RETHINKING DEVELOPMENT
Promoting Global Justice into the 21st Century

Inter Pares

WORKING FOR CHANGE…AMONG EQUALS
OEUVRER POUR LE CHANGEMENT…ENTRE ÉGAUX

Inter Pares Occasional Papers Series

Inter Pares is a Canadian organization dedicated to promoting international social justice. In Canada and overseas we work to build understanding about the causes and effects of poverty and injustice, and the need for social change. We support communities in developing countries to create healthy, safe and secure futures. We support people's struggles for self-determination and their efforts to challenge structural obstacles to change and their alternative development approaches.

Rethinking Development
Promoting Global Justice in the 21st Century

This paper is the fruit of an ongoing process of reflection and action within Inter Pares and among several close counterparts and colleagues in Latin America, Africa and Asia, and was prepared as part of a collaborative editorial process among the Inter Pares staff team. The principal writer is Inter Pares staff member Brian Murphy.

Inter Pares' motto for almost thirty years has been working for change – among equals. What does "working for change" mean for us today?

Beyond globalization: a new globalism

Change is, of course, inevitable. Change is always happening, in ways too complex for anyone to control.

Our mission is to affect the quality and character of change, to influence the trajectory of change to the benefit of society, nationally and globally. This includes working with others internationally to try to end the permanent emergency that consumes the lives of the majority on the planet, and the spiral of violence and militarism that dominates global politics today. It also implies finding, promoting and amplifying alternative visions of life, livelihoods and citizenship in the interests of the broad global community. It implies resistance, opposition, and proposition. It implies imagining another future and trying to promote and live that future daily.

In our work in Africa, Asia and the Americas – and in Canada – we see people taking hold of their rights and responsibilities as citizens to revoke arbitrary authority and demand moral, ethical and political leadership, by demonstrating such leadership in their communities and in advocacy with their governments and legislatures.

The demographics of this new citizenship is also a profound shift. Global activism, long carried by an aging population, is increasingly led by the young, who now make up the vast majority of citizens in most nations; and by women, who have moved into the theatre of activist public citizenship as never before. At the same time, an inter-generational exchange among progressive citizen activists is passing on a legacy of experience from old to young, and a momentum of change that is as durable as history. As part of this movement we see a convergence of interests, a commitment to democratic diversity, and a vision that "another way is possible". We see people coming together to share experiences, values, dreams and actions within a new internationalist movement – a movement to announce a transcendent globalism as a positive and unifying force on the planet.

What we see happening in the world is the engagement of people as citizens, "doing politics" for the long term – engaged citizens with explicit proposals and structures of accountability. What we see emerging is a resurgent citizen activism, locally and globally – movements of people working together to re-appropriate their governments, their economies, and their societies. This action is responsible citizenship itself: first, to hold the state responsible for its deeds, ultimately to make government accountable in its form and substance, and to use government to develop progressive social and economic policy to the benefit of the entire community.

We have also learned that to support this shift on a global level requires a re-thinking of development, and a change of mind, of consciousness. We need to embrace diversity and challenge dichotomies – dichotomies like "us" and "them", for example – that obscure the common destiny of all who share our planet.[1]

Inter Pares and our colleagues around the world promote the values of health, creativity, and respect for life, and the ethics of care and community. What we call "development" is not a technical process. It is not technique and tools that will make the difference. What is required is an explicit internationalist movement for global cooperation within an ethos of universal respect, reciprocity and interdependent diversity – a new globalism based in hope and confidence, promoting cooperative international action to transform ourselves and with us, the world.

The context of global development action

Much that we present in this contextual analysis is the subject of intense debate within academic, governmental, and non-governmental circles globally. We participate in this ongoing debate with perspectives based in our direct experience and long relationships world-wide.[2] In our conclusions we take sides with the poor and the excluded, those who are marginal to the "march of progress", and those whose lives and livelihoods have been destroyed by the processes of "development" rather than enhanced. That is our role, and our responsibility.

We begin with an assertion that is the baseline for our deliberations about what is necessary for the world, what is possible, and how to get there. The present state of the world is unsustainable, and the events that dominate the attention of political leaders and citizen advocates world-wide are taking an increasingly brutal and tragic course. More of the same is not acceptable. This section reviews elements of the global context that we anticipate will form the imperatives that frame international development cooperation in the years ahead.

The rule of law

What perhaps most characterizes the present era is the diminishing sway of the rule of law, internally within countries, and internationally. This unfolding crisis has its roots not merely in an increase in international crime and terrorism but, more critically, in the intemperance of those who make laws and are charged with upholding them. The most dangerous law-breakers are the executive and legislative branches of governments, and their police and security forces. Impunity begins with the governors; the victims of this impunity are, as always, the governed, and the rule of law itself.

Of course there are also outlaws and rogue military forces, now lumped together by one name that obscures necessary distinctions – the name "terrorist". These elements are operating outside the law and, of course, are lawless when they operate their campaigns. But these forces are not responsible for protecting and sustaining the rule of law; to the contrary, they are committed to undermining and overturning it. It is the state that is charged with defending the rule of law. When the legitimate actors of the state overturn law to seek out the lawless, the lawless win and the rule of law loses, and with it, the rights of citizens everywhere.

> *When the state overturns the law to seek out the lawless, the lawless win, and the rule of law loses.*

The deterioration of the rule of law in the world in the past several years is a major disaster for civilization, and a major victory for those who seek anarchy as the landscape out of which to construct an authoritarian future. Under these circumstances, meaningful social and national development in the interests of the majority is impossible.

Today, global politics and global development are dominated by a continuum that incorporates militarism, unilateralism, unregulated corporatism and organized crime – licit and illicit – along with the expanding social exclusion of billions caused by poverty, and the corresponding alienation of citizens from choices and decisions about their future.

The links among militarism, unilateralism, corporatism and organized crime are direct and inextricable,[3] and mutually reinforcing. Wherever you start, the rest follow and proliferate. These links include and rely upon the connection between the criminal activity of "legitimate" corporations such as large international banks and trans-national corporations and the criminal activity of illicit commercial "corporate" structures (mafias, trafficking cartels, mercenaries, etc), whose existence depends on the vertical integration of legitimate and irregular corporate structures and their various commercial activities.[4]

In times of extreme global militarization as we are presently experiencing, these criminal commercial connections become even more pervasive and insidious. It is the perfect terrain for demagogues, warlords, dictators and crime bosses, whose power is reinforced by illicit wealth and the impunity they secure in lawless times. Within this continuum, intolerant and cruelly repressive fundamentalisms – religious and ideological – easily breed, grow and dominate. And the drift towards increasingly corrupt, unaccountable and totalitarian forms of government is a tragic corollary.

Along with the demise of the rule of law, we see an increasing influence of dogmatic, intolerant and repressive fundamentalisms that assert and enforce their own rules and dominance, arbitrarily and ruthlessly. These fundamentalisms include not only the religious, but a range of other fundamentalisms that mirror the historical function of institutional religion to control the knowledge, culture, norms and behaviors of society. Fundamentalisms of techno-science and social engineering, of economism and materialism, of militarism, of nationalism and "national security", and of religious intolerance are coming together in ways that represent an incipient fascism that threatens countries and citizens around the globe. These fundamentalisms are encroaching on society everywhere, increasingly dominating the instruments of social control, state

> *Fundamentalisms are coming together in an incipient fascism that threatens citizens around the globe.*

security and coercion, the institutions of law, commerce and finance, along with social norms concerning family, community and social reproduction, and the means and norms of production and consumption. When this has happened before, the name it has been given is "totalitarianism", although people do not want to call it by that name today. But that is its name, and the warning is in the wind.[5]

Militarism

The essence of militarism is the conviction that a manifest capacity to wield arbitrary, unrestrained and overpowering physical force is required to promote and defend the interests of the group and the nation in the face of its competitors and enemies, potential or actual. Militarism assumes that "might is right", and that effective coercive power relies on authoritarian and elite hierarchical decision and command structures, based in strict loyalty and obedience. Underlying the strength of these assumptions is the belief that the legitimacy of force is based in the laws of nature and the will of god; and that life arranges itself in "natural hierarchies", so that the fact of power creates its own legitimacy.

A corollary of militarism is that the nation and the state are primary, rather than the individual citizen, who exists merely as an extension of the state. Regimentation of society and social control are pre-conditions to national strength and power. Military structures and rigid hierarchy extend themselves throughout society and its institutions, and the norms of loyalty, subservience and obedience pervade, while deviance and dissent are discouraged ruthlessly. The virtues of conformism and patriotism, and national myths of military power and glory blessed by god and nature, pervade the daily rituals of family, church and neighbourhood.

Scientific fundamentalism

Associated with militarism has been the consolidation of the fundamentalism of science. Modern science has developed as a result of the self-elevation of humankind from *within* nature to *above* nature, with the emergence of the modernist obsession with objectifying the world to study it, and to modify it in the interest of society and the "wealth of nations". This development began in the period now known as the "Enlightenment" and has remade the world to what we see today.

The science that has developed in this intervening period assumes that 1) the world and all its working are knowable, and the human mind is capable of this knowing if it can achieve sufficient distance and objectivity; 2) achieving this understanding of the world is possible by objectively, mechanically, reducing it to its smallest possible parts and, by understanding its parts, being able to construct an understanding of the whole; and, 3) with the proper equipment, this knowledge can be complete and unified, codified, and applied systematically to achieve predicable results to make the world the way we want it to be.

The word "scientia" actually means knowledge – any knowledge, no matter how created or how universally-shared. But, in modern times science has come to mean the systematization and codification of knowledge – that is, turning knowledge into law.

Institutionalized science has today all the characteristics of organized religion: it is rooted in assumptions about nature, humanity and about the natural law of the universe, which it pronounces and defends with a ruthlessness that is as effectively controlling and exclusive as any religion on earth. With this difference: religion is rife with doctrinal schism and factional debate; modern science is global, universal, monolithic, and impermeable. It is doctrinaire and its dogmas have the status of sacred writ. The life of all of us, and of the planet, now hang on the word of an increasingly small elite who control science and its application, and whose ways and means are often beyond effective scrutiny and democratic control.

> *Institutionalized science has today all the characteristics of organized religion.*

Science has been a powerful tool of global dominance in the past century, not merely as the servant of militarism but as its partner. In achieving its hegemony, science has marginalized the subjective, the personal, the interpretative. It has also effectively outlawed other systems of knowledge, other manners and methods of knowing and interacting with the world.[6]

Technocracy

Technology originally emerged as applied science – that is, human knowledge applied to create tools and machines to change or manage the environment in the interests of society. The first technologies were almost exclusively technologies to provide shelter and to hunt, gather or cultivate food. Among the first tools were tools used to kill – for food, for protection and ultimately for conquest.

Early on, as well, came technologies that provided mobility and tools for communication. Even as these original basic technologies became increasingly more sophisticated and complex, they were used at the will and behest of individual human beings and humans in groups. Technology served human will, for good or ill.

Today the line between science – human knowledge – and technology is no longer distinct. Certainly some technology is applied science still; that is, the knowledge of human beings applied in the invention of tools and machines.

But science itself is also now, increasingly, applied technology – that is, knowledge created by machines, and applied by machines. A significant function of this new machine-derived knowledge is the invention of new machines, new technology, without requiring or accommodating the intervening step of human knowledge, human action, or human will.

Technology has achieved a state where it is capable of free-standing, self-sustaining, and self-perpetuating "research" and action – a disembodied industrial "praxis" – able to reproduce and to improve itself without human intelligence intervening directly. Technology that was once created to serve humans and was "driven" by humans, is now capable of driving itself, and is served by humans, most of whom who do not understand the very technology they serve. The dominant technologies today are neither understood in their complexity nor commanded in their simplicity by individual human beings, who now merely serve and service cogs and components, and in doing so, have themselves become cogs and components rather than masters and builders.

This is a critical shift, a shift predicted 50 years ago by Norbert Weiner,[7] acknowledged as one of the greatest of 20th century scientists and mathematicians, a pioneer in the science of computers, and the founder of the science of artificial intelligence. The implications of this shift are profound.

Modern science presumes that technology is neutral, that there is no such thing as good or bad technology, merely good and bad end-uses. Technology is justified by its ends. This is an inversion of thousands of years of human wisdom – that ends can never justify means – and represents the logical ethical extension of the utilitarian objectification of the universe implicit in the "Enlightenment".

The goal of science used to be democratic human knowledge, but the purpose of modern technology and modern science has become technology itself. We have

A "technopoly", now dominates the science of international development.

reached what the social philosopher Neil Postman has called a "technopoly".[8] The leading edge of this technopoly today is biotechnology, whose Faustian project is no less than the de-sacralization and re-definition of life – that is, life reduced to technological artifact, controlled by "industry" (corporate scientists, technicians), legitimized by the scientific academy (now largely owned by industry) and promoted and protected by lawmakers and their bureaucrats and police (in the service of industry).[9] The masters of the technopoly are the integrated corporate structures of the biotech and bio-engineering chemical industries – pharmaceuticals, seed/fertilizer/biocides, and genetic engineering – along with the cybernetics, armaments and surveillance industries, and the public relations propaganda machine that conditions the attitudes, expectations and fears of the public.[10]

Inevitably this technopoly has come to dominate the science of international development, which is in constant search of the technical fix that will turn failing and volatile states into stable "developing" nations. But 60 years of systematic development experience has demonstrated that it is precisely the exclusive and uncritical application of material science and technology – its methods, tools and devices – and the increasing concentration of the control of technology and its devices, that guarantees that the majority of countries will never emerge from the economic and political margins. And even fewer of their citizens will ever experience the bounty that modern technology falsely promises as they are increasingly mired in the material deprivation and social destruction that this technology has wrought.

Globalization and technology

The modern age has reached its apogee with the extended industrial revolution, the third phase of which – the electronic revolution – we are in today. This present period represents the zenith of technological objectification of the world and knowledge, marked by a hyper-rationalist, scientific, linear, and reductionist de-struction of nature. It is no coincidence that capitalism, industrialism, and corporatism have flourished in such an extreme, radical and destructive fashion in this age. Nor is it a surprise that there is an intense aversion developing worldwide to the excesses of science and technology – including militarism – and the pragmatic, utilitarian calculations that mark this period.

There is increasing critique of the hyper-rationalist (particularly positivist), mechanistic and reductionist bias imposed by the knowledge elite that dominates the institutions of modern industrial society. This critique presents a radical challenge to the methods of experimental science and the capitalist, corporatist autocracy that institutionalized science supports. It challenges the idea of one universal progressive human history, emphasizing instead an appreciation of traditional knowledge and ways that are particular to a specific time, place and experience. This movement represents a return to the legitimacy of subjectivity and personal knowledge, and the sovereignty of the individual at the local level to create knowledge through living action. And it challenges the notion that a specific reality can be effectively uncovered (and re-directed) by objective – so-called, "scientific" – investigation and intervention by non-participating outsiders.

This is important to us because the profession of international socio-economic development is based in the modernist linear and cumulative notion of history, and the complex set of assumptions about "progress" that goes with it – including the bias of the "scientific" method, and the systems calculus that is used to measure and promote progress. In our work in international development this is typified in logical framework analysis and results-based management, presently imposed by international donors obsessed with the illusions of narrow reductionist "inputs", "outputs", "outcomes" and "indicators".

It is critical at this time to reappraise the role and significance of technology in the phenomenon of globalization. In the debate about its merits, globalization is represented either as the ultimate global triumph, or the ultimate disaster, of liberal capitalism.

From this perspective, globalization is not new, but merely a third plateau of a progressive historical process (the first plateau was the western renaissance, the emergence of empire, and the colonialization of the planet; the second, the industrial revolution). Following this logic, the present, and perhaps ultimate, phase of globalization is marked by an electronic revolution that makes possible the movement of virtual money in virtual time – meaning that time and space no longer constrain speculative trading of commodities and national currencies – and represents a transformation in the very essence of "trade". For some this is good and natural and bodes well for humanity; for others it is bad and has led to even more and deeper misery for the majority on the planet.

This debate is essentially an economistic debate, and focuses on people as economic beings, and as functions of economic laws. While many of the descriptive observations are valid, they are incomplete and inadequate to a profound analysis of what is at stake and what are the options.

While globalization is indeed a logical extension of recent history, it is far more complex than simply one more step in an inevitable historical process. It is, in fact, a fundamental discontinuity in that history. That is, the reality that underlies what we have come to call globalization is a largely new phenomenon, and its newness arises from transforming technology, not economics *per se*.

The implications of this go beyond the likelihood that much of the world will continue to be impoverished and dominated by globalized corporate capital, cruel as this reality is. Global society is increasingly being de-humanized and controlled by totalizing technology and its associated fundamentalisms. This new world is marked by:

- the destruction of "difference" (the emergence of what some call "undifferentiated man" and undifferentiated societies);
- the homogenization of culture (the global dominance of commercialized artifice over authentic art, craft and cultural action); and,
- the commodification of all aspects of life.

Together, these are destroying freedom and "human-ness", and the possibility of authentic citizenship, resistance and creation.

From this perspective, the conventional ideological categories of the past century are obsolete, two sides of the same coin. The "rightist" materialist catechism dominates, of course, in its triumphant celebration of the ascendancy of the industrialized liberal democracies and laissez-faire capitalism ("neo-liberalism"), even as the global failure of this economics becomes increasingly graphic and is challenged by its own leading proponents (cf. Stigliz, Soros, Krugman, *et alia*).

On the other hand, the "leftist" materialist critique is similarly inadequate, in its anachronistic analysis of modern globalization merely as a return of nineteenth century economic liberalization, free-trade, and de-regulation that can be mediated through powerful governance institutions at the global level, and some variation of socialism or social democracy at the national level, or a modified Keynesian welfare state.

Neither "more of the same" from the right, or "back to the future" from the left will adequately address the fundamental dilemmas of human development in this 21st century. More than economics is at stake, and more than economics is at play. And far more than a transformed economics is required to regain control of our lives, our governments, our societies and our nations.

Corporatism: the loss of the social and of the commons

In the context of the emerging "technopoly", citizenship is becoming extinct. We now have the state as corporation, and citizens as clients, stakeholders, or taxpayers. Politicians and bureaucrats see themselves largely as managers on strictly economistic and fiduciary grounds. The corporate interest is defined as the common interest, and the corporate state acts on behalf of these limited interests, in competition with the rest of the world rather than in common with it, or in cooperation. Public relations and "messaging" dominate public discourse. National research institutions serve commercial interests rather than public interest, and the function of science is to defend policy and profit rather than truth and the public good.

> *Neither "more of the same" from the right, nor "back to the future" from the left is adequate.*

The dominant theme in the priorities and policies of state has become commercialization – economizing culture and industrializing production so that individuals and their daily lives are alienated from the processes of production and commerce as social and cultural acts. We have seen the privatization of what used to be considered public goods, such as water, and the commodification of public services such as health and education, as well as the privatization of citizenship itself. Citizenship is not a right fully enjoyed by all, but rather, is often a privilege of wealth and assets – along with place of birth, ethnicity, and religion – which still determine to a large extent both the degree of citizenship enjoyed and the protection proffered by the state.

Beyond liberalism and essentialism

There is no evidence for the self-declared merits of existing global systems, nor of the existing hegemony of international capital and technology. Increasing numbers of citizens believe that these systems work to the disadvantage of the majority, and of the planet itself. The biosphere and human life are at risk. The consciousness that this must change is growing.

However, to achieve this shift on a global level requires more than will and action. It requires a change of mind, of consciousness. It means that we need to go beyond thinking in terms of absolute good and evil in constant tension, and to perceive and analyze the healthy and the harmful in all things and emphasize the healthy, reinforce the healthy, build on the healthy. There is no grand paradigmatic generic alternative, just as there is no one single grand narrative of the human journey. There will never be one perfect system that applies to all, everywhere, always. We need not seek it. We should not impose it.

Rather, we need to embrace diversity and reject dichotomies – dichotomies like global vs. local, for example, which obscures the spherical nature of the planet and of action; or private vs. public, which obscures and splits the essential political quality of life and action.

We also need to name reality and name the effects of reality clearly, with an acute sense of justice. Patriarchy, imperialism, fascism, greed, militarism, corporate licentiousness and crime – these things need to be brought into the cleansing light of public scrutiny, debate and transformation.

In all of this, values and ethics form the heart of the matter – the human values of health, creativity and respect for life, and the ethics of care and community. What is required is an explicit articulated global people's movement for international cooperation within an ethos of respect, reciprocity and interdependent diversity.

In building this movement we will have to transform the notion of "the Other", and the need for identity to be rooted in difference rather than affinity, in the perception of the other-not-us, rather than in we-who-are-not-homogenous.

It is the creation of "the Other" that justifies cruelty and terror – whether the pervasive terrorism of the powerful, or the much-less-frequent terrorism of the weak. When the victim has been re-imagined as less than human, then isolation, exploitation, repression and even obliteration are justified as a necessity, rather than a crime. But the generalized qualities of "the Other" are always figments imagined in the consciousness of the victimizer and projected onto "the Other" to justify repression. The demonization of "the Other" is a primary function of propaganda, and of the ideologies – religious and secular – that propaganda serves.

This fixation on "the Other" is central to the crisis of humanity in the present phase of globalization and the militarization of politics that has intensified across the globe. It is central to the terrible violence that destroys people and peoples, their places and communities. It is

central to the economic violence that lays waste entire cultures, communities and commons, without compassion or recompense. It is central to the logic of capitalist competition that sets countless people adrift – the majority of them women and children – without community or gainful work, then restricts their movement so that they cannot seek elsewhere what has been destroyed at home. Their one remaining "asset", their labour, is itself constrained and stolen.

Poverty has been criminalized, migration to seek a better life outlawed. For millions on the planet, to follow their dream has become a crime. The result is predictable and dangerous. When people are perceived as less-than-us, their circumstances matter less than ours. When people are seen as less-than-us, their lives matter less than ours. When people are considered less-than-us, their deaths matter less than our deaths, and the manner of their dying is obscured by bigotry and our own imagined fears. This notion of difference is perverse and deceitful. It must be challenged.

> *It is the creation of "the Other" that justifies cruelty and terror as a necessity, rather than a crime.*

What human society offers is not so much difference, as diversity. Humanity is not made up of fundamentally different civilizations, but rather diversity within civilization. And there is as much diversity within any single living culture as there is diversity among them. The way forward is to embrace the qualities of the "Other" in ourselves, and see ourselves always in "the Other," so that we are defined not by what separates human beings but by what joins us.

This is an ethos that is growing in the world, creating movements of common cause, locally and globally. In our work we see everywhere the core human values of care and generosity and mutuality present and promoted and defended by a diverse range of citizens and activists working together to defend and protect the rights and lives of those besieged, and to challenge the marginalization of people on the basis of origin, "race," gender, religion or class.

Rethinking International Development Cooperation

In the final analysis, the future depends on a deep and broad global movement of people prepared to be advocates of hope against the merchants of fear; advocates of life against merchants of death; advocates of the planet against those who would appropriate life and the entire earth to buy it and sell it; advocates of nature against the machine; advocates of one universal humanity against those who define themselves in their superiority and dominance over the other. The new emerging globalism is based in such hope and articulated consciousness, promoting cooperative international action to try again to transform the world.

At the same time, world events, and our experiences and relationships around the world, have also deepened our sense of the urgency people feel about the problems that need to be addressed. This urgency not only focuses on the critical dangers and misery that we all confront, but equally on the windows of opportunity that exist – opportunities for meaningful and effective interventions to mitigate the effects of social, political and economic upheavals, and contribute to justice, peace, authentic participative democracy and long-term social development. We are convinced that to seize these opportunities, donor nations such as Canada, and Canadian international non-government organizations such as Inter Pares – and our NGO colleagues in countries around the world, north and south – need to re-think our actions, our relationships, and some of our assumptions and habits-of-mind.

This section summarizes briefly some elements of our own attempts to "re-think" international development cooperation.

Critique of economism

The focus of development theory and practice has from the outset been economistic. By this, we mean that the development paradigm regards human beings and human affairs as primarily economic in nature and in impetus. Development has looked almost exclusively at "economic man" (and sometimes, lately, woman, but not very profoundly or effectively, or even economically), and at the economic variables in the collective lives of people. Development is similarly based on assumptions about "progress" – as a natural process – with laws that are primarily economic, and outcomes that can and should be measured primarily, if not exclusively, by economic indicators.

This bias is not surprising. The Cartesian revolution of the "Enlightenment", out of which emerged modern liberal capitalism and development theory, is profoundly materialistic, and its logic continues to influence official development discourse in a demonstrably failing way. The dominance since the mid-19th century of scientific materialism and historical determinism have infused development thinking with an uncritical, almost theological, quality that is linear, reductionist, and blinkered.

> *Development thinking is infused with an uncritical quality that is linear, reductionist, and blinkered.*

To seriously engage in the challenge facing human society globally, and in particular in the global South, requires that we transcend the assumptions and blinkers of economism and see human "progress" in much broader and dynamic terms – social, cultural and spiritual – with economic activity as merely one expression of human development, rather than the driver.

The human being is not an economic entity. There is no need for economics – and certainly not extreme market capitalism and corporate commerce – to be the sole definer and determinant of the quality of human existence, and the health, growth and joy of individual humans. This just happens to be the way we have developed the planet, to the disadvantage of billions. The wealth and the wisdom exists to create alternatives, and the evidence is that developing such alternatives is imperative in these times, for the survival of global human society and perhaps the planet itself.

An authentic project for development will refine the focus on the economic – at the very least, will not start and end with economics – and will emphasize human communities and people as citizens defining their own world and engaging with each other to elaborate and govern their various relationships, including commercial relationships, and their societies, in ways that benefit themselves, their families and their neighbours.

That is, rather than simply focusing on broad indicators of national economies, the priorities of development ought to reflect the broader aspirations of human beings, their communities and their societies, according to the increasingly articulate aspirations and visions among these citizens. This shift is emerging from the growing acknowledgement of the flaws in the traditional assumption within the development paradigm – that universal benefits and opportunities flow naturally from increased production and the growth of wealth measured abstractly. This assumption has been demonstrated conclusively and repeatedly to be false, not only in the global South but in every nation on earth.

Essentialism and scientific reductionism

Central to the dilemmas of scientism and economism in development theory is the implicit essentialism in development discourse and practice. People are generalized into categories and defined with universal and essential qualities that are often inaccurate and always superficial, based in theory rather than lived lives. These categories, while sometimes useful, obscure the diversity among people and their situations, and the most important definers of everyday experience. Therefore, poverty itself is essentialized, as are the poor, and peasants, and women, and workers. These become the essential "Poor", the essential "Peasant Farmer", the essential "Woman" – people lost in categories and descriptors rather than appreciated as individual and diverse beings and agents.

There is more difference among the members of these categories than there are similarities, and in these differences lie the seeds of health, growth, citizenship and social development. The actualization of these personal qualities and potentialities is the very purpose of development at the same time as they are development's primary resource.

In a compounding way, these same categories are further essentialized by categories defined not by who people are, or even what they are, but by their circumstances or conditions: people reduced to the category "refugees", for example, or "internally-displaced people", or simply "victims" – of natural and man-made disaster, of war, of political upheaval. When people are reduced to "target groups", we strip from them precisely the qualities that provide the possibility of their transforming the conditions of their present lives. And without their active agency – participating in forging solutions out of the crucible of their circumstances – these conditions and their own lives can never be transformed.

The tendency to essentialize people is integral to the reductionist framework of the scientific and technological method that drives the assumptions and systems of mainstream development theory and practice. Social and economic engineering is premised on the belief that the whole is comprised of parts, and that by reducing all phenomena and processes to their smallest parts, it is possible to study and understand the whole; and by manipulating these component parts in the appropriate order and manner, to influence the whole. But in dynamic reality, events are neither linear nor mechanical, complex effects do not flow from discrete causes, and the results of the most important processes and dynamics are quite indeterminate in advance, and often obscure within the event itself.

The myth of "progress"

Explicit in the political expression of this linear and reductionist frame of reference is the myth of historical progress, upon which development theory and practice

are premised. This includes the assumption that there are natural and universal steps in the development of societies – "stages", they are often referred to – and that the task of international development is to assist societies, or nations, through these stages to successively higher orders of development. These stages are defined almost entirely on the basis of economic and technological criteria, and the successive stages are premised on obliteration of the more "primitive" characteristics of the stages they replace – for example, diverse family farming and local markets being supplanted by industrialized agriculture, monocultures and external international markets. Most fundamental is the erosion of the local and the communal by increasingly massive economies of scale (sometimes also called, without apparent irony, "efficiencies"). This is seen as natural and inevitable, and for the greater good.

So we have development by bulldozer, by crane, by technology and by chemistry – thwarting dreams, uprooting lives, scarring landscapes and destroying entire local biospheres and ecologies. Many, if not the majority, of the displaced people and refugees on the planet are "development refugees" – people uprooted by externally-imposed "progress", in many cases not merely dislodged coincidentally ("collateral damage"), but actually forcibly and violently driven out of their communities and off their traditional lands by paramilitary mercenaries

> *People are reduced to "target groups": refugees, IDPs, or simply "victims".*

engaged by economic elites and corporate entities who crave the land or its resources for their own commercial activity, wealth and power. The teeming cities are full of such uprooted people. And the self-serving apologia that has been uttered now for 300 years, "You can't stand in the way of progress!", merely insults the injury and does not begin to address the contradictions and dilemmas that come with the unaccountable, inexorable development machine – often underwritten by ODA (Overseas Development Assistance)– that works to the almost exclusive benefit of economic elites and international capital.

But one person's progress is another's catastrophe. More fundamentally, what is destroyed is not only individuals, and families, or even entire communities, but whole societies. What is destroyed are entire local cultures and the diverse heritage of thousands of years of human history, with their own living knowledge, wisdom and science, increasingly fragmented, atomized and homogenized. We are creating a planet of the alienated in their own lands, and rootless and stateless aliens who languish at the shuttered doors and the militarized shores of the increasingly gated nations that dominate the systems that are responsible for all this.

Agency

Who are the agents of development, and who should be the agents? In reality, ordinary people are the agents of development, individual citizens and citizens in groups or associations, acting in their own name in their own communities and, through what has become known as "civil society", as social advocates with their own governments. Most particularly, people are the agents of their own personal development, and that of their families and their communities.

There is no other way. There is no controversy on this point. Yet the operative norm remains otherwise. The driving force of virtually all "development" initiatives remains external actors determined to engineer change in spite of the opinions and aspirations of local people, and regardless of their specific knowledge and wisdom about how changes might be brought about in ways that conserve what is most precious to them, while improving the conditions that contribute most to health and quality of life.

This critique applies as much to national and international NGOs that over-run the most stricken countries on earth, as it applies to national governments and their international donors. We refer here to not only the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Delvelopment) donor governments but, most particularly, the international financial institutions that set the framework and conditions for virtually all other development interventions, whether by national public and private entities, or international government and non-government donors.

The assumptions of all of these external actors is that change can be engineered in the best interests of the people, and that the nature of such change and the measures to achieve it are best worked out by the professionals in local government and non-government bureaucracies and the large donor institutions. The participation of people in this process is not as authors and agents, but as objects of public education and behaviour modification campaigns – that is, advertising and social marketing.

It's not working. It can't work without people as the agents of the change processes that affect them, and they won't be the agents unless they are included as authentic participants from the outset.

Poor people are not stupid. They can't afford to be. They will act in their own interest and the interest of those closest to them, and they will exploit and subvert all interventions imposed from outside that are not in their interest.

> *The driving force of "development" remains external actors determined to engineer change.*

Much of the assistance in the name of "development" has become clientalist social welfare, in-and-out flows of resources that rarely create or build assets for families or their communities, and frequently undermine democracy and democratic economies. And in this process the politics of development has become cynical and corrupt. Cynical, because we do not do what we say, and we do not say what we do. Corrupt, because resources are exploited in expedient and arbitrary ways according to existing power structures and elite interests, and against the interests of the people in whose name all of this is justified, and whose images are broadcast daily across the globe to keep the funds flowing.

A way forward: escaping constructs and categories

To move away from this disastrous course should now be the imperative of those committed to global peace, justice and security. This is the message of Nobel laureate Amartya Sen,[11] one of the most important voices in the field of international development in the early moments of this century. We simply have to escape outworn constructs and categories to renew and renovate development theory and practice. This imperative is not controversial. It has become the mantra of almost every institution engaged in the dilemmas of global development, peace and security, who have made theorists such as the prophet Sen, the penitent Stiglitz, the magician Soros, and the chameleon-like development guru, Jeffrey Sachs, celebrities of their seminars and banquets.

The controversy is not at all about what is necessary, but about what is possible, what is realistic. It is upon this shoal that the discourse has run aground. To change things fundamentally, some things are going to have to funda-mentally change, and the first of these is how power is structured and used, and in whose interest. To change the world fundamentally means starting where the problems begin – which is not in the fields and villages and marginal urban communities of the global South, but in the industrialized, corporate centres of global power in the transnational north and south.

The most likely place for this process to begin is with the formal processes and practices of the development industry itself. Development has to become the living search for alternatives, the active pursuit of another way of being

and doing things. It has to embrace a new mission, a new leadership, to promote genuine and profound self-determination and democratization. Its priority should be authentic participation of citizens in forging solutions to the conditions of their lives, and sharing generously the resources to make these efforts permanent and sustainable.

This means not merely charity, although charity is required, nor only global social solidarity, which is also critical. The new development paradigm has to be based and built in profound, radical common cause: to change the world in the common interest of all humans, and the planet itself. Not international development for them, but global development for all of us, under one sky.

Holistic development

The case for taking an holistic approach to social develop-ment could not be more self-evident. It is evidenced in the failure of the segmented, fragmented approach that has been traditionally applied by development interveners. People do not live their lives in "sectors" or in "projects". Their lives will not be improved substantially nor sustainably until they are directly involved as the agents of change, and the initiatives promoted take into account the whole of people's lives – health, education, livelihoods, social and physical infrastructure, relationships and community integration, freedom and citizenship. That is, until these processes engage in the development of and for the whole person, in a society that itself is whole and secure.

In taking this approach, the most fundamental shift will be to establish priorities in an integrated and horizontal

> *The controversy is not about what is necessary, but about what is possible.*

fashion, rather than a disintegrated, hierarchical and vertical fashion. Development is not advanced by recipe. It is a dynamic. Given the opportunity to develop and identify choices among elements in an integrated horizontal spectrum of self-defined needs and priorities, people will choose what is most immediately important in their own circumstances, but will also set priorities in an order and sequence that enhance the longer-term opportunity for substantial and sustainable development of their communities.

People do know what is best for them. And they can determine quite wisely the mix and sequence of interven-tions and inputs that are most likely to serve their interest in the short and long term. When asked to make choices in a holistic, integrated fashion that reflects their own

experience and aspirations for themselves, their families and their communities, they will apply a development science and a home-economics no less rigorous and more informed and practical, than anything that can be contrived and inserted by outside agents.

This is not to say that this process cannot be assisted by external actors. Indeed, that is the primary role of interveners: to engage with people as collaborators in authentic integrated investigation and holistic planning, and then to provide resources not yet available inside the community to carry out these plans.

Public, private and the commons

The obliteration of the social commons, and the goods and services that ought to remain as part of the public domain, has been one of the most disastrous, even criminal, effects of development as it has been practiced in the past several decades. This has been most pronounced and overt in the past 20 years of imposed neo-liberal economics and structural adjustment, which made explicit the goal to obliterate the commons and the public sphere. This goal has been an article of almost religious faith, imposed in the clear economic self-interest of the elites who have enforced these policies, and in whose interest the project of international development has been advanced.

The communal commons is that territory and space – including resources, landscapes and all living things – which is not property, and cannot be owned. It is space that is open to all and closed to none, to be used for daily needs but not exploited beyond these needs or to the exclusion of the needs of others. At one time, and not very long ago, the greatest proportion of the planet fell into this category.

The public and private domains are more properly "property" – areas controlled by those who have title, formal or conventional. The private domain is that domestic realm over which the individual or family hold exclusive and unchallenged sway and privilege, to be shared or withheld at the will of the private holder. In this case, the private domain includes not merely goods, but social and civil prerogatives. The public domain, on the other hand, is the domain that is publicly owned and administered on behalf of all citizens, accessible to all according to rules accepted by all and governed by all through a responsible government and its officials. Universally available health and education resources, and infrastructure such as water and sanitation, are obvious examples, as are roads and parks and ports, where access is open to all, but the rules must be obeyed, and are enforced in the interests of all.[12]

We live in a time when economic elites are increasingly preoccupied with property – its privatization, and the protection of its absolute prerogatives. This singular obsession is manifested in all walks of life and runs counter to the conservation and protection of what many of us continue to believe is the common property of all members of the human community: the air we breathe, the water we drink, the seas, the forests, mountains, the genetic heritage that is the basis of the continuation and diversity of life on our planet, and the public spaces for true citizen participation.

> *The obliteration of the commons has been one of the most disastrous, even criminal, effects of development.*

What was once known as "the commons" – the terms comes from the historic concept of property and space that is shared by all communally – is now all but gone. For authentic, universal development to occur, we need engaged citizens to protect and expand what commons are left, while also resisting the encroaching privatization of the shared property in the public domain. Indeed, development will be impossible until much of the public domain that has been cleared away in nations across the globe is restored and enhanced. One of the key challenges then is in realizing the role of development in conserving this common heritage and defining it within a social justice perspective.

Local ownership

The new development assistance mantra is "local ownership", a concept as old as human organization, but which has re-emerged in the last few years as an apparently ground-breaking innovation from the World Bank and embraced by the club of donors (DAC) within the OECD, including the Canadian government. What does this new emphasis imply about the old emphasis? Who owned the processes of development before? And why do we think that what has gone on before will now change simply because politicians and international aid bureaucrats have a new term?

Unless the entire process and mechanics of ODA change fundamentally, the criteria of local ownership will be only rhetorical. The mechanics that have been imposed to ensure local ownership – the operational details of which are captured, and obscured, in such devices as SWAPs (Sector-wide approaches) and PRSPs (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers) – are still rooted in harsh conditionalities, now synchronized and harmonized among the donor countries in a way that makes these conditionalities absolute and non-negotiable. The fact is, and no one disputes this,

these onerous conditionalities and procedures imposed by the donors respond not to local conditions and needs, but to a neo-conservative politics and radical neo-liberal economic agenda rooted in the donor countries.[13]

Equally critical are the processes at the local level. In many places it has become clear that there is a great deal of hypocrisy in the commitment to "local ownership". Local ownership is often undermined by the fact that the imposed conditionalities and sector priorities mentioned above are accepted and administered by an implicit international elite. This elite includes international donor agencies, international NGOs, local (national) policy institutions and intellectuals, and their national civil servant counterparts, who collaborate in developing national programs to the exclusion of local input from citizens bringing data and perspectives of their real lived lives. These contradictions have

> *"Local ownership" is undermined by imposed conditionalities and sector priorities.*

been documented recently by a series of studies collected and published by the Overseas Studies Institute (UK).[14] The discussion of this phenomenon in these papers is very revealing.

We need to approach the issue of local ownership from the perspective of building capacity of citizens to develop and articulate their own analysis and programs in specific and concrete situations, and to participate in processes of citizen-based policy formulation and advocacy to influence government in establishing social and economic policy and priorities. For Inter Pares, this means emphasizing in our actions the development of common cause relationships, which combine direct support for local actions – locally conceived and implemented – while reinforcing and collaborating with these actions through international policy advocacy, including advocacy here in Canada with the Canadian government concerning Canada's foreign policy and ODA strategies.

Partnership

The sister concept to the re-discovered value of local ownership is "partnership". But the most important impact of a commitment to authentic local ownership on the part of donors, whether government donors or NGOs, ought to be a rejection of old notions of partnership.

A devalued ideology of partnership has become pervasive, in which the conditions and terms of partnering relation-ships are determined and dictated by the partner with the money, whether donor governments, international financial institutions, corporations, or international NGOs. The symbolism of partnership usually masks the bitter realities of fundamentally unequal relationships that often represent a repudiation of sovereignty and self-determination.

An insidious contemporary variation is the so-called "social partnership", dominated by corporations in the interest of social marketing and public relations. These are fast becoming a major source of aid resources, not only with NGOs but within the United Nations and multilateral system. Under this form of "partnership", corporations that are notorious transgressors of the common good and acknowledged violators of human rights, environmental regulations and business ethics – particularly the vertically-integrated pharmaceutical, chemical and resource extraction industries – rehabilitate their reputations through cheap association with humanitarian agencies and their charitable "good works".[15]

Partnership is a negotiated relationship for mutually inclusive action toward limited, but – at least on the surface – mutually consistent, goals. It implies a division of labour, of responsibility, of authority, of ownership and reward. Partnership does not challenge existing relations or disparities – for example, of power and resources, or influence. This certainly remains the reality, in spite of the belated emphasis on local ownership among the donor nations.

Partnership that is based within disparity is, at least in part, exploitation. It can work to maintain and sometimes increase the existing disparity and fundamental inequality between and among partners – as has been the case with the unconscionable debt load that has undermined the efforts of scores of countries to improve the lives and security of their citizens.

This is so even when partnership is benign, or even benevolent, and when both partners achieve real concrete benefits (for example, Canadian NGOs and CIDA, CIDA and beneficiary countries, and Canadian NGOs and their Southern "partners").

Partnership is virtually always based on division and separation, and on disparity and inequality of labour and of gains. Authentic and fundamental relations among those working for change with a commitment to promoting and defending local ownership will be based within a joining and an integration; will be based on fundamentally shared goals and interests; and by extension, will be based on a commitment to a common and shared future – that is, on parity and equality.

Authentic and fundamental relations for justice and social change are not manifest in mere partnership, but in *collaboration*, as equals, *co-operation*, as equals, and most importantly, on an open and publicly-professed *conspiracy*, among equals (*co-spirare = breathing* together). We need to challenge and change the structures and relations that perpetuate the injustice and inequities that separate people and peoples, and exploit the labour and lives of the many at the service of the few. In building partnerships we need to aspire to a higher and more radical form of collaboration and offer it to our co-conspirators in our effort to create change.

A critical implication for Inter Pares is that we do not see our relationship with our own donors and funders, including the Canadian government through CIDA, as a partnership, but as a collaboration. And similarly, we do not see those with whom we work as partners, but as co-protagonists and colleagues. To make this distinction Inter Pares uses the (still imperfect) term "counterparts", to try to capture the sense of common cause, among equals.

Coordination among donors

Reference is made above to the existing practices of donor coordination and "harmonization". Coordination in and of itself is not a bad thing, and indeed could be extremely useful and profoundly transformative. Everywhere we go we hear our counterparts yearn for more coordination among donors, since they are relentlessly exposed to diverse demands, expectations and priorities to which they have to respond. These extraneous demands absorb tremendous energies and radically skew priorities and activities.

But by coordination they do not mean a universal, coordinated – and therefore even more restrictive – set of external demands, expectations and priorities. Such coordination only means they become even more the implementing agents of the priorities and norms of donors, rather than agents of their own aspirations and priorities. What they *do* mean is a coordinated set of mutual and reciprocal obligations, agreed upon with the recipient of assistance as an equal and leading participant, both in the formulation of the reciprocities, and the ongoing evaluation of the adherence to agreements. What is most important is not whether the donors coordinate and harmonize their ODA programs. What is important are the actual policies, practices and procedures that they implement in their "harmony". If priorities, policies, practices and procedures are imposed and reflect only the interests of the donors, then coordination is negative, and far worse for the ostensible beneficiary than no coordination at all.

The key element in development assistance coordination, therefore, has to be a reciprocity and mutuality that fundamentally shifts the paradigm of aid from one of giving, to one of sharing; from one of charity out of benevolence, to one of engaging and sharing out of a sense of justice.

Development assistance is not merely a choice. It is a duty flowing from our common humanity. It is a sharing of resources globally among all people and groups of people, whose collective human right it is to share in global resources, and whose human obligation is to share what they have with those who are less fortunate. This implies going beyond charity to share – globally and universally – the authentic opportunity for self-determination, health, growth and sustainable autonomous development. Ultimately, we have to engage with others not as beneficiaries, but as equals and as the agents of their own futures and that of their communities and the wider world. Development assistance is not *noblesse oblige*, but a moral, ethical and political response to the inequities that are imbedded in existing global political, social and economic structures.

> *When priorities, policies, practices and procedures only reflect the interests of the donors, coordination is negative for the "beneficiary".*

Only when the notion of "donors", along with its precedence and privilege, has been surrendered, and resources are shared in social solidarity and common cause, will "coordination" be a substantial advance in development assistance.

Good governance, good citizenship

Much of this discourse revolves around governance and citizenship. It bears emphasis that two basic notions are central to these themes: responsibility and reciprocity. The key to good governance is that all forms of governance be responsible, and that responsible governance is rooted in reciprocity among citizens, among shared rights and responsibilities, and among shared privileges and obligations.

Governance in this sense does not refer simply to government; in fact, government is not the primary element. Rather, good and effective government flows from and is a function of broad, active, mature, and responsible citizenship. And good governance also applies to communities (not only communities of locality, but also communities of mutual interest), to associations of all

types, as well as to social and economic organizations and institutions.

It is for precisely this reason that citizens, and citizen associations and institutions within civil society, have to be central to any development strategy and international programs to support local development. It is also why the development of effective citizens and civil society has to be a priority in any development action. This is an area where the NGO/CSO sector has a critical and indispensable role.

Citizenship is the key to good governance, and good government flows from good citizenship, just as good political leadership flows from good citizenship. Any program that emphasizes good governance, in the sense of formal government, must include the development of citizens and citizenship as a first priority.

Our emphasis on the qualities of responsibility and reciprocity reflect our conviction that the best governance is self-governance, defined as managed self-determination with respect for one's own obligations, and the rights of others, as well as the rights we claim for ourselves. It implies citizens taking responsibility for their actions in reciprocity with others, and together ensuring the satisfaction of mutual needs and shared goals.

Such governance does not necessarily imply the forms and values of liberal democracy, which is only one model of responsible citizenship and governance. It does imply responsibility and accountability governed by appropriate processes and norms determined over time by a social group.

Programs promoting and nurturing good governance and good citizenship will focus not only on responsibility and reciprocity as values. They will also focus on the formulation and application of norms, skills, processes and structures that mitigate disparities of power, arbitrary action and impunity, while encouraging and facilitating responsibility, reciprocity and public accountability.

The right to be

Development action has to be rooted in the principle that every person has the "right to be". This right implies that every person and every community not only has a right to live, but also has a right to a quality of life that is human and humane. Every person and every community has a right to live decently and with dignity, and to develop their authentic human capacity and qualities. Each person, and each community, has a right to develop as they wish, to their full creativity and potential.

This "right to be" includes, at a minimum, the right not to be killed by the state, or its military proxies. It means the

right not to waste away from malnutrition; the right not to die from disasters that the simplest precautions could prevent, or from wars waged by dictators against their own people. It means the right not to die from diseases that are easily preventable.

But the "right to be" goes beyond this right to live with a minimal degree of physical security. It is also the right of all citizens to be free persons, to be thriving and growing individuals, to be full participants in a free and equal society, to resist oppression and promote justice. It is the right *to become* – to become what we can, and to seek what we dream. Development action should first and foremost promote the right of all persons to be fully human and achieve their full creative potential to live creatively and actively as citizens in their communities, their countries and their world. Nurturing citizen action to transform structural obstacles to equitable and sustainable development therefore has to be a central focus and goal.

Role of civil society

As described earlier, over the past decades there has emerged an incredible amount of sophisticated, effective mobilization world-wide within the contested space commonly referred to as civil society. Active, intentional citizenship is increasing, and is increasingly effective. And links among citizens and citizen's groups – locally, nationally, regionally and globally – are also increasing. In this context, the role of the voluntary sector in society is to give breath and heart to innovative and alternative ideas for developing and conserving creative, vibrant, tolerant, caring and dynamic societies. It is a role of nurturing mutual support and social solidarity, of promoting values of social responsibility and reciprocity, of supporting and mobilizing citizenship in the interests of the entire community.

> *The role of the voluntary sector is to give breath and heart to innovative and alternative ideas.*

The voluntary sector can be a garden of social innovation and change, as well as a locus of organized resistance and dissent to the excesses of the market and of privilege – whether the privilege of class, of race, or of gender.[16]

The world is not the way it must be if it is to nurture and protect human health and prosperity. It can be changed for the better, and this can happen best through the direct participation of citizens collaborating to envision better ways, and mobilizing to bring their propositions forward, in the diverse theatre of debate we know as civil society.

Endnotes

1 See Murphy, Brian K., *Citizenship and Action, What's at Stake?*, Inter Pares Occasional Paper No.3, Inter Pares, Ottawa, 2003, adapted from a keynote address presented at the Community Forum on Social Action hosted by the Institute in Community Development of Concordia University, Montréal, June 16, 2003, and available on Inter Pares web site, http://www.interpares.ca/en/publications/index.php or http://instdev.concordia.ca/viewpoints/index.html.

2 Inter Pares has presented the Canadian government, and our own public, with two major policy statements on the issue of foreign policy and international development assistance in the recent past: *An Honourable Commitment: Policy Coherence in Canada's Relations with the Global South*, Inter Pares, Ottawa, February, 2001; and *In Our Own Name, Promoting Peace through Justice: Reflections on the Theme of Canada's Role in the World*, a Brief to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Inter Pares, Ottawa, April 2003. These policy documents represent a theoretical baseline for the present analysis – which builds on the values, assumptions and conclusions elaborated there – and should be seen as integral antecedents to this paper [available at http://www.interpares.ca/en/publications/index.php].

3 See Saul, John Ralston, *The Unconscious Civilization*, Anansi, Toronto, 1995.

4 See Murphy, Brian K., *Beyond the Politics of the Possible, Corporations and the Pursuit of Social Justice*, Inter Pares Occasional Paper No. 1, Ottawa, 2002. This paper is adapted from a keynote address to an invitational two-day Forum on corporate social responsibility hosted by Concordia University Institute in Management and Community Development, June 12-14, 2002. [Available at http://www.interpares.ca/en/publications/index.php].

5 See, for example, Power, Samantha, "The Lesson of Hannah Arendt", in *New York Review*, Vol LI, Number 7, April 29, 2004, pp. 34-37. Power, whose *America in the Age of Genocide* won a Pulitzer Prize in 2003, is a Professor at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government. In this recent essay – using categories borrowed from Arendt's groundbreaking work analyzing the cataclysms she witnessed in the first half of the 20th century – Power argues that the world is perilously close to a new epoch of totalitarian control and reaction.

6 See Feyerabend, Paul, *Against Method*, Third Edition, with new *Introduction*, published by Verso, New York, 1993 [First Edition published in 1975].

7 See Weiner, Norbert, *The Human Use of Human Beings, Cybernetics and Society*, published in 1950, revised in 1954 (Houghten Mifflen/Anchor Books), reprinted by Da Capo, New York, 1988. Norbert Wiener (1894-64) was Professor of Mathematics at M.I.T. where he developed the science of cybernetics – the theoretical and practical application of information and communication systems, including the human nervous system, to computers and computer-assisted or computer-driven machines. The new edition of *The Human Use of Human Beings* declares, "Only a few books stand as landmarks in social and scientific upheaval. [*The Human Use of Human Beings*] is one of that small company."

8 See Postman Neil, Technopoly, *The Surrender of Culture to Technology*, Knopf, NY, 1992.

9 See *Emerging Technologies: Genetic Engineering and Biological Weapons*, Third World Network, 2004, Penang, Malaysia, for a discussion on the application of biotechnology in biological warfare.

10 Vigilance requires that we understand that contemporary technological hubris has its roots and antecedents in the same modernist/positivist ideology and triumphant philosophy (cf. Hegel, Nietzsche) that spawned the dystopian vision of totalitarian social engineering manifest in mid-20th century fascism; see Thom Hartmann, *The Ghost of Vice President Wallace Warns, "It Can Happen Here"*, [CommonDreams.org, July 19, 2004, http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0719-15.htm. Hartmann recalls Giovanni Gentile's entry in the Encyclopedia Italiana: "Fascism should more appropriately be called corporatism because it is a merger of state and corporate power." He also notes the 1983 American Heritage Dictionary definition of fascism: "A system of government that exercises a dictatorship of the extreme right, typically through the merging of state and business leadership, together with belligerent nationalism."

11 See Amartya Sen's "capability" approach, elaborated in *Development as Freedom* [Knopf, NY 1999], adapted from seminars conducted in the World Bank during 1997; *Freedom, Social Choice and Responsibility* [Oxford, 2000] (which includes the Arrow Lecture and other essays), and Rationality and Freedom, [Harvard, 2003]. "Why We Should Preserve the Spotted Owl", in *London Review of Books*, Vol. 26 No. 3, 5 February 2004 is a recent declaration of what is at stake in this discourse.

12 Cf. Kneen, Brewster, "Re-defining 'Property': Private Property, the Commons and the Public Domain", in *Seedling* [Journal of Genetic Resources Action International, Barcelona], January 2004. pp. 1-5.

13 For a discussion of these factors and how they have influenced the discourse, see Guttal, Shalmali and Jenina Joy Chavez Malaluan, "Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: A Poor Package for Poverty Reduction", in *Anti-Poverty or Anti-Poor, The Millennium Development Goals and the Eradication of Extreme Poverty and Hunger*, Focus on the Global South, October 2003, pp. 19-35. The book collects papers presented as part of a 13 country CSO symposium convoked by Focus in collaboration with the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) to prepare recommendations for the UNESCAP Committee on Poverty Reduction.

14 See *Merging in the Circle: The Politics of Tanzania's Poverty Reduction Strategy*. This is an excellent joint study by Helsinki and Mzumbe (Tanzania) Universities challenging the rhetoric of PRSPs as consensual nationally-owned plans, one of a series of studies from Africa and Latin America published by the Overseas Studies Institute (UK). This paper can be found at <http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/kmi/policy/merging.pdf>. The larger series of five case studies forms part of a research program titled "Consultation and Empowerment: Governance Implications of Participatory Public Policy Formulation in Five Developing Countries." The research program is jointly funded by Finland (Tanzania and Honduras case studies), Norway (Malawi and Zambia case studies), and Sweden (Vietnam case study). Other case studies are being posted at <http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/kmi/english/conf/tpoc/index.htm> as they become available. Also see *Structural Adjustment, The Policy Roots of Economic Crisis, Poverty and Inequality*, The Structural Adjustment Participatory Review International Network (SAPRIN), A report on a Joint Participatory Investigation by Civil Society and the World Bank of the Impact of Structural Adjustment Policies, Zed Books, 2004.

15 See Murphy, Brian K, *Beyond the Politics of the Possible, Corporations and the Pursuit of Social Justice*, Inter Pares Occasional Paper No.1, Ottawa, 2002.

16 We do not regard "women" or "women's issues" as merely a sectoral issue or category. The struggle for human equality is a primary and fundamental independent variable that infuses our thinking and our activity. At the same time, a gender-based analysis and a feminist approach to methodology and programming are direct and central. For Inter Pares, the distinction between gender analysis and a feminist approach is that gender analysis makes visible the material conditions of oppression based on gender and the power differential among men and women, while feminism envisions an alternative reality and identifies structures and norms that need to be transformed to bring it about, along with processes and strategies through which this transformation might begin to be achieved. For an elaboration of these themes, see, *Towards a Feminist Political Economy*, Inter Pares Occasional Paper No.5, Ottawa, November 2004.

Inter Pares

WORKING FOR CHANGE…AMONG EQUALS
OEUVRER POUR LE CHANGEMENT…ENTRE ÉGAUX

221 av. Laurier Ave. E
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1N 6P1

Tel: 613 563-4801
Fax: 613 594-4704
www.interpares.ca