

Review Essay

BEYOND CRITICAL ANALYSES OF THE AFTERMATH OF THE 2015 NEPAL EARTHQUAKES

Katsuo Nawa

Michael Hutt, Mark Liechty and Stefanie Lotter, eds. 2021. *Epicentre to Aftermath: Rebuilding and Remembering in the Wake of Nepal's Earthquakes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Epicentre to Aftermath: Rebuilding and Remembering in the Wake of Nepal's Earthquakes is a substantial contribution to the growing literature on the aftermath of the 2015 earthquakes in Nepal. Unlike many earlier contributions (most notably, Raj and Gautam 2015; and articles in Warner, Hindman and Snellinger 2015), its main focus does not lie in the various experiences of the earthquakes and their immediate aftermath. Rather, the book focuses on diverse, twisted, and entangled political and sociocultural processes of the next five years, in which various people of diverse positionalities, both Nepalis and foreigners, have negotiated with each other to reimagine and reconstruct their past, present and future. The emphasis on contextual and situated agency—individual, collective and institutional—together with the inclusion of wider topics, notably various artistic practices inspired by the earthquakes, provides broader and more nuanced perspectives to better understand the aftermaths of the *mahābhūkampa* of 2072 v.s.

The book consists of four parts and fifteen chapters. Part I, “Contextualizing Disaster,” starts with the introductory chapter by Mark Liechty and Michael Hutt. Arguing that the failure of well-planned bilateral and I/NGO-driven relief interventions has often been derived from the presupposition to treat the disaster-affected simply as passive victims, they emphasize the need to acknowledge the situated and generative nature of disaster aftermaths, in which not only one’s current situation but also their past and future are

negotiated and reconstituted among differentially positioned actors within a complex and contingent situation. They thus stress the importance of the effective collaboration between disaster studies and area studies (I come back to this point later). In the second chapter, John Whelpton summarizes the information on major earthquakes in Nepali history and scrutinizes the government's response to (and the political consequences of) the 1934 and 1988 earthquakes, though he does so without referring to Yogesh Raj's (2015) important study on the relief and reconstruction management after the 1934 earthquake. This chapter also provides valuable clues to relativize the accounts of former earthquakes written by those who took a leading role in the post-earthquake process, most notably by Brahma Shamsheer J.B. Rana (Brahmashamsheer 2015).

Part II, "Rebuilding Lives and Livelihood," starts with the chapter "Expertise, Labour, and Mobility in Nepal's Post-conflict, Post-disaster Reconstruction: Law, Construction, and Finance as Domains of Social Transformation," the collaborative work of many scholars and researchers: Sara Shneiderman, Dan Hirslund, Jeevan Baniya, Philippe Le Billon, Bina Limbu, Bishnu Pandey, Katharine Rankin, Nabin Rawal, Prakash Chandra Subedi, Manoj Suji, Deepak Thapa and Cameron Warner. Comparing the ever-shifting situation of three research sites—Bhaktapur Municipality, the village of Borang in Dhading and Kartike Bazaar and adjoining two villages in Sindhupalchok—the article shows how the process of reconstruction was differently experienced at the household level, sorting out several intertwined layers: the legal process (obtaining landownership documentation, applying for housing reconstruction grants, and getting certification from a state-certified engineer); the physical construction process (house designs and materials, the costs of construction, and laborers and their training to build earthquake-resilient houses); and the financial process (loans and selling property as well as governmental grants). In so doing, the chapter ethnographically depicts how various actors—politicians, engineers, contractors, laborers and households as well as their kins and relatives, for instance—have negotiated with each other in different ways in three research sites to transform each locality materially and socially. This chapter thus provides both a useful and convenient framework and various ethnographic

vignettes of unexpected twists for those who are working with the complexity of post-earthquake reconstruction processes at the local level.¹

The following four chapters in this part focus on a specific aspect of the post-earthquake reconstruction process. The fourth chapter by Shyam Kunwar, Elsie Lewison and Katharine Rankin analyzes the domain of labor as an important arena in which individuals and institutions have contested with each other within the process of reconstruction, based on research in Dolakha district. In Chapter Five, Jeevan Baniya vividly shows the introduction process of an “integrated settlement project” to a Majhi community in Sindhupalchok. Though seemingly well-planned, the project turned out to be highly frustrating for many villagers, not only due to delays and economic difficulties, but also due to the serious gaps between what the project materially constructed and the economic, sociocultural and religious needs of the villagers. Chapter Six by Amrita Gurung and Jeevan Baniya discusses another important category of actors: INGOs, NGOs and CBOs. Comparing the results of fieldwork in Gorkha, Sindhupalchok and southern Lalitpur, they point out the unregulated nature of I/NGOs’ activities, which often diverge from local-level realities. In Chapter Seven, Katie Oven, Shubheksha Rana, Gopi K. Basyal, Nick Rosser and Mark Kincey scrutinize “the different ways in which risk is experienced, understood, framed, and prioritized by rural residents, the government, NGOs and scientists, and how these plural understandings have shaped the post-earthquake disaster risk management agenda in Nepal” (p. 152), taking up the case of landslide risk management in the upper Bhote Koshi Valley and elsewhere.

All the four chapters in Part III, “Rebuilding Structures,” examine the process of planning and materially constructing houses, buildings, and infrastructure, by following complex negotiations among differently positioned stakeholders. As all the chapters discuss Newa (Newar) cities and/or settlements, the issues of “heritage” on the one hand and *guthi* on the other often appear as crucial factors, though actual processes that occurred in relation to these institutions were highly diverse. In Chapter Eight, based on his fieldwork in Sankhu and Kathmandu, Nimesh Dhungana shows the gap between policy and real implementation of “owner-led reconstruction,” in which the spaces of participatory governance were often utilized to legitimize top-down governmental decisions, within the wider context of the shifting

¹ See the working paper by Bina Limbu *et al.* (2019) for more data and findings from this project.

relationship between state and society in Nepal. In Chapter Nine, based on various newspaper reports and the case of Bhaktapur, where a German donor withdrew from the heritage restoration project in 2018, Shobhit Shakya traces the discursive transformation of international aid in Nepal and its sociopolitical impacts since 2015. An important keyword here is “dignity,” which Shakya discusses in relation to the sense of autonomy and self-sufficiency in both national and local levels. In Chapter Ten, taking up “household” as the primary unit of analysis, Sabin Ninglekhu, Patrick Daly, and Pia Hollenbach vividly show us, through the case of post-earthquake Bungamati, the tension between the rights of individual families and the various restrictions implemented to rebuild the historic town authentically. They point out, “for the local community, the by-law prioritized aesthetics and ‘authenticity’ over use and function of the house deemed critical to meet their everyday needs” (p. 251), thus enabling (at least partially) the use of heritage architecture for modern purposes such as tourism. In Chapter Eleven, Stefanie Lotter describes the complicated political process of the heritage reconstruction of Kathmandu Darbar Square as a continuous re-negotiation of various claims of ownership and authority. While “outsiders” were rejected repeatedly from being involved with sacred spaces, who could be an “insider” with authority has been contested. This is ethnographically shown through detailed analysis of the creative interventions, and their limitations, by young Nepali activists with various professional backgrounds.

Part IV, “Building Memory,” focuses on activities of artists who often collaboratively worked on post-earthquake memorialization projects. In Chapter Twelve, Katharina Weiler presents us with exhibitions of Architecture Galleries at the Patan Museum after the 2015 earthquake, with the curation reflecting both the peculiar materiality of each displayed object and the values projected onto them by local and international agents. In Chapter Thirteen, Christiane Brosius presents two examples of artists-cum-activists’ engagements in the post-earthquake situation to create bottom-up solidarity through photography in the Kathmandu valley: Sanjeev Maharjan’s “Meanwhile in My Neighbourhood: Earthquake Diary” and activities of the Kathmandu-based artist collective ArTree Nepal. In Chapter Fourteen, Austin Lord and Jennifer Bradley show us the trajectory of the Langtang Memory Project, with which they have been involved. The process of collecting and sharing photographs with local survivors of the Langtang Valley, where the most devastating avalanche hit on April 25, 2015, are described in terms of the two almost

contradictory concepts in the Langtangpa variety of Tibetan, *sempa tserah* and *kipu sho* (roughly, remembering and longing for the past, and forgetting and moving forward). Finally, in Chapter Fifteen, Michael Hutt critically analyzes Nepali-language poems on the earthquakes published within three months of the April earthquake in terms of six themes: anguish and determination, witness, the *bhūkampa* as a punisher, the *bhūkampa* as unifier and leveler, distribution of loss, and political anger and distrust. The author does not explain why this chapter, unlike many others in this volume, focuses exclusively on poems published within a relatively short period of time after the disaster, and how this restriction affects the discussion in this chapter.²

Even though dealing with a surprisingly wide range of aspects of the 2015 earthquake aftermaths, the book does not cover every important issue. Several important sectors, notably mental health,³ are not discussed, though this is not a serious problem, since it is impossible to discuss all the relevant issues with sufficient ethnographic detail in a single volume. More importantly, some crucial factors, which already existed before the earthquakes and which should be seriously considered in analyzing the earthquake aftermath, are not discussed sufficiently. For example, even though media reports in newspapers and television are mentioned in many chapters, sometimes in a negative way, little substantial analysis of this is given, with the exception of Chapter Nine. The same can be pointed out with regard to the internet, mobile phone use, and social media, which all played a significant role in pre- and post-earthquake Nepal (cf. Hutt 2022). The rapid development of the motorable road network as well as other infrastructures in Nepal after 2006 is also treated as a given factor. I am not pointing this out for unproductive fault-finding. First, adequate attention to the status of these factors prior to the disaster will

² Elsewhere, Hutt (2022) discusses another genre, YouTube Nepali music videos related to the earthquakes. Here, too, the five music videos on which his detailed contents analysis is based were released within two months after the main earthquake.

³ Seale-Feldman's article (2020) gives us an important account of what the disaster "generates" by juxtaposing the movements of international and national agencies after the 2015 earthquakes with local-level shifting ethnographic reality. This is comparable to, if slightly less rigid than, many chapters in Part II and III. The tone of this article, however, is more phenomenological, stressing not only the criticism of the notion of "the better" predetermined by outside agencies, but also the importance of the present moment of "being together" to imagine the possibility "for an otherwise to emerge" (Seale-Feldman 2020: 257).

provide important clues for detailed comparisons with other disasters in the past and future. In addition, I would argue that these factors could be blind spots, especially in surveys started after the earthquakes. Many articles in this volume suggest that disaster aftermaths are to be understood as generative processes, in which past, present and future are negotiated and (re-)constituted. Moreover, Mark Liechty, a co-editor of the volume, stresses elsewhere the need to avoid causal explanations of the disaster aftermaths in terms of pre-disaster socio-political conditions (Liechty 2022). I agree with them. This type of argument, however, inevitably generates a corollary: if the post-disaster past, present and future are constantly regenerated, one cannot simply use *ex post facto* interviews as straightforward testimonies of pre-earthquake pasts. This strongly suggests the necessity of multifaceted examination of pre-disaster conditions, independent from post-disaster ethnographic field research, especially in researches that started after the earthquakes.

Another crucial issue which is raised but not fully developed in this volume is who are the contributors to this volume and who are not. I admit that this is an awkward topic: I take up it here because Liechty and Hutt suggest in their introductory chapter the necessity to go beyond the distinction between the knowledge of academics and non-academics, of “experts” and others, and of insiders and outsiders (p. 17). The composition of the contributors is clear. Most contributors to this volume are from disciplines within social sciences and humanities. This means that the following two categories of people are seldom included as contributors to this volume: first, scholars in natural sciences as well as relief and reconstruction experts, many of whom have natural sciences or engineering backgrounds; and second, non-scholar, non-researcher Nepalis, not only politicians, administrators, journalists, etc., but also those whom we might vaguely call “ordinary” villagers and city dwellers.

The exclusion of scholars in natural sciences and relief and reconstruction experts should be a deliberate choice of the editors, as Liechty and Hutt write that “the contributors to this volume are not disaster-studies experts” (p. 16). It has dual consequences. First, even though critical arguments are repeatedly raised toward them in many chapters, their responses are not heard in the volume. Second, the scientific and technical aspects of the overall situation are largely treated as given or as “black boxes,” without further substantial scrutiny. The exception is Chapter Seven, where authors utilize the technical knowledge and data of landslide hazard, relocating them within local contexts.

Here I would like to elaborate on this issue by means of a brief comparison with another collection of articles published three years before this volume: *Evolving Narratives of Hazard and Risk: The Gorkha Earthquake, Nepal, 2015* (Bracken, Rusczyk and Robinson 2018). The latter is the result of a collaboration between scholars and practitioners based in Nepal and the Institute of Hazard, Risk and Resilience (IHRR) at Durham University. The editors are scholars in hazard and risk management and a geographer, all of whom have been working in Nepal for many years but are not specialized in Nepal Studies *per se*. The authors stress the importance of interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, or transdisciplinary perspectives beyond natural sciences and engineering, and the volume includes one chapter by a social anthropologist and another chapter chiefly written by archaeologists (on the issue of heritage).⁴ The editors write in the concluding chapter that the volume “showcases the way in which viewing the consequences of an earthquake through the lens of inter- and multidisciplinary work, can contribute to a more holistic and nuanced understanding of the fuller impact of the event” (Robinson, Rusczyk and Bracken 2018: 184). Interestingly, however, the volume is seldom referred to in *Epicentre to Aftermath*, even though the former was published about three years before the latter. Moreover, the only chapter quoted in the latter is the chapter written by social anthropologist Ben Campbell on the severe aftermath of the earthquakes among Tamang communities. What we see here is the following contrast: whereas Bracken, Rusczyk and Robinson (2018), edited by natural scientists and experts, includes as a part of it the work of an anthropologist who has carried out his research in Nepal over a long period of time, the contributors to Hutt, Liechty and Lotter (2021) are largely confined to specialists in Nepal Studies, who seldom refer to the contents of the related book published three years ago, unless the author is a fellow Nepal Studies scholar. Of course, this is not in itself a problem, as each volume has its own distinct scope. Nor do I intend to say that Bracken, Rusczyk and Robinson’s volume is superior in terms of contents.

Having said that, I must point out the gap between what Liechty and Hutt call in the introductory chapter “a more holistic approach”—which,

⁴ This is not the place to discuss this book in detail, but it seems that it does not fully articulate what is actually revealed by juxtaposing the various perspectives from different disciplines. Perhaps this is partly due to the fact that the editors deliberately chose to publish the book relatively quickly: indeed, they notice the risk that the discussion might not be well-developed enough in some places.

according to them, the volume pursues against relatively narrow pragmatic approaches often held by experts in relief and reconstruction (p. 4)—and the selective nature of the volume. This problem probably stems from the fact that the volume contains little direct dialogue, let alone collaboration, between disaster studies practitioners and experts on the one hand and scholars in regional studies on the other, even though it contains various meta-level critiques from the latter against the former, presupposing the separation between the two fields as clear-cut and self-evident. In other words, many of the authors of this book are non-participating observers in their relationships with disaster studies experts.

Let us move on to the exclusion of non-scholar, non-researcher Nepalis, not only politicians, administrators, and journalists but those whom we might call “ordinary” villagers and city dwellers. To be sure, many chapters include diverse voices of various agents involved, Nepali and foreign, but those voices are always selected, edited, and in many cases translated into English by the author(s). The problem that arises here is that of representation. Certainly, many chapters use the ethnographic trope effectively to reflect diverse voices. Of course, the key trope is different from chapter to chapter. Some chapters, most notably Chapter Twelve, seem to be written from an aesthetic perspective, tacitly presupposing the socio-culturally neutral visitor-audience to museums. In the same vein, Chapter Thirteen is written by a single author as a meta-level critical introduction based on her observation, and consequently, it sounds much less collaborative than the book the author published with one of the artists discussed in the chapter (Brosius and Maharjan 2017). On the contrary, several chapters, most notably Chapter Fourteen, are engaged anthropology, in that authors write recursively about the trajectory of the projects with which they themselves have been deeply involved and engaged. After reading chapters in Parts II and III, I am afraid, however, that this type of straightforward engagement would be much more difficult in other settings, where a relatively homogeneous “local community” with its local language variety cannot be presupposed even as a proxy.

What many chapters of the volume show us, brilliantly but always partially, is the process of negotiation among various agents with uneven power and resources: foreign donors, politicians and administrators at various levels, traditional local leaders, contractors, various activists (from I/NGO workers to artists), and “ordinary” villagers/city dwellers of various positionalities, from various *jāt/jāti* backgrounds, male and female

(I remember no voice challenging this dichotomy itself in this volume). In other words, the issue of “who represents whom” always already existed out there well before the arrival of researchers. In the process of research and writing, the decision of how to allocate individual voices in one’s own narrative selectively using these (and other) social categories is left to the author(s). Moreover, as is aptly pointed out in several chapters, it is not easy to hear the voices of those who have suffered most seriously, and those who have been most marginalized, either geographically, politically, or socio-culturally. In addition, a short-term, interview-based research is often not enough to uncover problems that are faced but not clearly articulated locally. In particular, as Chapter Five clearly indicates, local knowledge—crucial for researchers to recognize in the post-disaster predicament—is often embodied, not clearly articulated. Last but not least, the ethical aspect of representation, “how should those who have not suffered the worst impacts of a disaster represent or give voice to those who have?” (p. 21), always remains, though not only among scholars and researchers. Taking all these points into serious consideration, some arguments of Liechty and Hutt’s introduction—for instance, “disaster relief and reconstruction efforts will succeed only to the extent that they bring together people with generic disaster assistance experience *and* people with deep knowledge of the relevant local historical, social, and cultural context” (p. 15)—pose an extremely heavy burden on the latter category of people for articulating the inner construction of “people” as well as one’s own positionality.⁵

To be sure, the editors of this volume clearly recognize all these issues. Indeed, quoting Seira Tamang’s arguments in her unpublished paper, Liechty and Hutt straightforwardly admit that there exists “‘a certain deployment of the politics of knowledge’ which leaves little room to question the expert, and cements a distinction between ‘academic’ and ‘non-academic’ knowledge and Western ‘experts’ and others” (p. 17). Then, quoting Mallika Shakya’s (2015) article, the authors foster their belief that the contributors to this volume “consider the overlap between categories of insider and outsider

⁵ Amrita Gurung and Jeevan Baniya write in the conclusion of Chapter Six, “Local-level organizations need to be given equal power in decision making, priority setting, and designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating programmes and plans so that they are enabled not only to build back better but also to cope with future disasters” (p. 150). I agree, but the other chapters of the volume suggest the need to scrutinize the composition of local-level organizations at the same time.

while digging through localized experiences of the event and its aftermath” (p. 17). I see here a clear example of politics of quotation, but it is not the issue now. The difficulty of this argument lies, first of all, in that the second quote does not aptly correspond to the issue raised in the first quote, as considering the overlap between categories does not necessarily lead to challenging the exclusive authority of (Western) experts and academics, either discursively or practically. Indeed, the fact that almost all the contributors to the volume are scholars and researchers might practically reinforce the divides problematized by Tamang and Shakya, but no clear explanation is made on this point by the authors.

I am not saying that the selection of contributors to this volume is problematic in and of itself. Nor am I suggesting that we should return to the issue of multivocality and heteroglossia, once exalted as a fashionable solution of the problem of ethnographic authority, after more than thirty-five years. Quite the contrary. I would argue that, despite the attempts made in several specific chapters (most notably Chapters Seven and Fourteen), the book as a whole seems to avoid discussing in an integrated way the following issue, which the accumulation of data and arguments in the volume virtually raised. How is it practically possible to implement effective intervention practices that are as much in line with the will of the people as possible, in a situation where “local voices” themselves are diverse and constantly being (re-)generated, where the voices of the vulnerable tend to be least represented, and where the practical knowledge required for the various collaborations with the experts might be embodied, not well articulated? This is an enormous question directly related to at least three fundamental issues: to socioeconomic issues of aid and intervention as well as their cost-benefits; to sociocultural and ethical issues of representation by those who seek to be involved from the outside; and to political philosophical issues of the nature of democracy itself and its better implementation. But, if this book is to go beyond a descriptive and analytical critique of what has occurred in the earthquake aftermath and explore the possibility of better practices in the present and the future, it would be indispensable to embark on attempts at concrete dialogue and collaborative practice with those outside the field of area studies.

For the readers who are not scholars in Nepal Studies, what this book shows is, I believe, the results of what many excellent scholars in Nepal Studies have carried out in the context of the earthquake aftermath. They have

done so in pursuit of more nuanced and comprehensive understandings of it, sometimes criticizing post-disaster practitioners and various non-specialists, though generally without including them as co-authors. In this sense, this volume lacks critiques from the outside in it. A conclusion of this review essay is, thus, a highly twisted one for me: future inter-disciplinary dialogue based on this volume would continue more productively if the various issues raised in this book, together with rich information, are critically scrutinized and discussed not only by scholars in Nepal Studies such as myself. In other words, the contents of this volume should be relocated within agonistic discussion toward future collaboration between regional studies scholars and experts in disaster studies and other disciplines who are not necessarily specialized in Nepal Studies on the one hand, and Nepali people with various backgrounds and positionalities on the other. I sincerely hope that such dialogues will continue, as this book is ethnographically rich and analytically challenging, well enough to merit such discussions.

For scholars in Nepal Studies, on the other hand, the major merit of this book, I believe, lies in providing readers several frameworks as well as a wide range of perspectives on the 2015 earthquakes for further discussion. In addition, each chapter includes detailed information and analyses of specific incidents and processes, often with twists, entanglements, and unintended consequences, which I could not include in the summary above. In these respects, the contribution of this book is truly groundbreaking. To write on the aftermaths of the *mahābhūkampa* of 2072 v.s. in relation to contents of this volume, and sometimes against them, will further enrich and deepen our debates on this field.

References

- Bracken, Louise, Hanna A. Rusczyk and Tom Robinson, eds. 2018. *Evolving Narratives of Hazard and Risk: The Gorkha Earthquake, Nepal, 2015*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brahmashamsher. 2015. *Nepalko Mahābhūkampa, 1990*. Fourth edition. Kathmandu: nepa~laya.
- Brosius, Christiane and Sanjeev Maharjan. 2017. *Breaking Views: Engaging Art in Post-Earthquake Nepal*. Kathmandu: Himal Books for Social Science Baha
- Hutt, Michael. 2022. Earthquake Aftersongs: Music Videos and the Imagining of an Online Nepali Public. *Popular Communication* 20(1): 42–59.

- Liechty, Mark. 2022. Disasters and ‘Conditions of Possibility’: Rethinking Causation through an Analysis of Earthquakes in Nepal. *Disasters* 46(1): 185–205.
- Limbu, Bina, Nabin Rawal, Manoj Suji, Prakash Chandra Subedi and Jeevan Baniya. 2019. Reconstructing Nepal: Post-Earthquake Experiences from Bhaktapur, Dhading and Sindhupalchowk. Working paper. Social Science Baha, Kathmandu.
- Raj, Yogesh. 2015. Management of the Relief and Reconstruction after the Great Earthquake of 1934. *Studies in Nepali History and Society* 20(2): 375–422.
- Raj, Yogesh and Bhaskar Gautam. 2015. *Courage in Chaos: Early Rescue and Relief after the April Earthquake*. Kathmandu: Martin Chautari.
- Robinson, Tom R., Hanna A. Ruszczyk and Louise J. Bracken. 2018. Looking and Moving Forward. In *Evolving Narratives of Hazard and Risk: The Gorkha Earthquake, Nepal, 2015*. Louise Bracken, Hanna A. Ruszczyk and Tom Robinson, eds., pp. 183–192. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seale-Feldman, Aidan. 2020. The Work of Disaster: Building Back Otherwise in Post-Earthquake Nepal. *Cultural Anthropology* 35(2): 237–263.
- Shakya, Mallika. 2015. The Question of Locality in Rupture. *Hot Spots, Fieldsights*. October 14. Available at <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/the-question-of-locality-in-rupture>; accessed April 5, 2022.
- Warner, Cameron David, Heather Hindman and Amanda Snellinger, eds. 2015. Aftershocked: Reflections on the 2015 Earthquakes in Nepal. *Hot Spots series, Fieldsights*, October 14. Available at <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/series/aftershocked-reflections-on-the-2015-earthquakes-in-nepal>; accessed April 5, 2022.

Biographical Note

Katsuo Nawa is a Professor of Cultural Anthropology at Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies and Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, the University of Tokyo. Largely based on his ethnographic fieldwork in Far Western Nepal and elsewhere, he has written extensively on such issues as inter-ethnic and inter-caste relations, transformation of ritual process, multilingualism and translation, and ethnohistory. He also co-edited with Hiroshi Ishii and David N. Gellner two volumes, *Nepalis Inside and Outside Nepal: Social Dynamics in Northern South Asia*, Vol. 1, and *Political and Social Transformations in North India and Nepal: Social Dynamics in Northern South Asia*, Vol. 2 (Manohar 2007). Email: nawa@ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp