

DEVELOPMENT-CRITIQUE IN THE CULTURE TRAP

Saral Sarkar

In the last ten years or so, I have read books and papers and listened to discussions in which critics of the hitherto dominant models of development have introduced cultural arguments. I share their rejection of some development models but I am very unhappy about what they say regarding traditional and/or indigenous cultures. I am afraid they are supporting in this way, without perhaps being aware of it, movements that are harming man-kind.

I think we must now talk of two approaches to the critique of development: (1) the cultural and (2) the ecological-economic-political. The protagonists of the cultural approach do not wholly ignore the other approach. But it appears to me that for many of them, the main evil in the current approach to development is that it destroys or suppresses the traditional indigenous cultures of the South.

Wolfgang Sachs¹ maintains that the West² had in 1949 arbitrarily declared the peoples of the South to be underdeveloped and poor and then imposed or palmed off on them ideas and programmes of development which have caused the evaporation of cultures and languages and destroyed the modest/contented subsistence economies of traditional cultures. The result was that these peoples not only remained poor but also lost their cultural identity.

For Sachs, the slogan 'one world' is a horror, because it endangers self-willed ways of living and understanding and because it restricts the space for self-determination and autonomy. He is aware of the dangers to the biosphere and of the logic of spaceship Earth. But his love of difference is very strong, and hence it is for him "a sacrilege to design the global space as a united, highly integrated world".

T.G. Verhelst³ adds a few more points. He speaks of the right of peoples to be different. Whereas Sachs is even against literacy programmes for tribal peoples who do not have a written language, Verhelst does not oppose development. But he criticises programmes for imposing Western models of development including Western technology and culture on the peoples of the South. He thinks that "failure to give due recognition to the indigenous cultures is one of the fundamental reasons for the failures and difficulties of 'development' work". He demands respect for all cultures and thinks that those NGOs which understand development as a contribution to liberation should consider indigenous cultures as the foundation of development.

Such views have also been expressed in the South too. Let me give a few examples from India. Smithu Kothari writes:

And alongside this biological survival of marginal communities is the continuous threat to the survival of their cultures. The undermining of cultural plurality is thus built into the dominant model of progress.⁴

For Anil Agarwal and some ecologists of the South, an examination of the cultural and biological diversity of human society resulted in:

An understanding of the essential rationality of each culture, how it had emerged in its own particular ecosystem and the way people had developed social and production systems, behaviour patterns and survival techniques. Once this was understood, there was an immediate respect for all cultures..⁵

Some Indian ecologists have maintained that India's religious and/or cultural heritage had made the economy of ancient (or pre-colonial) India very ecological and that Ahimsa (non-violence) and Dharma (right conduct) were /are parts of that heritage.

In a recent article, Fr S Kappen, an Indian Christian priest, demands that "the right to... culture identity must be affirmed as a fundamental human right". He asserts that "a development that consists in the satisfaction of our... needs" (he describes these needs with rather philosophical concepts as "ecotic, poetic, social and noetic") "will necessarily be culture-specific, that is, it will be one that reflects our conceptions and values and dreams and visions". In his opinion, "culture must body forth not only into the political organisation of society", but also into science. Our "approach to Western science and technology" must be selective, "whatever science and technology we learn from outside must submit to the superior claim of the indigenous wisdom".⁶

A Trap

This is a necessarily short and approximate summary of the views I want to criticise here, but they do represent a trend. However, it is not always clear, firstly, whether they mean only the traditional cultures of the tribal and marginalised peoples or also those of the majorities among the peoples of the South. And, secondly, it is not always clear whether the concept of traditional culture refers only to the ways of life expressed and recommended in the ancient, holy and philosophical texts and/or (also) the cultures actually practised in the past or the present. I have the impression that their category includes all that is not Western or Westernised.

In order to avoid possible misunderstanding, it must be emphasised that participants in such discussions use the word culture in its social-anthropological meaning, namely "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". In this meaning, culture includes also "the material organization of life", ie "social and economic institutions".⁷

My main criticism is that, in rejecting certain models of development, they use arguments which are not only wrong but also harmful, even dangerous in their consequences. Development should be rejected, but not because it is Western or foreign. It should be rejected because it is ecologically, economically, politically and socially impossible and/or harmful, and that goes for the West too. Most protagonists of the cultural approach would likely agree to the second part of the above statement, but then their cultural approach would become, at the least, unnecessary.

Their approach is harmful, because it romanticizes traditional indigenous cultures and so produces a false image of reality. Where it can lead us is shown in the following extract from a report on a conference on the new world order held in Germany (in free translation):

Hans May, director of the Protestant Academy, agreed that even in the next few decades it would be impossible to equalize the standards of living in the Western and Eastern (former GDR) parts of Germany and accepted the idea that this impossibility should be compensated for by strengthening the regional identities of the Eastern parts. He then proposed this as a model for the whole world. The impossibility of achieving a standard of living in the South which is approximately equal to that in the North leads us to conclude that human rights must be differentiated and regionalized. May cautioned in this connection against discrediting religious fundamentalism.⁸

Here the motive is not respect for all cultures or love of difference, but the fear that the South's aspiration to catch up with the North economically is ecologically disastrous for the whole world. I am not suggesting that all protagonists of the cultural approach explicitly share Hans May's conclusion. But their emphasis on cultural difference and identity leads logically to such conclusions.

It is also incorrect to say that the North imposed or palmed off its development models and culture on the South. Most people in the South gladly accepted development and Western culture. In India, a National Planning Commission had been constituted in 1938 at the instance of the government. According to a standard book on the history of India,

Broadly speaking the objectives of planning were to raise the general standard of living of the people as a whole and to ensure useful employment for all by the development of the resources of the country to the maximum extent possible, and by the distribution of national wealth in an equitable manner.⁹

And since the early 80s-i.e. long before Sachs and Verhelst published their criticism of Western cultural imperialism-some European politicians have themselves been explicitly advising the South not to copy the West - may be out of the same fear demonstrated by Hans May. Edgar Pisani, then a leading politician of the European Economic Community (EEC) said: "divesting our relations (with the South) of any hint of racism is to affirm: we are different and we are going to stay different".¹⁰ Narducci, then President of the EEC-Parliament, demanded intercultural dialogue and respect for specificity and cultural identity.¹¹ In the Third Lome Convention (1984), the EEC as a whole promised to promote the cultural identities of the peoples of the European powers in Africa and Caribbean and Pacific regions) and agreed that development should be based on their cultural and social values.¹²

What brutalities and oppressions religious fundamentalism can inspire and condone, we have seen in parts of the Islamic world and in India. Think of the Babri Masjid and its aftermath. One could argue that the cultural approach does not mean a religious approach, but religion is a very important element of culture; Verhelst has explicitly subsumed religion in the concept of culture. Cultural identity is, therefore, to a large extent religious identity. It does not help at all to obfuscate the matter by introducing unsound differentiations as Kappen does:

While, on the one hand, religious revivalism and fundamentalism is cropping up in many parts of the world-which itself is a pointer to a loss of wisdom - people are losing their moorings in authentic religion.

What is authentic religion? Is not the Sharia, the Islamic law book, and e.g. the decrees of the Popes parts of authentic Islam and authentic Catholicism? And who knows what is and what is not authentic Hinduism? Is not the caste system a part of it? In which respects do their fundamentalisms differ from authentic Catholicism and authentic Hinduism? All three have their infidels: the Kafirs, the heathens, the Mlechchhas.

But no matter what one exactly means by cultural identity, laying emphasis on it causes separation between peoples, nations, ethnic groups etc. Of course, under certain circumstances, it can unite a group of people and so generate some solidarity within the group. But it can do so only by creating separation between this group and others. Under unfavourable circumstances, the search for identity may easily end in a search for enemies. That generates hatred, war, civil war or communal riots as we know them in India. Of course, in such conflicts, there is almost always a deeper economic cause, but emphasizing separate cultural identities makes finding a compromise-solution impossible.

Particularly for India, the emphasis on cultural identity constitutes a great danger. There is no such thing as an Indian traditional culture. There is a Hindu traditional culture and also cultures of Indian Muslims, a very large minority, or of the Indian Sikhs etc. And there are also Christians, Jains and Parsis in India. If Fr Kappen's idea becomes reality, then it

would be Hindu traditional culture that would body forth... into the political organisation of Indian society. Then it would be the end of the secular Indian state. Then we would have created a Hindu Rashtra with consequences that do not need any elaboration.

The opportunistic attitude of some in the West (like Hans May) towards religious fundamentalists and other kinds of identity fetishists will be of no use. For, in economic matters, all -whether Hindu, Muslim or Christian fundamentalists or Buddhist or Confucian identity fetishists of Hongkong, Singapore and Thailand-want to catch up with the North and contribute as much to the destruction of the biosphere as the industrial societies of Europe and America. It, therefore, does not surprise anybody to see Iranian Ayatollahs processing with computers their holy scriptures in the library of Gom. For the North industrial wealth and for the South cultural identity - this new ideology of imperialism is easy to see through.

"We are different and we are going to stay different" - this ideology must be rejected for another reason. With it, e.g. the Americans can defend their ecologically destructive and exploitative American way of life as part of their cultural identity; the Hindus can defend untouchability and almost all peoples of the world the subordinate status of women.

There are also people who reject development for ecological, economic and social reasons, but who, nevertheless, land in the culture trap. Here is an example: in the Singrauli region of Madhya Pradesh, India, some activists of a movement for defending the interests of the victims of development expressed the view that the only alternative to development is to return to the past. They spoke of the glory that was India before the British came. They maintained that the villages of ancient and pre-colonial India were a happy world free from exploitation, that there were no famines then, that women used to be treated as equals of men. Although these assertions are all wrong, they are still expressions of some ideals. But the culture of ancient India also contained caste discrimination. So these romanticists also defended the caste system.¹³ Another example is Fr Kappen, from whose paper I have already quoted. His solution is also a retrieval of the perennially valid insights of the past, whatever that might mean.

Traditional Cultures

One meaning of this phrase of Fr Kappen - perennially valid insights of the past - could be the alleged ecological wisdom of the ancients. Without doubt, most cultures that existed at the beginning of the industrial revolution had found some sort of ecological balance in that their economy was more or less adapted to their ecology. Otherwise they could not have survived. It is also a fact that in Egypt and parts of China and India, peasants have been cultivating the same field for several thousand years. So their agriculture and, generally, their way of life must have been ecologically sound. They must also have had some ecological wisdom, for, after all, their livelihood depended to a much large extent than today on the health of their ecology. But they were also

blessed by certain circumstances: the pressure of population growth was much less and there was enough empty or thinly populated territory to which the part of the population that could not be fed any more could migrate. Europe would have been ecologically ruined if America had not been discovered in the 15th century.

But archaeologists and historians have unearthed a lot of evidence that shows that the ancients too destroyed their ecology in many parts of the world. Only, in their case, the process was slower so slow that not many individuals could perceive it in their lifetime. Clive Ponting¹⁴ gives several examples: the Mediterranean region had experienced massive ecological degradation before its present landscape took shape, due to the relentless pressure of long-term settlement and growing population expressed in deforestation and overgrazing. One of the main reasons for the collapse of the civilization of the Mayas in Central America was ecological degradation. The Sumerian and Indus Valley civilizations declined because of overirrigation resulting in waterlogging and salinisation of agricultural land. In north China, deforestation in the highlands plus agriculture on formerly grass covered loess soils resulted in massive soil erosion, which was the main cause of the often disastrous flooding of the Yellow river (so called because of the colour of the huge amount of soil it carried).

In present-day ecological literature, we often read about the ecological wisdom of the peoples of the pre-industrial eras. One popular example is that of the Bishnois, some 300 of whom sacrificed their lives in order to protect trees.¹⁵ These Bishnois had a material interest to protect the trees: they protected the village from the Thar desert of Rajasthan. But it cannot be overlooked that the king, the axmen and the workers who wanted to fell the trees also had a material interest - to get fuel for producing lime needed for building a palace. It was simply a case of conflict over resources in pre-industrial, pre-colonial India. Today also there are such conflicts, e.g. the conflict over the Narmada dams between those who want water for irrigation and those whose lands are being submerged. In this respect at least, there is not much difference between the past and the present, except in the matter of tempo. Ecologically, the past was not more virtuous than the present.

Finally, let me quote the evidence of an ancient wise man on the ecological "wisdom" of the ancients. Plato describes the effects of deforestation and soil erosion in ancient Greece:

What now remains compared with what then existed is like the skeleton of a sick man, all the fat and soft earth having wasted away, and only the bare framework of the land being left... there are some mountains which now have nothing but food for bees, but they had trees not very long ago... there were many lofty trees of cultivated species and... boundless pasturage for flocks. Moreover, it was enriched by the yearly rains from Zeus, which were not lost to it, as now, by flowing from the bare land into the sea; but the soil it had was deep, and therein it received the water, storing it up in the retentive loamy soil, and...

provided all the various districts with abundant supplies of springwaters and streams, whereof the shrines still remain even now, at the spots where the fountains formerly existed.¹⁶

The cases of ecological destruction revealed by archaeologists and historians might perhaps be dismissed by those who romanticize the past as isolated cases. Perhaps such cases were really not very numerous. But there is no doubt that in all traditional advanced cultures of the world- the Indian-Hindu, the Arabic-Islamic, the Chinese-Confucian etc- there was always and there is still exploitation and oppression, violence and crime. We know that in almost all cultures of the world, hierarchy, class or caste systems, and patriarchy had condemned large parts of the population to a permanently humiliated existence. And almost all cultures of the world, including the tribal ones, have waged war. It is not even true that the wise men of the ancient Indian culture were apostles of non-violence. The entire Bhagavat-Gita is an exhortation for fighting a war. And historians tell the tale of Hindu colonial and cultural conquests in South-East Asia between the 2nd and 6th centuries AD. Jainism and Buddhism are non-violent religions. But they also do not forbid economic exploitation of fellow human beings. In view of these facts, one cannot have respect for all cultures. And, except in the case of their economies which were probably more or less ecologically sound, I do not see any essential rationality in each traditional/preindustrial culture (not to speak of each modern industrial culture). The ancient Hindus did not create their caste system and untouchability in order to adapt themselves to their particular ecology. And nowhere in the world did/does the ecosystem make it necessary that men should oppress women.

In almost all societies there are (have been) contradictions and conflicts, and some of them are (have been) related to cultural values. There are (have been) struggles against exploitative, oppressive, discriminating values, mores and customs, struggles against superstition and for scientific knowledge. And in general, there are (have been) struggles for emancipation. No culture deserves wholesale praise or wholesale contempt. And all of them are inadequate for the difficult and complex tasks of today. Today, only dialogue and critical as well as differentiating solidarity are appropriate behaviour in the relations between people belonging to different cultures.

To be sure, there are (have been) tribes, among the members of which solidarity and mutual help is/was the norm. But this norm is/was never extended to the members of the neighbouring tribes. And the same tribes have/had no norm that prohibits exploitation or even massacre of neighbouring tribes (look at the Hutus, Tutsis and the Zulus, for example!). In any case, it is illogical to build up a whole ideology or an alternative paradigm on the basis of a few positive elements in a few exceptional cultures. Equally illogical is to quote a few suitable sentences from rarely read holy and philosophical texts of traditional advanced cultures and to treat them as expressions of actually existing Hindu culture. Just as little was/is the Sermon on the Mount an expression of the actually existing cultures of the Christians.

Theoretical Error

P fundamental theoretical error of the protagonists of the cultural approach is to draw a parallel between ecology and culture. They talk of ecological and cultural diversity in the same breath. Diversity is absolutely essential and monoculture is very bad for the health of a particular ecology. But for the health of a human society, it is not bad if all people in it speak the same language or wear similar clothes or worship the same God. There is another difference. A mango tree will not grow in Europe and an apple tree in South India. But Christianity has thrived in the Philippines and Yoga has become very popular in Europe.

Lewis Mumford, one of the major philosophers of the eco-alternative movements in Europe and America, gives another reason for preserving the traditional (he says: "national and regional") cultures: He wrote:

One of the great benefits of individualized national and regional cultures is that, if the opportunities are consciously seized, these potential alternatives can be experimented with under varied conditions and their advantages compared. Any philosophy of history that takes account of natural and human diversity must recognize that selective processes in nature have reached a higher stage in man, and that any mode of organizing human activities, mechanically, which limits the possibilities of continued trial, selection, emergence, and transcendence, in favour of a closed and completely unified system, is nothing less than an effort to arrest human cultural evolution.¹⁷

This is not convincing. Firstly, he is reducing national and regional cultures to the status of guinea-pigs to be experimented with. Secondly, the argument here sounds like: we should have a culture bank just like we should have a gene bank. Neither is a very respectful attitude to other cultures. And thirdly, it is the protagonists of the cultural approach who are trying to arrest human cultural evolution by demanding that traditional cultures should remain as they are or even become again as they were before. But my argument against Mumford's observation is that neither cultural guineapigs nor a culture bank is necessary for his purpose. In nature, if a species becomes extinct it is gone forever. But we can if we want, revive old extinct cultures. Descriptions of old cultures and their various elements are available in books. The revival of the Olympic games is a case in point. Moreover, whereas genetic engineers need a gene bank for their experiments and creations, we can use our fantasy and intelligence for creating entirely new social or cultural institutions, rules and regulations.

What Do the People Want?

P rotagonists of the cultural approach insist on the peoples' right to be different, the right not to become like the Europeans. All right, but who is compelling them to be like the latter? Since the 1960s, all peoples of the world are at least politically free. And since the early '80s, the Pisanis

and Narduccis and the EEC are even telling the peoples of the South to be different. Nobody prevented us from using camels or bullock carts or wearing dhotis instead of trousers. It is we who wanted to have cars and wear trousers and so on.

Since the '60s, the circumstances have changed and many indirect (economic) compulsions have come up. But, in principle, nobody would have any objection if a people (or a part of it) itself wants to revive, preserve and practise its traditional cultures as long as it does not harm others. But what do the peoples want? What are their dreams and visions? There is no doubt at all that the peoples of the South want to catch up on what the North has achieved in the areas of economy, science, technology, education etc. In addition to their own traditional art, literature, music etc, they also want to learn and enjoy what the West has created in these areas. Whether that is good or not is a different question. There is no doubt that in social matters -e.g. marriage and other ceremonies, rituals and customs in connection with birth and death, in matters of clothing, most peoples of the South actually practise their traditional culture. But this they do only so far as it does not stand in the way of their efforts to catch up with the North in the areas of economy, science, technology and education.

Protagonists of the cultural approach want indigenous peoples to live their traditional cultures. But what do they themselves want? Let us take an example from India. Siddharta, himself a protagonist and activist of the cultural approach, writes about the Kurubas, a tribal people of Karnataka:

Apart from imitating Hindu values, they are also being influenced by Western and commercial values communicated through the cinema. Many tribal youth do not know tribal songs, but will enthusiastically sing film songs in Kannada ... They still practise herbal medicine. But modern medicine has made deep inroads. For serious ailments many get admitted to government hospitals... If the tribals are giving up some of their values, it is not entirely because of the aggression of the capitalist economy. To a certain extent they themselves want these changes. The space that the modern period creates for the individual is exhilarating to many tribal youth who find some of the customs of the clan oppressive (like the authority vested in the Yajamana, or chief, for example). It must be admitted that the freedom of the individual and the space for that ... is an important gain.¹⁸

Industrial Civilization and Capitalism

Why should Western culture be bad for the peoples of the South if it is good for the peoples of the North? Verhelst perhaps saw this question coming. He writes: "Like the Third World, the West is suffering from cultural uprooting". That is also the opinion of Siddharta, who has lived many years in France. This is confusing. Who or what is uprooting it? At this point, Verhelst suddenly makes other factors responsible for the evil, namely "the great Promethean adventure... intensified during the last 300 years" and modern culture through which many Westerners have become

egocentric and "creatures of domination and competitiveness".¹⁹ With this analysis I fully agree. In plain English, these factors are called industrial civilization and capitalism, the destructive results of which the protagonists of the cultural approach are actually criticising but wrongly ascribing to Western culture. Industrial civilization and capitalism (also the socialism of Eastern Europe which was only a variant of industrial civilization) are bad, not because they originated in the West, but because they are ecologically, economically, socially and politically destructive-whether in the South or the North. The alternative should not, therefore, be a return to or retrieval of Eastern, traditional, regional or national cultures, but an ecological and collective economy, an egalitarian and solidary society and a truly democratic political system both in the South and the North.

New Cultures

Some of the protagonists of the cultural approach have also recognized the need for change or reform, which must, however, according to them, remain within the framework of traditional/indigenous culture. For Agarwal et al., the return to one's own culture is "not a blind harking back to traditions".²⁰ Sachs writes: "The opposite of 'development' is by no means stagnation... From Gandhi's swaraj to Zapata's ejidos there are in every culture visions of change".²¹ But a culture that wants to change itself radically must be prepared to cease to be the same culture. If e.g. the Americans, in 20 years from today, give up their private cars and travel only by trams, trains, buses and bicycles, eat only vegetarian food and dissolve their armed forces - all necessary for ecological and humanitarian reasons - then that would no longer be the current American culture, but a new one.

Indeed, we must leave behind traditional cultures as well as the modern industrial/capitalist culture, however much we might be in love with or used to them. We must create new cultures. We must not weep over the evaporation of traditional cultures. All hitherto existing cultures have proved themselves to be incapable of tackling the great crises mankind is confronted with today, crises which these cultures have themselves generated through their omissions and commissions. It need not be one single new culture for the whole of mankind, although I do not know any argument against it except that cultural diversity is a beautiful thing. By all means, we can have several new cultures in future. Why should anyone be afraid of the origin of new cultures? In the history of mankind, many cultures have disappeared and all cultures originated sometime in history as new cultures.

The new cultures to be created must accept some categorical imperatives which were unknown to the hitherto existing cultures. The most important of them is the ecological imperative. They must accept the limits to growth - both to economic growth and to growth of population.

And they must accept the imperative of equality. Without equality there will be no peace, neither in a society nor among the peoples of the world. All the ideals of Enlightenment and the French Revolution did not bring peace because the principle

of equality was reduced to mean equality before the law. In the name of right to property, great inequalities in income and wealth were legitimised. In the name of freedom of contract, exploitation of fellow citizens was allowed. And in the name of "white man's burden" colonial conquest, plunder, oppression and slavery were declared a civilizing mission. The West's betrayal of the ideals of the enlightenment and the French Revolution is the original cause of today's counter Enlightenment of all kinds - religious fundamentalisms, racisms, nationalisms, ethnic expulsions, xenophobia etc etc. It is mainly under conditions of exploitation, oppression, discrimination or contempt by another people that an excessive, morbid, separatistic need for identity arises. It may be called cultural identity, but it may be based on anything: nation, tribe, race, clan, caste, religion or language. But a return to the genuine ideals of Enlightenment is no longer adequate; the philosophers of the Enlightenment were not aware of the ecological and demographic problematic.

Siddharta reports about the Kurubas that "they lived as a group and their collective responsibilities were sacred. If somebody did not have food, he did not starve. The tribe saw to it that he had enough to eat". In general, they had a collective spirit. These values must be defended, revived and developed further-not because they are part of the traditional culture of the Kurubas but because they are good for them as well as for the whole of mankind, and especially because they are the right values for the tasks ahead. These values are necessary for peace and ecological transformation of economy. Where they do not exist (anymore), they must be created anew.

There is no rule that ideas and impulses necessary for radical changes must originate in the particular cultures concerned. In the history of mankind, all peoples have learned from one another. The Europeans took over Christianity from the Palestinian Jews. Gandhi learned a lot from Tolstoi, Ruskin and Thoreau. And many Europeans and Americans have learned much from Gandhi and Lao Tse. Why should we then be suspicious of the slogan "one world"? The laws of nature are the same for all peoples and the earth is one from the very beginning. For solving local ecological problems and the problem of hunger in the poor countries of the South, global cooperation and help from the rich countries would be necessary, at least for the next two or three decades. "One world" need not necessarily mean the one world conception of the GATT, the World Bank, the IMF and the TNCs. Necessary for the process of making the world one in our sense is - apart from dialogue, solidarity and mutual help - also constructive criticism and self-criticism among those minorities among all peoples who want to change the world and so save it. Nobody is saying that the Europeans and Americans must take the initiative in changing the traditional cultures of the South. But if some people in the countries of the South are struggling to bring about the necessary changes, then it is legitimate and necessary that their political friends in the North help them with moral and concrete support. For example, when Tasleema Nasreen is struggling in Bangladesh against Muslim fundamentalism, it is the duty of all people in the World who share her views in this matter to amplify her efforts by

criticising Muslims and all other religious fundamentalisms. Similarly, it is legitimate and necessary that we in the South criticise Euro-American culture not only because it is exploitative and ecologically destructive but also because it violates human rights - e.g. through discrimination against the blacks and foreigners and by rendering hundreds of thousands of Europeans and Americans homeless.²²

I am not afraid that the world of the future will know only one monotonous culture. The future ecological and decentralised economies and the various new institutions of the different regions would provide enough space for new and different expressions of economic, social, political, religious, spiritual, literary and artistic life of the various peoples. But we must not forget that the peoples of the world are only so many variants of the same human species. The similarities between them are much greater than the differences. I do not mean by it only the species-similarities. The peoples of the world are not only biologically similar. Psychoanalysts have shown that also their psyche, even their unconscious is similar. Institutions like monogamous marriage, belief in a God or in gods and goddesses, priesthood, temple etc, artistic expressions like poetry, music and dance-all these things are almost universal. They existed among most peoples even before they had contact with each other. So, also culturally, we are one mankind.

Notes and References

1. Wolfgang Sachs: *Zur Archaologie der Entwicklungsidee* (an essay in 6 parts); in EPD-EP; different issues, 1989. (The essay has also appeared in English, but I cannot give details. English translation of the title: *On the Archaeology of the Development Idea*).
2. The two terms West and North mean in discussions of this kind actually the same thing. West is generally used when the subject matter is culture, North when it is development. I have had to use both because my subject matter is both culture and development.
3. T G Verhelst *No Life Without Roots-Culture and Development*; London; 1990.
4. Smithu Kothari "Ecology vs Development; in *Lokayan Bulletin*"; No 3-4/5; 1985; p 8.
5. Anil Agarwal et al (ed): *The Fight for Survival*; New Delhi; 1987; P 351.
6. S Kappen "Towards an Alternative Cultural Paradigm of Development"; in *Lokayan Bulletin*; No 10/4.
7. *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* (ed. Paul Edwards); New York: 1967; P 274.
8. *Frankfurter Rundschau*; 27.4.92.
9. R.C. Majumdar et al: *An Advanced History of India*; London etc; 1967; P 969.

- 10 Edgar Pisani; quoted in Verhelst (note 3); P vii.
11. Narducci; quoted in Verhelst (note 3); P 149-150.
12. quoted in Verhelst (note 3); P 150.
13. cf Vasudha Dhagamvar: "The Displaced, Their Past and Their Future"; in *Lokayan Bulletin*; P 3-4/5.
14. cf Clive Ponting: *A Green History of the World*; London; 1991; ch 5.
15. cf Sunderlal Bahuguna's account of the Chipko movement in: Ludmilla Tuting: *Umarmt dir Baume-Die Chipko-Bewegung in Indien*; Berlin; 1993; P 16-19.
16. Plato; quoted in Ponting (note 3); P76.
17. Lewis Mumford: *The Myth of the Machine*; New York; 1970; p 159.
18. Siddharta: "Tribals in HD Kote Area-a case from India"; In *Cultures and Development-quid proquo*; No. 5-6/1991.
19. All quotes in this paragraph are from Verhelst (note 3); P 72.
20. Agarwal (note 5) ; P 351.
21. Sachs (note 1).
22. In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), dwelling is explicitly mentioned as a human right (Article 25/1).
- Courtesy: *Frontier Vol. 27 Nos. 9-12*

Forthcoming from the SSA

HISTORIOGRAPHY IN A TIME OF ETHNIC CONFLICT

Professor R.A.L.H.GUNAWARDENA
in Sinhala & English

UNMAKING THE NATION: THE POLITICS OF IDENTITY AND HISTORY IN MODERN SRI LANKA

Edited by Pradeep Jeganathan & Qadri Ismail

TOWARDS A PEACEFUL SRI LANKA

Carlo Fonseka
in Sinhala

Now Available

PRUDENTLY NEGOTIATING A MORAL PEACE

Ram Manikkalingam

WHAT IS PATRIARCHY?

Kamla Bhasin

FEMINISM & NATIONALISM IN THE THIRD WORLD

Kumari Jayawardena
in Sinhala

Social Scientists' Association
129/6A, Nawala Road, Narahenpita
Colombo-05.
Tel: 501339