

Hence the need for the Nepal school of anthropology is quite pressing. We will have to keep all of this in mind when we develop the curriculum for the Department of Sociology/Anthropology, as we will have to do this when the first group of undergraduate students finish their courses of study by the end of summer 1987. Unless we keep in mind the need of the country in coming years and the possible role our graduate students will be playing in shaping the future course of Nepalese society, it is possible that we will have provided a very outdated orientation and a useless nonfunctional education to our young people.

Departments of sociology and anthropology at some other universities may not be doing exactly what we want to do. So we may not be able to find a model anywhere. Visiting scholars or graduate students from outside cannot be models either. Their needs and values are different from ours. Our students will have to be strongly oriented towards the observation of the process and dynamics of emergent Nepalese society at an all encompassing level. This will be our Nepal school of anthropology. At this stage, we should not concern ourselves too much with whether or not our graduates will be recognized by one or the other famous universities around the world; that is not yet our priority. Anthropology in its application has always served the interests of the people who have used it. It began as a handmaiden of Western Christian missionaries, followed by colonial governments who used it quite extensively in many parts of the non-western and non-Christian world. In recent decades, applied anthropology has been used by U.N. agencies, WHO, World Bank, and international aid organizations for various types of development activities. Recently, it is also being used by industries and multinational corporations for sales promotions and production expansions.

Our priority at the moment is for graduates who understand the dynamics of Nepalese society and have the ability to project a better future for the people at the lower economic levels and provide a wider base for participation in the creation of a resilient and progressive national culture with a strong national identity. This will be Nepal's own school of anthropology.

## SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY CURRICULUM AND THE NEEDS OF NEPAL

*Krishna B. Bhattachan*

### I

#### Introduction

Although sociology and anthropology emerged in the West during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the disciplines entered Nepal only during the early 1950's at the research level and in 1981 at the teaching level, the latter in a combined form. Thus, sociology and anthropology, so rich and mature in theories and methods, is just five years old in Nepal. Until 1981, Sarana and Sinha's statement about the status of anthropology in Asia was correct: "To the best of our knowledge, anthropology has not been accorded independent academic recognition in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh, although there are some anthropologists working in basically non-anthropological institutions" (1976:210).

In Nepal, however, the situation has changed since then. Sociology and anthropology are now taught at the Master's level at Tribhuvan University. A Master's level program is taught at the Kirtipur campus, and at four other campuses -- Pokhara, Kathmandu, Patan, and Biratnagar -- a B.A. level program has just been introduced. We must now evaluate our past performance and take stock of what we possess of sociology and anthropology curriculum, its relevance to the needs of Nepal, and future demands, needs, and priorities.

With these facts in mind, this paper will outline the development of the sociology and anthropology curriculum, critically review the current nature and the needs of Nepal, and discuss the problems and issues in curriculum development.

## II

Development of Sociology and Anthropology Curriculum in Nepal

The sociology curriculum was developed in non-academic institutions, like the training centre under the aegis of the Village Development Program (VDP), which was established in 1953 in Kathmandu. The program offered a course on rural sociology, one of the major subjects in the curriculum, to familiarize rural field workers, social organizers, block development officers, and extension agents with the rural social structure and its problems. The paper on rural sociology focused on rural society, rural family, folk life, and community development (Thapa, 1973: 46). In 1968, when VDP became the Panchayat Training Centre (PTC), the curriculum was revised to focus on rural society, group dynamics, communication, local leadership, panchayat development, social survey, and social planning (Thapa, 1973:47).

Only towards the end of the 1960's did the concerned intellectuals of Tribhuvan University gradually feel the need for separate departments of sociology and anthropology for the promotion of teaching and research. Macdonald recalls, "As a result of concern expressed by the Vice Chancellor of Tribhuvan University about the absence of a sociology department, Professor Ernest Gellner of the London School of Economics visited Nepal in September 1970, with a view to preparing a report on this question" (1973:27). The department of Sociology and Anthropology, one of the major wings in the Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies (INAS) was established on July 15, 1973, to train post-graduate research assistants and students in M.A. or Ph. D. programs.

INAS earnestly planned to develop a B.A. curriculum and to start an M.A. dissertation program (Macdonald, 1973:28). But all their high aspirations, hopes, promises and enthusiasm later turned into a fiasco as INAS, entangled by its own internal problems, could produce only two M.A.'s in anthropology by dissertation before it was denied the right to grant M.A. or Ph.D. degrees (Dahal, 1985:39). At first, this appeared to be a major

setback for the institutional development of sociology and anthropology (Bista, 1980:3). If the Research Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies (CNAS), the successor to INAS, had continued the tradition of granting degrees, it would have badly affected the establishment of a separate department under the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences. In addition, the Centre would have produced many anthropologists strong in field experience but weak in general theoretical and conceptual knowledge. In other words, it would have completely damaged the growth of sociology in Nepal.

However, this "setback" eventually proved to be useful in developing a department of sociology and anthropology, under the IHSS at the Kirtipur campus. The ending of the degree program at INAS stimulated and stirred the minds of some concerned academicians at Tribhuvan University. They increased efforts, under the direction of the IHSS, to establish a department of Sociology and Anthropology at the M.A. level at the Kirtipur campus.

In March 1978, a meeting was held in Kathmandu, under the chairmanship of Chandra B. Shrestha, chairman of the Geography department, to explore the feasibility of opening a Department of Sociology and Anthropology. The committee was comprised of eleven members<sup>1</sup>, representing the fields of Political Science, English, Culture, History, Nepal, Home Science, Psychology, and Sociology. This committee was reshuffled in 1979<sup>2</sup>, adding five sociology and two anthropology members, and then was again reorganized into another committee<sup>3</sup>, now headed by Dr. Soorya Lal Amatya, Dean of IHSS. This new committee included noted sociologists and anthropologists, such as Prof. Dor Bahadur Bista, Bihari Krishna Shrestha, Dr. Chaitanya Mishra, T.S. Thapa, Dr. Hikmat Bista, and Dr. Linda Stone. They formed a Curriculum and Draft Action Committee (CDAC)<sup>4</sup> to prepare a Master's level sociology/anthropology curriculum (IHSS, 1986). The CDAC prepared a curriculum for a Master of Arts degree in sociology/anthropology which was approved by the Subject Committee of IHSS and the Faculty Board of Tribhuvan University.

The two year program consisted of eight papers. The first four concerned the History of Social Science, Human Adaptation, Social Organization and Economy, and Methods of Social Research (IHSS, 1980). The second four concerned Nepalese Culture and Society, Population Studies, Social Change, and Dissertation and Field Trip (IHSS, 1980). All papers were required of both sociology and anthropology students. Each student completing the degree program would receive a combined M.A. degree in sociology/anthropology. The primary aim of this curriculum was to produce inter-disciplinary experts who would be able to work in planning, managing, guiding, teaching, and research (IHSS, 1980:1). This curriculum was rather lacking in organization and theme. All five faculty members<sup>5</sup>, including the chairman of the department, disliked this curriculum from the very day the department opened. They immediately redesigned the four courses required for the first part of the M.A. program. This new curriculum was later approved by the Subject Committee and the Faculty Board in 1981<sup>6</sup>. The same year, the Faculty Board also approved the awarding of separate degrees in sociology and anthropology.

At the end of 1981, the task of redesigning the curriculum was given to the Steering Committee of the Subject Committee of Sociology and Anthropology<sup>7</sup>. Their revised curriculum was approved by the Subject Committee as well as by the Faculty Board. This curriculum contains eight papers, four each for part I and II: Theories in Sociology/Anthropology, Human Evolution and Pre-Historic Culture (formerly Human Adaptation), Social Organization, Methodology of Social Research, Nepali Society and Culture, Sociological Perspectives on Contemporary Nepal, Population Studies (sociology option) or Ecology and Subsistence (anthropology option), and Field Research and Field Report (Dissertation). The Steering Committee wished to offer specialized papers to M.A. sociology and anthropology students, but because of manpower constraints in the department and lack of sociological and anthropological orientation of the students at the B.A. level, all papers except number seven (Population Studies or Ecology and Subsistence) were required of all students.

So far, students holding a B.A. degree in any of the following subjects -- History, Political Science, Geography, Culture, Home Science, Psychology, Economics, Sociology and Anthropology -- are eligible to apply for the degree program. The M.A. level curriculum was presuming that a majority of students come from different fields<sup>8</sup>.

In 1985, Tribhuvan University decided to teach undergraduate level sociology and anthropology at four campuses: Trichandra campus, Kathmandu; Patan campus, Lalitpur; Prithwi Narayan campus, Pokhara; and Mahendra Morang campus, Biratanagar. The Steering Committee of the Subject Committee<sup>9</sup> developed three papers at the B.A. level: Introduction to Sociology/Anthropology, Nepali Culture and Society, and Methodology of Social Research. The objectives of this program are to prepare students as middle level professionals in the field, to develop sociological/anthropological understanding of Nepali society and culture, and to conduct sociological/anthropological research independently (IHSS, 1985:1). From the next year onwards, the department of sociology/anthropology at the Kirtipur campus will admit those students who have majored in sociology/anthropology in undergraduate studies. Because of this, the existing M.A. curriculum should be completely revised. More advanced courses should be offered, as they will already be familiar with many courses offered now at the M.A. level.

Sociology, it should be noted here, is offered in some other departments as one of the compulsory papers. For instance, Sociology of Child Development, and Community and Culture are offered to M.A. Home Science students as compulsory papers. Similarly, Sociology of Education is offered to the M. Ed. students. At the Medical school, M.B.B.S. students are offered a paper on Community Medicine. Two papers on sociology -- Sociology of Rural Development, and Sociology of Migration -- are offered to the B. Sc. students in Agriculture at the Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Rampur. A paper on Rural Sociology is offered to certificate level students in the Institute of Forestry, Hetauda. Most of this undergraduate level sociology curriculum is not good enough and, therefore, needs to be revised to make it more relevant, useful, and up-to-date.

### III

#### Critical Review of the Existing Curriculum in the Light of the Needs of Nepal

In most of the departments under IHSS, graduate students devote at least two years on campus studying general theories and methods. All the graduate courses are designed so that they have little application to everyday life. After completion of their studies, students will have to work, experiencing things which have nothing to do with what they have learned in classrooms for two years. This is exactly why the social sciences are losing their prestige, compared with technical subjects like engineering, medicine, agriculture, and forestry. Nepalese sociologists and anthropologists, however, realized this fact well before the creation of a sociology/anthropology department. They are determined not to repeat the mistakes others have made. Therefore, maximum efforts have been made to relate the M.A. and the B.A. level sociology and anthropology curriculum to the needs of Nepal.

Mishra, while discussing the challenges for sociology in the 1980's, has aptly pointed out that:

"the first question sociologists will ask themselves in the immediate future will be of the form: what problem areas do we work on? what sociology do we teach? what sociology do we learn? and, finally, what we as sociologists, can do?"

He further queries:

"should sociology focus primarily on ethnography? on ideologies, values, and norms? on development, national integration, and 'modernization'? on education? on poverty? on population and family planning? on land? on other resources? on ecology in general? on defined 'social problems' and 'social welfare'?"

(Mishra, 1981:4)

Sociology and anthropology should throw away ethnography as well as studies on ideologies, values and norms. It should address issues and problems of contemporary interest

like poverty, ecology, planning, resource management, and development, with more substantive concern. In this light, Mishra suggests that theoretically sociology and anthropology should move away from their traditional preoccupations with the study of ideology and forms of ideological expression; methodologically, it should move away from positivism and empiricism; and substantially, it should move away from an exclusive reliance on non-local knowledge (1980: 1-2). Given these, the courses of study, as suggested by Mishra, may focus on themes of social organization, current theories, epistemology and methodology of social research, population studies, political economy and society, social stratification, social change, and current critical issues.

In the above scenario, efforts were made to develop and introduce papers on different aspects of Nepal when the M.A. level curriculum was redesigned in 1981. All five papers of the first part of the M.A. program -- Nepali Society and Culture, Sociological Perspectives on Contemporary Nepal, Ecology and Subsistence, Population Studies, and Field Research and Field Report -- exclusively focus on Nepal. Nepali Culture and Society, an ethnographic paper, concentrates more on continuity and change in various social/cultural institutions. Sociological Perspectives on Contemporary Nepal is more critical and analytic, primarily with substantial concern for the political economy of Nepal. Two other papers -- Population Studies, and Ecology and Subsistence -- focus on important issues in present day Nepal. In addition, students are encouraged to carry out field research in different areas like landlessness, fishery, poverty, forest resources, population (fertility, migration, breast feeding, family planning), resource management, ecology, and local cooperative organizations like *guthi*, *parma*, and *dhikur*.

In brief, the nature of the curriculum is equally divided between sociology and anthropology. Working within the given university framework as a combined department, it is a Herculean task to do justice to either sociology or anthropology. The curriculum is loaded with social and cultural anthropology fused with sociology. Of the three other major wings of anthropology, Physical Anthropology and Archaeology are only minimally represented, and Linguistics is absent altogether.

### Curriculum: Research Oriented or Theory Oriented?

Some sociologists and anthropologists are of the view that the overall focus of the curriculum should be to give enough theoretical orientation to the students. Therefore, if our aim is to produce sociologists and anthropologists who are able to compete with their Western counterparts, research methodology or research work should not be the main emphasis. They insist that our aim is not only to produce researchers but also to produce planners, administrators, and teachers. I, however, am in favor of giving priority to research-oriented curriculum because theory and research should go together.

#### IV

### Main Focus of the Curriculum

The M.A. level sociology and anthropology curriculum should focus on the following:

#### A. Philosophy/Objective

The Philosophy of the M.A. sociology/anthropology curriculum should be geared to enable students to become planners, administrators, development experts, advisors and social researchers who will contribute to expediting the process of development and change in Nepal.

#### B. Programs

With regards to the above mentioned objective, the M.A. level curriculum may incorporate the following programs:

1. The Whole curriculum should be related to the needs of Nepal. In other words, Nepal-oriented papers should be introduced right from the first year.
2. General sociological and anthropological theories and research should be utilized to better understand Nepali culture, society, and economy.
3. Separate full-fledged papers should be developed in major areas such as agriculture, forestry, rural development, development planning, health/medicine, people's participation, population, urbanization, ecology, political

economy, education, social stratification, social change, national integration, national issues, ethnicity, poverty, and social problems.

4. More emphasis should be given to first-hand field research experience instead of purely theoretical orientation. Students should get practical research experience by developing a research proposal, participating in various research activities, such as basic research, action research, applied research, participatory research, and social survey.
5. The curriculum should incorporate on-the-spot observation of various institutions and on-going programs related to development and change in rural as well as urban areas.
6. People who have experience in the relevant areas -- planning development programs, extension programs, and research-- should be invited to share this experience with students.
7. Reading assignments and book/article reviews should be required of each student in order to substantiate lectures.
8. Each student should develop and present at least one seminar paper each academic year.
9. Educational tours in different parts of rural Nepal should be included for practical experience of village life.
10. More specialized and optional papers should be offered to both sociology and anthropology groups.
11. To cover more topics and fields, each paper should be divided into two groups containing two different topics. This will provide scope for 14 topics (excluding dissertation) instead of only 7 topics.
12. Some courses on computer programming, such as word processing and data processing, should be provided to second year M.A. students.

### Problems and Issues

The following problems and issues related to the sociology and anthropology curriculum have a bearing on its growth in Nepal:

Sociology and anthropology: Fusion or Fission?: Although sociology and anthropology in Nepal have been fused so far, the debate on its fusion or fission is still going on, and there are many arguments and counter-arguments. This debate has a significant bearing on the pattern of the sociology and anthropology curriculum as well as the growth of these disciplines in Nepal.

The very first sentence of the curriculum developed in 1980 states: "It is unnecessary in the Nepalese perspective to separate sociology/anthropology as two distinctive fields of study" (IHSS, 1980:1). Dahal (1985: 43), as mentioned earlier, sees this effort as a purely administrative problem and not an academic one. He writes: "This type of common effort negates the academic excellence of a student who is pursuing a higher degree either to become an anthropologist or a sociologist" (Dahal, 1985: 45). Dahal's argument is partially valid. Some sociologists and anthropologists believe that a separate department of sociology will face neither an administrative problem nor an academic problem, but a separate department of anthropology could not exist alone.

Many sociologists and anthropologists fail to understand and appreciate the unification of sociology and anthropology. Neither administrative nor purely academic considerations was a determining factor in the creation of a combined department of sociology and anthropology. Instead, deeply rooted in a philosophical base, i.e., the theoretical perspectives and methodological tools of both disciplines, when synthesized together, would enable to better understand and analyze Nepali society and culture. Therefore, at least in Nepal, the tree of sociology and anthropology should be grafted for its proper growth and development.

Focus on General Sociology and Anthropology in Nepal: Many Nepali social scientists, including sociologists and anthropologists, think that the sociology and anthropology curriculum should focus more on general concepts, theories, principles, and methodologies with less emphasis on one's own society. However, many disagree with this idea and argue that it always should refer to and focus on everyday problems of Nepal. This means we should develop papers exclusively concerned with various contemporary issues of Nepal. If the students spend their whole academic year in understanding different aspects of Nepalese society, this knowledge gained in the classroom will be useful afterwards when they work in international, national, or private organizations in various capacities.

Different Label- Same Content, or Different Label - Different Content?: This issue is closely related with the earlier issue of fusion or fission of sociology and anthropology. It has come up because of the existing provision of granting an M.A. degree of either sociology or anthropology by offering a paper on Population Studies or Ecology and Subsistence -- all other papers being the same for both groups. It has created some technical problems, such as whether a student who has completed an M.A. in either sociology or anthropology is entitled to get another degree by studying the next optional paper only. If the answer is "yes," some sociologists, anthropologists, and other social scientists argue: how can a student get two degrees by studying the same courses with the exception of a single paper? If the answer is "no," why can he not do that? Why should he study all seven papers, which he has already studied and passed, to get another degree?

These, I think, are very serious technical problems which need to be solved immediately by the Subject Committee:

Curriculum: Ideal or Pragmatic?: The curriculum designer always faces a dilemma whether to design an ideal or a pragmatic curriculum; the former implies quality while the latter ignores it. The pragmatic curriculum designer designs curriculum with regards to expertise of the available teachers, availability of textbooks, earlier orientation of students in concerned fields, etc. These considerations ultimately damage the quality of curriculum.

In contrast, the ideal curriculum designer designs curriculum in regard to the needs of the society regardless of the ability of teachers, the availability of text books, the ability of students, etc. Instead, the quality and standard of the curriculum is maintained at any cost.

Quality or Performance: This issue is also related to the earlier issue of an ideal or pragmatic curriculum. If the curriculum is prepared in accordance with the needs and priorities of our society, some teachers may not be qualified enough to teach, and also many students will discover a problem of getting appropriate text books on the subject. On the other hand, if the curriculum is prepared in accordance to the performance of teachers and students, the curriculum would not maintain quality teaching and learning activities.

Curriculum Standard: Indian, Western or Mixed: Some sociologists and anthropologists assert that the curriculum should follow the curriculum of Indian universities, while others argue it should follow that of Western universities. Still some other sociologists and anthropologists insist on borrowing the best of anywhere. But I think we should take the best curriculum we can find and modify it in accordance with our own needs and priorities. We need not to follow the curriculum format of any particular university.

Curriculum: Continuation or Change?: Many sociologists and anthropologists agree that curriculum should be updated every year. But frequent changes in curriculum create many problems for the proper administration of examinations. Because of such complications, the university has decided not to change the syllabus for five years once it is approved by the Faculty Board. Thus, in the existing system, if the curriculum is not up to standard, or if necessary changes are to be made, it would not be possible to do so for at least five years. But to up-date the curriculum and relate it to the needs of Nepal it is essential to review the existing curriculum every year and make necessary changes as and when required.

## VI

### Conclusion

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology in Tribhuvan University is growing rapidly. Though the department was established only in 1981, the M.A. level curriculum of sociology and anthropology has gradually "come of age". Since the very beginning it has aptly related itself to the needs of Nepal. Despite several administrative and technical problems, sociologists and anthropologists in Nepal are looking forward to happier years.

### NOTES

1. The following committee members attended the meeting on Chaitra 28, 2034:
  1. Dr. Chandra Bahadur Shrestha (Geography), Chairman
  2. Dr. Loka Raj Baral (Political Science)
  3. Dr. Yugeswor Verma (English)
  4. Dr. Prem Raman Upreti (History)
  5. Dr. Hit Narayan Jha (Culture)
  6. Dr. Basudev Tripathi (Nepali)
  7. Naresh Man Singh
  8. Rajyashree Pokharel (Home Science)
  9. Sarala Thapa (Psychology)
  10. Dr. Chaitanya Mishra (Sociology)
2. The following committee members attended the meeting held on Baisakh 18, 2035:
  1. Dr. Chandra Bahadur Shrestha (Geography), Chairman
  2. T.S. Thapa (Sociology)
  3. Dr. Khem Bahadur Bista (Anthropology)
  4. Dilli Ram Dahal (Anthropology)
  5. Sudha Paneru (Sociology)
  6. Prabhakar Lal Das (Sociology)
  7. Dr. Prem Raman Upreti (History)
  8. Sita Sharma (Sociology)
  9. Daya Chandra Upadhyaya
  10. Dr. Chaitanya Mishra (Sociology)
  11. Dr. Bal Kumar K.C. (Geography)
3. The following committee members attended the meeting held on Baisakh 8, 2037:
  1. Dr. Soorya Lal Amatya (Geography), Dean
  2. Prof. Dor Bahadur Bista (Anthropology), Chairman of Subject committee of Sociology and Anthropology
  3. Prof. Madhav Raj Pandey (History)
  4. Dr. Hikmat Bista (Anthropology)

5. Ram Niwas Pandey (Culture)
  6. Dr. Bed Prakash Upreti (Anthropology)
  7. Dr. Chaitanya Mishra (Sociology)
  8. Sudha Paneru (Sociology)
  9. Padma Dikshit (Sociology)
  10. T.S. Thapa (Sociology)
  11. Bihari Krishna Shrestha (Anthropology)
  12. Dr. Linda Stone (Anthropology)
  13. Dr. Khem Bahadur Bista (Anthropology)
4. Curriculum Draft Committee (CDC) members:
    1. Dr. Hikmat Bista
    2. Sudha Paneru
    3. T.S. Thapa
  5. Dr. Chaitnya Mishra, Krishna B. Bhattachan, Padam Lal Devkota, Ram B. Chhetri, and Padma Dikshit.
  6. The Subject committee meeting held on Paush 9, 2038 was attended by the following members:
    1. Dr. Soorya Lal Amatya (Geography), Dean
    2. Prof. Dor Bahadur Bista (Anthropology), Chairman
    3. Dr. Chaitanya Mishra (Sociology) Chairman of Department of Sociology and Anthropology
    4. Padam Dikshit (Sociology)
    5. Ram Bahadur Chhetri (Anthropology)
    6. Padam Lal Devkota (Anthropology)
    7. Dr. Khem Bahadur Bista (Anthropology)
    8. Dr. Hikmat Bista (Anthropology)
    9. Krishna Bahadur Bhattachan (Sociology)
    10. S.M. Zahid Parwez (Sociology)
    11. Ram Niwas Pandey (Culture)
  7. The working group was comprised of:
    1. Dr. Chaitnya Mishra, Coordinator
    2. Dr. Hikmat Bista
    3. Krishna Bahadur Bhattachan
    4. Ram Bahadur Chhetri
    5. Padam Lal Devkota

8. Many Students with a B.A. degree in Law and Journalism; with a B. Sc. and M. Sc. degree in Physics, Chemistry, Botany, Zoology, and Agriculture; with a B. Com. and M. Com. degree have shown a strong desire to join the department. As of now they are not eligible to apply for admission. I personally think that those interested students having degrees in science, medicine, forestry, engineering, and management should be made eligible to apply for admission in sociology and anthropology. They are often more competent than students having degrees in social sciences. Here it should be noted that many well-established sociologists and anthropologists all over the world have backgrounds in disciplines other than sociology and anthropology, but even so they have been able to contribute much in sociology and anthropology.
9. The committee was comprised of:
1. Dr. Chaitnaya Mishra
  2. Dr. Navin K. Rai
  3. Krishna Bahadur Bhattachan
  4. Padam Lal Devkota
  5. Om Gurung

## REFERENCES

- Bista, Dor Bahadur  
1980 "Prospects for Anthropology in Nepal." Paper submitted to the Social Science Seminar, Tribhuvan University.
- Dahal, Dilli Ram  
1985 "Anthropology in Nepal: Infrastructure and Development" in Lohani, Mohan P. (ed.) *Social Science in Nepal: Infrastructure and Development*. IHSS, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, pp. 37-49.
- IHSS  
1980 *Course of Study M.A. Sociology & Anthropology* (1981 - 1984). Dean's Office, IHSS, Tribhuvan University, Pokhara.
- 1982 *Course of Study M.A. Sociology/Antropology*. IHSS, Tribhuvan University, Pokhara.
- 1985 *Course of Study B.A. Sociology/Antropology*. IHSS, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.
- Macdonald, A.W.  
1974 "Sociology and Anthropology in Nepal." in Sharma, P.R. (ed.) *Social Science in Nepal*. A report on the proceedings of a seminar on social science in Nepal held at INAS in October 1973. INAS, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu. pp. 27-38.
- Mishra, Chaitnya  
1980 "Sociology/Antropology Courses of Study." A typed letter to Sociology/Antropology Committee of IHSS, Tribhuvan University, Dated 5 July 1980.
- 1981 "Sociology in Nepal: Challenges for the 1980's." Paper submitted to the Social Science Seminar, Tribhuvan University.
- 1984 "Social Research in Nepal: A Critique and a Proposal." in *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*. CNAS, Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur. pp 1-10.

Sarana, Gopala and Kharni P. Sinha

1976 "Status of Social-cultural Anthropology of India." in Siegel, Bernard J. (ed.) *Annual Review of Anthropology*, California: Annual Reviews Inc.

Thapa, T.S.

1974 "The Development of Sociology in Nepal." in Sharma, P.R. (ed.) . *Social Science in Nepal*. A report on the proceedings of a seminar on Social science in Nepal held at INAS in October 1973. INAS, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu. pp. 27-38.

## "ROMANTICISM" AND "DEVELOPMENT" IN NEPALESE ANTHROPOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

James F. Fisher

It has become almost a public mantra, repeated by high and low government officials, foreign observers of the contemporary scene, and increasingly, the citizenry at large, that "development" now occupies pride of place in the national agenda of Nepal. From that stance it is but a short step to the position that "development" is what anthropology should be all about in Nepal too; in this view, without such a development orientation anthropology would be merely a frivolous luxury the country can ill afford.

The preeminence of "development" having been thus established -- for the country and for the discipline -- the next point in the argument is that anthropologists in Nepal are uniquely situated to spot forms of social organization and decode cultural patterns, both of which are frequently seen to be obstacles to "development," with which myopic economists, provincial political scientists, and culture-bound psychologists have been unable to cope. The anthropologist, so attuned to the minute and exotic differences that exist between this ethnic group and the one in the next valley, will stride onto the scene and, like Manjusri at Chobar, cut through the developmental impasse that seems to stymie us at every turn.

Despite the cogency of this argument not all anthropology (so the critical line goes) is development-oriented. In fact, the besetting sin of most foreign anthropology (and until recently most Nepalese anthropology has been foreign) is that rather than being development-oriented it is just the opposite -- that is to say, it is entangled in the false consciousness of "romanticism" and, therefore, not relevant to the country's needs.

I should be clear from the outset on two points: one is that I agree wholeheartedly with the position of my colleagues in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (including the