

Towards equity in forest and climate change processes? An intersectionality lens to examining power relations

Grace Wong, Maria Brockhaus, Mawa Karambiri, Pham Thu Thuy, Andrea Downing, Amanda Jimenez-Aceituno, Moira Moeliono, Hermann Kambire, Cecilia Luttrell

Environmental Justice Conference 2019, Norwich

Gender, natural resources and climate change

- Gender framings in climate change: women as the *vulnerable* and the *virtuous* (Arora-Jonsson 2012)

"... women, but mainly poor women, are most virtuous and conscientious in relation to the environment"

- Reinforcement of a victimization discourse within climate change studies (Djouadi et al. 2016)

Most studies *"... agree that assets and context promote vulnerability and barriers to adaptation for women"*, but *"very few address ... context-specific mechanisms of exclusion and marginalization"*

→ Distracts attention from **gendered power inequalities** in decision-making

→ Unequal gender relations do not cause or aggravate climate change ... but **gender relations do determine how the environment is managed, who has access and who benefits**

Feminist theoretical framings

- Bacchi's ***What's the Problem Represented to be? (WPR)***: Foucauldian-inspired approach to making visible the politics and power relations in how problems are framed in policies and practices
 - "... rather than evaluate policies for their ability to 'solve' problems, we need to study the way policies *construct* problems" (Bacchi 2009)
- **Intersectionality**
 - "... interaction between gender, race and other categories of difference in individual lives, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural ideologies and the outcomes of these interactions in terms of power" (Davis 2008)
 - An intersectional analysis goes beyond identifying power patterns to problematizing the underlying social categorisations – which identities are promoted and which identities become invisible (Kaijser & Kronsell 2012)

Case studies

- Case studies of **CAF Cassou in Burkina Faso** and **PFES in Cat Tien, Vietnam**
 - Existing forest management systems targeted for climate mitigation and adaptation strategies
 - Contestations and discontent between state, local elites, minorities, migrants, men and women risks any expectation of equitable access and benefit sharing
- Adapts the WPR approach to examining the problem in decisions on, access to, and benefits from forest management
 - What's the problem of *access and benefits in forest management* represented in policy and practice?
 - What assumptions underlie this representation of the problem?
 - What is left unproblematic? Where are the silences? How could it be questioned or disrupted?
- Brings in an intersectional lens with perspectives from different social groups

Case study 1: CAF Cassou, Burkina Faso

- **CAF:** community managed forestry within a multilevel governance architecture, implemented since 1980 with FAO-state led projects
- **Objectives:** improve the local peoples' livelihoods by implementing a forest management plan and organizing fuelwood
- Concession contract transferring forest management rights from the CAF project to forest users' groups (GGF)
- Benefits based on fuelwood sales (about 4 euros/m³ of wood) and shared between:
 - loggers or GGF members (50%)
 - forest management fund (27%)
 - the State (14%)
 - village development fund (9%)



Case study 1: CAF Cassou, Burkina Faso

What's the problem of *access and benefits in forest management* represented?

- Formal benefits (fuelwood revenues) derived from privatization of a common resource for the loggers

"...people like us are only loggers but those of us who are members of the CAF office have gotten rich and some have built houses, and do what they want" (Autochton, male)

"We women cut wood. But we did not have any profits because we cut only for our consumption and not for sale. It is men who cut and sell wood" (Autochton, female)

"The forest is beneficial for us because we collect the karite nuts, fruits and nere ... as well as the firewood" (Migrant, female)



Case study 1: CAF Cassou, Burkina Faso

What assumptions underlie this representation of the problem?

"...they [CAF] told us that ... our forest has a lot of wood. And that this wood is money but that we do not know how to profit from this money and if we agree they will bring a project for us so that we can exploit the wood." (Autochton, male)

"It is a small section that benefits. But for all the population it is the protection of the forest, the environment, the greenery and the medicinal plants which one can still find in the forest ..." (Autochton, youth)

"... the objective is to help the village by giving them the benefits of the forest... people can cultivate on one side of the village lands while preserving the other for the forest ..." (Migrant, male)

"We were told that the goal is to protect the forest so that new migrants can have cropland. That it will also benefit the herders for grazing in the forest" (Migrant, female)



Case study 1: CAF Cassou, Burkina Faso

What is left unproblematic? Where are the silences? How could it be questioned or disrupted?

- Autochthons (natives) manifest their discontent claiming back their land from the CAF and clear forests for farming or to sell

*“Revolt? ... yes, because we do not see the benefits of the forest”
(Autochton, male)*

*“Today our lands are really degraded, if you have no fertilizer or herbicide you can not cultivate. Yet there is CAF land that is fertile ... yes, I'm talking about our old fields they took to make the CAF”
(Autochton, male)*

“In the bush where the cattle can pasture is on land that people have bought but have not yet started to develop. Here ... we can no longer go out with the cattle to pasture because people have already sown and there is no more space for herding. We tried to advise the natives on the sale of these lands but they did not accept our advice” (Migrant, male)



Case study 2: PFES in Cat Tien, Vietnam



- Initiated in 2008 with the goals to increase forest cover, enhance forestry added-value and improve local livelihoods
- Forest ES: watershed protection and landscape beauty
- ES buyers: hydropower plants, water supply and tourism companies
- Intermediary governance structures: VNFF/PFES Funds at national and provincial levels
- Involves over 4422 communities, covers approx 4 mil ha (30% of total forest area)
- Local communities carry out forest patrols to monitor fires and encroachment

Case study 2: PFES in Cat Tien, Vietnam



What's the problem of *access and benefits in forest management* represented?

- Party resolution prioritizes support for poverty reduction and explicitly for ethnic minorities ... thus excludes Vietnamese Kinh migrants by design

"We did not choose to migrate here but the government encouraged us to move here as part of economic development program. But when we came, we were treated as outsiders... We do not have any land and our family does not even have household registration number. We do not ask for benefits from government programs because our incomes are good. However, being rejected from government programs made us feel invisible (Kinh, female).

"We have to pay more for forest officers and rangers to have access to forest after the restrictions..." (M'ông, female)

"With the law forbidding people to exploit the forest's many resources... income from PFES barely makes ends meet" (Ede, male)

Case study 2: PFES in Cat Tien, Vietnam



What assumptions underlie this representation of the problem?

“[In order] to protect ethnic people from land grabbing by Kinh people, the government forbid the Kinh to have land and buy land from ethnic groups in these areas” (Kinh, provincial government officer)

“This is our land and we do not want to share it with any outsiders” (Head of village, M’ông)

“We also need to show that we support ethnic groups ... although many ethnic people are still clearing forests, we cannot punish them or cancel their PFES contract because it will become a sensitive social discrimination story and we will face problem of low disbursement rate” (National government officer, male)

Case study 2: PFES in Cat Tien, Vietnam



What is left unproblematic? Where are the silences? How could it be questioned or disrupted?

- Created a new form of marginalization and conflict between ethnicities

“It is unfair ... whenever the fire occurs and illegal loggers enter the area, we are always willing to join the villagers to protect forests. We also have to pay our own money to cover petrol costs and working like everyone else. But when the community get PFES payment, we are not informed or paid” (Kinh, male)

“We have raised this issue [inequity] to the government for the last 20 years. We wrote letters, we called, we raised when politicians came to our villages but all we hear is this is government policy so nothing can change. Now as you [government officers] are participating in this meeting, i want to raise it again and say directly to you that we are not happy about this” (Kinh, female)

“My parents have tried to fight for this for decades and nothing happens and i do not want to even think or speak about this anymore” (Kinh, male)

Discussion: identities and power relations

- **Logging was the driver for establishment of CAF – thus the administrative structures and benefit sharing mechanisms focus on the loggers**

“If you want to collect the wood with a cart and not on your head, you must go and get a permit from the foresters” (Migrant, female)

- **Information and participation is privileged**

“I have never attended any CAF meeting. By the time we learned the information the meeting had already taken place. So we did not take part” (Migrant, female)

“Indeed we heard about this fund. But I do not know if they have already made an achievement in the village with the money from this fund and if they did it I'm not aware.” (Migrant, male)

“Kinh people are richest in this village so we do not need to receive PFES payment as they play very small contribution to our daily income. However, being a part of the village activities means that we exist and we are part of the community and are not isolated or criminalised that everyone has to stay away from us” (Kinh, male)

“I have lived here since the village was first established and I have never been invited to any village meetings and been involved in any government programs” (Kinh, female)

Discussion: identities and power relations

- **Tenure and rights remain with the natives**

“They [Autochtons] are the landowners here, they are the ones who decide what they want to do with the forest ... we are foreigners here, we have no authority” (Migrant, female)

“We only want [land and benefits] to be shared among our people. But if Kinh people marry our people, they can receive benefit as we all do” (Head of village, Ede)

- **“Culture” underlie gender relations?**

“it is the subject of men and we women are always at home so we are not informed about this subject. Even if our husbands are aware of something they will not tell us!” (Migrant, female)

“... for Central Highland ethnic groups such as Ede or M’ông, women are the head of the households and determine how their villages should operate and how benefits are” (Retired government official, female)

“If our trees are not well-protected, we will lose money but if we do not respect gender equity, there is no problem with us” (Provincial government official, male)

Thank you!

Subscribe to our newsletter
www.stockholmresilience.org/subscribe