not acknowledging territorial rights; by considering indigenous peoples as objects of study and development not as self-determining subjects of their lives; and by limiting them to passive and reactive roles in participation and partnership.

Despite policy recognition of the role of indigenous peoples, women and local communities in the implementation of the Rio agreements, there exist no mechanisms in current inter-governmental processes for full and equal participation and shared decision-making between governments and other major groups. This means that the world views and perspectives of the majority of the world's peoples are not taken into account in current environmental negotiations, despite our overwhelming presence in all lands and territories critical for the protection and renewal of the earth, and in local grassroots actions to build sustainable communities. The issue of **clear mechanisms for participation**, within the intergovernmental processes is an important issue for attention.

These fundamental limitations of the Forest Principles and Agenda 21 have informed the post-Rio forest negotiations, thus limiting advances for indigenous peoples. These limitations were evident in the final negotiations of the IPF Report, the UNCSD Report and the Outcomes of the UN General Assembly Special Session (Earth Summit + 5), where governments sought to limit the adoption of action proposals affecting indigenous peoples, who were not allowed a voice in the final negotiations.

This disappointing aspect of the forest negotiations at UNGASS, is more marked in view of the promising opening made to indigenous peoples and other forest-dependent peoples during the IPF process.

The intergovernmental panel on forests

The Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF) was created by the third session of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) in April 1995 during its review of the Forest Principles and Chapter 11 of Agenda 21. The IPF's mandate was to pursue consensus and coordinated proposals for action to support the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests. The IPF met four times before reporting back to the CSD at its fifth session in April 1997. In addition to the main meetings, intersessional meetings sponsored by governments from North and South to discuss specific themes took place under the auspices of the IPF. Subjects have

included criteria and indicators, forestry and land use planning, international organizations and multilateral institutions, and financial assistance.

At IPF2, during the discussion of “Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge”, indigenous organizations called for an intersessional meeting on indigenous peoples and forests. This call was supported by the Danish and Colombian governments, who agreed to co-sponsor this meeting. During IPF3, approval was given for the International Alliance of Indigenous Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests, together with its Amazon members COICA and OPIAC, to organize an “International Meeting of Indigenous and Other Forest-Dependent Peoples on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests” at Leticia, Colombia, in December 1996.

This meeting was a good example of indigenous participation taken in its fullest sense. One hundred participants attended from indigenous and forest peoples organizations, governments, international agencies and NGOs. The meeting discussed four areas: national land use and forest programmes, underlying causes of deforestation, traditional forest-related knowledge and international mechanisms and institutions. Case studies were presented and discussed; at the end of the meeting, the Declaration of Leticia was approved with a work programme to implement the recommendations.

The Leticia meeting - indigenous proposals³

The Leticia meeting was one of the most constructive events to come out of the UN environmental process for indigenous peoples. A two-day preparatory meeting provided the indigenous participants with the time and space to organize their discussions on the themes, and during the meeting, discussions led to a comprehensive set of proposals made by indigenous and other forest peoples, in collaboration with NGOs and government representatives. The Leticia Declaration and Proposals for Action is an example of the way in which indigenous peoples’ perspectives can inform the International Forest Agenda.

The Leticia Declaration affirmed the need to respect the rights of indigenous and other forest peoples to their lands and territories including their right to control the use of these resources. Their representative institutions should be recognized and new mechanisms should be established to ensure equal participation in decision-making about forests at all levels.

With respect to *National Forest and Land-Use Programmes* the meeting concluded that much more needs to be done to ensure effective participation in planning including mechanisms to devolve decision-making to local levels so that customary systems of resource management can be asserted effectively. The tenure rights of Indigenous and other forest dependent peoples to their lands and territories must be guaranteed by such plans.

With respect to the *Underlying Causes of Deforestation and Forest Degradation* the meeting noted that this is exacerbated by a lack of understanding of the holistic world views and ways of life of indigenous and forest peoples. The failure of governments to recognize and respect the rights of indigenous and other forest-dependent peoples to their lands and territories increases the vulnerability of forests to invasion and misuse by outside interests. The problem of pressure on forests by peasants deprived of access to land outside forests was also highlighted as a major cause of deforestation that needs to be addressed.

The meeting emphasized the need to recognize the importance of *Traditional Forest-Related Knowledge* for sustainable forest management, in which women often play a key role. The application and survival of this knowledge is intimately bound up with the indigenous and other forest-dependent peoples’ ownership and control of their lands and territories. New legislative frameworks and *sui generis* systems that recognize and effectively protect indigenous cultural heritage must therefore be established, based on customary law and governance structures. No use of indigenous knowledge should be made without our free and informed consent.

³ Chairperson’s Report.

In relation to *Financial Assistance and Technology Transfer*, the meeting called for publicly accountable, transparent and unconditional assistance: for the provision of direct access to such funds to indigenous and forest peoples and to enable full participation in the international forest policy debate.

All sets of *Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management* must secure the spiritual, cultural, social and material well-being of indigenous and other forest dependent peoples.

All future *International Instruments and Mechanisms* dealing with forests should involve Indigenous and other forest-dependent peoples in all stages of decision-making as equal partners.

Following through the recommendations of Leticia in IPF4

IPF4 discussed the final report which the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests was to present to CSD5 and to UNGASS. The indigenous participation was centred around presenting the conclusions of the Leticia meeting to the Panel for inclusion into the final report.

A review of the final report, shows that several elements have been included, although they are clearly watered down from their original proposals. Several aspects are relevant here:

- a) Paragraph 9 acknowledges the need to consider ‘appropriate participatory mechanisms to involve all interested parties’, ‘recognition and respect for customary and traditional rights of *inter alia* indigenous people, local communities, forest dwellers and forest owners and “a secure land tenure arrangements”.
- b) Governments are encouraged in paragraph 17a to develop, implement, monitor and evaluate national forest programmes which would include indigenous peoples.
- c) Paragraph 20 refers to the threat to deforestation from mining and oil exploration not conducted in accordance with the appropriate national legislation. This point was emphasized by indigenous peoples.
- d) The section on traditional forest-related knowledge (TFRK) acknowledges that “indigenous people and other forest-dependent people...should play a key role in developing participatory approaches to forest and land management”. And in paragraph 35 says that holders of traditional forest-related knowledge need to be represented by their own representatives; to feel secure in their land tenure arrangements; to be reassured that they have been accorded status equal to that of the other members of the agreements to be convinced of a common purpose compatible with their cultural and ecological values”.
- e) Paragraph 36 states that “Governments and others who wish to use TFRK should acknowledge however, that it cannot be taken from people, especially indigenous people... without their prior informed consent.” Benefit sharing should take place on the basis of “their intellectual property rights”.. which may include recognition of their customary law and indigenous legal systems.
- f) The proposals for action on forest-related knowledge include advancing understanding, applying intellectual property rights or other protections, advocating cultural survival, enhancing the capacity of indigenous peoples, respecting the consent of indigenous peoples, assisting them financially, and collaborating fully with them.
- g) The section on criteria and indicators includes social, cultural, economic and ecological factors, including land tenure (paragraph 107) and that certification schemes should be open and non-discriminatory.

These proposals were included in the IPF report which was adopted and approved by CSD5 in its agenda item on forests. This means that the process of lobbying for the Leticia meeting and pushing its results did have some effect. The Leticia intersessional meeting provided the basis for some proposals which were reflected in final IPF report.

But the IPF should not be judged on its outcomes alone, but also in its process and conduct. For indigenous participants in this process, including myself, it was a very humiliating, disempowering and frustrating experience to be denied any voice during the negotiations and decision-making regarding indigenous peoples, traditional forest-related knowledge, and sustainable forest management. It was acknowledged at the IPF and the UNGASS, that actions by the international community and national governments on issues relating to Traditional-forest Related Knowledge and other indigenous peoples' concerns are still at an early stage of understanding and implementation. However, the present closed-door procedures of intergovernmental negotiations do not support the building of understanding by closing off opportunities for dialogue with major groups. Limiting NGO participation also undermines consensus-building and working in an open and transparent manner, which are the avowed purpose of the forest dialogue.

The future International Forest Forum must in itself incorporate and demonstrate the ethos and practice of dialogue and shared decision-making to have any political and practical credibility for all actors in sustainable forest management.

Present intergovernmental forest negotiations are still dominated by power politics and the promotion of national interests. Decision-making is dominated by cultural patterns of unsustainable development over local ecological perspectives and traditional forest-related knowledge. These perspectives are needed at the policy level, as well as on the ground. Their exclusion will perpetuate centralized decision-making on forests which have historically benefited outside interests and deforestation.

International policy-making can be seen as an indicator of the political process: the balance between centralized decision-making and local democracy. The UN Research Institute in Social Development (UNRISD) defines popular participation in development "organized efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in given social situations, on the parts of groups and movements of those hitherto excluded from such control ..."

These efforts include those processes at an international level, which have a decisive impact on indigenous peoples, women and local communities. When the power relationship is highly imbalanced, there is also greater conflict and opposition from local peoples. When the imbalance is less great and is seriously addressed, there can be the possibility of cooperation and partnership.

At all times, it requires mechanisms for dialogue to resolve conflicts, and the commitment to supporting greater local empowerment and strengthening for local peoples to respond adequately to the policy challenges and the actual requirements for sustainable forest management.

Some reflections on the forest partnership

From my own experience in the Cordillera region of the Philippines, there are clear contradictions in the plans of the Philippine Government to achieve "newly industrializing country" status in the year 2000, and its sustainable development plans.

The central Cordillera region, as a centrally important forested mountain area has been identified as a conservation zone and yet 86% of its area has been opened up for mining exploration by foreign corporations under the new Mining Code. New power projects are planned in the Agno valley where families displaced by the building of dams in the 1950s are still awaiting resettlement. Despite constitutional recognition of ancestral lands and regional autonomy, no enabling legislation has been passed to strengthen indigenous peoples' rights. The thrust of government policy continues to subordinate indigenous peoples' interests to the economic growth strategy, despite the promulgation of national strategies for sustainable development. The broader policy environment for the implementation of sustainable development empowers precisely those actors which have been the forces for deforestation.

Current participatory forestry approaches stress stakeholder analysis and participation in forestry

planning and management. What is not acknowledged in the stakeholder approach is the existing structural imbalance and social injustice within the existing forestry relationships, whereby some actors are historically powerful, and others historically excluded. Unfortunately, recent trends for trade liberalization, market deregulation and capitalist globalization all point towards greater exclusion, rather than inclusion.

Forums for dialogue at all levels, aimed at conflict resolution and consensus-building for sustainable forestry are urgently needed. Intergovernmental processes, with gestures towards popular participation, but no real mechanisms for shared decision-making, are “business as usual “ arrangements, and are not good enough for the 21st century. Ecological, political, cultural and social diversification will not survive economic globalization unless measures are put in place at the local, national, regional and international levels to ensure the voices of diversity and the marginalized in the forest debate. Their rich heritage of knowledge is needed to bear in the current forest crisis.

Today we must all ask ourselves - **What cultural patterns are ecologically sustainable over the longer term?** - rather than continuing and perpetuating the present cultural patterns of progressive modernization and globalization which inform the present policy debates. The loss of traditional forest-related knowledge characterizes the present forest crisis and it is the renewal of such values which are urgently required.

The forest policy deliberations, as learning processes must meet the criteria of generating knowledge that will meet the test of long-term sustainability. Forest decision-makers must apply their own recommendations to respect and incorporate traditional forest-related knowledge within their own practices. Only then can they set an example for the rest of society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anti-Slavery Society. 1983. *The Philippines: Authoritarian government, multinationals and ancestral lands*. London.
- Colchester, M. & Lohmann, L. (Eds). 1993. The struggle for land and the fate of the forests, world rainforest movement. *The Ecologist*. Zed Books.
- Guha, R. 1989 *The unquiet woods, ecological change and peasant resistance in the Himalaya*. Oxford University Press.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Forests. 1997. *Report of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Panel on Forests on its fourth session*. New York, 11-27 February 1997. E/CN.17/1997/12
- International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests. 1992. *Charter of indigenous-tribal peoples of the tropical forests*.
1997. Background Papers, Chairpersons' Report, Leticia Declaration and Proposals for Action, International Meeting of Indigenous and other Forest-dependent Peoples on the Management, Conservation and Sustainable Development of All Types of Forests
- Martin, C. 1991. *The rainforests of West Africa: Ecology, threats conservation*. Birkhauser Verlag, Basel.
- Poffenberger, M. (Ed.) 1990 *Keepers of the forest: Land management alternatives in South-east Asia*. Kumarian Press.
- Stiefel, M. & Wolfe, M. 1994. *A voice for the excluded, popular participation in development*. UNRISD and Zed Books, London.

An aboriginal perspective on Canada's progress toward meeting its national commitments to improve aboriginal participation in sustainable forest management

Geoff Quaile,¹ Peggy Smith²

PURPOSE

There is widespread national and international acknowledgment that an essential part of sustainable forest management is the recognition of indigenous rights and values and indigenous participation in forest management. This paper will:

- review international commitments to indigenous rights and participation in forest management;
- review some of the areas where Canada has made commitments to indigenous participation in forest management;
- discuss the role that an indigenous-controlled organization, the National Aboriginal Forestry Association has played in the development of these initiatives;
- illustrate the experience of an Indigenous People in Canada - the Cree of Eeyou Astchee in northern Quebec - which shows that, in spite of policy commitments, Canada and its provinces still have a long way to go in meeting these commitments; and, finally,
- outline how Indigenous Peoples and national and provincial governments in Canada might improve on narrowing the gap between promises and practice in the hope that these suggestions might also provide guidance for other national governments addressing indigenous participation in forest management.

BACKGROUND

Indigenous Peoples in Canada

The Canadian Constitution defines Aboriginal Peoples in Canada as “Indian, Inuit and Metis” (which means “mixed blood”). The Canadian Constitution also affirms and protects aboriginal and treaty rights, particularly the right to hunt, fish, trap and gather.

There are eleven different aboriginal language families (McMillan 1988) and over 600 First Nations in about 1 000 communities who operate under special federal legislation called the “Indian Act”. Over 80% of aboriginal communities in Canada are in productive forest areas which cover eight broad forest ecosystems. The Indigenous Peoples of Canada have built a way of life dependent on and respectful of these forest lands.

This way of life has been disrupted and transformed over the past four centuries by European settlement and natural resource development which founded the economy of modern day Canada.

¹ Adviser, Grand Council of the Cree of Northern Quebec, 24 Bayswater Avenue, Ottawa, Canada K1Y 2E4.

² Senior Adviser, National Aboriginal Forestry Association, 875 Bank Street, Ottawa, Canada K1S 3W4.

The pace of natural resource development has increased over the past 100 years. Aboriginal communities in developed areas are still fighting for a share in the decision-making and benefits of forest operations in their territories and, at the northern boundary of the boreal forest, aboriginal communities are being affected by timber harvesting operations in areas never before touched by industrial timber harvesting. Aboriginal communities in all parts of Canada are struggling to overcome the alienation resulting from being removed from their land and way of life, a social disruption reflected in poverty, high suicide rates among youth, health problems and low education levels.

Subsistence forest activities such as hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering still form a vital component of the economic base of indigenous communities. For example, one third of over 12 000 Crees who reside in the boreal forest of northern Quebec still depend on subsistence activities as their primary source of food and income. It is these activities that are most often protected under Treaties signed between Canada and Indigenous Peoples. Many of the treaties have wording like, *as long as the sun shines and the water flows* (Getty & Lussier 1983), that capture the strength and lasting commitment of these agreements.

International Commitments to Indigenous Participation in Forest Management

Indigenous rights, as they have been declared by Indigenous Peoples' organizations, differ from what has been described through processes led by groups such as the United Nations International Labor Organization (ILO), the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States (OAS). Though these formal UN and OAS processes have not found universal consensus from member governments or from Indigenous Peoples, they have provided a focus for discussion. Indigenous Peoples have declared non-recognition of their right to self-determination as the most contentious item.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION: ILO Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (1989), although ratified by only a few countries, is a statement of minimum rights including equal rights and opportunities under national laws, a sharing of social and economic benefits, protection of social, cultural, religious and spiritual values, participation in decision-making and due regard for customary law.

UN WORKING GROUP ON INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS: The WGIP has completed a United Nations Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, a comprehensive statement which makes the commitment to resolve the issue of self-determination. For Indigenous Peoples, the international recognition of the right to self-determination is fundamental. The Draft Declaration states that "*Indigenous Peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right, they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.*"

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT & DEVELOPMENT (UNCED): Several commitments made at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development, including Agenda 21, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the non-legally binding statement of Forest Principles, recognized that indigenous knowledge is not only useful but critically important to the development and cultural survival of indigenous people, the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable forest management. The Forest Principles also stated that national forest policies should recognize and duly support the identity, culture and rights of indigenous people and other forest dwellers. (See Appendix 1 for wording of UNCED indigenous forest-related commitments.)

To coordinate activities on forest issues arising from UNCED, the Commission on Sustainable

Development set up the *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF). The IPF had a limited mandate and time to offer direction on future international action on forest issues. Indigenous issues became an important part of the IPF discussions under a number of elements, including traditional forest-related knowledge, national forest programmes, underlying causes of deforestation, criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management and future international organizations and multilateral mechanisms. Central to these discussions were the principles of recognition and protection of Indigenous rights, using traditional forest-related knowledge to improve forest management practices and open and transparent planning processes which include Indigenous participants.

CANADA'S POLICY COMMITMENTS TO INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

In keeping with its endorsement of the UNCED forest commitments, Canada has begun to build a policy framework which promotes increased indigenous participation in forest management. Canada's National Forest Strategy and the network of ten Model Forests established in 1992 laid the groundwork for these policies. The development of a set of Canadian criteria and indicators for sustainable forest management, approved by the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers in 1995, strengthened this policy direction.

The National Aboriginal Forestry Association, an indigenous-controlled, non-political, non-governmental organization, whose goal is to increase Indigenous participation in sustainable forest management, has been an active participant in all of these processes. NAFA was formed after participants in a 1989 conference on aboriginal forestry identified the need for an advocacy organization at the national level.

THE NATIONAL FOREST STRATEGY, 1992: In its National Forest Strategy entitled, *Sustainable Forests: A Canadian Commitment*, a commitment was made to develop an aboriginal forest strategy which "respects the shared beliefs and aspirations of aboriginal people, and addresses ... the development of models for sustainable forest management." At the heart of this aboriginal forest strategy is the principle that "Canada should recognize and make provision for the rights of aboriginal people who rely on forests for their livelihood, community structure and cultural identity."

To achieve these goals the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, which includes representatives of the federal, provincial and territorial governments of Canada, set out a "Framework for Action" with three directives:

- to increase the involvement of aboriginal people in forest land management;
- to ensure the recognition of aboriginal rights in forest management;
- and to increase forest-based economic opportunities for aboriginal people.

MODEL FORESTS: The Model Forest Programme, with its principles of partnership and opportunity to explore the practical application of sustainable forest management principles, encouraged Indigenous participation. In 1997 Canada announced that the Model Forest Programme would continue for another five years with the addition of an Aboriginal-led Model Forest.

CANADIAN CRITERIA & INDICATORS FOR SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT: The Canadian Criteria and Indicators exercise addressed indigenous involvement in forest management in Criterion Six: Accepting Society's Responsibility for Sustainable Forest Management (Defining Sustainable Forest Management: A Canadian Approach to Criteria and Indicators 1995). Elements 6.1 *Aboriginal and treaty rights* and 6.2 *Participation by aboriginal communities in sustainable forest management* set out a number of indicators by which Canada hopes to measure its commitment to meeting these principles. Included among the indicators are the:

- extent to which forest planning and management processes consider and meet legal obligations with respect to duly established aboriginal and treaty rights;
- extent of aboriginal participation in forest-based economic opportunities;
- extent to which forest management planning takes into account the protection of unique or significant aboriginal social, cultural or spiritual sites;
- area of land available for subsistence purposes.

Many other nations around the world have also been working on the development of criteria and indicators, doing this for both the national level and working with other countries on a regional basis (Background Report on Criteria and Indicators 1996). Many of the regional processes, like the Montreal Process of which Canada is a part, have also addressed indigenous issues and participation.

CANADA'S PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING ITS COMMITMENTS

While Canada's federal government has Constitutional responsibility for entering into international agreements on matters relating to forest policy and trade and responsibility for "Indians and lands reserved for Indians", it is the provincial governments that have primary jurisdiction over the management of Canada's forests. Each province has its own set of forest legislation, policies and regulations. The autonomy the provinces have over forest management makes it difficult for the federal government to coordinate efforts to fulfil national and international commitments and to protect indigenous interests in natural resources. A good example is found in Quebec where the provincial government has refused to officially sign the National Forest Strategy, instead opting only to adhere to its goals and objectives.

Currently, there is great diversity in how each province approaches aboriginal peoples. For example, the province of British Columbia, Canada's largest producer of forest products, instituted sweeping forest management reforms through the passage of its *Forest Practices Code of British Columbia Act* in 1994. Among many changes was its approach to the province's aboriginal peoples. The *Act's* Preamble made a commitment to balance the needs of all peoples and communities, including First Nations. To achieve this promise to aboriginals, the *Forest Practices Code* includes a number of provisions related to protecting key areas of interest. Under these provisions, companies are required to complete an assessment of cultural heritage resources and ensure that forest development plans identify and describe "*areas of aboriginal sustenance, cultural, social and religious activities associated with aboriginal life.*"

The province of Ontario, the nation's third largest lumber producer, also passed new forestry legislation, the *Crown Forest Sustainability Act*. Its regulated Forest Management Planning Manual requires forest managers to prepare Native Background Information Reports and Native Values Maps to help assess past problems of timber management and identify areas of economic, cultural and spiritual importance to affected aboriginal communities.

In spite of these provincial commitments, there are still many land claims unsettled, broken treaties and agreements and outstanding self-government negotiations which prevent a truly equal partnership between governments and Indigenous Peoples in Canada. For example, no consistent approach exists among provinces with respect to how aboriginal and treaty rights are to be dealt with in forest policy, despite the obvious fact that these rights pertain to the same land base as is licensed by provinces to forest companies for timber harvesting.

Although governments have begun to develop mechanisms to address the participation of Indigenous Peoples in forest management, Indigenous Peoples do not always trust these processes. Governments more often than not develop these consultation processes without indigenous input. Governments usually determine general direction and goals and then ask for input and present

information in language that does not respect cultural and educational differences. Indigenous Peoples do not see this as effective or proper consultation (Smith 1995).

There are many obstacles to overcome in forging a new relationship between Indigenous Peoples and governments in Canada. Forging such a new relationship is the main recommendation of the recent Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples whose report is titled *People to People, Nation to Nation* (1996).

Canada is a test case for a grand notion - the notion that dissimilar peoples can share lands, resources, power and dreams while respecting and sustaining their differences.... But there cannot be peace or harmony unless there is justice.... Canadians need to understand that aboriginal peoples are nations.... To say that aboriginal peoples are nations is not to say that they are nation-states seeking independence from Canada. They are collectivities with a long shared history, a right to govern themselves and, in general, a strong desire to do so in partnership with Canada.

We hope that our report will ... be a guide to the many ways aboriginal and non-aboriginal people can begin - right now - to repair the damage to the relationship and enter the next millennium on a new footing of mutual recognition and respect, sharing and responsibility.

A closer look at one Indigenous People, the Crees of Eeyou Astchee in northern Quebec, will reveal some of the difficulties of forging a new relationship in the forest sector (Quaile 1996).

The Crees of Eeyou Astchee

The Cree Nation of Eeyou Astchee's traditional lands encompass 50 000 km² of commercial forest land in northern Quebec. Quebec is Canada's second largest forest products producing province.

Over the last 30 years members of Cree Nation of Eeyou Astchee have had to endure the impacts of unsustainable forestry development. Since 1975 the amount of land cleared each year has increased by a factor of five. This represents approximately 500 km² per year or 5 million m³ of wood annually. Virtually all of this wood is harvested using large area clearcutting.

The net effect of this escalation in forestry activity is a disruption in many Crees' ability to sustain themselves through hunting, fishing and trapping. Cree lands are divided into family hunting territories. Families harvest these territories in a cyclical manner, changing locations from year to year so as not to exhaust the land's resources. However, in the community of Waswanipi, whose surrounding traditional lands have been affected by logging the most, Cree hunters and their families have witnessed an average of 38% of the trees being removed from each Waswanipi hunting territory. In the most extreme case, over 80% of the trees of a single hunting territory were cut. According to forest management plans for Waswanipi, 100% of its traditional lands are slated for commercial logging. In human terms this means that over 100 families will eventually be displaced from their land. As the logging moves steadily north, a similar situation will be repeated in four other Cree communities whose hunting territories fall within Quebec's commercially designated forest.

In addition to the severe economic and social consequences of these logging activities, the environmental consequences are serious. In the region around Waswanipi, the moose population was measured at 1200 in 1985. Today, after thousands of square kilometres of logging and hundreds of kilometres of forestry access roads, there are fewer than 400 moose left. Reduced habitat and pressure from sport hunters from the south and outside the province have decimated a once healthy moose population.

Adding to these environmental, economic and social impacts which have eroded their traditional way of life, the Crees have not benefited or shared in the profits gained from logging their traditional forests. Only 40-50 Crees are employed in the estimated 14 000 forest products related jobs dependent

upon their traditional lands. The Crees benefit very little from the over \$ 1 200 million flowing from their lands annually. Little has been done to improve this situation, notwithstanding the National Forest Strategy directive to “increase forest-based economic opportunities for aboriginal people.”

Perhaps most disturbing for the Cree Nation is that there is no satisfactory mechanism in place between the province of Quebec and the Cree to solve these problems. Similar to other provinces in Canada, Quebec refuses to recognize the Crees right to self-determination and their right to negotiate a government-to-government solution to forest management practices in northern Quebec. Despite having a treaty protecting the Crees’ sustainable way of life, the province of Quebec is treating the Crees like just one more stakeholder in an area with diverse interests, including the very sports hunters who have gained access to the Crees’ food supply through logging roads. It has become a common practice for forest industry companies to approach individual Cree trappers and offer compensation settlement in the form of cash or goods like snow machines, rather than sit down and negotiate a forest management agreement with the Crees’ political representatives, an agreement that would both benefit the Crees overall and lead to improved forest management practices on their territory.

NARROWING THE GAP BETWEEN PROMISES AND PRACTICE

Although some provinces have begun to take steps towards more equitable treatment of the aboriginal communities who depend on the forest, more work is required. Indigenous Peoples from all provinces maintain that measures developed without their effective participation and endorsement are lacking. Undermining some of the recent legislative initiatives which provide for more indigenous participation is the assumption that Indigenous Peoples are but just one of a whole series of social groups with a stake in the forest resource. Legislation itself has been developed without consultation and ratification by Indigenous Peoples.

Treating Indigenous Peoples as just another stakeholder is the predominant attitude in Canada, even though this attitude runs counter to international agreements which recognize the rights of Indigenous Peoples to self-determination, self-governance and self-management of their traditional resources. Article 26 of the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples states:

Indigenous peoples have the right to own, develop, control and use the lands and territories ... This includes the right to full recognition of their laws, traditions and customs, land-tenure systems and institutions for development and management of resources, and the right to effective measures by States to prevent any interference with, alienation of or encroachment upon these rights.

What must be done to ensure a truly equal partnership for sustainable forest management between Indigenous Peoples and governments which addresses both forest health and the health of the indigenous communities dependent on forests? How do we move beyond forests as battlefields between conflicting ways of life and cultures? How do we learn to accept and promote the indigenous traditional concepts of the circle where everything is connected, of sharing, of respect for all living things, of never taking more than we need and of always giving back to the land when we take something?

Governments must accept their responsibility to meet commitments made to Indigenous Peoples through treaties and land claims and follow internationally recognized protocol for negotiating modern-day agreements. Outstanding claims should be settled before industrial development is promoted.

Governments must accept that Indigenous Peoples are not just another stakeholder in forest management. By being the original occupants of the land and having rights entrenched in agreements, Indigenous Peoples have a unique voice in forest management decisions. With this understanding,

effective consultation will mean consultation that has been developed and endorsed by Indigenous Peoples.

More opportunities should be provided for the development of sustainable forest management practices defined and determined by Indigenous Peoples and in harmony with their traditional practices and values. The inclusion of an Aboriginal-led Model Forest in Canada's Model Forest Programme may provide such an opportunity.

Indigenous participants in Canada's forest sector welcome the changes that have occurred in the past five years. There is still a difficult road ahead, but we are committed to working together to achieve sustainable forest management. We hope that national and regional governments will walk this road with us.

APPENDIX 1. INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS ON INDIGENOUS PARTICIPATION IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

Agenda 21, Chapter 26, Clause 26.1:

"In view of the interrelationship between the natural environment & its sustainable development & the cultural, social, economic & physical well-being of indigenous people, national & international efforts to implement environmentally sound & sustainable development should recognize, accommodate & promote & strengthen the role of indigenous peoples & their communities."

The Convention on Biological Diversity, Article 8(j):

"Subject to its national legislation, respect, preserve & maintain knowledge, innovations & practices of indigenous & local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation & sustainable use of biological diversity & promote the wider application with the approval & involvement of holders of such knowledge, innovations & practices & encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations & practices."

Guiding Principles on Forests:

"Governments should promote & provide opportunities for the participation of interested parties, including local communities & indigenous people, industries, labour, non-governmental organizations & individuals, forest dwellers & women, in the development, implementation & planning of national forest policies."

"National forest policies should recognize & duly support the identity, culture & respect the rights of indigenous people, their communities, & other communities, & forest dwellers. Appropriate conditions should be promoted for these groups to enable them to have an economic stake in forest use, perform economic activities, & achieve & maintain cultural identity & social organization, as well as adequate levels of livelihood & well-being, through, among others, those land tenure arrangements which serve as incentives for the sustainable management of forests."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Background Report on Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management. 1996. Prepared for the Integovernmental Seminar on Criteria and Indicators. Helsinki: Forestry Dept., Government of Finland.
- Canadian Council of Forest Ministers. March 1995. *Defining sustainable forest management: A Canadian approach to criteria and indicators*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Forest Service, Natural Resources Canada.
- Getty, I.A.L. & Lussier, A.S. 1983. *as long as the sun shines and water flows: a reader in canadian native studies*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development. 1996. *People of peoples; equality, autonomy and self-determination: The issues at stake of the international decade of the world's indigenous people*. Montreal, Canada.
- McMillan, A.D. 1988. *Native peoples and cultures of Canada*. Vancouver, British Columbia: Douglas & McIntyre Ltd.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association. 1996a. *Aboriginal forest-based ecological knowledge in Canada*. Ottawa, Canada.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association. 1996b. *Aboriginal forestry: Significant developments and events 1992-1995*. Ottawa, Canada.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association. 1995. *An aboriginal criterion for sustainable forest management*. Ottawa, Canada.
- National Aboriginal Forestry Association. 1993. *Forest lands and resources for aboriginal people: An intervenor submission to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples*. Ottawa, Canada.
- People to People, Nation to Nation: Highlights from the Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. 1996. Ottawa, Canada: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Quaile, Geoff. 1996. *Crees and trees: An introduction*. Ottawa, Canada: Grand Council of the Crees (of Quebec).
- Smith, Peggy. 1995. *Aboriginal participation in forest management: |Not just another "stakeholder"*. Ottawa, Canada: National Aboriginal Forestry Association.

Summaries of voluntary papers

(also published in Spanish, French and Turkish)

A GENDER ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPATION IN NEPAL'S COMMUNITY FORESTRY PROGRAMME

Jeff Fields,¹ Jo Ellen Force¹

Although it is well known that women in Nepal play a major role in forest use and management, it has proven difficult to ensure their participation in community-based forest management. One recurring idea in the search for a solution to this problem has been the establishment of a minimum quota for women members of a community forest user group's executive committee. A case study of two forestry user groups in Nepal's western region investigated the relationship between women's formal participation (as executive committee members) and broader participation by women in the user group. In one case women comprised nearly 50% of the executive committee, while in the other case there were no women executive committee members. The cases were compared and analysed for men's and women's participation in decision-making and opinions about women committee members. The extent to which women participate and factors constraining women committee members from having a larger impact on women's participation, as well as suggestions for increasing women's participation in community forestry are discussed.

Keywords: Community forestry, gender analysis, Nepal.

¹ Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83844-1133. USA.
E-mail: joellen@uidaho.edu

RESOURCE-DEPENDENT COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Jo Ellen Force,¹ Gary E. Machlis,¹ Lianjun Zhang²

Social scientists have long attempted to understand change in natural resource-dependent communities. This paper examines the relationship of three alternative “engines of change” in such communities: local resource production, local historical events and societal trends. Regression models, using historical records for over 50-year periods, were developed for four dimensions of community social change: size, structure, cohesion and anomie. Hypotheses were tested examining the relationship between community social change and the alternative “engines of change” in seven resource-dependent communities in the Pacific North-west in the United States. Included in the group were four timber towns, as well as communities dependent upon fishing, tourism and mining. Statistical analyses suggest that societal trends is the most powerful independent variable in explaining social change in these communities, followed by local historical events. Local resource production has modest explanatory power when combined with the other explanations.

Keywords: Forest dependence, community social change, regression analysis, USA.

¹ Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844-1133, USA.

E-mail: joellen@uidaho.edu

² SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry, One Forestry Drive, Syracuse, New York 13210-2778, USA.

E-mail: lizhang@mailbox.syr.edu



DEMAND FOR RIGHT TO SELF DETERMINATION, ANTI-STATE ACTIVITIES AND THE STATE OF THE GOVERNMENT FORESTS : A CASE STUDY AGAINST THE BACKDROP OF THE GORKHALAND AGITATION DURING 1986-89

Milindo Chakrabarti,¹ S.S. Bist²

For the last couple of years India has been witnessing persistent demands in different parts of the country, for regional autonomy. Interestingly, most of the regions demanding autonomy are rich in natural resources and, during the agitation in support of such demands, these resource bases have been destructed to a large extent. Destruction of forests in Darjeeling during the agitation for a separate state of Gorkhaland during 1986-89 is a typical case taken up for understanding the interrelationship between political conflicts and the status of natural resources.

The present paper is an attempt to derive insight about the interrelationship mentioned above in a framework of property regime and access interface. In so doing it argues that during political conflicts the state-owned natural resources tend to be converted into open access properties leading to considerable damage to the said resources. Identifying some of the factors responsible for such conversion, the paper argues that a proper protection of these resources may be ensured if they are gradually converted into community resources, with active participation of the local people.

¹ Academic Associate, C.M.A., Wing 6, Indian Institute of Management, Vastrapur, Ahmedabad 380 015, India.

² Conservator of Forests (Hill Circle), Darjeeling, West Bengal 734101, India.

INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE USED FOR SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOOD BY PRIMITIVE KONYAK NAGAS FROM NORTHERN NAGALAND, INDIA.

Archana Godbole¹

Nagaland is a small state in the north-eastern corner of India. It is very rich in plant and animal resources. The Konyaks are still primitive and occupy the northern District of Mon. The Konyaks were expert hunters and still living in perfect harmony with the nature around them. These very colourful and interesting tribals of Nagaland and their cultural traditions have been thoroughly studied since the British era, but the ethnobiological knowledge of Nagas, except for few studies on the Angami and Aao tribals, has remained hidden. During our recent studies in Nagaland we revealed that the primitive Konyak tribals have a tremendous knowledge about natural resources and their use in day-to-day life. The fast approaching modern development is forcing acculturation and the loss of traditional knowledge of the Konyaks is irreparable.

The resource management structure of the Konyak Nagas is a complex system developed through their experience and experimentations of many generations. Therefore, it was thought necessary to understand the role of Indigenous Knowledge in achieving sustainable livelihood using forests and biodiversity and to study the social dimensions of these systems as part of our broader study of documentation of ethnobiology of the Konyak Nagas.

¹ Applied Environmental Research Foundation, Ganga-Tara Apt., 917/7 Ganesh Wadi, Pune 411 004, India.
Facsimile: (91 212) 639203



ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN IN THE REHABILITATION OF COMMON LANDS: EXPERIENCES IN THE ARAVALLI PROJECT, HARYANA (INDIA)

J.K. Rawat¹

The Aravalli Project in Haryana (India), started in 1990, aims at rehabilitating common lands of the villages in the Aravalli hills with community participation. Women being the primary collectors of fodder, firewood and other produce from the common lands, have a greater stake in its rehabilitation and management. Therefore active involvement of women in project activities became a major component of the project and, consequently, a Women-in-Development (WID) programme was initiated on the project. This paper describes the various strategies developed to bring about active involvement of women, viz. (i) integrating gender issue into project activities; (ii) organizing and increasing awareness of women; (iii) enhancing income and economic power of women (iv) sensitizing male field staff and villagers towards women-related issues; (v) increasing women's say in decision-making and enhancing their political power.

Keywords: Common lands, common property resource, rehabilitation, WID programme, gender issues.

¹ CCF and Project Director, Aravalli Project, Gurgaon, India.

HIDDEN FACES AND PUBLIC SPACES: A REAPPRAISAL OF WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTION IN REALIZING COMMUNITY FOREST MANAGEMENT IN THE HINDU-KUSH HIMALAYA

N. Kaji Shrestha,¹ Charla Britt²

In literature looking at women's participation in community forestry, the emphasis is on formal institutional (meeting attendance and decision-making rights) or target-oriented (plantation and nursery work) participation. Little attention is paid to the role that women play in negotiating consensus in forest management practices, and the gender relations embedded in the material or socio-cultural constraints which may impact women's methods and choices. This devalues the importance of women's involvement in forest management activities and obscures their potential for effecting a better balance between social and biophysical resources. This paper celebrates women's initiatives in mediating conflicts, seeking viable solutions, and negotiating consensus in community forestry management. It highlights the contribution women have made in creating and developing processes for user group formation and sustenance. Drawing on case study examples from eastern Nepal and northern India, this paper brings to the fore the nature of women's contribution to resource management, challenging conventional prescriptions of "participation" and elaborating on the crucial role that women play in realizing and sustaining forest management practices and processes.

Keywords: Community forestry, women, participation, development.

¹ FTTP South Asia Region Facilitator, GPO Box 5723, Kathmandu, Nepal.

² PhD Candidate, Cornell University, USEF P.O. Box 380, Kathmandu, Nepal.

THE VISION AND ROLE OF COMMUNITY FORESTRY IN SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Te Taru White¹

This paper discusses the potential vision and role of a new community forestry concept in New Zealand. The concept of community forestry in New Zealand is different from what is practised in other countries. This paper focuses on the involvement of Maori (i.e. the indigenous people of New Zealand) as community groups that participate in the sustainable development and management of forests. It describes the Maori land tenure system and how they manage their land resources including forests. In managing their forests in order to retain lands for the use of future generations and provide income streams for their communities, Maori are facing several challenges. The paper highlights the manner in which Maori are moving towards forestry development and sustainable management.

Keywords: Sustainable development of Maori forestry.

¹ Branch Manager, Asset Management, Ministry of Maori Development, P.O. Box 3943, Wellington, New Zealand.
Facsimile: (64 4) 4947010

The following summaries are published only in the original language

KARNATAKA, INDIA: CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF TREE GROWERS CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES

N.R. Gangadharappa,¹ M. Shivamurthy¹

It has become inevitable for every organization to awake, inform and motivate people about the importance of forests and to ensure participation in the community forest development programmes. The National Dairy Development Board, which has made remarkable progress in milk production and vegetable oil production by establishing cooperatives at villages, has promoted Tree Growers Cooperatives during 1988-89 in five states of India. The societies have been working in promoting community forests to meet fodder, food, fuel and equity problems. To assess the impact of these societies, research was conducted during 1995-96 in Karnataka. The findings revealed that 35% of the members had medium level of overall knowledge about the general profile of the society. Among different categories of farmer members, the majority of big farmers had high knowledge whereas the majority of landless labourers had low knowledge. With respect to the activities undertaken, 46% of the members knew them. From among different categories of farmers, the majority of big farmers and landless labourers had high or low knowledge, respectively. Coming to the participation aspect, the majority of members, irrespective of categories, had participated in most of the activities conducted by the societies. Soil and water conservation, energy conservation and nursery raising techniques were some of the training need areas identified by the members. They did not participate in all the activities organized by the society because of non-availability of time due to their normal agricultural work. Members of these societies also suggested that valuable fruit tree species must be planted because of their economic importance.

¹ Department of Agricultural Extension, UAS, Hebbal, Bangalore 560 024, India.

THE "LAND QUESTION" AND ITS IMPORTANCE TO DECENTRALIZED FOREST USE AND MANAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF THE KOLLI HILLS, TAMIL NADU, INDIA

Ajit Menon¹

The oft-made claim that allocating rights to village communities will lead to more efficient and sustainable forest management strategies is far more complex than is suggested in much of the existing literature. What we have attempted to do in this paper is to examine the importance of the wider land question, namely access to agricultural land and its relationship to forest use and management. Besides illustrating the specifics of the Kolli Hills case, our purpose has been to suggest that allocating rights to forest-dependent communities to use forest resources will not necessarily result in more efficient and sustainable forest management practices. Given its considerable biodiversity, the question of rights in the Kolli Hills is assuming a new importance with increasing attention being given to biodiversity conservation, intellectual property rights and the role of village communities. It might be necessary, therefore, to go beyond the conceptual boundaries of joint forest management type strategies and search for other alternatives where the role of village communities and the state are re-examined and re-cast in different ways.

¹ Madras Institute of Development Studies, 79 2nd Main Road, Gandhinagar, Adyar, Madras 600 020, India.
Facsimile: (91 44) 4910872; E-mail: ssmids@ren.nic.in



POTENTIAL AND PROSPECTS OF NON TIMBER FOREST PRODUCTS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF TRIBALS - A CASE STUDY FROM RAJASTHAN, INDIA

E.S.K.Srivastava¹

Forests are a main source of fodder and non-timber forest products (NTFP), such as oils, medicinal plants, silk, resins, dyes, fibre, food and leaves. Non-timber forest products play an important role in the subsistence economy of tribals. NTFP have gained enormous importance in rural development in general and tribal development in particular. The management and development of NTFP is being viewed as one of the major participatory survival options for tribals in the changing scenario of forest management in third world countries like India. This paper presents a case study about the role of NTFP in the tribal economy in Rajasthan and suggests that the concept of sustainability can be realized only when the local communities perceive and benefit from conservation and utilization of the resources round them. This will be facilitated by providing training, processing, marketing, institutional and infrastructural facilities.

Keywords: Natural resources, ecosystem, tribals, non-timber forest products, management, collection, RTADCF, commodity.

¹ Conservator of Forests, Soil Conservation Van Bhawan, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

THE ROLE OF RURAL WOMEN IN COMMUNITY FORESTRY ACTIVITIES IN TURKEY

Suade Arançlı

This paper outlines the role of rural women in community forestry activities in Turkey, including access to resources and services, decision-making mechanisms, constraints and potentials. Data have been obtained from the project entitled “Development of Appropriate Methods for Community Forestry in Turkey” implemented between 1992 and 1995 in 19 pilot forest villages and the project “Forestry and Food Security in the Mediterranean and Near East Region” implemented since 1992 in four pilot forest villages.

Keywords: Women in development, gender and development, community forestry, participation in community forestry.

¹ Foreign Relations and EC Department, Research, Planning and Coordination Board, Ministry of Forestry, 06100 Bakanlıklar, Ankara, Turkey.
Facsimile No.: (90 312) 4179160



IMPACTS OF THE NOMADISM AND THE LOCAL COMMUNITIES ON THE FOREST ECOSYSTEM IN ÇUKUROVA REGION/TURKEY

Berrin Sirel,¹ K. Tuluhan Yılmaz¹

Nomadism, which is the former life-style of Turkoman tribes in Anatolia, survived until the settling activities of the Ottoman government in late 1980s. This life-style is still existing but has already changed because of socio-economic development. At present, this activity is based on forests and arable lands. Cultivation, applied by the settled communities, has been more effective than grazing in terms of degradation on the forest ecosystem. This has caused changes on the structure and composition of the natural vegetation. In addition, intensive and unplanned secondary house construction in the highlands, which originated from increasing recreational needs, is also an important destructive factor on the forest communities. Within this study, the influence of land uses such as seasonal highland settlements, grazing, tourism and villages in the forest have been examined in the territory of Mersin, Adana and Kahramanmaraş regional authorities.

¹ University of Çukurova, Faculty of Agriculture Department of Landscape Architecture, Adana, Turkey.