UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Katarina Mozetič

WORDS CAN CREATE REALITIES: ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE OF NGOs FROM THE GLOBAL NORTH

BESEDE USTVARJAJO RESNIČNOSTI: ANALIZA DISKURZA RAZVOJNEGA SODELOVANJA NVO SVETOVNEGA SEVERA

Final Thesis

Ljubljana, 2008

UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Katarina Mozetič

Supervisor: Associate Prof. Dr. Mitja Velikonja
Co-Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Johannes Moser

WORDS CAN CREATE REALITIES: ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE OF NGOs FROM THE GLOBAL NORTH

BESEDE USTVARJAJO RESNIČNOSTI: ANALIZA DISKURZA RAZVOJNEGA SODELOVANJA NVO SVETOVNEGA SEVERA

Final Thesis

Ljubljana, 2008

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"Words can do things, can change the world, can create new realities."
Apffel Marglin (1990, 115)

I would like to express gratitude to Dr. Daniela Molzbichler from Afro-Asian Institute in Salzburg (AU) and Ms. Alenka Kemptner for their interest in this thesis and their effort to shape its starting steps. I would also like to show appreciation to Indienhilfe, especially Ms. Elisabeth Kreuz and Ms. Sabine Dlugosch, for their readiness to participate in the creation of this thesis and their immense kindness in doing it. Last but not least, I would sincerely like to thank both of my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Mitja Velikonja and Prof. Dr. Johannes Moser, for their open-minded acceptance of cooperation between FDV and LMU that enabled me to do the enriching work on this thesis.

***WORDS CAN CREATE REALITIES:* ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPMENT DISCOURSE OF NGOS FROM THE GLOBAL NORTH**

Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have in the last decades become an important actor in international development. Seen as a voice of the people and as an alternative to states and big transnational bodies, such as World Bank and International Monetary Fund, NGOs represent for many a moral and fairer actor in the contemporary development. This thesis claims that development practiced by NGOs of the global North is not merely benevolent ambition to help the "poor," but that it is a political act which influences the reality of many. To do this, this thesis adopts a discursive analysis of NGOs' development programs, as an example taking a German NGO called Indienhilfe. This approach is constructed on the theoretical field of anthropology of development and with the help of Michel Foucault's notions of power and knowledge. By doing so, this thesis not only shows what development is and what it does, but also indicates the possibilities of changing and even overcoming it.

Key words: *development, discourse, NGOs, anthropology of development, Michel Foucault*

***BESEDE USTVARJAJO RESNIČNOSTI:* ANALIZA DISKURZA RAZVOJNEGA SODELOVANJA NVO SVETOVNEGA SEVERA**

Nevladne organizacije (NVO) so v zadnjih desetletjih postale pomemben dejavnik v mednarodnemu razvojnemu sodelovanju. NVO predstavljajo za mnoge glas ljudstva in alternativo državnim in velikim transnacionalnim telesom, kakršna sta Svetovna banka in Mednarodni denarni sklad, in s tem bolj moralni in pravični dejavnik v sodobnem razvojnem sodelovanju. Ta diplomska naloga želi dokazati, da razvojno sodelovanje, kakršnega izvajajo NVO svetovnega Severa, ni le dobrodušna in na etičnih prepričanjih zasnovana ambicija pomagati "revnim," temveč je tudi politično dejanje, ki vpliva na življenja mnogih. V ta namen sem se v diplomski nalogi posvetila diskurzivni analizi razvojnih programov NVO svetovnega Severa, pri čemer se raziskava opira na primer nemške NVO Indienhilfe. Ta pristop se opira na teoretični okvir antropologije razvoja ter na francoskega filozofa Michela Foucaulta in njegovo razumevanje diskurza, moči in znanja. S tem diplomska naloga ne pokaže le, kaj razvojno sodelovanje je in kaj počne, temveč tudi nakaže možnosti njegovega spreminjanja in celo prehajanja.

Ključne besede: razvojno sodelovanje, diskurz, NVO, antropologija razvoja, Michel Foucault

INDEX

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEVA	Cyriac Elias Voluntary Association
IDP	Integrated Development Project
IH	Indienhilfe
IK	Indigenous Knowledge
IMF	International Monetary Fund
NPMS	Namasole Pally Mangal Samity
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
PAR	Participatory Action Research
SKC	Seva Kendra Calcutta
SUSK	Saha Upa Swastha Kendra
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank

1 INTRODUCTION

Even though calling development "the central organizing concept of our time" (Cowen and Shenton 1995, 27), "an omnipresent reality," (Escobar 1988, 430) "the twentieth-century global project" (Ferguson 1997, 150) or even "a matter of life and death" (Edelman and Haugerud 2007, 1) might seem exaggerated, one cannot neglect its importance in the contemporary world. In the second half of the twentieth century the vocabulary of colonization got changed for the one of "less developed countries" and "the Third World," development becoming a new frame of perception of global relations. (cf. Bennett 1988, 3; Cooper and Packard 1997, 1; Escobar 1984-85, 384-385)

> Like "civilization" in the nineteenth century, "development" is the name not only for a value, but also for a dominant problematic or interpretative grid through which the impoverished regions of the world are known to us. Within this interpretative grid, a host of everyday observations are rendered intelligible and meaningful. Poor countries are by definition "less developed," and the poverty and powerlessness of the people who live in such countries are only the external signs of this underlying condition. The images of the ragged poor of Asia thus become legible as markers of a stage of development, while the bloated bellies of African children are the signs of social as well as nutritional deficiency. Within this problematic, it appears self-evident that debtor Third World nation-states and starving peasants share a common "problem," that both lack a single "thing": "development." (Ferguson 1990, xiii)

Development can be defined as a path towards modernization for the countries of global South.[1] In the words of Stephen Marglin (1990, 2), this means

> on the economic side, industrialization and urbanization, as well as the technological transformation of agriculture; on the political side, rationalization of authority and the growth of a rationalizing bureaucracy; on the social side, the weakening of ascriptive ties and the rise of achievement as the basis for personal achievement; [and] culturally, the 'disenchantment' of the world […], the growth of science and secularization based on increasing literacy and numeracy.

Since the middle of the last century, when the described conception has been established, development has been believed to exist as a "solid and material" (Escobar 1997, 501) fact of reality. It was defined and redefined; various theoretical approaches categorized and re-categorized it; its forms and techniques changed through the course of time – but no matter how much development has been contested, it remained "a true descriptor of reality" (Escobar 1997, 501). It remained a self-evident and taken for

[1] In this thesis the term 'global South' tries to replace the similarly generalizing term 'Third World.' In my opinion, 'global South' demarcates its countries and their inhabitants in the least gradating manner, yet still simplifying and connoting the ideas of 'poverty' and 'non-Western.' In this thesis, the concept of 'global South' refers to the so-called "underdeveloped" and "developing" countries, especially in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania. To read more about the concept of the 'Third World,' please see e.g. Mintz (1975) and Sachs (1992).

granted idea that "Asia, Africa and Latin America can be defined as underdeveloped and that their communities are ineluctably in need of 'development' – in whatever guise or grab." (Escobar 1997, 502)

Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) play an important role in development since they are perceived as a valuable alternative to the state's service provisions of raising the living standard of the world's poorest, as well as to the economic philosophy present especially at the beginning of the development era. Next to this, NGOs are imagined to be more democratic, a purer and fairer actor (than e.g. states and transnational development bodies such as World Bank) in the world affairs and thus better in reaching those for whom development is meant. (cf. Drabek 1987a, vii; Ebrahim 2003, 1)

The above raises, in my opinion, the following questions: do "underdeveloped" countries really stand "out there" as objective entities which need only to be reached out for by the beneficial aspirations of nongovernmental organizations, or is their "underdeveloped" nature politically and economically constructed? Can development be comprehendingly conceived only in terms of technical progress on the basis of humanitarian concern and the ambition towards global equality, or is it also a political act which, as a form of power, actively affects the present state of international affairs?

Despite the fact that development usually tries to hide its political character behind the façade of nongovernmental organizations and scientific expertise, (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 387) I would like to show that development is a form of power which not only reacts on the present global situation, but simultaneously also creates it by constructing the countries of global South and their problems of underdevelopment.

In doing so, this thesis treats development as a discourse, since it is only in this manner that one is able to show the power development exercises over its objects. Discourse is nonetheless a "system that determines what can be thought and what can be said, framing what is acceptable and what is not" (Gow 2002, 301) and determines "who can speak, from what points of view, with what authority, and according to what criteria of expertise." (Escobar 1995, 41) Moreover, discourse "sets the rules that must be followed for this or that problem, theory, or object to emerge and be named, analyzed, and eventually transformed into a policy or plan." (Escobar 1995, 41)

To study development discourse would be, in an ideal situation, done through a specialized analysis of a case study, meaning not only a discursive analysis of its development project, but also an ethnographic study of the organization itself and a close observation of the implementation of this project and the reactions of the people concerned to it. This, however, far transcends the scope of this thesis. The analysis of development discourse presented here still tries to include all of the mentioned, yet not on the example of one particular case study, but mainly through the research of scientific literature written on this topic. Yet, not to make it all too theoretical, the thesis draws a part of its research material from an existing example: a development project called Integrated Development Project, supported by a German NGO Indienhilfe. By doing so, this thesis' research aims are: (1) to point to "what development is and does" (Crush 1995, 4), and thus tries (2) to contribute to the "critique and contestation of what is given and established" (Escobar 1997, 497). Finally, it strives (3) to answer the question "whether it is possible to extricate ourselves from the development morass" (Crush 1995, 4) and what could be an alternative to it.

Despite the idea of analyzing development texts as a form of writing isn't completely foreign to the development studies (e.g. Apffel Marglin and Marglin 1990, Crush 1995, Escobar 1984-85, 1988, 1995, Ferguson 1990), many might find it rather strange, even obscure to pursue such armchair meditation while the real life problems of development are so pressing. However, recognizing that "language is fundamental to the way in which we order, understand, intervene and justify those interventions into the natural and social world" (Crush 1995, 4) and considering discourse "as an interwoven set of languages and practices" (Crush 1995, xiii), development discourse shows itself as having "real effects" (Ferguson 1990, 18), "very real interventions and […] very real […] consequences." (Crush 1995, 6) As Edward Said (1979, 3) puts it in his book *Orientalism*: "My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse one cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period."

Development discourse analysis presented in this thesis leans on anthropology of development as its theoretical framework, and uses Michel Foucault's insights into the

character of discourse, power and knowledge as its main lines of inquiry. Anthropology of development rests on methods of language and significations analysis usually named as 'post-structuralism,' tries to indicate critical points of the development and thus shows itself as a post-development attempt to demonstrate the shortcomings and handicaps, even impossibility of development aspirations. For this purpose, anthropology of development uses "a Foucaudian perspective and proposes to examine development as a discursive formation that systematically relates forms of knowledge and techniques of power." (Gow 2002, 301) Discourses of development are here claimed not to be simple reflections of the reality, but to be a constitutive part of it. Hence, the focus on the text does not neglect the existence of the social reality and historical frameworks within which these texts are created and act.

By using anthropology of development as the theoretical point of departure and, accordingly, Foucault's apprehensions of "the control of the production of discourse and the workings of power and knowledge" (Escobar 1984-85, 384), I believe this thesis can offer a valuable interpretation of development.

> Here the primary focus is on the texts and words of development – on the ways that development is written, narrated and spoken; on the vocabularies deployed in development texts to construct the world as an unruly terrain requiring management and intervention; on their stylized and repetitive form and content, their spatial imagery and symbolism, their use (and abuse) of history, their modes of establishing expertise and authority and silencing alternative voices; on the forms of knowledge that development produces and assumes; and on the power relations it underwrites and reproduces. (Crush 1995, 3)

The goal of this thesis "is neither to bury development nor to praise it." (Cooper and Packard 1997, 4) Similarly, the following pages "have nothing to say against longer life-spans, healthier children, more and better-quality food and clothing, sturdier and more ample shelter, better amenities. Nor is any criticism levelled against the luxuries that people buy when their incomes grow enough to permit discretionary purchases, such as the radios and television sets that one sees even in very poor Third World villages." (Marglin 1990, 1) Instead, it seeks to make the self-evident conducts of the present development apparatus problematical, to point to its political power and attempts to examine the possibility of its alternatives.

2 PRESENTATION OF THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

2. 1 Anthropology and Development, Anthropology of Development

> *"The marked antipathy of much mainstream anthropology for development, as well as the sharp separation of an applied development anthropology from a theoretical academic sort, may be taken as signs not of anthropology's critical distance from development but of its uncomfortable intimacy with it." (Ferguson 1997, 152)*[2]

Anthropology has in the last two decades witnessed an intensive debate about development issues which led to a distinction between two broad schools of thought: development anthropology and anthropology of development. (cf. Escobar 1997, 498; Gow 1996, 165) The former includes those anthropologists who favor an active involvement in the development organizations, usually meaning those "working within development institutions and in anthropology departments training students for applied anthropology jobs in development" (Escobar 1997, 498). These anthropologists aim at contributing to the development processes and the transformations of its practices from within. However, they are mostly criticized for a low "degree of critical independence" (Bennett 1988, 8) and for carving "a niche for themselves in prestigious and powerful institutions." (Escobar 1997, 499)

The outset of the development theory and practice after World War II was largely economically and technically orientated which soon proved as "profoundly damaging" (Cernea in Escobar 1997, 499).

> The apparent failure of economically orientated approaches to development prompted a reevaluation of development's "social" aspects and goals beginning in the early 1970's and, more recently, of its cultural aspects, among them the impact of the development projects on local communities and the importance of local knowledge systems for programs. (Escobar 1991, 659)

This new sensitivity towards culture in the 1970's created a demand for anthropological skills in the development field, using anthropologists as "cultural intermediaries ('brokers') between the worlds of development and community; collecting the local knowledge and point of view; placing local communities and projects in larger contexts of political economy; and viewing culture holistically." (Escobar 1997, 500) Despite its acknowledged contributions to the development practices and also anthropology,[3]

[2] More about the ambivalence of the relation between anthropology and development, please see chapter *3. 3. 2 Professionalization* and related authors (e.g. Escobar 1997; Ferguson 1997; Gow 2002; Hoben 1982).
[3] For more, please see e.g. Bates (1988).

development anthropology faces a number of critiques. The core of these can be summed up as the reliance on the mainstream positions of both anthropology and development, and the negligence of the critiques both of these have been subject of, mostly since the second half of the 1980's. (cf. Escobar 1997, 501; Gow 1996, 165-166) For the most part, development anthropology embraces

> a commonsense view of language which holds that our experience of the world, and by association of development, is not affected by the form and content of language … Such a simple-minded faith in the neutrality of language, particularly in its written form, has meant that development anthropology has tended to ignore the relationship between language and power and take at face value much of the official development literature. In the same way, it has accepted at face value the "scientific" basis of development discourse and development research, with the implied assumption that there is order in the social world, that social life is patterned, and that the objective of planning should be to predict and control. (Gow 1996, 165)[4]

Anthropology of development is, on the other hand, supposed to take a more "reflexive, and critical stance" (Gow 1996, 165) towards development establishment, or, if nothing else, "a strikingly different" (Escobar 1997, 501) one. Anthropology of development, taking off in the late 1980's, draws from a theoretical corpus usually associated under the term 'post-structuralism.' While there is no space to summarize its basic tenets, it is important to stress that post-structuralism "highlights the role of language and meaning in the constitution of social reality. Language and discourse are seen not as a reflection of social reality, but as a constitutive of it; it is through language and discourse that social reality inevitably comes into being." (Escobar 1997, 501)

In this post-structuralist fashion, anthropology of development perceives development as (1) a discursive formation, "the apparatus of expert knowledge forms and institutions which organize the production of forms of knowledge and types of power, linking one to the other in a systematic manner." (Escobar 1997, 503) Next to this, development is seen as (2) creation, "as a historically singular experience that was neither natural nor inevitable, but very much the product of identifiable historical processes." (Escobar 1997, 503) Because of this, anthropology of development questions the notion of development itself, asking questions such as: what were the historical circumstances under which development was invented and what is the socio-political context in which development finds itself today? How did the perception of development change throughout the decades? Under which principles of authority development works and what kind of order

[4] For an alternative view, please see Edelman and Haugerud (2007, 40).

of knowledge it creates? In which ways does the language of development intervene into social reality, what are its consequences and what groups of people it affects? What forms of contestations and resistances does development discourse undergo? (cf. Escobar 1997, 502-504)

What is important to note is that there is not one single discourse of development, but that there are several ones. Different discourses of development, those related to different institutions as well as specific disciplines, are contested (cf. Gow 2002, 301) and "it is thus too simple to assert the emergence of a singular development discourse, a single knowledge-power regime." (Cooper and Packard 1997, 10) What deserves special attention are the reasons why certain ways of thinking about development and practicing of it are predominant.

> The point is not to decide whether or not development discourse is truly hegemonic, but to examine projects of building and fracturing hegemonies: how financial, political, and discursive power was deployed, how such projects were contested within their own terms and through efforts to redefine the terrain of debate, and how one can find where room for maneuver remains in international institutions and in the numerous sites where development initiatives encounter the complexity of particular social struggles. (Cooper and Packard 1997, 13)

When dealing with the development discourse it is thus not so important whether its content is true or false, or whether what it tries to achieve is good or bad, but rather how it exists and how it affects the social reality. (cf. Ferguson 1990, xv-xvi) Conceptualizing development as a discourse is not only "attuned to the language of development itself, pushing towards an analysis focused on the texts of development" (Crush 1995, xiii), but also understanding of "the power-laden local and international context out of which they arise and to which they speak." (Crush 1995, xiii)

At this point it seems useful to introduce the work of French philosopher Michel Foucault who, through his insights into discourse, power and knowledge, provides a series of conceptual tools that can make us understand better the nature and dynamics of development.

2. 2 Michel Foucault

"The study of development has benefited from the application of 'mainstream' Foucauldian notions of discourse and power/knowledge. These notions have made possible a critical deconstruction of the totalizing discursive formation of 'aid', the constellations of power it gives rise to, and its concrete impacts on North-South relations." (Rossi 2004, 7)

Speaking very broadly about the work of Michel Foucault, one can say that Foucault sets himself to investigate practices by which one governs oneself and the others. Foucault tries to understand the dynamics of these practices through a discursive analysis of certain fundamental human experiences such as e.g. sexuality and illness. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 378-379) He "directs his attention to the discursive practices associated with these experiences, in the belief that the manifold operations of power are at once most visible and most difficult to identify in such practices and that, moreover, it is in discourse that that power and knowledge are joined together." (Escobar 1984-85, 379)

Foucault (1978, 18) claims that "discourse is constituted by the difference between what one could say correctly at one period (according to the rules of grammar and those of logic) and what is actually said." This implies that discourse works as "a structure of knowledge, allowing, at any particular time, certain events and patterns of agency […], and rendering unthinkable, unsayable, and undoable others" (Rossi 2004, 2) and that any human practice cannot exist without a certain regime of rationality which is historically rooted. By establishing distinction between true and false, and investing objects and actions with meaning, discourse acts as a form of power. As Foucault writes in *Discipline and Punish* (in Rossi 2004, 2): "Power produces; it produces reality, it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production." Thus knowledge that is embedded in a discursive practice is not seen as a reflection of universal truths, but rather as a tool of domination and an exercise of power, which Foucault denotes as 'power/knowledge.' (cf. Ebrahim 2003, 11-12; Rossi 2004, 1-2)[5] As Foucault (1984a, 72-73) puts it:

> The important thing here, I believe, is that truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power: contrary to a myth whose history and functions would repay further study, truth isn't the reward of free spirits, the child of protracted solitude, nor the privilege of those who have succeeded in liberating themselves. Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of

[5] As Rabinow (1985, 4) reminds us: "Foucault is highly suspicious of claims to universal truths. He doesn't refute them; instead, his consistent response is to historicize grand abstractions," or "For Foucault, there is no external position of certainty, no universal understanding that is beyond history and society."

> constraint. And it induces general effects of power. Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.

According to Foucault (cf. 1978, 9-10), every discourse is characterized by three criteria which also serve as criteria for its individualization: (1) the criteria of formation, (2) the criteria of transformation or of threshold, and (3) the criteria of correlations. Foucault believes that these criteria allow us to substitute the theme of a totalizing history ("the progress of reason" or "the spirit of a century," as he (1978, 10) calls it) with a differentiated analysis of its formations, transformations and correlations. In Foucault's (1978, 15) words:

> It is against this background that the analyses which I have begun are set; it is towards it that they are directed. I am writing, therefore, not a history of the mind, according to the succession of its forms or according to the density of its sedimented meanings: I do not question the discourses for their silent meanings but on the fact and the conditions of their manifest appearance; not on the contents which they may conceal, but on the transformations which they have effectuated; not on the meaning which is maintained in them like a perpetual origin, but on the field where they coexist, remain and disappear. It is a question of an analysis of the discourses in their exterior dimensions.

The dimensions of discourse should be studied in two ways: (1) archeologically and (2) genealogically. Archaeology means "identifying the different elements of which they are composed, and the system of relations by which these elements form wholes." (Escobar 1984-85, 379) In other words, it means analyzing a set of rules which at a given period and for a definite society define the limits and the forms of expressibility, conversation, memory, reactivation and appropriation. (cf. Foucault 1978, 14-15) Genealogy, on the other hand, means "historical contextualization" (Foucault 1984a, 59) or, differently, scrutinizing the formation of discursive by non-discursive practices such as socio-political and economic factors, institutions etc. The objects of genealogy are the historical events responsible for the constitution of present rationalities, their localization in specific discourses, and their identification in specific political relations, institutions and disciplines. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 379)

Foucault's studies of the ways in which certain ideas and related behaviors became problematized at specific historical moments in Western society, and of how these problematizations got associated with specific discursive and institutional practices help us understand the fundamental processes of appropriation and disposition. They shed

light on the appropriation of human practices, societal common meanings and cultural contents, and on the ways these are disposed through a series of discourses and practices, institutionalizing a regime of truth. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 381-382; Rossi 2004, 25)

Hence, if we say that development is a contemporary social practice and we direct ourselves to the study of it through the analysis of its discourse, what can it bring to us? Foucault's insights into discourse, knowledge and power permit us to conduct a reinterpretation of common development theory and practice. In such manner, one puts under question mark a common assumption that development body aims at achieving a progress towards modernization and better life quality, and rather considers development as a form of power that creates and shapes reality in a certain manner. Approaching development as discourse thus shows us development as a "historically and culturally specific form of rationality which is inseparable from related regimes of practices and configurations of power" (Rossi 2004, 1) and enables us to "understand the systematic ways in which the Western developed countries have been able to manage and control and, in many ways, create the Third World politically, economically, sociologically and culturally." (Escobar 1984-85, 384)

The study of discourse thus implies also a study of power that is exercised through the discourse. Without an ambition to follow Foucault's example by trying to submit a complete archaeological and genealogical analysis of development, it seems useful to take at least some very basic lines of his method for analyzing development. Because "only in this two-pronged approach can we begin to comprehend the power of development to make and remake the world." (Crush 1995, 8) In our case this would mean an investigation of events and actors that led to the formation of this particular discursive formation, the subjects who maintain this discourse and their ways of employing it, and the way the knowledge that is embodied in the discourse is deployed as a form of power. In other words, four major points will be elaborated on the following pages: (1) historical conditions under which the development discourse arose, changed and exists today; (2) the structure of the discourse itself; (3) the deployment of development and the relations of power and knowledge made possible by it; and (4) the appearance of counter-discourses. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 384-392)

The first point refers to a range of academic literature, explaining the socio-economic and political contexts in which modern development discourse occurred, transformed and is at present existing. In addressing both historical trends and shifts in development discourse and practice, we emphasize the latter, yet try to make suggestions about how the changes in history and development discourse influence one another. The structure of development discourse, on the other hand, introduces the example of Indienhilfe's development project and the discourse of development used by this NGO and the project it supports. Within this chapter, three moments of development discourse are launched for a more transparent presentation of discourse's structure: (1) the *elements* with which this development discourse deals with, (2) the *actors* that employ this discourse, and (3) the *practices* through which it is enacted. The aim of the chosen example is not to provide an exhaustive case study, but to provide an existing instance of development discourse by which the issue of development discourse as political practice would not be only enriched but also further elaborated. I am aware that development discourse (and practice) is neither singular nor homogenous in its interests and vocabulary, and that there exists a variety of development discourses which are closely connected to their historical surrounding and thus require detailed study in connection to the particular environment they are a part of. Yet, I claim it is possible – and this is also the aim of this thesis – to outline a coherence of mechanisms that are structuring modern development discourse and to trace the unity of effects such discourse produces. From this point of view, the selected example isn't the central point of analysis but rather an enhancement of the theoretical claims concerning the nature and workings of development discourse. In the third point, we refer to three strategies through which development discourse deploys power and knowledge: (1) problematization, (2) professionalization, and (3) institutionalization. These are analyzed mainly through the research of academic literature about development discourse and practice, yet still interwoven with the observations regarding the exemplary development project. The last, fourth point of our analysis of the development discourse touches upon the (theoretical) character and possibilities of development counterdiscourses and resistances, this time being again founded merely on the academic literature regarding this theme.

I follow the presented methodological approach not without risks. The main risk is most lucidly summarized in the following paragraph:

> Basing an analysis of attitudes to development on the ideology of official texts alone would make us all orientalists, believing that the 'swarming, unpredictable and problematic mess in which human beings live can be understood on the basis of what books – texts – say' (Said, 1995: 93). Such an approach runs the danger that our evaluation of these texts is based purely upon theory-internal perspectives that can become self-perpetuating and self-fulfilling, rather than evaluated as means to wider ends. In these terms, we must ask ourselves what purpose is served by merely revealing the 'bad ideologies' behind key texts without relating these to their conditions of production, the individual perspectives they form and reflect, their purpose as moves in extended discourses, their relation to situated practice and, ultimately, the material outcomes they foster. […] Within such an analysis tensions can be identified among […] documents, […] key players, and […] discourse. […] Enhanced voices that fail to change power imbalances are little more than a technologization of discourse practice […] and should not be evaluated on purely theoretical ground but should lead to a reappraisal of the theory. (Bartlett 2005, 361-382)

Let the text in front of you not be anything more than a summary of various, already existing perspectives on development. However, I still hope it would be at least interesting and mentally rousing, opening up topics that, even though they may be very well known in the scholarship of development and anthropology, might be new for some others.

3 DEVELOPMENT AS DISCOURSE

3. 1 Historical overview of development discourse

> *"What is "development"? It is perhaps worth remembering just how recent a question this is. This question, which today is apt to strike us as so natural, so self-evidently necessary, would have made no sense even a century ago. It is a peculiarity of our historical era that the idea of "development" is central to so much of our thinking about so much of the world. It seems to us today almost non-sensical to deny that there is such a thing as "development," or to dismiss it as a meaningless concept, just as it must have been virtually impossible to reject the concept "civilization" in the nineteenth century, or the concept "God" in the twelfth."*
> *(Ferguson 1990, xiii)*

Scientific milieu mostly equates the beginning of development as we think it today – "the struggle of the Third and Second World countries to "catch up" […] to the First World" (Ebrahim 2003, 12) – with the period after World War II.[6] The establishment of Bretton Woods financial institutions (World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF)), the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference and the inaugural speech of Harry Truman in 1949 are usually claimed as the markers of the start of this development era. Colonization framework that previously described the relations between "the West and the rest" was succeeded by the framing device of development, which produced a whole new strategy for dealing with problems of a large number of countries from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania that came to be called "underdeveloped." Around this fictitious construct of "underdevelopment" a discourse of development was created that established in these countries an invariable goal of accessing the forms of life of industrialized world and provided them with required techniques and categories to do so. (cf. Adams 1988, 33; Cooper and Packard 1997, 1, 7; Ebrahim 2003, 34; Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 6; Escobar 1984-85, 384-386; 1988, 428-430)

[6] Although the beginning of the modern idea of development is routinely associated with the year 1945, there exist alternative views on development's history. For example, Cowen and Shenton (1995) argue that "development was always implicated and from the first" (Crush 1995, 10) and that contemporary notion of development is "a state practice rooted in the nineteenth century." (Cowen and Shenton 1995, 29) These authors root the beginnings of modern development discourse "in the rise of the West, in the history of capitalism, in modernity, and the globalization of Western state institutions, disciplines, cultures and mechanisms of exploitation." (Crush 1995, 11) Also, for example, Ebrahim (2003, 162) notes long historical presence of development work: "Although development as an international industry is relatively young, development within different regional and local contexts predates the 1940s. In the Indian subcontinent, for example, Gandhian "constructive work" activities were common in the 1920s and 1930s […] and Christian missionary and welfare activity can be traced back to the arrival of St. Francis Xavier of Portugal in the early 1540s." Without wanting to neglect the existence of development before the 1950s, this thesis adopts the view that the modern concept of development occurred after World War II since then an essential change in the discourse of development occurred: "[p]eople who were once simply the objects of development now came to see and define themselves in its terms." (Crush 1995, 11)

Besides the breakdown of colonial systems, there exist numerous other historical conditions that gave rise to this new strategy, called development.

> [T]hese included […] changes in the structures of population and production, the advance of communism in certain parts of the world and the concomitant fear of communism in the capitalist world; it also included faith in science and technology, reinvigorated by the success of the Marshall Plan, new forms of economic knowledge and the development of area studies (e.g., "Latin American Studies"), as well as an enriched experience with the management of complex social systems. The end of the war had also confronted the advanced countries, particularly the United States, with the need to find overseas investment opportunities and, at the same time, markets for their goods. (Escobar 1988, 429-430)

This initial approach to development stressed the centrality of state sovereignty and encouraged extensive state intervention in economy as well as the public sector, making national governments responsible for improving the living situation of their citizens. Nation-states were assisted on their path of development by supranational governance and financial institutions such as WB, IMF and United Nations (UN), inside which one branch of professionals played a specifically important role: the economists. (cf. Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 6) As Escobar (1988, 432) puts it: "The development economist was the expert *par excellence* called upon to produce the most basic truths about development. Little by little, so it was thought, underdevelopment would yield its secrets to the attentive – and, of course, unprejudiced and objective – gaze of the economist."

In the 1950's a new field, called development economics, became the one to direct the entire development mission. The most important predecessor of development economics were growth economics, leaning on growth theory which claims that economies must save and invest a part of their output, as a result of what economies grow and the well-being of people rises accordingly. Development economists tried to implement this theory to the countries of global South and soon realized that the level of savings was too low to sustain the growth process. However, they found a privileged area of investment: industrialization. "Industrialization would not only pave the way for growth and modernization of the backward economies, but also for spreading among the local populations the proper rationality." (Escobar 1988, 433) In the core of most development models in the so-called First Decade was thus the ideal of economic progress, i.e. greater production, economic growth, and industrialization. Backed by foreign aid, investments and loans, economic growth was perceived as a necessary effort to push the states out of their "underdevelopment". (cf. Escobar 1988, 432-433)

The economist approach to development, characterized by the logic: "change the economy, and all the rest follows," (Bennett 1988, 10) soon proved to be inefficient – all the rest simply did not follow. The economic theory on which development was based views humans as values-giving beings who possess wishes that they can express and try to satisfy. The problematic point with this formulation is its presupposition that humans have economic wishes (measured by quantitative units such as money), thus assuming that by giving more money to the poor, they would act in a predictable way, forming a desired rationality found in "developed" societies. By focusing on such simple pattern of incentive; by neglecting other values and motives such as politics, religion, status; and by reducing other societal factors of organization, education, cultural customs etc. to economic factors, development aims could not be achieved. (cf. Bennett 1988, 11-12)

In the early 1970's, 'culture' became a new organizing concept around which the development apparatus formed itself.

> Development experts and agencies, having become discontent with the poor results of technology and capital-intensive top-down interventions, developed a new sensitivity towards the social and cultural factors in their programs. Moreover, they began to realize that the poor themselves had to participate actively in the programs if these were to have a reasonable margin of success. Projects had to be socially relevant, to be culturally appropriate, and to involve their direct beneficiaries in a significant fashion. (Escobar 1991, 663)

In contrast to the First Decade which tried to separate the social and economic aspects of development, the Second Decade aimed at merging the two. One can most clearly observe these changes by having a look at the numerous declarations, strategies and other pronouncement of development views by world's biggest organizations such as WB, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and UN. These organizations suddenly aspired for a unified approach to development, and endogenous, human-centered and integrated development taking into account basic needs of the peoples. Both WB, under Robert McNamara's leadership, and USAID started to focus on equity issues and poverty-oriented programs in the areas of health, nutrition, rural development, family planning and so on. This approach also shifted from development centered on nation-states to development seen as a global strategy, based on joint action in all spheres of economic and social life. Development came to overlap with flows of globalization, especially globalization as neoliberal economic policies, but also globalization as "increased integration of various places into the world economy, and the

effects of vastly improved transportation and communication systems on multidirectional cultural flows." (Edelmand and Haugerud 2007, 3) This increased interrelatedness was partly influenced by the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system of fixed exchange rates and national controls of capital flows, and its replacement with "free-market" economic policies which accord the market rather than the state the main role in resolving economic and other problems. (cf. Ebrahim 2003, 34; Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 3-4, 7, 17; Esteva 1992, 14-16; Escobar 1991, 663-664) In the 1980s, the WB and IMF endorsed in the countries of the global South a number of reforms known as structural adjustment, which, according to the previously mentioned changes in global economics, aimed at reducing the state role in economy and sought to minimize the expenses on social services. Recently expanded powers of global capital markets over national economies, together with other changes, signaled that "the only development policy that was officially approved was not to have one – to leave it to the market to allocate resources, not the state." (Leys in Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 8) Hence many call this period "the lost decade of development." (cf. Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 7; Esteva 1992, 16) These processes, however, soon proved to be not as helping as it was wished, hitting hard the poor sectors of targeted societies and continuing to leave these countries in debt problems. The following decade, the 1990s, was thus mainly marked by the criticism of the neoliberal orthodoxy that had held sway in the international financial and development institutions, and in many governments of the countries of the global South. Realizing the negative effects of structural adjustment policies on the economic and living standards of people in these countries, international institutions such as WB tried to modify its policies, introduced social investment programs, and continued to work on debt relief programs. There appeared a new development ethos, giving way to redevelopment policies in the North and the South, presently taking shape of sustainable and human development. (cf. Edelman and Haugerud 2005, 7-8; Esteva 1992, 16)

Yet, the basic premise of the development apparatus did not change. Modernization perspective that characterized already the economist period of development in 1950s and 1960 remained. Till today the development discourse continues to situate itself on "a world organized around production and markets, divided between developed and underdeveloped, "traditional" and "modern"." (Escobar 1991, 664)

3. 2 Structure of discourse

After giving a condensed description of historical advancement of development discourse and its social conditions, we turn to the study of the structure of development discourse. Through the survey of the development texts we examine the *elements* which this discourse deals with, and, next to this, take a look at the *actors* that employ this discourse and the *practices* through which it is enacted. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 386)

This thesis observes the described parts (or moments) of discourse and their relations on the example of a development project called Integrated Development Project (IDP). IDP is a project of co-operation between the German NGO Indienhilfe (IH) and the Indian organization Seva Kendra Calcutta (SKC). By studying the documents of the IDP from the period between 2000 and 2008, focusing on the health part of this project, we try to discern the *elements* of the development discourse used in this project and by Indienhilfe. This is complemented by the presentation of the approach to development projects and IDP itself (*practice*), and of Indienhilfe and other institutions concerned in its realization (*subject*), making a relational link between the three moments of discourse. This is done with the help of Indienhilfe's information material and a general interview conducted with Elizabeth Kreuz, the president of IH, and Sabine Dlugosch, project officer, which sought to obtain a more holistic image of the work of IDP, IH an SKC by retaining the missing information and by clarifying the unclear sections of the documents of IDP and IH. Throughout the discourse analysis we try to present as much of the original material as possible, in order to be able to observe the language used in development aspirations of IDP.[7] Thus we expose the structure of this particular discourse and, simultaneously, hope to indicate a more general structure of development discourse.[8]

[7] Here it is important to note that the quotations from the information material aren't in the original language, but were translated for the purpose of this thesis from German to English. Next to this, the documents concerning IDP are written by SKC. IH reads them for obtaining information regarding the development work and sometimes corrects them and gives remarks on them. However, I believe that there don't exist major differences in the manner of expression, since the co-operation would not be possible, if this would be the case.

[8] Despite the apparent inertia of the categories of discourse (elements, practices and institutions) through which we plan to study discourse, these moments are vivid entities that are constantly changing and are fluidly interrelated. Discourse does not exist as a solid body, but has a character of plasticity that is subjected to numerous transformations, modification and correlations through the course of time. It is thus important to know that the presented example does not stand as a model figure of development discourse, but rather as only one of its manifold manifestations.

The description of the qualitative analysis used in this section of the thesis should not be left without remarks. We already mentioned the limitedness of the study of IH and IDP, due to which we cannot really call it a case study, and some other difficulties that restrain this analysis from being an analysis of a clear example of development discourse (e.g. the mixture of actors involved in the management of IDP and thus the difficulty of claiming that the development discourse used in its documents is equivalent to the one of IH.) Next to these, we should point to at least a couple of other problems that burden this and (almost) any other qualitative research. Neither me as a researcher, neither the employees of IH (i.e. Ms. Kreuz and Ms. Dlugosch) did not enter this research relation without our human attributes of expectations, prejudice, views and opinions. These can certainly not be extracted from any step of our interactions, starting with IH proposing which of their projects to study, through the general interview carried out with Ms. Kreuz and Ms. Dlugosch, till my final reading and interpretation of the obtained material. Also language should be pointed out as a factor that played a role in this research: not only that the translated material can not really be equated with the original texts produced by IH, what was also the case in this study is that English is not the mother tongue of any of us. For some these limitations might be enough to label qualitative research as unscientific. For me these are an integrated part of such research and thus important enough to point to their existence.

3. 2. 1 Indienhilfe

Indienhilfe (IH) is a German non-profit organization, founded in 1980 to fight the causes of migrations into cities and impoverishment in India with the help of poverty-oriented development programs. At present aims IH at the improvement of the situation of children and its most important target groups are Adivasi,[9] Dalits,[10] people under poverty line, marginal and peasant families etc. The office of Indinhilfe in Herrsching is

[9] Adivasi is an Indian tribe that represents 7% of the Indian population. Its name literally means "original inhabitants," which were partly integrated into the lowest cast of untouchable by the Hindu culture. They were displaced into less fertile and mountainous regions of India, thus maintaining their religions and languages in isolation, but at the same time suffering of harder living conditions. (cf. Indienhilfe 2008a)

[10] Dalits or the untouchable represent in traditional Indian society any member of a wide range of low-caste Hindu groups and any person outside the caste system. Traditionally, the groups characterized as untouchable were those whose occupations involved polluting activities, such as taking life for a living; killing or disposing of dead cattle or working with their hides for a living; pursuing activities that brought the person into contact with emissions of the human body; and eating the flesh of cattle or of domestic animals. (cf. Encyclopædia Britannica 2008)

run by six part-time employees and a working committee, formed by voluntary members of IH. The committee takes the basic decisions and its members have distributed the supervision of the projects – as "project speakers" they devote themselves to the cooperation with certain partner organizations and prepare decisions. (cf. Indienhilfe 2002, 2008b)

IH's main financial sources are private donations and donations of small solitary groups. They have almost no public funding, because it does not fit into their image of development work. As Elizabeth Kreuz (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) explains:

> We have some co-financed projects with BMZ [Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development], but we didn't go for it on a long run because it is very much of administrative work and we are very much tightened up with the original project plan. […] We have the idea to work for a long time with a partner in an area and, in the meantime, some villages may be phasing out, because they are better off, and other villages are taken up. That is all a flowing process, it is not that you could say: "This is a project of three years now. Then we will start a new project." And that is not at all the philosophy of the public funding. […] It is much more stable for us if we depend on our donors.

It is the same with European funding:

> If we would be bigger, if we would have more staff who can concentrate on that, who could learn about the procedures and do that, we could do it. […] [We] have different priorities, and we want to be very free and flexible. […] I think it is better for bigger organizations […] But they don't have the direct relation with the projects as we have it. And that is for us much more important. We also like the relation with our donors because we know many of them and we try to inform them. (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008)

IH conceives itself "as a part of the survival movement that concentrates on the relationships between India and Germany, in which peace, women, ecology, human rights and Third World groups etc. are turning against a constantly stronger threat to humane life." (Indienhilfe 1992) IH considers the following main causes for the impoverishment of the populations in the countries of the so-called Third World:

1. the following of wrong and dangerous progress and development models of the populations in industrial countries, based on an irrational and arrogant belief in the unlimited material growth and material progress; in the preference of absolute freedom of the individual to the grading and subordination of the individual in a stable net of relationships between humans and nature on the planet Earth;
2. the take-over of this model, which occurs in the top-down way via the (economical, political, scientific) elites and the middle-class and which apparent success (wealth, even abundance for the majority of the population, undreamed-possibilities of the individual self-realization, reduction of exhausting and felt-as mortifying handwork, elimination of much physical discomfort) acts attractively on outsiders, and to an extremely high degree corruptive on the populations of the Third World;
3. the ruthless exploitation of the global resources (commodities, plants and animals, water, air, soil, and newly even genetic "material") of approximately one third of the human kind that accomplishes its wrong development model by creation of and maintenance of unequal distribution of power and of (post)colonial structures in politics and economy, on costs of

> other two thirds that live predominantly in the countries of the Third World. (Indienhilfe 1992)

IH thus aspires "to contribute (1) to the reduction of injustice in the relationship between Third World and industrial countries; (2) to stop the impoverishment; (3) to (re)establish human life conditions and (4) to accomplish a different development model that is orientated on the aims of sustainability, justice, ahimsa, and the largest possible participation of all humans." (Indienhilfe 1992) IH sees this alternative development model as following:

> This other model of development that can be reduced to the slogan "POVERTY (in the sense of simplicity, modesty and in contrast to misery!) IN DIGNITY FOR ALL," can only be reached through active action of the concerned – the suffering under misery and injustice, as well as those who benefit by the misery of the others and of the structures of injustice. "Poverty in dignity" means for us the satisfaction of all basic needs and furthermore enough space for social, cultural, intellectual and religious life; space to enjoy life. Human dignity gets lost, if people have to use their energy and time completely on pure preservation of physical existence. We remind on the positive meaning of the concept of "poverty" in religious such as Christianity and Buddhism, and in political/philosophical teachings like the ones of Gandhi and we challenge the thesis "Poverty liberates!"; - some from misery, the others from the destructive abundance, and all from the obsession of wanting '**to have'** instead of developing the character '**to be'.** (Indienhilfe 1992)

IH believes that industrial societies act as idols for many humans in the Third World, out of which results their double responsibility: "On the one hand, we have to out of **reasons of justice** reduce our disproportionally high consumption of energy and resources to a justifiable amount; and on the other hand, we have to out of reasons of **credibility** make clear through a new lifestyle that we mean it serious with our warnings of the ecological collapse of the world, if everybody overtakes our present standard of life." (Indienhilfe 1992) However, IH "tries to stay free of ideologies and dogmatism, and to orientate only on reality and chosen values and aims." (Indienhilfe 1992)

IH's partner organization that works on IDP is Seva Kendra Calcutta. SKC is a diocesan social work ring with its main seat in Calcutta. It also has two sub-centers in Barasat, north of Calcutta, and in Kharagpur, in the south-west: "The IDP office is now in Kharagpur. Earlier it was all organized from Calcutta, but the distance was too long. This contributed to the alienation of the staff in charge and the project, because travelling took so much time, so they had the tendency to spend less time on the project area. That has changed now and that is very good." (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) Another organization that was for some time involved in the work of IDP is Cyriac Elias Voluntary Association (CEVA), a consultancy organization from Kochi, Kerala. At the end of 1990s IH decided

to engage CEVA to take care of their projects because IH at that time still didn't have an office in India and was thus too far away from its projects. That improved the cooperation between IH and its partners a lot, yet, due to later misunderstandings between IH and CEVA, the cooperation ended in 2004. In the same year, IH opened its Indian office in the SKC centre in Calcutta. (cf. Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) In this way "experienced staff advises and accompanies the partner organizations on planning and realization of projects, and organizes further trainings." (Indienhilfe 2002)

3. 2. 2 Development Project Work and Integrated Development Project

IH tries to achieve the above described development goals "through projects, public relations and fair trade." (Indienhilfe 1992) IH works on development projects together with ten Indian partner organizations, most of which are NGOs, accept of SKC "that is the responsible institution for development and social work of the archdiocese Calcutta." (Indienhilfe 2008b) At the moment, IH supports 22 development projects, most of which are located in the federal state of West Bengal and one in the state of Orissa.

> [W]e found out it is too difficult to spread to different parts of India, because the local situations are very different – the culture is totally different, the language is different, political situation is different. We are paying all our travel by ourselves, and it's difficult to have enough time for all the project visits, so it becomes more expensive and more time consuming, if you spread, so we took a decision to concentrate on West Bengal. […] West Bengal has nearly the size of Germany and for such a small organization as Indienhilfe that is quite enough. We want to go more into depth of the relations, we want to know more by ourselves about the cultures. We are not only interested in the political or economic developments, but also in the culture of West Bengal as a specific culture of India. It is very interesting for us. If you restrain yourself to something, you can know things more into depth, and that's what we are trying and interested to do. (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008)

IH thinks that "direct contact to the project partners and the cooperation that is designed for a long time guarantee the reliable and goal-oriented use of the donations." (Indienhilfe 2002) Even though they aim at a long-term cooperation with each of the organizations, they know that the projects can be thoroughly time-limited. The reason why IH works with partner organizations lies in their view that "it is illusionary to belief that a German organization like ours could find direct access to the target group […] and work together with them. Our experience show that it normally fails because of the absence of common language." (Indienhilfe 1992) In this way, "IH doesn't implement its own projects, but supports existing initiatives," (Indienhilfe 1992) out of which, they hope, doesn't develop a relationship of dependency. When IH chooses its partners it puts special attention on

democratic structures in this organization. It categorically cooperates "only with organizations that exclude violence as a mean of change and sees high priority in an active support of measures of awareness rising that aim at tolerance, better understanding and balancing of interests between members of different religious, ethnic or cast groups." (Indienhilfe 1992) IH is open to cooperate with organizations working in rural as well as urban milieu, and is also willing to give emergency aid in life threatening situations. Because IH believes that "there are no patent remedies for the improvement of the present situation" (Indienhilfe 1992) and that projects have thus "an experimental character and have to be measured continuingly by their actual results," (Indienhilfe 1992) IH leads with its partners regular discussions about the development of their work in written (e.g. projects reports) and oral form (e.g. conversations during the visits). As IH explains: "By dealing with public money [...] we esteem transparency as essential – this we apply to us as well as to the partner organizations that only receive and manage money to use it as effectively as possible for the sake of the target groups." (Indienhilfe 1992) IH also tries to encourage as many visits to India and Germany as possible: "In the direct, personal meeting partnership is realized for us, mutual trust and respect are possible, we learn to understand each other better despite of the different cultural backgrounds." (Indienhilfe 1992) However, IH understands "**these principles as our actual position in discussion.** They should be developed in the dialogue with our partners, friends, members." (Indienhilfe 1992)

In their project work, IH favors to support projects with integrated approach, where ecological effects and effects on women are considered and where the projects "are not an end in themselves, but a part of a general development process." (Indienhilfe 1992) Further criteria are: (1) geographical emphasis on West Bengal and the neighboring states; (2) no preference of certain religions, casts or races; and (3) project work should not have any negative effects outside the actual target area. (cf. Indienhilfe 1992)

One of the development projects IH supports is Integrated Development Project, a project focused on integrated rural development work in 77 villages around Baligeria, Basinda and Salboni unites in the West Midnapore, district of West Bengal. IH has been involved in the development work in this area since the first half of the 1980's. At that time, their development activities were not consolidated under IDP and cooperation with

SKC. IH financially supported the work of one Father, however, as IH came to know SKC a couple of years later, it came to realize that it might be better to replace the co-operation with only one person with co-operation with SKC, which works on a large area and aspires for balanced, just and transparent money transfers for development work. From that time onwards, IH channels the money through SKC and expects of the organization not only to channel the money further to the Fathers working on the field, but to show initiative, to give feedback and to lead a joint discussion process about the activities to be done. At the beginning, the work with SKC wasn't of the best quality, however, this improved much in the year 2002, when Father Reggie became the director of SKC, bringing the whole institution up and improving its work.

IH normally doesn't participate in Church projects, but as it has a good relationship with SKC and wants to continue working in this area, they decided to pursue the project with them. But IH is aware there are both positive and negative sides of such co-operation. "One positive side is that you can normally expect that they don't pursue their own interests, that they are not dishonest. Though it can also happen, it is not totally impossible." (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) Another advantage might be the impact of Christian convictions: "That everyone is equal and that therefore Church works to pave a way for people who are not considered as equal in Indian society. […] Or that there is no concept of purity and impurity which is a very important concept in Hinduism. […] That's very close to Adivasi ideas and society, and therefore Christians usually have much better access to Adivasi than to any Hindu populations." (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) On the other hand, a disadvantage is that priests, who work on projects and are directors of SKC, are subjects to shifts. Priests can stay on one position for three years and can extend it for another three, but after six years they are shifted, which can cause problems in the continuity of the work. Another disadvantage is that "we were often fighting to keep separate Church related works and development works because we don't want to be involved in Church related works." (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008)

IH does not participate at the implementation of IDP, but it supports this project financially, and with planning and developing of ideas, giving priority to certain issues, which always takes a form of a continuously ongoing dialogue. As Elizabeth Kreuz (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) points out: "We learn certain things from particular partners

who are very good and we think: “Yes, that’s a line to follow.” And then we try to make other partners know about this particular progress. So that they can take it up, if it also fits in their environment.” IH thus believes it is – in the case of IDP where special emphasis is laid on children –

> important not only the material input, but also the way how parents can perceive their children, the personality of their children, how they can perceive their own world, and how they can be strengthened under certain conditions. We think this is good and important, and so we give that input. But in general, the things are developed by the partners. It depends very much on the personality of the key staff in a project and Sudarsan Dey, the coordinator of IDP, is a very organized person. He can deal with the staff very well, and he has his own visions and ideas. Like this you have a partner with whom you can lead a dialogue. (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008)

Even though the co-operation between IH and SKC was not always smooth, IH estimates SKC as one of its very good projects and partners. (cf. Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008)

SKC also works closely with the Indian national as well as regional governments. SKC needs to inform them about their activities and the financial transactions in order to make their work transparent. As Elizabeth Kreuz (Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008) explains the control of Indian government over donations SKC receives from IH:

> Whatever money comes from abroad to India, it has to be recorded. Organizations all have to apply for one account on which they can receive foreign money. They get it only after at least two years of work and then, if they get this permission, all this money comes to this one account. Every six months they have to report to the ministry how the money has been spent, because Indian government wants to avoid money which comes from religious groups or separatist movements. There are a lot of problems with, for example, Sikhs in Punjab, who wanted a free state of Punjab. Or other movements, like Muslim movements or whatever.

There exists also a different cooperation between SKC and Indian governments - SKC tries to integrate IDP health activities with governmental programs in order to avoid duplication and to bring coordination between them. IH doesn’t have direct contact to Indian governments, except of occasional exchanges with the Indian consulate in Germany. (cf. Kreuz and Dlugosch 2008; Seva Kendra Calcutta 2006b)

3. 2. 3 IDP through the analysis of its documents [11]

Integrated Development Project, as already the name suggests, aims at integrated development approach which is defined by Sudarsan Dey, the coordinator of IDP, in the following way:

> The term Integrated Development project means a holistic development of the poor (here: specifically Adivasi population, with a special focus on Lodhas) in the area in terms of Savings, Health, Education and Improvement of Natural Resources. These four components of development are not in isolation, rather they are integrated, and change in one factor will influence the other. Lack of education/awareness will influence health status as they will not obey basic hygiene aspects and ignore preventive health care. This will cause diseases and in turn effect the resource base as they have to pay to doctor for medicine and also cannot work in the field to earn their food. Same way if they do not have enough resources they cannot afford good education and health care facilities. (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2006b)

The purpose of IDP is described in various documents slightly differently, sometimes more precisely, sometimes with fewer words, but its core can be stated as the following: "Empowerment of 45 tribal and marginalized villages in Baligeria, Basinda and Salboni of West Midnapore district, towards sustainable development, by organizing the community, imparting non formal education, creation of health awareness and enhancing the skill and capacity of the people for income generation activities." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003e) Most differently was the project purpose formulated in a document from 2000-2001:

> Development is a journey of conscientisation in Human society. With the cordial support of IH, SKC started this Integrated Development Programme in 8 tribal dominated villages under Nayagram block of Midnapore since 1997, through awareness, organization training and capacity building for sustainability among the most downtrodden people. There are 1659 people of 312 families, those who are marginalized and day labourers started this journey along with the promotion of local leadership like VLA, NF instructors and committed village leaders with hope and prosperity. (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2001a)

IDP justifies its development aspirations by stating that "change is inevitable. We cannot stop the process of change. What we can do is to interfere the process and bring a desired change so that the manifestation of change will contribute positively towards development of human lives and values (here for our target groups mainly Adivasi and Lodha children and also adults)." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2007b)

[11] Some starting notes: annual documents of IDP are always valid from April till March of the succeeding year, while the Indian financial year starts and finishes in these months. An additional note should be made regarding the fact, that far less information regarding IDP stand as direct quotes than it might be desirable. This is due to the fact that the English used in IDP documents was often not correct or clear enough that it would make sense to quote it; the information offered in these passages is thus summarized for the purposes of clarity. However, these summaries still try to follow the original vocabulary of the documents.

Even though the activities IDP tries to integrate changed slightly between the years 2000 and 2008, its main areas of work remain constant: (1) improvement of economic situation; (2) provision of education and trainings both for children as well as adults; (3) improvement of health situation; (4) creating and strengthening of community based organizations; and (5) creation of project's institutional requirements. Because the analysis of all fields of activity integrated in the project would be too extensive for a thesis like this, we focus only on the health part of IDP. A lucid description, why I think medicine is interesting to investigate in the field of development discourse, and a comprehensive answer to the question, why did I decide to investigate the health part of IDP, one can find in the following passage of Nandy and Visvanathan (1995, 145):

> One purpose, however, development has served less conspicuously: it has endorsed the claims to power over the human body, as a domain of social knowledge and social intervention, ventured by organized centres of power in a society. These are centres inaccessible to the citizen and often even to the community to which he or she belongs. Taken away from the individual and handed over to the organized centres of power in the society, the body politically becomes and is redefined as a carrier of hedonistic pleasures or as a vehicle of disease and suffering.
> If the body can be separated from a person's selfhood and controlled, it can also be corrected and improved. Also, the body can be controlled only if it can be corrected and improved. Either way, another domain of individual choice becomes a part of public life, directly subject to the society's power-knowledge nexus and to the typical format of expertise which goes with the nexus. What was once a matter of personal suffering and personalized healing thus becomes subject to the demands of large-scale engineering, planning, and intervention. Medicine becomes a proper theme in development.

Development activities regarding "the improvement of tribal health" (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2001b) are numerous:

3. 2. 3. 1 Construction of Health Clinic

One of them is the construction of a health clinic in Baligeria which was inaugurated in September 2002. "The clinic is built due to make facilities available to the local doctors and give better services to patients specially the women and children." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003d) The reasons for its establishment were described as following: "There is an open shed at the entrance of Holy Cross Church, Baligeria […] This shed is also used as 'clinic.' During the monsoon it becomes difficult to accommodate the people. Since it is an open shed, women folk have no privacy. If we can have a proper clinic then the patients can wait in the open shed for their tern." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2001b) It provides general (allopathic) clinic once a week and herbal clinic twice in a month and, next to this, tries to increase the motivation of local people for health and

hygiene and the knowledge of tribal medicine through development of herbal garden in Baligeria. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2001b)

3. 2. 3. 2 Health and Student Profile Cards

Student and health profile cards are designed to document child's personal details, education progress and health records. In this way, one is able to observe the progress of a child and find reasons for child's possible problems or achievements. Health profile cards can be either in red or yellow color, depending on the condition of the child – yellow are for the "normal" and the red ones for the malnourished or undernourished children. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003c, 2003d)

3. 2. 3. 3 Health Awareness Camps

Health Awareness Camps are a day long camps organized for parents and students, being organized couple of times a year by the local doctors and specialists with the help of audio-visual media, banners, wall writing etc. Topics of these camps are e.g. mother and child health; vaccination; Do's and Don't's during pregnancy and how to have a safe birth; common, water and air borne, skin and sexually transmitted diseases and others; family planning etc. Camps are made because SKC believes that the poor become more poor due to lack of awareness of disease and treatment. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003a, 2003b, 2003e, 2004, 2006b, 2007a) Besides, they are "gradually creating consciousness among poor tribals for better health and breaking their superstitious practices." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003c)

3. 2. 3. 4 Health Check-Ups

Health check-ups are conducted by qualified doctors and teachers for the students of the Learning Centre, for the pre-primary students and for certain other children. The specialist doctors check each student and also study their psychology. If required, they prescribe them medicines and a further examination, writing it down on the student profile card. The doctors also distribute some medicines to the needy students. They follow up all serious and chronic diseases, and malnourished children. In such a way, "students will be morally educated on personal health and hygiene and they will be free from com. Diseases." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003a) Next to this, they want to identify

mentally retarded and physically challenged children in the project area and give these children special care. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003b, 2003e, 2004, 2005, 2006b)

3. 2. 3. 5 Health Workers Trainings

Health workers trainings are organized for one person, working as a health worker, from each village where IDP is taking place. Trainings are lead by the local doctors, Church workers, nurses etc. On these trainings, participants get to know the topics of nutrition; family planning; immunization; "life-style" diseases such as smoking, drinking, drug abuse; problems related to early marriage; superstitious believes; "preservation of medical species through cultivation and propagation" (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2006a); personal and domestic cleanness etc. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003b, 2003e, 2004, 2005, 2006a) After successful completion of the training, they are provided with the first aid kit for each village and with the register for emergency cases. In the frame of IDP follow up/refresher courses are also organized to make the health workers "more knowledgeable and to strengthen them" (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2004), and "to update them about responsibilities." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2005)

3. 2. 3. 6 Saha Upa Swastha Kendra (SUSK or Health Care Center)

> In most cases it is found that the Primary Health Centres, which provide the basic health facilities to the rural community, are situated in places which are not easily accessible to most of the villages in this region. Villagers have to forgo their wage for the day if they want to visit the health center. This discourages them to go to the health center to avail the facilities of Govt. programme […] To make the system more effective one saha upa swastha will be opened in three units where villagers will get facilities like immunization, Iron tablets, first aid. (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2006b)

Today, three SUSKs operate in the area of IDP, each in one of the units of Baligeria, Basinda and Salboni. The selection of the locations of these centers was made together by the villagers of these units. The centers are run by health workers, who undergo training on preventive health care, organized by Namasole Pally Mangal Samity (NPMS), a health committee working on indigenous herbal medicine. Health workers are for the first year financed by IH, later they have to maintain their salary by themselves with the help of the fees they charge for the medical services and by the sale of medicines. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2006b, 2007b)

3. 2. 3. 7 Drinkable Water

With the help of renowned institutes IDP conducts twice a year sample water tests (e.g. arsenic) to ensure the working of pure drinking water sources. Next to this, they try to generate awareness among the villagers about safe drinking habits at Health Awareness Camps. IDP also constructed three dug wells to provide clean drinking water for domestic use throughout the whole year in some model villages. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003e, 2004, 2005)

3. 3 Power/knowledge in deployment of development

> *"For Johnston, colonialism was about gaining control of disorderly territory and setting loose the redemptive powers of development. The African landscape is rewritten, figuratively and literally, to reflect the subsumption of one reality by another. Africans are incorporated into this landscape as garbed agents of a higher power. Their bodies and behaviours testify to the new order. The text smooths out incongruities and inconsistencies, and erases all oppositional voices and spaces of dissent. Africans become objects for the application of power rather than subjects experiencing and responding to the exercise of that power. This is the power of development: the power to transform old worlds, the power to imagine new ones." Crush (1995, 2)*

A mere description of the three moments of discourse, which we got to know in the previous chapter, is, however, not enough. Discourse results out of a systematization of relations between these three moments which, conversely, gives the discourse the power to organize the objects with which it deals; "to form systematically the objects of which it spoke, to group them and arrange them in certain ways, to give them a unity of their own." (Escobar 1984-85, 386) Hence, we now turn to the study of forms of power and knowledge (the described) development discourse makes possible and try to show what techniques it uses in its management of the objects it deals with.

According to Escobar (cf. 1984-85, 387; 1988, 430; 1995, 45), discourse of development brings about an endless number of practices through which new mechanisms of control, i.e. new forms of power and knowledge, are deployed. This deployment operates through three major strategies, all of them carrying disciplinary and normalizing elements: (1) problematization, (2) professionalization, and (3) institutionalization. All of these strategies serve in the process of creation of development discourse, yet, professionalization and institutionalization serve as mechanisms to bring this discourse to circulate, to become "an active, real force." (Escobar 1995, 45) Although we here, for the purpose of clarity, separate these strategies, "they are interrelated and converge in the practice itself," (Escobar 1991, 666) bridging the discursive with non-discursive realities. As Jonathan Crush (1995b, 5-6) puts it:

> But ideas about development do not arise in a social, institutional or literary vacuum. […] A contextual reading of the literature of development therefore has a great deal to say about the apparatus of power and domination within which those texts emerge, circulate and are consumed. […] In this way, conceptual space is made for an exploration of the links between the discursive and non-discursive; between the words, practices and the institutional expression of development; between the relations of power and domination that order the world and the words and images that represent those worlds.

3. 3. 1 Problematization

Discourse brings up certain issues and topics with which it deals and, as such, also development discourse deals with numerous "problems" of the Third World such as "underdeveloped countries," "superstitious practices," the "needy" etc. (cf. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003b, 2003c) Discourse later treats and reforms, manages and refines these issues, however, "not so much to illuminate problems and possible solutions as to give them a visible reality amenable to specific treatments." (Escobar 1984-85, 387) This strategy thus forms a *field of intervention of power* (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 387), explained by Foucault (1984e, 301), concerning the topic of sex in the 17th century, in the following words: "As if in order to gain mastery over it in reality, it had first been necessary to subjugate it at the level of language, control its free circulation in speech, expunge it from the things that were said, and extinguish the words that render it too visibly present."

Indienhilfe, as the name already suggests, focuses its development ambitions on the country of India and, with the act itself, involves India into the interplay of binary oppositions between the North and the South, or, as it is more common to say, between "developed" and "underdeveloped" countries. "Development writing constantly delineates and divides territory by means of a relentless dualistic logic," writes Crush (1995b, 14), representing whole regions either as donors or objects of development. "This tendency finds fruition in the simplistic reaggregation of demarcated units into homogenous swathes of territory that span the globe – the 'developing world,' the 'Third World,' the 'South.' These global spaces are inhabited by generic populations, with generic characteristics and generic landscapes either requiring transformation or in the process of being transformed," continues Crush (1995b, 15).

Nation-state plays in this process a significant role, as it is the one that is usually subjected to development programs. James Ferguson (cf. 1990, 55-73) makes this point evident when analyzing characteristics by which development programs describe the African state of Lesotho. He says that apart from epitomizing Lesotho as having aboriginal economy and agricultural society, development representations seek at illustrating Lesotho as having national economy and "neutral, unitary, and effective national government." (Ferguson 1990, 72) Bounding Lesotho's economy and society in national frames makes possible for development agencies to bring about the sort of

transformations they claim they are able to accomplish, thus supporting the framework within which these agencies operate. However, such demarcation of nation-state has additional consequences: "it creates an illusion that the nation-state is a functional unit rather than the product of a larger constellation of forces" (Crush 1995b, 14-15) and "described as a self-contained, bounded object, the country is constructed as something apart from the discourse that describes it." (Crush 1995b, 15) It can thus very easily happen that descriptions, such as "underdeveloped country," are taken as factual entities and not as historical categorizations which are not only entrenched in specific social, cultural, political and economic forces, but that also classify and gradate.

Hand in hand with such divisions of geographies goes also the classification of the populations inhabiting these spaces. The following excerpt from one of the IDP documents shows the representation of differences between "developed" and "not-yet-developed" people:

> In Baligeria IDP started with community awareness specially in the field of Education, health, organization & environment. Initially, it was too difficult to bring men & women together for meeting or training. But now different changes came into the community men & women group formed, saving habit, started, parents are taking interest to give their child education, child health, child care. Moreover, women and equally treating in the community. Superstitious belief gradually judging with logics and the group committee taking initiatives for solving the general problem (socio-economic). […] The people (lodha) [a tribe in India] who preferred to stay in jungle and also scared from locality during day time, they are also gradually coming to attend the small discussion in the villages. […] The […] teachers motivating boys & girls by music, dance and also beautiful poem etc. They are very poor and needy but we want to start real animation in these villages instead of charity / rehabilitation. (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003d)

People of the "underdeveloped" countries are represented as "staying in jungle," "needy" and "superstitious" that have to be animated by development practitioners and introduced into the world of "art," "logics" and "responsible society." Similar we read already in the cited project purpose (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2001a), where "the most downtrodden people" start "this journey" "of conscientisation" with "the cordial support of IH" in the frame of IDP.

The power of development lies in the construction of dichotomous images which, on the one side, aim at creating a "civilized Westerner" and, on the other side, piece together an "untutored, natural and childlike" (Crush 1995, 12) native. In this respect, it does not seem incorrect to talk of development discourse as a form of colonization, following Chandra T. Mohanty's conception of it. In discursive terms, colonization stands for a

"certain mode of appropriation and codification." (Mohanty 1991, 51) "However sophisticated or problematical," continues Mohanty (1991, 52), "its use as an explanatory construct, colonization almost inevitably implies a relation of structural domination, and a suppression – often violent – of the heterogeneity of the subject(s) in question." Development writings thus "discursively colonize the material and historical heterogeneities" (Mohanty 1991, 53) of the people in the global South.

Development discourse thus not only characterizes diverse groups of people with clear-cut labels, but also includes and excludes, creating a sense of Self and the Other.[12] Next to this, it assumes some sort of hierarchical relation between the two opposites, "privileging of a particular group as the norm or referent." (Mohanty 1991, 56) In the idea of development lies the concept of 'model,' by many development researchers embodied in the relationship between an adult and a child. As Stephen A. Marglin (1990, 2) writes: "'Development' makes sense in analysing the transformation of a child into an adult precisely because adult behaviour is an agreed standard against which to measure the progress of the child." Also Crush (1995, 12), when writing about Kate Manzo's contribution to his anthology, writes that "familiar dichotomies such as white/black, civilized/uncivilized, European/native are underpinned by a parent/child metaphor." In this way, development discourse implies the modernization idea that all societies travel the same historical trajectory, albeit their specific characters and environments. (Edelman and Haugerud 2007, 16)

Such imagery of disintegrated "tribal folk" creates an obvious need for external intervention, where "development animates the static and manages the chaotic." (Crush 1995, 10) "Change is inevitable" (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2007b), is written in one IDP document, and what a development project can do is "to interfere the process and bring a desired change so that the manifestation of change will contribute positively towards development of human lives and values." (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2007b) The reasons for intervention are usually seen as endogenous, attributed to tribalism, ethnicity, illiteracy, or ignorance of the local population. (cf. Crush 1995, 10) Hence development must come "from outside" rather than "from within," what, in fact, does not seem surprising as this is

[12] To read more about the notions of strangeness and the Other, please see Rottenburg (2006) and Shimada (2006).

not only one of the most taken-for-granted traits of contemporary international development, but also its raison d'être.[13]

> The ideology of international development calls for representing the world to be developed from the perspective of the institutions that are to do the developing – donors, governments, expatriates, non-governmental organizations, rather than from those waiting "to be developed." […] To do otherwise would question the basic rationale of planned development, which presupposes the need for external intervention. Empowerment and development from within may raise embarrassing questions about the need and justification for such assistance in the first place. (Gow 1996, 166)

Related to the mentioned is the depiction of development as "Eurocentric," which might seem too hastened, yet, if one follows the origins of development thought, one could reply to this depiction only: How could it be anything else? As Cowen and Shenton (1995, 41-42) write: "The conditions which gave rise to international development as a redress to progress arose first in Europe." Development can be seen as "Eurocentric" or "Westernizing" also in another regard. Frédérique Apffel Marglin (1990) writes about the reaction of Indian population to the introduction of smallpox vaccination between the early 19th Century and the years following India's independence. Her aim is to challenge "the claim of Western science to be a superior form of knowledge which renders obsolete more traditional systems of knowledge," (1990, 102) hence she decides to study a medical case that is usually seen as absolute success: the eradication of smallpox.

Vaccination was brought to India shortly after its discovery in England and tried to ban the practice used by the bulk of the Indian population, variolation.[14] The technical operation of variolation was accompanied by worship of the goddess of smallpox Śītalā and "the two aspects of the treatment were not experienced or thought of as being separate or as belonging to two different modes of thought and action." (Apffel Marglin 1990, 104) According to the author, such mode of thought can be named as 'non-logocentric,' highlighting the continuity between different natural processes and seeing the person as integral to natural and social environment. "The individual is not viewed – as in the modern West – as pitted against nature in an effort to conquer and dominate it, nor in opposition to society. In this system of though, the person's very being derives from his or her integration into nature, society, and cosmos." (Apffel Marglin 1990, 125)

[13] "What the map makes invisible is just as interesting as what it includes for this says a great deal about those who compile the maps. […] That the fruits of development practice may flow *from* rather than *to* the groups and areas 'targeted' is certainly not part of 'the map of development.' The 'interests of power' demand a rather different geography of development." (Crush 1995b: 17)

[14] Variolation or inoculation "consisted in inoculating healthy persons by picking the skin with a needle impregnated with human smallpox matter. (By contrast, vaccination uses cowpox matter.)" (Apffel Marglin 1990, 104)

The system of thought which predominates in the modern West designates the author, following Derrida, as 'logocentric,' which is underlay by binary oppositions, a system of differences that constitutes meaning in language. Applied to the case of smallpox, Apffel Marglin (1990, 103) observes the following: "Smallpox in modern medical discourse is a disease, and health is the absence of disease. There is an absolute boundary between the two terms which mutually define each other as presence and absence. Smallpox in non-modern India is a goddess who is *both* the presence and the absence of the disease."[15] The introduction of vaccination in India did not immediately displace variolation, however, after the British government in India outlawed variolation in 1865, the practice and the knowledge of the variolators irretrievably disappeared, although the worship of the goddess continues. The author (1990, 122) thinks that the colonial government's "logocentric approach to disease gave it an opportunity to take control of and institutionalize an activity heretofore outside its purview. Non-logocentric approaches to disease, be they Western or Indian, lend themselves with much greater difficulty to control by a centralized state." Yet, the disappearance of such knowledge was and is not considered as "real loss since it has been supplanted by a superior form of knowledge, that of vaccination and monocausal view of disease." (Apffel Marglin 1990, 104)

> The scientific system of knowledge is dominant in the world of development experts and the élites of the new nation-states of the Third World. It is a system which takes as axiomatic the separation between rational thought and beliefs in 'supernatural beings'. By contrast variolation was embedded in religious belief and practice, and the resistance to vaccination in India was in the name of the goddess of smallpox. Therefore the resistance was not seen as a political act but as obscurantism and superstition. (Apffel Marglin 1990, 105)

Hence it seems that development can no longer be development if it does not take "the benefits of modern medicine to the traditional, underdeveloped parts of the society,

[15] Also Tariq Banuri (1990) deals in his article with the supremacy of Western *episteme* over the traditional knowledge systems – the *technai*. He talks of two ways of perceiving the world: impersonal and personal maps. These exist in every culture. However, as Banuri writes, the uniqueness of the Western culture is that it favors just one of them, the impersonal. By this impersonality postulate, modernity tries to make everything impersonal. Related to this, we can read James Clifford's remarks in his *Introduction* (1986, 5): "Since the seventeenth century, they suggest, Western science has excluded certain expressive modes from its legitimate repertoire: rhetoric (in the name of "plain", transparent signification), fiction (in the name of the fact), and subjectivity (in the name of objectivity). The qualities eliminated from science were localized in the category of "literature." Literary texts are deemed to be metaphoric and allegorical, composed of inventions rather than observed facts; they allowed a wide latitude to the emotions, speculations, and subjective "genius" of their authors. De Certeau notes that the fictions of literary language were scientifically condemned (and esthetically appreciated) for lacking "univocity," the purportedly unambiguous accounting of natural science and professional history. In this schema, the discourse of literature and fiction is inherently unstable; it "plays on the stratification of meaning; it narrates one thing in order to tell something else; it delineates itself in a language from which it continuously draws effects of meaning that cannot be circumscribed or checked" (1983, 128). This discourse, repeatedly banished from science, but with uneven success, is incurably figurative and polysemous."

unless diseases and pestilences are removed by modern knowledge from the lives of the citizens, and unless the entire population of a country is brought within the ambit of the modern doctor and taken out of the domination of folk wisdom, domestic remedies, and the non-modern healers." (Nandy and Visvanathan 1990, 146) In similar way, we can find in IDP reports development discourse that aims at leading away from "misconceptions" and "social taboos" by "raising awareness" about Western medical issues. (cf. e.g. Seva Kendra Calcutta 2007a) Besides, one of the aims of IDP is the elimination of certain local practices, often seen as "superstitious," even though IDP simultaneously supports certain other types of local knowledge (e.g. herbal medicine) and supports its practice. (cf. Cyriac Elias Voluntary Association 2000; Seva Kendra Calcutta 2003c, 2007b)

This goes together with what we have already shown in the historical overview of the development discourse – that much of the contemporary discourse on development is underlaid by notions of 'indigenous knowledge,' 'empowerment' and 'participation.' These notions promote "a change of power relations," (Fernando 2003, 61); stand for "planning in which the direction and rate of change affecting localities should be set, to the extent possible, by the local people themselves" (Bennett 1988, 15); and advocate for a "much fuller use of local skills and knowledge in any development operation, whoever may set the goals." (Bennett 1988, 15)[16] But these concepts are not unproblematic and have recently been subjected to critical scrutiny. What is attractive about these notions is their demand to shift the development efforts from the development agencies to the local population. Still, what such "empowerment" tries to achieve stays, according to many, the same: modernity. As Henkel and Stirrat (in Gow 2002, 307) write: "The attempt to empower people through the projects envisaged and implemented by the practitioners of the new orthodoxy is always an attempt, however benevolent, to reshape the personhood of the participants. It is in this sense that we argue that 'empowerment' is tantamount to what Foucault calls subjection."

Generally, indigenous knowledge (IK) in development discourse is considered as local, "informal, experiential, and uncodified" (Fernando 2003, 56) knowledge system in

[16] De Feyter's article *Localizing Human Rights* (2006), for example, stresses the 'view from below' where local perception of human rights should be taken in consideration and invited to a dialogue with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, thus establishing a more reciprocial approach to their declaration.

comparison to the system of knowledge associated with the Western sciences. However, such definition of IK tells more about what IK isn't than what it is. Besides, the binary opposition between the so-called indigenous and scientific knowledge is an institutional one rather than naturally given and is based on opposing attributes such as subjective/objective and local/universal which are in themselves problematic. It is not anymore tenable to believe that scientific knowledge is "divorced from the social, political, and economic contexts in which it is produced and implemented." (Fernando 2003, 57) Science is attached to a specific social milieu and hence cannot be viewed as objective but "as practice and culture." (Fernando 2003, 57) Similarly problematic is the distinction between local and universal. "The term *local* […] is an ambiguous concept. It is relative and its boundary with the universal is dynamic. […] What is local knowledge is construed in relation to its exterior," writes Fernando (2003, 58), indicating that locality and universality don't exist *per se* but only in relation to each other. Next to this, it is difficult to claim that a knowledge system of a particular group is "pure and authentic in terms of its origins, content, and methods of practical use." (Fernando 2003, 58) Instead it is characterized by hybridity and a constant dialogue with its wider context. IK is a situated knowledge that "provides people with a body of ideas and practices which can be adapted to changing circumstances, but which can also, should the occasion or the opportunity arise, change the nature of the circumstances." (Gow 1996, 170) Hence one needs to examine IK (as well as scientific knowledge) as a social phenomenon produced within a specific context and further analyze it in the frame of the institutional and power relations in which it is embedded, allowing it to take different forms in unlike surroundings and to be appropriated in the ways unintended. (cf. Fernando 2003, 56-59)

Although notions like 'IK' and 'participation' cannot be simply replicated; despite their meanings change and their usages get appropriated in different environments by different actors, they are continuingly being reduced to their oversimplified definitions and uncomplicated consequences. May the contemporary development texts not be always clearly dividing (as one can see in IH and IDP documents), "yet […] one of the basic impulses of those who write development is a desire to define, categorize and bring order to a heterogeneous and constantly multiplying field of meaning." (Crush 1995, 2) This is exactly the point where power is deployed in development discourse, while

language essentially orders our understanding of the world and validates the interventions we make into it. As James Clifford (1986, 7) puts it in connection to ethnographic texts: "In this view, more Nietzschean than realist or hermeneutic, all constructed truths are made possible by powerful "lies" of exclusion and rhetoric. Even the best ethnographic texts – serious, true fictions – are systems, or economies, of truth. Power and history work through them, in ways their authors cannot fully control." Despite the fact that most development texts are quite prosaic in their highly repetitive form, banal style of language and pedant threading of data, these texts are also written in a figurative language of images, metaphors and allusions (as we can observe in the documents of IDP). This is done with the purpose (which is not only the purpose of development, but also of many other texts) "to convince, to persuade, that this (and not that) is the way world actually is and ought to be amended." (Crush 1995, 5)

To summarize: the basic principle according to which development discourse structures and problematizes is the one of binary oppositions and the supposed hierarchical rather than dialectical relation between opposing poles. This is a principle which stems out of Western philosophical tradition and is thus not immanent in the nature of things but, instead, historical and social. This is a most crucial observation, as it uncovers the functioning of knowledge on which development discourse is settled and of power relations in which it is embedded. (cf. Banuri 1990, 88)

3. 3. 2 Professionalization

Professionalization refers "mainly to the process that brings the Third World into the politics of expert knowledge and Western science in general." (Escobar 1995, 45) It is accomplished through processes by which politics of truth are created and maintained, through which certain forms of knowledge are given the status of truth, so to speak. In regard to development, professionalization was achieved through the application of existing disciplines to Third World issues, i.e. through the establishment of development sciences and subdisciplines, which are nowadays consolidated in the field of development studies. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 387-388; 1988, 430; 1995, 45) The professionalization of development discourse "made possible the progressive incorporation of problems into the space of development, bringing problems to light in ways congruent with the established

system of knowledge and power." (Escobar 1995, 45) This strategy resulted in a *field of control of knowledge* through which truth and thus power are produced. As Foucault (1984a, 74) writes: ""Truth" is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extends it."

The shift from the colonial discourse of progress to the modern discourse of development in the mid of the 20th century influenced Western academia in two ways. Not only that historical processes of decolonization and creation of new nation-states produced new fields of inquiry, they also created a sudden, large demand for new kinds of knowledge. A whole range of advisory committees was constructed and the technical side of bureaucracy of these countries was expanded, creating a demand for relevant training of their employees. These processes also affected academia, resulting in the establishment of programs related to development studies in most major universities in the developed world and produced the creation or restructuring of Third World universities (by e.g. training of Third World students at U.S. and European universities, socialization of professors into the empirical social science model in Third World universities) to suit the needs of development. (cf. Escobar 1988, 431; 1995, 45; Cooper and Packard 1997, 13) In this way, "the professionalization of development also made it possible to remove all problems from the political and cultural realms and to recast them in terms of the apparently more neutral realm of science." (Escobar 1995, 45)

Two most important disciplines related to development studies are economics and anthropology. Escobar (cf. 1984-85, 388) points to the importance of development economics which subjected development subdisciplines to the economic rationality, hence "economizing" development. This has to be viewed in the larger perspective of "the economization of life," the advance during the last two hundred years of a specific economic rationality which is linked to the progress of capitalism and entails "as necessary prerequisites the establishment of the normative discourse of classical political economy, the adoption of certain principles of government…and the introduction of new forms of discipline and control." (Escobar 1984-85, 388)

Anthropology is, on the other hand, characterized as having a particularly ambivalent relationship with development. Its relation to development "has been both especially difficult and especially central, thanks to anthropology's historical role as the science of

"less developed" peoples." (Ferguson 1997, 152) According to Ferguson (1997), the idea of social evolution, which gave to anthropology its early conceptual coherence, is closely related to the idea of development, and even though the strength of the social evolutionist thought was largely eroded from anthropology in the course of the 20th century, the academic division of labor still places anthropology in relation to "less developed." Development is, however, not only intimately associated with anthropology, but is also subjected to critical scrutiny and skeptical observation by this social science. One of the development's essential features, which "entails the simultaneous recognition and negation of difference; Third World subjects are recognized as different, on the one hand, whereas development is precisely the mechanism through which that difference is to be obliterated, on the other," (Escobar 1997, 497) is the foundation of anthropology's uneasiness with development. As Ferguson (1997, 169) summarizes:

> We are left, then, with a curious dual organization binding anthropology to its evil twin: the field that fetishizes the local, the autonomous, the traditional, locked in a strange, agonistic dance with the field that, through the magic of development, would destroy locality, autonomy, and tradition in the name of becoming modern. Anthropology is left with a distinct resentment of its evil twin, Development; but also with a certain intimacy, and an uneasy recognition of a disturbing, inverted resemblance.

Anthropologists have generally accepted the idea that development is a problematic and invasive concept, which is dealt with within the filed of anthropology in two broad schools of thought: development anthropology and anthropology of development.[17] The relationship between anthropology and development has witnessed inside this anthropological milieu a heated discussion, which has in the last decades resulted in a more nuanced understanding of development and its operations. (cf. Escobar 1997, 498)

The establishment of development subdisciplines and their consolidation under the name of 'development studies' in numerous universities and other educational and research institutions throughout the world produces a powerful mechanism for creation of truths about the global South. "The policies and programs that originated from this vast field of knowledge inevitably carried with them strong normalizing components. At stake was a politics of knowledge that allowed experts to classify problems and formulate policies, to pass judgment on entire social groups and forecast their future – to produce, in short, a regime of truth and norms about them," writes Escobar (1995, 46)

[17] More about these two schools was written in the chapter *2.1 Anthropology and Development, Anthropology of Development*.

The consequences of this seemingly neutral but deeply ideological strategy of professionalization for the groups and countries about which the knowledge is produced are immense. Although development knowledge is neatly situated in the area of science, this is only an obstruction for its political and historical character and consequences it produces. As Chandra T. Mohanty (1991, 53) notes: "There can, of course, be no apolitical scholarship."

The field of professionalization is intimately connected with the process of institutionalization, and together these two amount to a tool "that organizes the production of forms of knowledge and the deployment of forms of power, relating one to the other." (Escobar 1995, 46)

3. 3. 3 Institutionalization

The invention of development involved also the establishment of an institutional field from which discourses are produced, stabilized, modified and put into circulation. Institutionalization of development took place at various levels, extending from international and national planning organizations to local development bodies, encompassing departments and bureaucracies of the states throughout the world, aid agencies and multilateral organizations, NGOs, private sector organizations and consultants, experts and institutes of development studies etc. Inside and from this institutional field development discourses are produced, stabilized, modified and put into operation. These institutions are the agents of deployment of development, the net of which constitutes the 'development apparatus,' which, since its start in the mid-1940s, did not cease to spread. The strategy of institutionalization thus represents the *dispersion of local centres of power-knowledge*, the establishment of a multiplicity of sites of power which make possible the disciplinary system of development. (cf. Crush 1995b, 6; Escobar 1984-85, 388; 1988, 431; 1995, 46)

Institutions within the development apparatus are, however, not equal and the power among them is distributed in a highly uneven manner. The acceptance of certain development ideas or discourse by key institutions, such as WB, gives power to these ideas and imposes further consensus. Reasons for adopting a certain discourse by these institutions are numerous, ranging from socio-political contexts and economic interests to

institutional transformations, interests and capacities. Yet, "the fact that a new orthodoxy emerges within powerful institutions does not by itself explain the wider acceptance of this orthodoxy." (Cooper and Packard 1997, 21) The knowledge about development produced by dominating institutions is diffused "through applied programs, conferences, international consultant services, local extension practices, and so on," (Escobar 1995, 46) which is further related to the central position of these institutions in development finances, networks of research, communication and training, and to the changes in global economy and shifts in global politics. But as development ideas spread out from key institutions, they might not be simply agreed to or copied. They are rather challenged and disputed, signifying for different people, different groups in different environments dissimilar things.[18] (cf. Cooper and Packard 1997, 20-29)

Still, it seems that major development institutions follow their narrow definitions and single-meaning language, ignoring the wider plurality of discourses. As the authors point out, these development ideas are a "part of a range of template mechanisms […] which are used to simplify and control complex environments." (Cooper and Packard 1997, 24) According to them, these templates can be expanded into far-reaching cultural paradigms or constructs which preclude analysis of social relations, hierarchies and structures of power, hence structuring options, defining relevant data and ruling out alternatives. Application of templates to real world serves as filter of experience, enabling the development apparatus to focus on its objects not as they are, but as generic categories. Next to this, "academic disciplines as much as development institutions work through paradigms and other template mechanisms which are resistant to change, and the way they select future practitioners often works to exclude rather than encourage form of knowledge which challenge the discipline's core assumptions." (Cooper and Packard 1997, 27) At this point it is also important to note, as it can be also seen in the documents of IDP and Indienhilfe, that development

> institutions rely heavily on a documentary reality, composed of texts, reports, guidelines, memoranda, and the like which serve as a means of representing, preserving, and controlling a given reality, in this case underdevelopment. […] The discourse tends to be self-referential and intertextual in the sense that the major references, the major sources of information, and the major

[18] This is the point where Foucauldian approach may fail. As Rossi (cf. 2004) shows, Foucault's philosophy provides valuable conceptual tools for unraveling the regimes of rationality underpinning development practices, however, it fails to address the relations between discourse and agency within hierarchically stratified contexts. In this respect, Pierre Bourdieu's analytical tools might be more helpful.

> ideas come from texts produced within the institution, with little or on reference to outside sources. Too many references to such sources could undermine the institution. (Gow 1996, 168)

Problematic about such mode of thinking is not only the way it constructs certain problems and controls the topics discussed in development discourse, but also its ability to affect social relations. Escobar (1988, 435) provides an example of labeling:

> One such practice, for instance, is the production of labels ("small farmers," "illiterate peasants," "pregnant and lactating women," etc.) which the appropriate programs would treat and reform. These labels – and, in general, the professional discourses that sustain them – inevitable structure the encounter of the organization and its "clients" (e.g., peasants) in such a way that the latter's local reality is transcended and elaborated upon by the former. In the process, peasants are organized by the development apparatus as producers, or as elements to be displaced, or modernized, or "integrated" into the national economy. In other words, they are managed and controlled, obliged to maneuver within the limits posed by the institutions.

There are numerous additional institutional practices which contribute to organizing the reality. One of them is that development discourse used by a certain organization seems to be an isolated act, separated from "conflicting interests and worldviews, in the course of which choices are made and exclusions effected." (Escobar 1991, 667) Development practices thus appear as rational and deduced from objective analysis, despite the fact they are mostly predetermined conclusions. Another practice is the demarcation of new fields of development (e.g. rural development) and subdisciplines of development study (e.g. development anthropology), and their assignment to experts. "This operation not only assumes the pre-existence of compartments such as "health," "agriculture," "culture," and the like – which are in truth no more than fictions created by the scientists – but also imposes them on cultures to which they are alien. Along the way, states, dominant institutions, and mainstream ways are strengthened and the domain of their action is inexorably expanded." (Escobar 1991, 667) This we can observe also in IDP, where the development approach is separated in several distinct units (health, education, finances etc.). Not only are these "sections" of the project perceived as taken-for-granted, their connections are as well.[19]

The scientific neutrality of identifying the "problems" of development, which we discussed in the preceding chapter, is another of such apparently rational measures which are actually political, having the power of creating and transforming. (cf. Escobar 1991, 666-668) To sum up:

[19] The already mentioned description of the integrated development approach by Sudarsan Dey (Seva Kendra Calcutta 2006b) is only one of the examples.

> Policy is thus bureaucratized and depoliticized through "commonsense" practices such as planning. Strategies such as "rural development" are seen as exogenous to social and political situations, charitable medicines provided by the "international community" to be applied on sore spots perceived as external. Moreover, professional ideologies […] provide the categories with which "facts" can be named an analyzed. This means, simply said, that the encounter between, say, peasants and development experts is socially constructed, that is, structured by professional and bureaucratic mechanisms which are anterior to the encounter. The local situation is inevitably transcended and objectified as it is translated into documentary and conceptual forms that can be recognized by the institutions. In this way, the locally historical is greatly determined by nonlocal practices of institutions. Not only that, but since the internal processes of organizations are tied to social relations involving governments and specific groups, they become an aspect of ruling: organizations rely upon and replicate conceptions and means of description that are features of the world as understood and practiced for those who rule it. The "development encounter" produces forms of consciousness that are more the property of organizations and ruling groups than a reflection of the concrete coming together of individuals. (Escobar 1991, 667-668)

The example of IDP and IH raises further questions regarding institutionalization of development discourse: questions about civil society bodies (i.e. NGOs), donor relations and their broader embedment in national and global environments.

In the international context, NGOs have been attributed the agency of bridging the gap between different policy structures and people. This agency has been attributed on the basis of certain assumptions underpinning the work of NGOs: (a) NGOs are a part of civil society, thus reflecting people's needs and being close to them; (b) this closeness allows effective reaching of people by NGOs; (c) thus NGOs should be placed in the center of service delivery; and (d) thus NGOs can increase accountability and transparency of governments in accordance with their development and restructuring plans.[20] (cf. Seckinelgin 2006, 720-721) As Hardt and Negri (2000, 312) write:

> The newest and perhaps most important forces in the global civil society go under the name of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The term NGO has not been given a very rigorous definition, but we would define it as any organization that purports to present the People and operate in its interest, separate from (and often against) the structured of the state. Many in fact regard NGOs as synonymous with "people's organizations" because the People's interest is defined in distinction from state interest.

Development NGOs are similarly seen as people-centered organizations, not working only to satisfy the needs of "the poor" but also to assist them in articulating them. Parallel

[20] However, Hakan Seckinelgin (2006) criticizes such conception of NGOs' agency, saying that it "becomes rendered in generic terms independent of the socio-political context in which it may have emerged." (2006, 721) Seckinelgin argues, when analyzing NGOs' activities a significant emphasis has to be placed on "social processes implicit in multiple institutionalized settings that differently frame NGO identity and agency." (Seckinelgin 2006: 720) Relating to the work of Mary Douglas (1986), Seckinelgin argues that NGOs are not only participating in the creation of agreed conventions involving numerous social actors, but are seen also embedded in certain socio-political relations which structure and limit their capacities to act, placing them "within a policy field-specific set of justificatory norms, values and knowledge claims." (Seckinelgin 2006, 720) However, as this thesis primary emphasis lies on a different issue, we shall for now pursue our work down the lines of more general recognitions about NGOs and leave this comment as a useful reminder for any future, and more extensive researches of NGOs.

to this one can observe an increasing importance of Southern NGOs in providing development work, arguing that "development in the Third World is their responsibility – from setting the development priorities to implementing projects to generating more of their own funds." (Drabek 1987b, x) The case of IDP supports this claim; moreover, the relationship between the two organizations, working on this project, has been close to what is considered a sincere partnership between northern and southern NGOs.[21]

An interesting observation regarding the place of NGOs in the contemporary global context may be drawn out of the book by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000), called *Empire.* The authors name the present state of global affairs the 'Empire,' which is, according to them, a form of contemporary global rule which knows no boarders and dominates (and creates) the world in a total way, encompassing the widths and depths of human population. (cf. Hardt and Negri 2000, xiv-xv) Michel Foucault's work provides useful concepts and techniques of understanding this present empire state. (cf. Hardt and Negri 2000, 22-24) His work does not only offer an understanding of transition from *disciplinary society* to the *society of control*, which characterizes the new paradigm of power and is exemplified with "democratic" mechanisms of control which become immanent to society and internal to the bodies and minds of its population. Moreover, Foucault helps us to recognize the *bio-political* nature of the contemporary empire governance. Bio-power brings "phenomena peculiar of the life of the human species into the order of knowledge and power, into the sphere of political techniques," (Foucault 1984d, 264) or, as Hardt and Negri (2000, 23-24) put it:

> Biopower is a form of power that regulates social life from its interior, following it, interpreting it, absorbing it, and rearticulating it. Power can achieve an effective command over the entire life of the population only when it becomes an integral, vital function that every individual embraces and reactivates of his or her own accord. […] The highest function of this power is to invest life through and through, and its primary task is to administer life. Biopower thus refers to a situation in which what is directly at stake in power is the production and reproduction of life itself.

In this frame of global reign, there exists, besides military, also juridical and moral intervention, moral instruments representing the beginning of the Empire's power of intervention. Bodies that most importantly contribute to the practice of moral interventions are NGOs. The fact that they are not run by governments assumes that

[21] This is characterized by "mutual respect, trust, and equality; transparency or reciprocal accountability; understanding of each others' political/economic/cultural contexts and of institutional constraints; openness to learning from each other; and a long-term commitment to working together." (Drabek 1987, xi)

NGOs act on the basis of moral imperatives. By conducting ""just wars" without arms, without violence, without boarders," (Hardt and Negri 2000, 36) oriented towards the symbolic production of the Other with some of the most effective means of communication, these organizations are completely immersed in the bio-political nature of Empire and anticipate the power of its pacifying intervention of justice. (cf. Negri and Hardt 2000, 35-36)

Through a slight conceptual change, substituting humanitarian NGOs with the development ones, the following paragraph might offer an elusive summary of the role of NGOs in the contemporary world:

> For our argument, and in the context of Empire, we are most interested in a subject of NGOs that strive to represent the least among us, those who cannot represent themselves. These NGOs, which are sometimes characterized broadly as humanitarian organizations, are in fact the ones that have come to be among the most powerful and prominent in the contemporary global order. Their mandate is not really to further the particular interests of any limited groups but rather to represent directly global and universal human interests. Human rights organizations […], peace groups […], and the medical and famine relief agencies […] all defend human life against torture, starvation, massacre, imprisonment, and political assassinations. Their political action rests on a universal moral call – what is at stake is life itself. In this regard it is perhaps inaccurate to say that these NGOs represent those who cannot represent themselves (the warring populations, the starving masses, and so forth) or even that they represent the global People in its entirety. They go further than that. What they really represent is the vital force that underlines the People, and thus they transform politics into a question of generic life, life in all its generality. These NGOs extend far and wide in the humus of biopower; they are the capillary ends of the contemporary networks of power […]. Here, at this broadest, most universal level, the activities of these NGOs coincide with the workings of Empire "beyond politics," on the terrain of biopower, meeting the needs of life itself. (Hardt and Negri 2000, 313-314)

Indienhilfe, in a similar way, perceives development rather as moral than a political issue, describing it in terms of humane well-being for everyone and responsible behavior by the people in the "developed" countries as by the ones in the "Third World." In this Indienhilfe' discourse of development resembles the one of Robert Chambers, who "combing locally defined concepts of well-being […] with that of personal responsibility, […] creates the idea of "responsible well-being" as an overarching end to which all else – livelihood security, human capabilities, equity, and sustainability – contributes, and to which the powerful and the wealthy have perhaps the most to contribute." (Gow 2002, 307) Development is thus not seen so much as a political practice, embedded in power relations, but as some kind of personal conversion, stressing especially the moral values of the concerned. James Ferguson (1990) calls such development institutions an "anti-

politics machine," trying to cast development problems in apolitical, ahistorical, techno-managerial terms and simultaneously disguising their profound political nature.

In the case of IDP, Indienhilfe acts as a donor, yet, the resources transferred to SKC include more then just money, namely also information, knowledge and skills. Ebrahim (cf. 2003, 52-76) emphasizes the importance of another type of symbolic resources, those of reputation and status. The main point is that "the possibilities for exchanging and converting between various kinds of capital enable organizations to develop *interdependencies,* thereby reducing the uncertainties associated with their respective behaviors and thus the outcomes of their actions." (Ebrahim 2003, 75) Following Pierre Bourdieu, Ebrahim claims that the exchange of symbolic capital plays an important role in the interaction between NGOs and donors, as it represents a "form of power because of its association with expertise and thus with knowledge production." (Ebrahim 2003, 53) Ebrahim admits that even though the interactions between donors and NGOs are deeply structured by the exchanges of capital, they cannot be reduced only to them, given the common development aspirations.

The relationship between donors and organizations receiving their resources is a highly complicated one and needs a closer examination. According to Ebrahim (cf. 2003, 78-103) the core issue in the relationship between donors and NGOs lies in "highly politicized world of reporting and monitoring." (Ebrahim 2003, 2) NGOs are required by their international donors to provide reporting systems out of reasons of financial accountability and supervision of project implementation. However, this often causes tensions since many donors want to see evidence of fast results and "successes," even though social change is usually a slow process.[22] Such monitoring requirements of donors, which favor "product" data (information that is generally about physical and financial details, usually measurable by indicators and quantitative analysis) over "process" data (information that contains details of the qualitative and less easily measured dimensions of work), have a double impact on NGOs: they maneuver their attention and promote "positivist and easily quantifiable valuations of success and

[22] Also Bennett (1988, 18) emphasizes the factor of time, saying that "one of the most familiar critiques of the development process is the inadequate sense of time displayed by the aid agencies and the legislatures or treasuries that fund them." According to him (1988: 18), it often appears that if "payoff does not appear soon after an investment, it must be adjudged a loss."

failure." (Ebrahim 2003, 78) The focus on product rather than process data has an additional, depoliticizing effect: "A product data analysis treats NGO interventions as a collection of simple, discrete, and socially undifferentiated projects amenable to quantitative analysis, while downplaying the embeddedness of those activities in complex social and political environments." (Ebrahim 2003, 81) Also in the reports of IDP, one can observe a visible preference for quantitative analysis. The evaluation reports mainly consist of the described "product" data, however, there is also a tendency to mix it with qualitative data in the form of, for instance, case studies.

Ebrahim advances the given argument by claiming that the focus on product data significantly affects decision-making processes in NGOs: (1) organizational attention becomes restricted regarding other types of information, and may in certain cases reorient attention of NGOs upwards to donors, away from grassroots, supporters and staff; and (2) NGOs are able to secure the financial support and, simultaneously, protect themselves from too big donor's influence on them.[23] Yet, "ironically, it is through their very efforts to influence and resist one another that the NGOs and funders end up "reproducing" their relationships and tensions." (Ebrahim 2003, 78)

Related issue regarding NGO-donor relationship is one of dependency, many organizations feeling that "they have paid too high a price in terms of loss of autonomy, compromise of their priorities and lack of their own institutional identity in the way they have had to approach donors for funds." (Drabek 1987b, xi) Successful, people-led, long-term development can be achieved, according to these development institutions, only with "more core funding for sustained capacity building instead of funding on a project basis. Project support encourages a piecemeal approach to fundraising and development activities, whereas long-term strategic planning is crucial to successful development." (Drabek 1987b, xi) Because of this, southern development NGOs attach high priority "to finding ways to raise resources in their own countries so as to increase their autonomy and self-reliance." (Drabek 1987b, xi) Ebrahim (2003, 2), however, disagrees with "the standard notion that NGOs are "dependent" on international organizations for funds." Instead, he argues (cf. 2003, 2) that there exists interdependence between donors and

[23] "It is noteworthy that this resistance is not necessarily overt, deliberate, or easily identifiable. [It] may appear as compliance to funder requests rather than subtle forms of resistance which enable the NGOs to carry on as usual." (Ebrahim 2003, 102)

NGOs in which NGOs control funding by supplying information on "successful" parts of the projects, thereby conveying a positive picture of themselves and their development activities. This leads to a highly structured interaction that favors short-term and easily measurable activities instead of long-term processes of social change. Ebrahim sees the source of this issue in the more fundamental question of how to measure success and connects it to the issue of learning. NGOs are not mere passive recipients of the ideas, demands and technologies which they receive next to the financial support, but respond to them, often in unexpected ways, and engage themselves "in complex learning processes that eventually lead to modifications in their activities and ideas about development." (Ebrahim 2003, 9) Even more importantly, "sometimes these changes and learning even shape the ideas and behavior of funders." (Ebrahim 2003, 9)

NGOs have also an important relation to national governments, both in political as well as financial way. The example of Indienhilfe supports wider research literature in its claim that NGOs are not uncritical regarding the acceptance of funds from governments.[24] As Drabek (1987b, xiii) writes, "it is generally held that accepting such funds can compromise an NGO and pose a serious threat to its integrity, autonomy, and advocacy role." An interesting point is, however, that multilateral donors can serve as a "buffer" between governments and NGOs, "in order to avoid unnecessary political tension and to promote coherent national development strategies." (Drabek 1987b, xiv) This, however, does not erase the question of dependency, as we could see before.

Hence, NGOs are finding themselves in a thick organizational context, in which many of its actors have to be mobilized to put NGOs' activities into effect; in which flows of funds and information concerning NGO activities often pass through multiple organizational tiers; and in which a certain predominating discourse on development has to be accepted in order to legitimate NGOs' activities, thereby assessing NGOs' activities in a unitary manner that ignores features of NGOs environments and specific behavior. Although may pervasiveness of development discourses have a homogenizing effect on NGOs, organizational learning provides ways for NGOs to constantly adapt their activities to the contexts in which they are working, thus representing a dialectical relationship between structure and agency. (cf. Ebrahim 2003, 32-33, 152-154)

[24] For more, please see Ebrahim (2003, 77).

3. 4 Resistance

> *"I do not think that it is possible to say that one thing is of the order of "liberation" and another is of the order of "oppression." There are a certain number of things that one can say with some certainty about a concentration camp to the effect that it is not an instrument of liberation, but one should still take into account – and this is not generally acknowledged – that, aside from torture and execution, which preclude any resistance, no matter how terrifying a given system may be, there always remain the possibilities of resistance, disobedience, and oppositional groupings. On the other hand, I do not think that there is anything that is functionally – by its very nature – absolutely liberating. Liberty is a practice. So there may, in fact, always be a certain number of projects whose aim is to modify some constraints, to loosen, or even to break them, but none of these projects can, simply by its nature, assure that people will have liberty automatically, that it will be established by the project itself. The liberty of men is never assured by the institutions and laws that are intended to guarantee them. This is why almost all of these laws and institutions are quite capable of being turned around. Not because they are ambiguous, but simply because "liberty" is what must be exercised." (Foucault 1984c, 245)*

Now that we have provided a more complete image of how development discourse historically progressed, how it is structured and what kinds of power and knowledge are used for its installment, we can move to the study of the natures and possibilities of its counter-discourses and strategies of resistance. Only by knowing "the historical conditions which motivate our conception" (Foucault 1983, 209) of development, only by having "a historical awareness of our present circumstances" (Foucault 1983, 209) that are creating the context in which modern development discourse is existing and working, we are able to search out the possible sites of resistance and to rearrange the existing scheme of power relations. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 380)

Foucault (cf.1983, 212) distinguishes between three types of struggles: (1) against forms of *exploitation*, which divide individuals from what they produce; (2) against forms of (social, religious, professional, sexual, ethnic etc.) *domination*; and (3) against forms of *subjection*, which tie the individual to her/himself and submit her/him to the others in this manner.[25] These forms (and their concurring types of struggle) coexist in any given society in numerous ways, although one of them usually predominates. The point is that there exists a multiplicity of forms of power and that they are all immanent in various types of relations such as economic, sexual, familial, social, international etc. Power relations are the result of the disequilibria of these relations and, simultaneously, the root of their transformations. Moreover, it is the interlocking of these other types of relations with the relations of power that can sketch the more general image of

[25] However, the necessary prerequisite for resistance is the *awareness* of oppression. (cf. Banuri 1990, 91)

domination and present it in its more or less coherent, unitary strategy. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 380-381)

> Thus […] any strategy [of resistance] which overlooks this manifold structure of power is self-defeating. To the multiplicity of forms of power, we must respond with a multiplicity of localized resistances and counteroffensives. These localized resistances, however, must be of a radical and uncompromising character if they are to confront the totality of power. Rather than a massive revolutionary process, the strategy must be aimed at developing a network of struggles, points of resistance, and popular bases. This does not mean, however, that global processes should be abandoned. Like power, the multiplicity of resistances may be integrated into global strategies. (Escobar 1984-85, 381)

Deployment of development did not stay unchallenged either. Even if, or, maybe better, because this deployment exhibits power and control over the people concerned (people from the countries of both, global North and South), it makes possible the advancement of counter-discourses. As Crush (1995b, 8) notes: "Development, for all its power to speak and to control the terms of speaking, has never been impervious to challenge and resistance, nor, in response, to reformulation and change." Many in the countries of the global South did not simply take over the vocabulary of development, but transformed it and used it for means unpredicted by the dominant development machine. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 390)

This does, however, not mean that there exists one single discourse which is in some kind of (dis)continuous way subjected to alterations and variations, but that there subsists a plurality of discourses, in relation to which people are differently situated. As no discourse is *a priori* 'truer' or 'falser' in comparison to the others, some of them take a central, dominant position among them, while the others have been confined to marginality. (cf. Rossi 2004, 6) Which discourse gets the position of centrality, of the truth is socially constructed and "seems to depend upon the views and policies of those in position of authority in universities, national governments and international agencies." (Cowen and Shenton 1995, 28) It was precisely the historical context of the predominant, modernistic discourse of development and the relations of power underpinning it that we tried to analyze in the previous pages, hence showing the social constructiveness of this discourse, and the rationality and strategies its existence and functioning are based upon. We shall now take a closer look to the development discourses that act contra to this centralized development machinery and contemplate on the possibilities of resistance.

Many counter-discourses appear, as already said, as modifications and transformations of hegemonic development discourse, using it for their own ends and against the goals and practices established by this dominant discourse. These resistances thus take part in the same discursive field and within the same space of power relations as the dominant strategy. This opens questions such as: to what extent can such counter-discourse undermine the hegemonic discourse and change the power relation; or in what ways is this counter-discourse appropriated and circumvented by the dominant one? (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 390; Gow 1996, 168) Cooper and Packard (1990, 30), for instance, argue that "development rhetoric represents one possible framework in terms of which causes can be mobilized. The point is not that development – any more than a lost of universal human rights – itself offers answers, but that it shapes possibilities for political mobilization that cross differences of culture, nationality, and geography." According to them, numerous notions of development discourse, such as e.g. "indigenous" and "local," can be politically useful despite their incongruence with the complex reality they try to describe. "It is often in the name of "indigenous rights" that movements […] make a coherent and compelling case […]. While the leaders of such movements my gain structure by linkages to international NGOs as much as by support of a "community," is by demonstrating the power of the local that they make a case," they (1997, 28) write.

Yet, if counter-discourse does not break up with the forms of rationality and powers that shape hegemonic discourse of development and continues to operate in the same discursive field, it will not be able to counter the existing structures of power – "the tyranny of globalizing discourses with their hierarchy and all their privileges of a theoretical *avant-garde*" (Foucault 1980, 83) – and replace them with new ones. An example of counter-discourse that breaks with the dominant development discourse is the notion of Participatory Action Research (PAR). Central to the notion of PAR is the issue of popular power, i.e. the mechanisms necessary to develop popular-counter-power for the production of knowledge and social transformation. Hence PAR does not aim at development, but at generation of local power. PAR projects integrate techniques of adult education, social science research and political activism, more specifically they use methods of critical reconstruction of local histories; the restoration and use of popular cultures; new ways of diffusing knowledge; collective research between external agents

and the popular groups concerned, always taking popular knowledge as the starting point for action etc. More importantly, PAR represents, from a philosophical point of view, a radical departure from traditional Western thought. It rejects subject/object dualism, which is central to Western philosophy, and instead builds subject/subject relationships. By creating a close, but tensely dialectical relationship between the local population and the external agents, external agents start to share with local population their political commitment and goals of local transformations, enabling the relation of mutual commitment, not submission and dependence. This tends to create open-ended projects, which may last for many years and may branch out in diverse directions. These projects are thus not evaluated in terms of some criteria of "objective" knowledge, but rather on the basis of the practices and actions they enable. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 391-392)

> Since one of the major foundations of power is truth, the knowledge of that truth – i.e. its invention and confirmation – becomes as major mechanism for the legitimation of the hegemonic forms of power within a given system. Discourse thus seeks its legitimacy in a carefully controlled definition of science and truth. The counterdiscourse of participatory research, initiated in the Third World, conceives of popular science as the result of an endogenous process in which theory-building and popular organization for action are combined. Within this process of social theory as practice, not only existing social conditions, but science itself, are permanently transformed. In this way, it constitutes a radical challenge to the regime of knowledge and truth that has ruled discourse and life up to the present. (Escobar 1984-85, 392)

Participatory action research is not an isolated example of counter-discourses – there exists a number of local, grass-root and global movements which are taking a resisting stance towards the dominating discourse of development. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 392) Foucault (cf. 1980, 80-87) observes that since 1960s an "increasing vulnerability to criticism of things, institutions, practices, discourses," (Foucault 1980, 80) a certain fragility of those aspects of our existence "that are most familiar, most solid and most intimately related to our bodies and to our everyday behaviour" (Foucault 1980, 80) has appeared. He claims that the predominant feature of these criticisms is their *locality*, defining them as "an autonomous, non-centralised kind of theoretical production, one that is to say whose validity is not dependent on the approval of the established regimes of thought." (Foucault 1980, 81) This local criticism has been proceeded by what Foucault terms "a return of knowledge," (Foucault 1980, 81) or put more precisely, an "insurrection of subjugated knowledges." (Foucault 1980, 81) These subjugated knowledges, containing (1) erudite knowledges "that have been buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systematisation." (Foucault 1980, 81), and (2)

disqualified knowledges that have been banned "as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naive knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity" (Foucault 1980, 82) and which involve "a popular knowledge (*le savoir des gens*) though it is far from being a general commonsense knowledge, but it is on the contrary a particular, local, regional knowledge, a differential knowledge incapable of unanimity and which owes its force only to the harshness with which it is opposed by everything surrounding it." (Foucault 1980, 82) Hence Foucault claims that "it is through the re-emergence of these low-ranking knowledges, these unqualified, […] these local popular knowledges, these disqualified knowledges, that criticism performs its work." (Foucault 1980, 82) The turn towards these local criticisms, which are autonomous, non-centralized and non-hierarchical in character, entertains "the claims to attention of local, discontinuous, disqualified, illegitimate knowledges against the claims of a unitary body of theory which would filter, hierarchise and order them in the name of some true knowledge and some arbitrary idea of what constitutes a science and its objects." (Foucault 1980, 83) Genealogy, as Foucault (cf. 1980, 83) names this emancipation of erudite and disqualified knowledges from the dominant knowledge, is thus concerned "with the insurrection of knowledges that are opposed primarily not to the contents, methods or concepts of a science, but to the effects of the centralising powers which are linked to the institution and functioning of an organised scientific discourse within a society such as ours." (Foucault 1980, 84)

The task of any struggle and counter-discourse is then "to expose and specify the issue at stake in this opposition, this struggle, this insurrection of knowledges against the institutions and against effects of the knowledge and power that invests scientific discourse." (Foucault 1980, 87) To sum up:

> [A] genealogy should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from that subjection, to render them, that is, capable of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. It is based on a reactivation of local knowledges […] in opposition to the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges and the effects intrinsic to their power: this, then, is the project of these disordered and fragmentary genealogies. If we were to characterise it in two terms, then 'archeology' would be the appropriate methodology of this analysis of local discursitives, and 'genealogy' would be tactics whereby, on the basis of the descriptions of these local discursivities, the subjugated knowledges which were thus released would be brought into play. (Foucault 1980, 85)

Such de-hierarchization thus aims at creating a discourse of development that is based upon decentralized polity, economy, society and, most importantly, epistemology. In all

of these instances, smaller, local bodies would gain power, popular control would be the one that would replace the systematizing global one and the approach towards knowledge would emphasize its shared nature. (cf. Banuri 1990, 98-99)

> But these stories [of development] should be told, and heard, in concert with other stories – stories of what development meant for those whose visible and hidden lives is transformed. These stories at the very least provide 'a hindrance' and 'a stumbling block' to the discursive power of development. But they might also constitute 'a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy.' […] The power of development is the power to generalize, homogenize, objectify. One way to contest this homogenizing power, albeit in an incremental way, could be through the articulation of individual biographies and autobiographies of the development experience. […] In 'the hidden transcripts' and everyday resistances of the weak […] the power of development to remake the world according to the word is relentlessly contested. […] When confronted with the power of the ordinary, development discourse […] is forced to assume the most fantastical forms. That is actually when it is at its most transparent, fragile and feeble. (Crush 1995, 22-23)

It is a vision of future which is, in slightly different, but related images, presented by James Clifford (1986, 9-10):

> A new figure has entered the scene, the "indigenous ethnographer" […] Insiders studying their own cultures offer new angles of vision and depths of understanding. Their accounts are empowered and restricted in unique ways. The diverse post- and neo-colonial rules for ethnographic practice do not necessarily encourage "better" cultural accounts. The criteria for judging a good account have never been settled and are changing. But what has emerged from all these ideological shifts, rule changes, and new compromises is the fact that a series of historical pressures have begun to reposition anthropology with respect to its "objects" of study. Anthropology no longer speaks with automatic authority for others defined as unable to speak for themselves ("primitive," "pre-literal," "without history"). Other groups can less easily be distanced in special, almost always past or passing, times – represented as if they were not involved in the present world systems that implicate ethnographers along with the peoples they study. "Cultures" do not hold still for their portraits. Attempts to make them do so always involve simplification and exclusion, selection of a temporal focus, the construction of a particular self-other relationship, and the imposition or negotiation of a power relationship.

4 CONCLUSIONS

> *"It is an attempt to reveal discursive practices in their complexity and density; to show that to speak is to do something – something other than to express what one thinks; to translate what one knows, and something other than to play with the structure of a language (*langue*); to show that to add a statement to a pre-existing series of statements is to perform a complicated and costly gesture, which involves conditions (and not only a situation, a context, and motives), and rules (not the logical and linguistic rules of construction); to show that a change in the order of discourse does not presuppose 'new ideas', a little invention and creativity, a different mentality, but transformations in a practice, perhaps also in neighbouring practices, and in their common articulation. I have not denied – far from it – that possibility of changing discourse: I have deprived the sovereignty of the subject of the exclusive and instantaneous right to it."*
> *(Foucault 1972, 209)*

The analysis of development discourse in the preceding pages tried to demonstrate that this discourse functions as a mechanism of power which produces, manages and controls the countries of the global South in increasingly detailed and encompassing ways. It is doing so through systematic elaboration of varied forms of knowledge concerning different aspects of these societies, through the rational discourses of economists, politicians and development experts, and through the formation of corresponding forms of intervention (NGOs, university departments, local development agencies etc.). Development is thus a very real historical formation, even though it is constructed around a fictitious concept of "underdevelopment." By saying all this, we may go as far as to suggest that the aim of the modernist, postwar conception of development "is not pedagogy but control; not helping to understand the world, but rather helping to maintain existing […] structures of power; not expanding human freedoms, but legitimizing the denial of sovereignty to the populations of the Third World, as also to the common men and women in Western countries." (Banuri 1990, 88) The power of development to do all this, however, lays not so much in repression as in normalization; not in ignorance, but in carefully regulated knowledge; not in humanitarian concern, but in moralization of issues. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 388-389; 1991, 676)

After World War 2, countries of the global South started to be perceived (by the others and by themselves) and to be treated as "underdeveloped," development becoming a fundamental problem of them. These countries "embarked upon the task of un-underdeveloping themselves by subjecting their societies to systematic and minute observations and interventions that would allow them to discover and eventually eradicate their problems once and for all." (Escobar 1991, 675) Yet, at the dawn of the

21st century, we witness that development failed to solve the real problems of poverty, hunger and global inequalities which it set to solve. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 388; 1995, 46-47) However, even "failed" development projects can bring important structural changes in the targeted countries. This means that even if changes are not congruent with the transformations that the conceptual apparatus of a development institution planned, new structures are all the same produced. As Ferguson (1990, 276) writes: "Plans constructed within a conceptual apparatus do have effects but in the process of having these effects they generally "fail" to transform the world in their own image. But "failure" here does not mean doing nothing; it means doing something else, and that something else always has its own logic." By this, we don't want to suggest that planning is a 'myth' (cf. Bennett 1988, 16) or that the structured discourse of planning and its corresponding field of knowledge are not important, but that they are only important as a part of a larger 'machine of development.' Developer's conceptions and plans are thus not the blueprints for this 'development machine' through which structural production and changes take place, but are only visible parts of this machine. (cf. Ferguson 1990, 275-276) To sum up:

> The use of the "machine" metaphor [captures] something of the way that conceptual and discursive systems link up with social institutions and processes without even approximately determining the form or defining the logic of the outcome. As one cog in the "machine," the planning apparatus is not the "source" of whatever structural changes may come about, but only one among a number of links in the mechanism that produces them. (Ferguson 1990, 275)

This fact is problematic because of the irreversibility of development practices. As Stephen A. Marglin (1990, 5) writes: "[I]t would not matter that a process is irreversible if individuals were endowed with perfect foresight. However, the inability to foresee all the consequences of the first steps down a path makes irreversibility crucial."

Despite the challenges development faced throughout its history and still faces today, it has been able to reinvent itself, without drastically changing its ideological and institutional foundations. This is done by its constant periodic conceptual and policy innovations that become its chief focal point until a new one appears. (cf. Fernando 2003, 54-55) As Crush (1995b, 16) puts it: "Development itself is never the disease, only the cure. It proceeds […] by creating abnormalities which it can then treat or reform. Development discourse has a remarkable capacity for forgiving its own mistakes and reinventing itself as the remedy for the ills it causes. One of the primary mechanisms for

this periodic reinvention is the appropriation of the language and imagery of other, related, modernist discourses."

Moreover, development does not only reinvent itself, but also its contrary, the "underdevelopment". Despite its aspirations to erase "underdevelopment" from the face of Earth, it has ended up, instead, multiplying it perpetually. (cf. Escobar 1984-85, 389) This reminds us of Foucault (cf. 1984b, 226-232) and his claim that prison represents a failure in penal justice because it not only doesn't diminish the crime rate, but because it also causes recidivism, it cannot fail to produce delinquents, it makes possible and even encourages the organization of a milieu of delinquents, and because it produces delinquents by throwing the inmate's family into destitution.

> The carceral system combines in a single figure discourses and architectures, coercive regulations and scientific propositions, real social effects and invincible utopias, programs for correcting delinquents and mechanisms that reinforce delinquency. Is not the supposed failure part of the functioning of the prison? Is it not to be included among those effects of power that discipline and the auxiliary technology of imprisonment have induced in the apparatus of justice, and in society in general, and which may be grouped together under the name of "carceral system"? […] The prison is the hinge of these two mechanisms; it enables them to reinforce one another perpetually, to objectify the delinquency behind the offense, to solidify delinquency in the movement of illegalities. So successful has the prison been that, after a century and a half of "failures," the prison still exists, producing the same results, and there is the greatest reluctance to dispense with it. (Foucault 1984b, 230-232)

Ferguson (cf. 1990, 285) agrees when saying that development "problems" and urges for reforms are necessary part of the functioning of 'development machine.' "Pointing out errors and suggesting improvements is an integral part of the process of justifying and legitimating "development" interventions. Such an activity may indeed have some beneficial or mitigating effects, but it does not change the fundamental character of those interventions." (Ferguson 1990, 285)

The scrutiny of development through critical deconstruction of its discourse does, however, not want to neglect real global problems of poverty and inequality which, in our opinion, require continuous attention and effort. It should be clear until now that we don't perceive development only as a vibrant theoretical field and that we don't think that words of development discourse are "wind, an external whisper, a beating of wings that one has difficulty in hearing in the serious matter of history," (Foucault 1972, 209) but that development is a contemporary practice which points to global issues of poverty and inequality, actively streams the relations between the North and the South and manages

their realities. By our analysis of development discourse, we hence aim at showing development as a historical entity which exercises forms of power that create and transform. By doing so, we try to defamiliarize its naturalness, to render its political nature, and to pursue alternative conceptualizations and practices. Yet, it is not Western forms *per se* that we should object to, but rather to the types of rationality linked to them, to the forms of power and knowledge they are characterized by, and, especially, to the ways in which they assume responsibility for managing the conditions of life. It might be objected that "such an inquisition is simply another form of faddish intellectualism destined, like all the others, to bloom and fade." (Crush 1995b, 4) Our reply is: by being aware that nearly one-half of the world population subsists on two dollars a day or less, and by seeing that, after decades of development work, this number has not diminished, we see a critical deconstruction of development a very useful way to point to the characteristics of postwar development, its powers of transformation, the reasons for the continuation of global inequalities, and to search for the alternatives within or even to this kind of conception of development. (cf. Edelman and Haugerud 2007, 1-10; Escobar 1984-85, 389-390, 395; 1991, 676; 1988, 436)

In the late 20th century, the disillusionment with development ambitions contributed to a widespread disappointment with national governments and transnational development agencies, such as WB and IMF, to which the responsibility for development was entrusted in the starting decades of postwar development. The switch to alternative trustees, such as NGOs and other civil groups, however, also turned out to be incapable of fulfilling its ambitions of alleviating poverty, humanizing markets, or ensuring quality and social justice. (Edelman and Haugerud 2007, 10) Are we back at the question of time that was addressed already in the chapter about institutionalization of development discourse, in which we saw that current development projects of NGOs work on a much too-short-time basis? Is this produced by the inter-institutional connections and their embeddedness in contemporary capitalistic mentality? Could it be that we don´t need to give more time not only to development practitioners in realizing their projects, but that we also need to take a much longer time-period to evaluate them? Next to this, does this not also raise the question about the need to appropriate development projects to the communities that are being developed, thus tearing the development apparatus from its

external position and letting it grow out from the communities themselves? These (and many others) are all very pressing questions which should be further discussed and we hope to shed at least some light on their possible answers in the following paragraphs.

Within the existing development discourse, there are, as we have already shown, numerous "buzzwords," (such as empowerment, participation, sustainability, good governance etc.) which try to respond to the shortcomings of development. Authors (e.g. Little and Painter 1995) which support such alternatives *in* development favor reforms within the existing development apparatus. Also the example of IDP and Indienhilfe could be connected to this perspective: staying rooted inside the development apparatus, Indienhilfe simultaneously tries to follow its own vision of non-modernistic future in which every single one of us would have the right and responsibility for a good, but modest life. However, many (e.g. Apffel Marglin and Marglin 1990; Escobar 1984-85, 1988, 1995, 1997; Ferguson 1990; Sachs 1992) think that these notions merely disguise old, unsuccessful practices and thus argue that, in order to solve the issues of hunger, poverty and unequal distribution, we should look beyond development. (cf. Edelman and Heugerud 2007, 49) But "[i]s there a way of writing (speaking or thinking) beyond the language of development? Can its hold on the imagination of both the powerful and the powerless be transcended," asks Crush (1995b, 18). Some authors (e.g. Cowen & Shanon 1995) think that it is useless to talk about the alternatives within or to development, as development in itself is a Western notion and will thus always reinforce the existing dualities that underpin Western rationality, no matter how it is articulated or transformed. However, let us take a look at the possibilities offered by those who believe in the alternative visions.

According to Escobar (cf. 1995, 216-217), changing the order of development discourse is a political question which moves beyond the mere changes of vocabulary, ideas or manners of speaking, but rather "entails the collective practice of social actors and the restructuring of existing political economies of truth" (Escobar 1995, 216) and requires "moving away from development sciences [and] strategic move away from conventional Western modes of knowledge in general in order to make room for other types of knowledge and experience." (Escobar 1995, 216) This transformation further requires the formation of nuclei around which new forms of power and knowledge might

converge, social movements and anti-development struggles being possible examples. For this transformation to be a lasting one, "the breakdown of the basic organization of the discourse […], that is, the appearance of new rules of formation of statement and visibility" (Escobar 1995, 216-217) must appear.

Escobar (cf. 1991, 675) imagines a "post-development" era in which pluralistic grassroots movements and "new social movements" in general may provide a new basis for transforming the structures and discourses of the modern states in the Third World, and may thus become a reservoir of popular power and of alternatives *to* development. Escobar proposes to couple this idea with the notion of 'hybridization,' which stands for hybrid mixing of "traditional" and "modern" in a given culture.[26] Escobar is not alone in his vision of 'post-development' in which comes to a reversal of modernization theory's assumption that "traditional" poses obstacles to development, local community being seen as a crucial source of it. However, many others think that such post-development aspirations are not unproblematic, not without limitations and actually highly romantic. (cf. Edelman and Heugerud 2007, 49; Gow 1996, 169) Sivaramakrishnan and Agrawal (in Edelman and Haugerud 2007, 50) say that "this yearning is unrealistic about the limits of pragmatic politics, ignores the historical consequences of similar aspirations for utopias, and remains unfair in assessing the multiple forms of development." Moreover, Gow (cf. 1996, 169) claims that despite the intriguing nature of such post-development vision, evidence that would substantiate them is lacking.[27]

As poverty and hunger were not conceived by development discourse, they will also not disappear with its removal. Yet, this should not be a reason to rethink the whole development apparatus and try to work towards new conceptualizations which entail "the

[26] This might be read in relation to the concluding paragraph of Jonathan Crush in the previous chapter on resistance which works with the notion of 'heteroglossia,' a plurality of voices. In this manner, also the following quotations of James Clifford might be read: "Our cultures are no longer prefigured visually – as objects, theaters, texts – it becomes possible to think of a cultural poetics that is an interplay of voices, of positioned utterances," (1986, 12) and "Dialogical modes are not, in principle, autobiographical; they need not lead to hyper self-consciousness or self-absorption. As Bakhtin (1981) has shown, dialogical processes proliferate in any complexity represented discursive space (that of an ethnography, or, in his case, a realist novel). Many voices clamor for expression. Polyvocality was restrained and orchestrated in traditional ethnographies by giving to one voice a pervasive authorial function and to others the role of sources, "informants," to be quoted or paraphrased. Once dialogism and polyphony are recognized as modes of textual production, monophonic authority is questioned, revealed to be characteristic of a science that has claimed to represent cultures. The tendency to specify discourses – historically and intersubjectively – recasts this authority, and in the process alters the questions we put to cultural descriptions." (1986, 15)

[27] This is, according to many, a broader problem of anthropology of development, to which could be Escobar attributed. For more about the »theoretical« nature of anthropology of development and the possible solutions to bridge the void between theory and practice within it, please see Escobar 1997, 505-512.

abandonment of the whole epistemological and political field of postwar development." (Escobar 1991, 675)

> If development means fewer deaths from diseases and starvation, superior technologies such as vaccination must be used to alleviate the suffering of the masses. However, to be successfully diffused and transplanted they must be decoupled from their negative political and cultural entailments. This is seldom or ever done, probably because of the widespread perception that more efficacious techniques reflect superior form of knowledge. Thus superior form of knowledge must supplant older, backward, obsolete forms of knowledge. However, forms of knowledge are not graded on an evolutionary inclined plane with the Western sciences at the upper end and the non-Western forms spread on the lower end. (Apffel Marglin 1990, 140)

My conclusion is that no matter which vision of development or even anti-development practice is considered as the best one or the most possible one, there should be allowed a diversity of these models, a plurality of various voices. In this respect, the fight against poverty, illiteracy and hunger should stay existing in these terms, not covering them with an artificial construct of development and thus neglecting the particularity of each and every situation. This fight should thus not be threatened by differences and otherness, but would support a self-aware exchange between different, still equal subjects. (cf. Escobar 1991, 677-678, Marglin 1990, 16)

Even thought one of the aims of this thesis was to highlight the alternative visions of and to development, I am aware that this text cannot stand outside the phenomenon it analyzes and thus cannot in any possible way claim the success of representing the version of this world that exists without development. As Crush (1995b, 18-19) writes about his anthology: "The text itself is made possible by the languages of development and, in a sense, it contributes to their perpetuation. To imagine that the Western scholar can gaze on development from above as a distanced and impartial observer, and formulate alternative ways of thinking and writing, is simply a conceit. To claim or adopt such a position is simply to replicate a basic rhetorical strategy of development itself."

5 POVZETEK V SLOVENSKEM JEZIKU

V drugi polovici dvajsetega stoletja je jezik kolonializma zamenjal jezik razvojnega sodelovanja in pojma, kot sta npr. “nerazvite države” in “tretji svet” sta postala osrednja označevalca svetovnih razmerij. Razvojno sodelovanje v diplomski nalogi opredeljujemo kot prizadevanje, da bi se države svetovnega Juga, kot tretji svet imenujemo tukaj, modernizirale tako iz ekonomskega kot tudi političnega, socialnega in kulturnega vidika. Od sredine prejšnjega stoletja, ko se je omenjeni modernistični pojem razvojnega sodelovanja vzpostavil, se je razvojno sodelovanje osnovalo kot neizpodbitno dejstvo realnosti in od tedaj ustvarja samoumevno idejo, da se države Azije, Afrike, Latinske Amerike in Oceanije opredeli kot nerazvite in zato potrebne razvojnega sodelovanja.

Nevladne organizacije (NVO) igrajo v razvojnem sodelovanju zelo pomembno vlogo, saj se jih razume kot pomembno alternativo državnim razvojnim prizadevanjem in ekonomskemu pristopu, ki je prevladoval v začetnih desetletjih razvojnega sodelovanja. Poleg tega veljajo NVO za demokratičnega in pravičnega akterja, ki zaradi svojega civilnodružbenega karakterja lažje dosegajo tiste, katerim je svetovno sodelovanje namenjeno.

Čeprav skuša razvojno sodelovanje s povezanostjo z nevladnimi organizacijami in znanstveno stroko prikriti svojo politično naravo, je teza diplomske naloge, da je razvojno sodelovanje oblika (politične) moči, ki se ne samo odziva na svetovno situacijo, temveč jo tudi ustvarja skozi konstrukcijo držav svetovnega Juga in njihove težave z nerazvitostjo. Omenjeno tezo bomo preverili skozi obravnavo razvojnega sodelovanja kot oblike diskurza, saj je to po našem mnenju najprimernejši način, da raziščemo moč, ki jo ima razvojno sodelovanje nad svojimi objekti. Diskurz je namreč sistem, ki določa naš jezik in s tem misli ter na ta način določa kako neka stvar obstaja.

Diskurzivna analiza razvojnega sodelovanja se v diplomski nalogi opira na teoretični okvir antropologije razvoja in pri tem uporablja dognanja francoskega filozofa Michela Foucaulta o naravi diskurza, moči in znanja. Metodološko se diplomska naloga opira predvsem na obravnavo znanstvene literature, napisane na to temo, poleg tega pa obravnava tudi konkretni primer projekta razvojnega sodelovanja, tj. Integrated Development Project nemške NVO Indienhilfe. Znotraj omenjenega teoretičnega in

metodološkega okvira si diplomska naloga zastavlja tri raziskovalne cilje: (1) pokazati, kaj razvojno sodelovanje je in čemu je namenjeno; (2) prisostvovati h kritiki splošno sprejetega razumevanja razvojnega sodelovanja; in (3) odgovoriti na vprašanje, ali se je mogoče povzpeti čez miselni okvir sodobnega razvojnega sodelovanja in poskati nadomestilo temu. Cilj diplomske naloge torej ni niti ovreči razvojnega sodelovanja niti ga hvaliti. Prav tako ni njen namen odvzeti ljudem pravico do kakovostnega življenja, temveč skuša le kritično obravnavati sedanji aparat razvojnega sodelovanja, pokazati na njegovo politično naravo in pobrskati za možnimi alternativami.

Antropologija je bila v zadnjih dveh desetletjih priča intenzivni debati o vprašanjih razvojnega sodelovanja, kar je pripeljalo do razvoja dveh miselnih šol: razvojne antropologije (development anthropology) in antropologije razvoja (anthropology of development). Razvojno antropologijo zagovarjajo tisti antropologi, ki podpirajo aktivno sodelovanje v organizacijah razvojnega sodelovanja in delo v antropoloških oddelkih, ki se zavzemajo za praktično usmeritev študentov antropologije. Omenjeni antropologi se zavzemajo za spremembe v razvojnemu sodelovanju, ki prihajajo "od znotraj." Nemalokrat je razvojna antropologija kritizirana zaradi nizke stopnje kritične neodvisnosti do aparata razvojnega sodelovanja in zaradi opurtunističnega kreiranja zaposlitvenih možnosti v prestižnih razvojnih organizacijah.

Antropologija razvoja naj bi po drugi strani zavzela kritično pozicijo do aparata razvojnega sodelovanja. Antropologija razvoja, ki je nastala v 80. letih prejšnjega stoletja, se opira na teoretični korpus poststrukturalizma. Poenostavljeno, poststrukturalizem med drugim poudarja vlogo jezika in pomenov v konstrukciji družbene realnosti. Jezik in diskurz nista obravnavana kot odsev realnosti, temveč kot njen konstitut. Poststrukturalisti torej verjamejo, da realnost nastane šele skozi jezik in diskurzivno prakso. V tem poststrukturalističnem duhu antropologija razvoja obravnava razvojno sodelovanje kot (1) diskurzivno formacijo, tj. kot aparat strokovnega znanja in institucij, ki organizirajo produkcijo znanj in moči, ter te povežejo sistematično; in kot (2) zgodovinsko kreacijo, ki ni niti naravna niti nujna, temveč le produkt določljivih zgodovinskih procesov.

Za antropologijo razvoja in njeno kritično obravnavo razvojnega sodelovanja je še posebno pomembna obravnava Michela Foucaulta o diskurzu, moči in znanju. Foucault razume diskurz kot strukturo znanja, ki v določenem trenutku dovoljuje določene izraze in vzorce delovanja ter dela druge nesprejemljive. To implicira, da nobena človeška dejavnost ne more obstajati brez določenega režima racionalnosti, ki je zgodovinsko določen. S tem ko diskurz podeljuje objektom in dejanjem pomen ter ustvarja razlikovanje med pravilnim in napačnim, med resničnim in neresničnim, deluje diskurz kot oblika moči. Znanje, ki je zaobjeto v diskurzu, torej ni odsev univerzalne resnice, temveč je sredstvo vladanja in upravljanja z močjo. Analiza diskurza naj bi po Foucaultu potekala na dva načina: (1) arheološko in (2) genealoško. Foucaultu beseda arheologija pomeni identifikacijo elementov diskurza in sistem relacij, na katerega se ti elementi povezujejo, to pomeni analizo pravil, ki v določenem časovnem okviru in v določeni družbi definirajo meje in načine mišljenja in govorjenja. Genealogija po drugi strani pomeni zgodovinsko kontekstualizacijo, tj. analizo formiranja diskurza glede na nediskurzivne elemente, kot so npr. sociopolitični in ekonomski faktorji, institucije ipd.

Obravnava razvojnega sodelovanja kot diskurza torej sledi v naslednjih štirih točkah: (1) obravnava zgodovinskega konteksta, v katerem je modernistični diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja nastal, se razvijal in v katerem obstaja danes; (2) obravnava zgradbe diskurza; (3) obravnava udejanjanja diskurza in z njim povezanih oblik moči in znanja; in (4) obravnava protidiskurzov.

Zgodovinski kontekst: V tem delu se naša raziskava opira izključno na znanstveno literaturo, ki večinoma zagovarja trditev, da je modernistični diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja nastal v času po drugi svetovni vojni, ko je nadomestil diskurz kolonializma. V začetku je diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja poudarjal centralnost državnega aparata in se zavzemal predvsem za ekonomski razvoj držav Juga. Kmalu se je ta pristop izkazal za neuspešnega in tako je začel v 70. letih diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja poudarjati pomembnost kulture in družbenega razvoja. Diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja se je zazvzel za usmerjenost v človeka in integrativen pristop k razvoju držav svetovnega Juga, ki je v toku časa spreminjal svoje poudarke, a je do danes ostal nespremenjen v svoji

modernistični tezi, da morajo države svetovnega Juga slediti teku modernizacije, ki so ga ubrale države Severa. Danes je tako diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja, ne glede na prepričanost v pomembnost udeleženosti skupnosti držav svetovnega Juga, ki bi s svojim glasom pripomogle k bolj demokratičnemu in inkluzivnemu kreiranju razvojnih programov, še zmeraj zakoreninjen v prepričanju, da razvoj pomeni za vse enako premico premikanja proti trenutnemu stanju držav Severa.

Zgradba diskurza razvojnega sodelovanja: Zgradbo diskurza obravnavamo na primeru nevladnega razvojnega programa Integrated Development Project (IDP), ki je plod sodelovanja med nemško nevladno organizacijo Indienhilfe (IH) in indijsko cerkveno organizacijo Seva Kendra Calcutta (SKC). Diskurz obravnavamo v njegovih treh fazah: (1) obravnava akterjev diskurza, ki so vpeti v realizacijo projekta razvojnega sodelovanja (v tem primeru obravnavamo nemško IH in indijsko SKC z letaki in intervjujem); (2) obravnava udejanjanja diskurza, tj. razvojnega programa kot takega (v tem primeru obravnavamo pristop IH do razvojnih programov, ki jih prodpira – še posebej IDP – z letaki in intervjujem); in (3) obravnava elementov diskurza razvojnega programa (v tem primeru obravnavamo karakteristike programa IDP z dokumenti tega programa). Povzetek obravnave vseh treh faz diskurza nam pokaže, da je ne glede na to, da kaže IH visoko stopnjo kritičnosti do prevladujočih načinov razumevanja razvojnega sodelovanja, sama organizacija (in s tem programi razvojnega sodelovanja, ki jih podpira) v končni fazi vseeno ujeta v večino vzorcev mišljenja in delovanja, ki konstituirajo danes dominantno modernistično pojmovanje razvojnega sodelovanja.

Moč/znanje v udejanjanju diskurza razvojnega sodelovanja: Tretji segment obravnave diskurza razvojnega sodelovanja, ki temelji na obravnavi znanstvene literature na teme, ki jih odpira diskurz IDP in IH, analizira oblike moči in znanja, ki jih (opisani) diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja omogoča in skuša pokazati načine, s katerimi ta diskurz upravlja z omenjnimi objekti. Moč realizira skozi uporabo diskurza na različne načine, ki jih je mogoče razdeliti v tri skupine: (1) problematizacijo, (2) profesionalizacijo in (3) institucionalizacijo. Problematizacija ne postavlja teme "nerazvitosti" in njej sorodnih tem le v luč nepristranske obravnave, temveč določa tudi način njihove obravnave ter s

tem hkrati odseva in ustvarja naše mišljenje o njih. Osnovni princip, po katerem so teme "nerazvitosti" problematizirane in strukturirane, je princip binarnih opozicij in razumevanje razmerja med temi opozicijami kot hirerahije in nedialoškosti. Problematizacija torej ustvarja polje intervencije moči. Profesionalizacija se nanaša predvsem na procese, ki uvajajo teme "nerazvitosti" in "tretjega sveta" v polje strokovnega znanja in "Zahodnih" znanstvenih ved. Profesionalizacija pomeni načine, na katerih je ustvarjena in obvladovana politika resnice; pomeni načine, na katerih je določenemu vedenju dodeljen status resničnosti. Profesionalizacija diskurza razvojnega sodelovanja je omogočila prikaz tem razvojnega sodelovanja v oblikah, sprejemljivih za prevladujoči sistem strokovnega znanja. Strategija profesionalizacije torej omogoča nastanek polja kontrole znanja, skozi katerega sta ustvarjeni resničnost in moč. Polje profesionalizacije je intimno povezano s poljem institucionalizacije, saj obe strategiji skupaj ustvarjata orodje, s katerim diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja kroži in se utrjuje. Institucionalizacija diskurza tako ustvarja polje, v katerem je diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja ustvarjen, stabiliziran, spremenjen in v katerem se premika, tj. institucionalizacija pomeni nastanek številnih lokalnih centrov, skozi katere se udejanja diskurz in z njim povezane oblike moči in znanja.

Protidiskurzi: Na osnovi povedanega, ki razkriva zgodovinsko zakoreninjenost našega razumevanja svetovnih razmerij in razvojnega sodelovanja, ter principe racionalnosti, ki so podlaga našemu načinu razmišljanja, lahko spremenimo obstoječo mrežo razmerij moči in poiščemo možne alternative. Čeprav diskurz razvojnega sodelovanja ni en sam, temveč le dominira nad ostalimi razumevanji razvojnega sodelovanja, alternative k predominantnemu modernističnemu diskurzu – če resnično hočejo nasprotovati obstoječim razmerjem moči in jih celo zamenjati –, morajo opustiti obstoječe načine racionalnosti in hirerahizacije, iz katerih danes nastaja dominantni modernistčni diskurz. Le redki primeri razumevanja razvojnega sodelovanja kažejo v to smer in primera IDP vsekakor ni med njimi. Ne glede na zapriseženost k neodvisnosti od državnega financiranja in od idej velikih mednarodnih razvojnih organizacij, je IDP še vedno ukalupljena v temeljne vzorce "zahodne" racionalnosti in s tem v modernistični pristop k razvojnemu sodelovanju.

Analiza diskurza razvojnega sodelovanja torej pokaže, da le-ta deluje kot mehanizem moči, ki ustvarja, obvladuje in nadzoruje države svetovnega Juga izjemno celostno. Diskurz deluje tako skozi sistematično izdelavo različnih oblik znanja, ki se dotikajo mnogih aspektov držav svetovnega Juga – skozi racionalne diskurze ekonomistov, politikov in razvojnih strokovnjakov in skozi nastanek ujemajočih se oblik intervencije (NVO, univerzitetni oddelki, lokalne razvojne organizacije ...) Razvojno sodelovanje je torej zelo resnična zgodovinska formacija, ne glede na to, da je nastala na podlagi fiktivnega koncepta "nerazvitosti."

Sklepamo lahko, da je cilj modernističnega, povojnega razumevanja razvojnega sodelovanja kontrola (in ne izobraževanje), pomoč ohranjanja obstoječih razmerij moči (in ne boljše razumevanje sveta) in odvzem suverenosti prebivalcem držav svetovnega Juga (in ne širitev človeške svobode). Moči razvojnega sodelovanja, da ustvarja vse to, ne moremo črpati iz represivnih aparatov nadzora, temveč iz tehnik normalizacije, regulacije znanja in moralističnega pristopa do problematik držav svetovnega Juga.

6 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Richard N. 1988. Evolution and Development. In *Production and Autonomy: Anthropological Studies and Critiques of Development*, eds. John W. Bennett and John Bowen, 33-60. Lanham, MD: University Press of America/Society for Economic Anthropology.

Apffel Marglin, Fédérique. 1990. Smallpox in Two Systems of Knowledge. In *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture and Resistance*, eds. Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin, 102-144. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Banuri, Tariq. 1990. Modernization and its Discontents: A Cultural Perspective on the Theories of Development. In *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture and Resistance*, eds. Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin, 73-101. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bartlett, Tom. 2005. Amerindian Development in Guyana: Legal Documents as Background to Discourse Practice. *Discourse & Society* 16 (3): 341-364.

Bates, Robert H. 1988. Anthropology and Development: A Note on the Structure of the Field. In *Production and Autonomy: Anthropological Studies and Critiques of Development*, eds. John W. Bennett and John Bowen, 81-84. Lanham, MD: University Press of America/Society for Economic Anthropology.

Bennett, John W. 1988. Introductory Essay – Anthropology and Development: The Ambiguous Engagement to *Production and Autonomy: Anthropological Studies and Critiques of Development*, eds. John W. Bennett and John Bowen, 1-29. Lanham, MD: University Press of America/Society for Economic Anthropology.

Clifford, James. 1986. Introduction: Partial Truths to *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, eds. James Clifford and George Marcus, 1-26. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cooper, Frederick and Randall Packard. 1997. Introduction to *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*, eds. Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard, 1-41. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cowen, Michael and Robert Shenton .1995. The Invention of Development. In *Power of Development*, ed. Jonathan Crush, 27-43. New York: Routledge.

Crush, Jonathan. 1995a. Preface to *Power of Development*, ed. Jonathan Crush, xi-xiv. New York: Routledge.

--- 1995b. Introduction: Imagining Development to *Power of Development*, ed. Jonathan Crush, 1-23. New York: Routledge.

Cyriac Elias Voluntary Association. 2000. *Field Visit Report*. Internal material.

De Feyter, Koen. 2006. *Localizing Human Rights*. Retrieved from: http://www.ua.ac.be/objs/00152976.pdf (20th of July, 2008).

Douglas, Mary. 1986. *How Institutions Think.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Drabek, Anne Gordon. 1987a. Editor's Preface. *World Development* (15): vii-viii.

--- 1987b. Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs – An Overview of the Issues. *World Development* (15): ix-xv.
Ebrahim, Alnoor. 2003. *NGOs and Organizational Change: Discourse, Reporting, and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edelman, Marc and Angelique Haugerud. 2007. Introduction: The Anthropology of Development and Globalization to *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism,* eds. Marc Edelman and Angelique Haugerud, 1-74. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Encyclopædia Britannica. 2008. *Untouchable*. Retrieved from: http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/618508/untouchable (14th of July, 2008).

Escobar, Arturo. 1984-85. Discourse and Power in Development: Michel Foucault and the Relevance of His Work to the Third World. *Alternatives* 10 (3): 337-400.

--- 1988. Power and Visibility: Development and the Invention and Management of the Third World. *Cultural Anthropology* 3 (4): 428-443.

--- 1991. Anthropology and the Development Encounter: The Making and Marketing of Development Anthropology. *American Ethnologist* 18 (4): 658-682.

--- 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.* N.J.: Princeton University Press.

--- 1997. Anthropology and Development. *International Social Science Journal* 49 (4): 497-515.

Esteva, Gustavo. 1992. Development. In *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, ed. Wolfgang Sachs, 6-25. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Ferguson, James. 1990. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depolitization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

--- 1997. Anthropology and Its Evil Twin: "Development" in the Constitution of a Discipline. In *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History*

and Politics of Knowledge, eds. Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard, 150-175. Berkeley. CA: University of California Press.

Fernando, Jude L. 2003. NGOs and Production of Indigenous Knowledge Under the Condition of Postmodernity. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (590): 54-72.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.

--- 1978. Politics and the Study of Discourse. *Ideology and Consciousness* (3): 7-26.

--- 1980. Two Lectures. In *Power and Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, 78-108. Brighton: Harvester Press.

--- 1983. Afterword: The Subject and Power. In *Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, eds. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, 208-226. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

--- 1984a. Truth and Power (an excert from 'Power/Knowledge'). In *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 51-75. New York: Pantheon Books.

--- 1984b. Illegalities and Delinquency (an excert from 'Discipline and Punish'). In *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 226-233. New York: Pantheon Books.

--- 1984c. Space, Knowledge, and Power (an interview by Paul Rabinow). In *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 239-256. New York: Pantheon Books.

--- 1984d. Right of Death and Power over Life (an excert from 'The History of Sexuality, Volume I'). In *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 258-272. New York: Pantheon Books.

--- 1984e. The Repressive Hypothesis (an excert from 'The History of Sexuality, Volume I'). In *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 301-329. New York: Pantheon Books.

Gow, David D. 1996. The Anthropology of Development: Discourse, Agency, and Culture. *Anthropological Quarterly* 69 (3): 165-173.

--- 2002. Anthropology and Development: Evil Twin or Moral Narrative? *Human Organization* 61 (4): 299-313.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hoben, A. 1982. Anthropologists and Development. *Annual Review of Anthropology* (11): 349-375.

Indienhilfe. 1992. *Grundsätze für die Arbeit der Indienhilfe 1992*. Internal material.

--- 2002. *Projekte in Indien – Überblick*. Internal material.

--- 2008a. *Adivasi*. Retrieved from: http://www.indienhilfe-herrsching.de (14th of July, 2008).

--- 2008b. *Projekte der Indienhilfe e.V. Herrsching 2008-09*. Internal material.

Jayawardena, Lal. 1990. Foreword. In *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture and Resistance*, eds. Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin, v-vi. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kreuz, Elisabeth and Sabine Dlugosch. 2008. *Interview with the authors*. Herrsching (DE), 16th of May.

Little, Peter and M. Painter. 1995. Discourse, Politics, and the Development Process: Reflections on Escobar's "Anthropology and the Development Encounter". *American Ethnologist 22* (3): 602-609.

Marglin, Stephen A. 1990. Towards the Decolonization of the Mind. In *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture and Resistance*, eds. Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin, 1-27. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mintz, S. W. 1975. On the Concept of a Third World. *Dialectical Anthropology* 1 (4): 377-382.

Mohanty, C. 1991. Under Wester Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses. In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, eds. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres, 51-80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nandy, Ashis and Shiv Visvanathan. 1990. Modern Medicine and Its non-Modern Critics: A Study of Discourse. In *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture and Resistance*, eds. Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and Stephen A. Marglin, 145-184. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rossi, Benedetta. 2004. Revisiting Foucauldian Approaches: Power Dynamics in Development Projects. *The Journal of Development Studies* 40 (6): 1-29.

Rottenburg, Richard. 2006. Social Constructivism and the Enigma of Strangeness. In *The Making and Unmaking of Differences: Anthropological, Sociological and Philosophical Perspectives*, eds. Richard Rottenburg, Burkhard Schepel and Shingo Shimada, 27-41. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Sachs, Wolfgang. 1992. Introduction to *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, ed. Wolfgang Sachs, 1-5. London: Zed Books.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Seckinelgin, Hakan. 2006. The Multiple Worlds of NGOs and HIV/AIDS: Rethinking NGOs and Their Agency. *Journal of International Development* (18): 715-727.

Seva Kendra Calcutta. 2001a. *Integrated Development Programme Baligeria – Self-Assessment of IDP Baligeria.* Internal material.

--- 2001b. *Project Structure Plan (PSP) IDP – Baligeria (2001-2003)*. Internal material.

--- 2003a. *Activity Plan 2003-2004.* Internal material.

--- 2003b. *Half-Yearly Report*. Internal material.

--- 2003c. *Integrated development programme – Salboni Progress Report 2002-2003 Period April 2002 – March 2003*. Internal material.

--- 2003d. *Integrated development programme (IDP) Baligeria Unit Progress (Annual Report) Period: April 2002 to March 2003.* Internal material.

--- 2003e. *PSP-Based Reporting Matrix for covering Se. No. 1 of Quarterly/Annual Report (Systematic quantitative/qualitative description of the activities undertaken) 2003-2004.* Internal material.

--- 2004. *Project Structure Plan 2004-2005.* Internal material.

--- 2005. *Project Structure Plan 2005-2006*. Internal material.

--- 2006a. *Annual Report 2005-2006.* Internal material.

--- 2006b. *Project Structure Plan 2006-2007.* Internal material.

--- 2007a. *Annual Report 2006-2007.* Internal material.

--- 2007b. *Sanctioned Project Structure Plan 2007-2008.* Internal material.

Shimada, Shingo. 2006. Cultural Differences and the Problem of Translation. In *The Making and Unmaking of Differences: Anthropological, Sociological and Philosophical Perspectives*, eds. Richard Rottenburg, Burkhard Schepel and Shingo Shimada, 83-95. Bielefeld: Transcript.