

**Looking to the future: Theoretical orientations and  
issues for applied research in the link between  
development and culture**

Jasper Cooper

► **To cite this version:**

Jasper Cooper. Looking to the future: Theoretical orientations and issues for applied research in the link between development and culture. Le Duc, Florent. Culture as a Tool for Development: Challenges of Analysis and Action, ACTED - ARCADE, pp.266-287, 2010. <hal-01054001>

**HAL Id: hal-01054001**

**<https://hal-sciencespo.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01054001>**

Submitted on 4 Aug 2014

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## ABSTRACT

# Looking to the future: Theoretical orientations and issues for applied research

Drawing on the empirical findings and theoretical insights presented throughout the works in this volume, this article attempts to outline useful theoretical orientations and issues for future applied research. Certainty of the continuing normative and empirical feasibility of a mutually productive link between culture and development is considered essential to the promotion of continuing research; yet this feasibility should neither be considered given nor immediately self-evident.

Accordingly, the first half considers two cases 'against' a shared future for development and culture, both of which base their arguments on certain historical accounts. In this way any propositions for new directions are furnished with broader contextual considerations, and light is shed on exactly what is at stake in formulating these. In deeming a productive link between development and culture untenable, the first case holds culture to be at fault: its 'addition' to development is nugatory, as the practice of development is solely and unproblematically concerned with infrastructural and economic levers for human betterment. In the second case, it is the alleged 'culture of development' itself that is at fault: here, due to its continuing colonial complicity, development threatens global cultural diversity by transforming local cultures in a monocultural 'Westernizing' fashion.

In refutation of these gloomy prognoses for a mutually fruitful link between culture and development, the case 'for' starts by contesting the view of development as a historically unchanged enterprise. By situating development within the context of theories of reflexive modernity, and verifying corollaries to these broad trends with specific references to UNESCO's history of non-trivial recalibrations in its approach to culture, it is shown that a reciprocally fruitful partnership

between culture and development is not only empirically feasible, but also normatively desirable.

Correspondingly, the second half furthers the case for the normative desirability of a meaningful incorporation with culture by offering several opportune avenues for applied research into this link. Questions pertaining to *development as a cultural force* having been treated at length in the preceding sections, this section is initially concerned with *culture as a force of development*, highlighting tensions in ownership, autonomy and legitimacy. Following this, the article presents two areas for research into comparatively substantive issues. Potential responses by researchers to problems of scale and duration in a context of globalization are assessed and avenues for research into the development of feedback mechanisms at the institutional and project level are suggested as part of an integrated approach to development and culture.

Jasper Cooper

## RÉSUMÉ

## Regarder vers l'avenir : perspectives et questions théoriques pour la recherche appliquée

À partir des résultats empiriques et des conceptions théoriques présentés dans les études qui composent ce volume, cet article tente de donner un aperçu des perspectives et des questions théoriques qui pourront être utiles à la recherche appliquée. La possibilité durable, normative et empirique, d'un lien entre culture et développement, fécond pour l'une comme pour l'autre, est considérée comme essentiel à l'avancement de la recherche continue ; cependant, cette possibilité ne doit être considérée ni comme acquise, ni comme allant de soi.

Par conséquent, la première partie de l'article examine deux exposés qui se positionnent « contre » un avenir commun pour le développement et la culture et qui basent tous deux leurs arguments sur certaines raisons historiques. De cette manière, toute nouvelle direction proposée est fournie avec des considérations contextuelles plus larges, et la question de savoir ce qu'elles mettent en jeu exactement est éclaircie. Le premier exposé juge qu'un lien entre développement et culture est indéfendable et considère que la culture est fautive : son « addition » au développement est inefficace puisque la pratique du développement est seulement et simplement concernée par les moyens infrastructurels et économiques capables de servir le bien-être de l'humanité. Dans le second exposé, c'est la prétendue « culture du développement » elle-même qui est mise en cause. Dans ce cas le développement, à cause de sa constante connivence coloniale, menace la diversité culturelle mondiale en transformant les cultures locales de façon monoculturelle et « occidentalisante ».

En réponse à ces sombres pronostics concernant un lien mutuel et fécond entre culture et développement, l'exposé de l'argument « pour » commence par contester la conception du développement comme une entreprise

historiquement inchangée. En situant le développement dans le contexte des théories de la « modernité réflexive » et en vérifiant les corollaires de ces tendances générales par le biais de références spécifiques aux modifications importantes qu'a pu apporter l'UNESCO à son approche de la culture, on constate qu'un partenariat fructueux et réciproque entre culture et développement est non seulement possible d'un point de vue empirique, mais également souhaitable d'un point de vue normatif.

Ainsi, la deuxième partie poursuit l'exposé de l'intérêt normatif d'une inclusion significative de la culture et offre plusieurs pistes intéressantes pour la recherche appliquée à ce rapport entre culture et développement. Les questions relatives au développement en tant que force culturelle ayant été examinées dans le détail dans les parties précédentes, cette section s'intéresse surtout à la culture comme force de développement, et souligne les tensions concernant les questions de propriété, d'autonomie et de légitimité. Puis l'article présente deux domaines de recherches relatifs à des questions d'importance égale. Il évalue les réponses possibles des chercheurs aux problèmes d'échelle et de durée dans un contexte de mondialisation et suggère, dans le cadre d'une approche intégrée du développement et de la culture, des pistes de recherche pour le développement de mécanismes d'action à l'échelle institutionnelle ainsi qu'à l'échelle des projets.

*Jasper Cooper*



---

## *Jasper Cooper*

Jasper Cooper is currently assistant researcher at Le Centre Interdisciplinaire de Recherche Comparative en Sciences Sociales (CIR-Paris). Originating from Auckland, New Zealand, he has studied social theory and political science at The University of Melbourne, Australia, and at l'Institut d'études politiques de Paris (SciencesPo, Paris). His academic focus is oriented towards the socio-cultural issues of development theory. In particular, he has been involved with The Tomorrow Foundation, a NGO concerned with community and educational development in the urban slum-areas of Kolkata, India.

---

# Looking to the future: Theoretical orientations and issues for applied research

---

Jasper Cooper

## Introduction

Considerably indebted to the findings presented in this volume, this article attempts to outline useful theoretical orientations and issues for applied research to those interested in the link between culture and development. This 'link' is arguably a relatively new one as far as the short history of development goes, and it is noteworthy that its feasibility has from time to time been brought into question. As such, if one intends to proffer new directions for research into this area that are both sensitive to the stakes of the task and robust in the face of potential criticisms, it is advantageous to have sufficiently dealt with accounts in which the past of development is seized upon in making the case against the incorporation of culture into its future.

For these reasons the following is structured into two halves. The first half is intended to provide perspectives on debates pertaining to the past of development. This half is limited for reasons of convenience and argumentation to two (necessarily schematic) cases 'against' the feasibility of a mutually productive future for development and culture. Although both cases are distinct with regard to what they mean by the notion of culture, they are alike in the fact that they draw on the past of development in order to make arguments pertaining to its future. The case 'for' a form of developmentalism incorporated complementarily with culture is made through an alternative characterization of development. In the light of portrayals of development as a highly complex and increasingly reflexive process, it is argued that the ostensible compromise – between the development of material human well-being and cultural diversity – presented as inevitable by the cases 'against', is in fact a false one. Not only can cultural diversity be supported at the same time as material human betterment, but in a framework of reflexive models of participation and reform, the relationship between the two also has potential to be reciprocally fruitful.

The second half of the paper telescopes concrete issues for applied research. This half is not intended as a comprehensive program for research, and does not assume to cover all issues facing development today. Rather, the reasoning for these suggestions draws directly on the first half, seeking to use the implications surfacing from the preceding debates to bring to light tensions confronting contemporary development. Perspectives having already been provided on the stakes of *development as a cultural force*, the first issue signposts several avenues for applied research more directly centred on culture *as a developmental force*. Specifically, tensions of ownership, autonomy and legitimacy with regard to culture as a hindrance or lever for empowerment in civil society are highlighted. Following this, two comparatively substantive areas are discussed with regard to avenues for research: first, potential responses by researchers to the analytical and pragmatic problems of scale and duration in a context of globalization are presented; and, secondly, the potential development and implementation of reflexive feedback mechanisms at the institutional and project levels is discussed.

Throughout this argument two distinguishable yet interdependent notions of culture's interaction with development will be suggested and built-upon as a way of understanding this complex point of juncture. Operating on the assumption that defining 'culture-as-such' is not only prohibitively difficult, but also unnecessary – given the fact that something being called culture is actively employed and talked about by practitioners and theorists of development – the two terms, 'categorical' and 'reflexive', are intended as a helpful way of distinguishing between two modes of using the notion 'culture'. This distinction between ways of using the word culture should resonate with the culture and development pyramids proffered in Introduction to this volume. (See Crowley)

## Reading the past: Cases for and against a complementary link between culture and development

### The Case Against

Before suggesting directions for future research into the link between development and culture, it is deemed both pragmatic and intellectually responsible to have first considered potential arguments *against* the viability of such an enterprise, and to have dealt with them successfully. However, a universally comprehensive consideration of all such cases 'against' would most likely be as exhausting as fruitless for researchers and practitioners. Therefore, this discussion is limited to two arguments made common by their use of the past to make a case against the future of culture in development; one of which is comparatively more modest in its claims, the other more global in its challenges. The limitation of the analysis in such a way is convenient given the constraints, and furthermore, productive in that it provides occasion to contextualise and justify orientations for future research into a complementary link between culture and development.

#### *Culture as additive*

The first argument 'against', although the more moderate of the two, is by no means negligible. In employing the 'past' of development to make its case, it situates development's roots in post-WWII modernization efforts. Tony Smith, in an article written in 1985, depicts this historical narrative succinctly, stating "the field of development studies, which has always been dominated by American academics, was founded in the first years after World War II, when the United States assumed leadership of a ravaged world in which the problems of containing the Soviet Union and dealing with national liberation movements throughout much of Asia and Africa were the country's top foreign policy priorities." (p. 533) Accordingly, development's inception in a post-WWII climate and maturation in a Cold War climate have endowed it with a singularity of focus that renders it uncompromising in its limited concern with infrastructural and economic levers for material human betterment. Here, given this single-mindedness, the addition of culture as another 'tool' for development alongside mainstream economic integration and institution-forming is not likely to make any more than a superficial difference to developmentalism at large: culture is understood as an additive, inessential to the ongoing implementation and success of projects. In his 2005 paper, entitled, "It's [the] Culture, Stupid! Why 'Adding Culture' is Unlikely

to Make Any Serious Difference to International Developmentalism”, Raymond Apthorpe alleges, for example:

‘the defining [...] markers of ‘developmentalism’ in development policy and its institutions, instruments, and studies [...] are deep-seated, going back at least to the post-World War II development studies [...] Since then it seems to me there have been remarkably few changes in the underlying fundamentals as distinct from surfaces. Taken together, they militate against much likelihood of ‘adding culture’ [...] making any serious difference to [...] international development policy and its institutions, instruments, studies, and evaluations. The prospect for real change will remain gloomy while the context remains unaddressed and unchanged.’(p. 133)

What is important in such an account is the way in which development is only capable of changes at a superficial level, meaning that culture will always remain nothing more than something to which ‘lip-service’ is paid. According to this argument, at the level of its fundamental operations, development is and always will be an enterprise essentially concerned with quantitative and material matters. This is not *necessarily* viewed as a bad thing. It should be noted that the ‘additive’ argument in which development is characterized as an innately economic and infrastructural endeavour does not forcibly take issue with these qualities. Rather, it strongly questions the *usefulness* of ‘adding culture’ to development; thereby suggesting that future research into this link is likely to be too fruitless to be warranted.

### *The culture of development*

Whereas the first argument leaves completely intact the merit of ‘development itself’, focusing instead on questioning the utility of adding the new category, ‘culture’, to an economically - and in terms of infrastructure - focused enterprise, the second argument takes issue with the very ‘culture of development’ itself. Essential to the way in which this argument is made is the way in which the notion of culture is used. Whereas the ‘additive’ account understands culture ‘categorically’ – which is to say, as a reified section of produced *things*, connected to, yet distinct from, ‘politics’ and ‘the economy’ – the ‘culture of development’ argument understands culture ‘reflexively’. This means that culture permeates every facet of human life as the very feature by which groups of human beings define difference between themselves; it creates and inhabits the boundaries between individuals and groups.

Under this account, development itself constitutes a culture of sorts. Clammer helpfully summarises such a view of development-as-culture, as follows: “Not only is development seen... as much as a political process and a politically contested terrain as it is an economic one, but also development is viewed as pre-eminently a social and cultural process. It is one that is based upon, transforms, or destroys cultures, both as a whole and as represented in the elements that anthropologists often identify as characteristic of culture – values, systems of belief, material artefacts, expressive, and performative practices, modes of livelihood, kinship patterns and strategies, and so forth.”(2005, p. 102) Such an understanding spans the ‘categories’ of social analysis (politics, civil society, ecology, geography, economics) so that with this usage it becomes possible to speak of ‘conservative political cultures’, ‘local cultures’, and even ‘neo-liberal economic culture’, for example. As Arturo Escobar has recently put it in the introduction to his 2008 publication *Territories of Difference*, “Economic crises are ecological crises are cultural crises” (p. 14).

Rather than focusing solely on the post-WWII period, the ‘culture of development’ argument usually traces continuities in development to violent forms of colonial expansion. Here development is a self-interested culture, its impetus to modernize stemming from colonial processes of market expansion through land and agricultural reform. Assuredly, the ‘culture of development’ argument does not go so far as to simplistically conflate contemporary developmental practice with colonialism, however this argument nevertheless maintains a significant complicity and historical continuity between the two. Allegedly, as in colonialism, the culture constituted by development contains within it by default a conception of ‘developed’ society, on the one hand, and ‘backward’ society, on the other. Crucially, although they purport to be universal, such understandings are rarely felt by all parties to be a true characterization: presumably, for example, few ‘primitive’ societies would have used this label or the set of connotations associated with it to describe themselves before efforts were made to ‘modernize’ them.

Raymond Apthorpe, though he is by no means a dogmatic proponent of such a view, provides the sort of narrative common to such arguments. For example, he draws a connection between contemporary developmental practice and the inability of colonizers (‘early developmentalists’) to understand the stakes of their own position in their relationship with local culture, which they labelled ‘the human factor’: ‘When planners and others talked... of ‘the human factor’ very often all that they meant by this were the supposed obstacles put in the way of the [colonized] by the [colonizer]... if the colonist and his society was considered as ‘a social factor’ at all it was taken for granted that self-evidently it was efficient, constructive, rational., etc.’ (1970, p. 141) Arturo Escobar, in parallel with Apthorpe’s narrative, highlights development’s inability to apprehend its own position in its relation with other cultures: here, the culture of development ‘assumes that any contact with development and the commodity is a desire for development and the commodity on the part of ‘the people’, not the enactment of a cultural politics in which development and the commodity might mean very different things’. (2000, p. 13)

According to this argument, development is the technique by which ‘backward regions’ are incorporated into modern systems of exchange and social organisation, and is allegedly therefore nothing other than the tool of modernity *par excellence*. Likewise, this account understands modernity, development and the loss of local cultural diversity as one and the same thing: ‘Modernity and development are spatial-cultural projects that require the continuous conquest of territories and peoples and their ecological and cultural transformation along the lines of a logocentric order.’ (Escobar, 2008, p. 65). Such being the case, the practice of development operates by a singular logic in which “all world cultures and societies are reduced to being a manifestation of European culture”. (Escobar, 2004, pp. 211-212) As Latouche puts it, “Whether one likes it or not, one can’t make development different from what it has been. Development has been and still is the Westernization of the world.” (1993, p. 160).

## The Case For

The two briefly-rehearsed arguments ‘against’ a shared future for development and culture can be summarized in the following way: the ‘additive’ approach asserts that, due to its inception in a climate whose main priorities were economic integration and infrastructural modernization, developmentalism is innately (and unproblematically) limited to these priorities in its purposes



and scope of potential action. Such being the case, adding the category 'culture' is unhelpful at best. The 'culture of development approach' asserts that, due to a perceived continuity with colonialism, the enterprise of development itself constitutes a culture concerned solely with modernisation and blind to the monocultural consequences of its undertaking. Development's transformation of the 'Third World' therefore cannot allow for the existence of other 'local cultures' and destroys the latter in consistently 'Europeanizing' them in the name of technical and scientific modernity.

So much for the distinction between the two arguments. A refutation of the claim that a productively shared future for development and culture is unfeasible best starts by identifying the feature that *links* these two arguments, namely: a tendency – informed by a certain historical reading – to broadly characterise the 'development field' as a fundamentally unchanging set of ideas and practices, homogenous at base and, thanks to this logic, doomed forever to be incapable of understanding or forging complementarily with culture (whether this be understood 'categorically' or 'reflexively'). In other words, although these arguments provide a historical narrative that is different in both its focus and consequences, their common denominator consists in positing development as an unreflective discipline and practice, a property held to be unchanged throughout history and which, in the last instant, proves the incompatibility of development with culture. To return to the words of Apthorpe: development pertains to a set of "underlying fundamentals as distinct from surfaces" to which 'there have been remarkably few changes', and which 'Taken together... militate against much likelihood of 'adding culture'... making any serious difference to... international development policy and its institutions, instruments, studies, and evaluations.'

We need not contest every strand of argument presented in the two cases 'against' in order to prove that there is indeed potential for a productive and fruitful relationship between development and culture and that research into the link between the two is necessary. Nor, furthermore, *should* every strand be contested for there is much worthy of careful consideration in the two cases against. In particular, the notion presented in the 'culture of development' case, that development itself constitutes a culture of *its own* and is in turn constituted *by* the global forces and processes of modernity at large, will be central to arguments made in the second half. Moreover, it must be acknowledged that development does have a 'mixed' record, in the sense that its many successes are mixed in with many failures, particularly from the perspective of the promotion of cultural diversity. This does not mean that we should throw the proverbial 'development' baby out with the 'monocultural' water, however, if one can excuse the awkwardness of the phrase.

Rather, we might simply contest the universal validity of the claim that 'development has been and still is the *Westernization of the world*.' Development is capable not of *one* but of *many different* logics of interaction with culture; one of which, assuredly, is corrosive to local authenticity, westernizing and techno-focused, but (the point being) another of which can support the distinctive cultural identity of groups and can work towards a meaningful empowerment of their capacities which in turn produces a context of enriched diversity. Indeed, a more nuanced reading of the history of development in its interaction with culture reveals that – whatever the alleged historical roots of development – it has proven itself through various reforms and reflexive adjustments to be capable of a logic of interaction with culture entirely left out of the previous portrayals.

Before entering into this account proper, a final key point to be made is that development is no more likely to disappear than the problems to which it addresses itself are likely to vanish. As Clammer puts the point in response to self-proclaimed 'post-developmentalists' like Escobar and Latouche, "even if we do abandon the term 'development', the problems to which it traditionally refers – poverty, war, displacement of peoples, pollution, and the systemic and systematic injustices to which a huge proportion of the population of the globe are subject – will not miraculously disappear with it." (2005, p. 102) Research into fostering a more productive link between development and culture presents great potential for a more culturally-ethical, less culturally corrosive development with increased chances of reciprocal success for participants. From this perspective – the specificities of which will be addressed in greater detail in the second half – a complementary link between culture and development is not only empirically possible, but normatively imperative too.

### *Development, Reflexive Modernity and Cultural Diversity*

The 'development field' (defined as the institutions, groups, academics, projects and practitioners that constitute the international enterprise of development) is capable of different logics of interaction with culture apart from that in which its influence is perceived for historical reasons either as ineffectual or corrosive. In that it is capable of reflexively adjusting itself to the contingencies of its task, development can enrich cultural diversity, even within contexts of modernisation. The argument that developmentalism is capable of a degree of self-apprehensive reflexivity that ensures an interaction with culture that is beneficial for cultural diversity can be made in two contexts.

First, in refutation of the way in which the 'culture of development' account conflates modernity, monoculturalism and development, the development field can be situated within a broader context of trends towards reflexivity in modernity. In his first publication, Ulrich Beck described *Risk Society* as an 'inescapable structural condition of advanced industrial society', claiming that the increasing awareness of 'risk' in modern society has, so-to-speak, *forced* certain institutions of developed and developing societies into a 'state of reflexivity'. (1992, p. 14) He describes in this work a process whereby the perception and communication of 'threats' whose solution requires cooperation on a global scale (climate change, global economic recession, nuclear warfare, etc.) have a way of irreversibly linking actors with their consequences. The trend toward risk-induced reflexivity is identified everywhere in modern practices by Beck: from the financial internalizing of ecological externalities by transnational corporate firms, to the evolution of modern anthropology wherein the very society that produced the discipline becomes subject matter for analysis. Importantly, the element of reflexivity is essential to the understanding and promotion of diversity. This is because understanding culture as something *multiple*, and not uniform (i.e., as diverse), requires an analytical position in which one's own culture becomes one of many that constitute this diversity. One name for such an analytical position is 'reflexivity'.

Beck highlights the link between diversity, reflexivity and risk, stating that the induced interdependence of globally-perceived risks precipitates an inclusivity that no amount of diplomacy or multiculturalist arguments for the value of the 'Other' could achieve on their own. With reference to historical precedents, such as the global phasing out of chlorofluorocarbons by the IPPC in 1997, he claims "World risk is the... obligatory medium of communication in a world of irreconcilable differences... risks activate and connect actors across borders, who otherwise do

not want to have anything to do with one another.” (Beck, 2008, p. 6) Given that it renders more explicit the way in which certain outcomes are related to the decisions that originally precipitated their causes, the increasing incorporation of risk into the considerations of political actors has positive consequences from the perspective of accountability. As Beck puts it, ‘Risks presuppose human decisions. They are the partly positive, partly negative... consequences of human decisions and interventions. In relation to risks there is inevitably posed the highly explosive question of social accountability and responsibility... the acknowledged, decision-governed social roots of risks make it completely impossible to externalize the problem of accountability.’ (2008, p. 5)

By virtue of the fact that developmentalism is part of modernity, if not the tool of modernization, and that modernity is held to be ‘inevitably’ reflexive, development is likewise *forced* into being receptive to the wide-reaching consequences of its actions. Accordingly, Portes and Kincaid view a general trend within development towards this sort of diverse inclusivity, stating: “The past decade has dramatically undermined both the shared assumptions and divergent predictions of earlier developmental perspectives... Thus included within the broad purview of the sociology of development are the social relations of Third World populations and various subgroups, such as women or ethnic minorities; the diversity of political regimes and the determinants of their evolution; the strategic options available to Third World states in their relationships to transnational firms and other foreign actors; and the flows of capital, information, and people that link Third World countries with the developed or core countries.”(1989, p. 481) Jan Nederveen Pieterse identifies this trend as a precipitator of a new (or more modern) form of development in which a feedback between cause and action ensures accountability and awareness to cultural risks. According to this view, the field has effectively begun, for reasons of efficiency and risk-avoidance, to internalise factors that were traditionally dealt with as externalities: ‘In the currently emerging pattern of reflexive development a feedback mode is taking shape in which development policy increasingly becomes concerned with the management of development interventions itself. Features of this feedback include: ...a breakdown of faith that technical progress = social progress. It is no longer being taken for granted that the negative effects of technical progress can be treated separately, as social consequences of technological change’ (Pieterse, 1998, p. 368)

The significance of such an account is that it accepts the ‘culture of development’ argument that development is one of the outposts and veritable ‘tools’ of modernity, but provides an alternative to what this might mean with regard to its interaction with culture. When modernity is read in terms of an increasingly reflexive process, rather than in strictly colonial terms, it becomes harder to view development as an unchanging or overdetermined enterprise. Asserting that development takes part in the modernity-wide process of becoming-reflexive means that the potential exists for developmentalists to apprehend the possible negative social effects of their own action. This in turn allows for the reform necessary to ensure sensitivity to the cultural stakes of any development intervention.

Moreover, development’s ability to interact reflexively with culture can be situated in the light of the history of a particularly influential developmental institution, such as UNESCO, taking such theoretical assertions pertaining to modernity at large past broad refutations and concretising these with reference to specific precedents. Leaving aside the narrative by which this institution has grown from a Northern institution into one increasingly constituted by the South – which is significant in itself – one can focus on the changing history of UNESCO’s cultural policy, which

exhibits a receptivity to diverse notions of culture and to the stakes of any interaction with that which is defined as culture. This account is absent from the cases 'against'.

UNESCO, assumed for the sake of argument to be a 'paradigmatic example' of an institution of development and therefore of 'the development field', has, even since the post-WWII context, contained and promoted a complex definition of culture which has not insignificantly influenced the course of development projects and the fostering of global cultural diversity. The charge that the development enterprise is uniformly rooted in an unreflective ideology and discourse of monoculturalism seems somewhat worthy of scepticism in light of the following, from UNESCO General Conference, in Paris, 1946, for example:

'UNESCO believes firmly in maintaining the fullest diversity and variety of cultures... There was no question of creating a uniform culture, [...], a single culture for all the world. On the contrary, [UNESCO] would defend cultures in danger of extinction and would encourage new ones, preserving the maximum diversity among them.' (p. 2)

Indeed, in 1947, UNESCO expressed a policy of endogenous cultural empowerment that, although an unashamed promotion of modernity, is by no means a strictly Westernizing form of modernity:

'It is not enough for peoples to be educated from without, to have all their scientific research done by others, to receive their information through foreign newspapers or outside broadcasts: they should have their own educational and scientific systems, their own newspapers and radio stations, although of course they should not aim at cultural autarchy or isolationism.' (UNESCO, p. 14)

In the light of such assertions it is clear that UNESCO, even from the very early post-WWII era, had at least a certain self-conscious sensitivity to the dangers of cultural monoculturalism in the interaction between international development institutions and diverse place-based cultures. Moreover, subsequent refinements of the approach to this interaction that included notions of sub-national diversity led the institution to become one of the leading forces of the protection of minority cultures during anti-colonial and autochthonous-autonomy movements in the 50's and 60's. The following narrative, for example, seems to run directly against claims that developmental institutions can be universally understood as forces of monocultural transformation on a global scale:

'In 1952 the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations explicitly took on the task of combating discrimination and protecting minorities. Nevertheless, the importance of culture and education in UNESCO's duties led that organization, too, to act in the field of human rights. Minority voices were now being heard, demanding 'cultural rights' and obliging the world to recognize 'internal diversity' within countries. Decolonization and the birth of independent states were a distinguishing feature of the time, and gave internal diversity a prominence it had lost during the age of colonialism. Minorities sought representation in the social and political reorganizations brought about by new governments, and "internal diversity" gained ground in many countries... *Having stressed the benefits of "external" cultural diversity among countries from the outset, the United Nations system and UNESCO in particular now sought, by means of a series of exhortations or binding agreements, to*

*recognize cultural diversity as one of the keys to harmonious coexistence no longer just between country and country but also within individual countries.'* (UNESCO, 2007, pp. 90, italics mine.)

By the time of the World Conference on Cultural Policies (MONDIACULT) held in Mexico in July-August 1982, UNESCO had developed a conception of culture remarkably close to that used in the 'culture of development' argument, which is to say, a 'reflexive' definition in which culture is something breaching all categories of human existence, the acknowledgement of which allows for self-perception and self-correction. For example, the following definition of culture is given in the Mexico Declaration on cultural policies:

'In its widest sense, culture may now be said to be the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only the arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs. [...] It is culture that gives man the ability to reflect upon himself. It is culture that makes us specifically human, rational beings, endowed with a critical judgment and a sense of moral commitment. It is through culture that we discern values and make choices. It is through culture that man expresses himself, becomes aware of himself, recognizes his incompleteness, questions his own achievements, seeks untiringly for new meanings and creates works through which he transcends his limitations.' (1982, p. 39)

In accordance with the way in which such assertions would appear to contradict characterisations of development as a universally Westernizing force, the 2007 review, "UNESCO and the question of Cultural Diversity 1946-2007", is self-consciously clear about the importance of this conception in countering "head-on the belief that culture and development were incompatible or even contradictory". (p. 103) For example, the following quote from the article in question discusses the importance of the Mexico Declaration's definition of culture in endowing the capacity for reflexive and critical negotiations of cultural interaction:

'The conception of culture as a universal faculty rather than a rigid canon of practice leaves more room for flexibility and transcendence. The shift from a compartmentalized, fixed and unchangeable notion of "culture" as it was pictured in the later 1940s to a concept of culture as something that evolves and lives in a dynamic world of exchanges, was a radical change. The Mexico Declaration introduced the ideas of renewal, re-evaluation and critical choice into the very definition of "culture" and answered in advance the objection that cultural pluralism could hinder fair shares or solidarity among cultures.' (UNESCO, 2007, p. 106)

Put together, these portrayals show that, at the very least, broad generalizations, justified through a use of history, of development as a single-minded and unchanging process, ironically, suffer from a lack of historical reflection. Indeed, whatever its genesis, the development field has diversified its domain of influence, renovated its mechanisms of sharing and information exchange, and has generally become more self-accountable. Importantly, this has been to the benefit, rather than detriment, of a relationship with culture, as the theoretical, legal and institutional approaches to this question have been constantly re-worked throughout this process.

Insofar as it contradicts portrayals of the field as fundamentally unchanging and culturally-oblivious, the preceding account of development *does* help to suggest that a fruitful meeting of that which we call development with that which we call culture is at least empirically feasible, if not inevitable. However, this process is not simply better off left to its own devices: practitioners would be in a much better position to counter problems facing development *with* a flexible and productive link with culture, than *without* it. The fostering of this link is therefore something requiring sustained research and ethical sensitivity. It is in the interests of promoting such orientations that the discussion will turn to the second half to look at exactly where these opportunities that justify a normative case for research into the link between culture and development may lie.

## Looking to the future: Theoretical orientations and issues for applied research

### The stakes of ownership, autonomy and legitimacy with regard to culture as hindrance and lever in civil society

The following issue for applied research, of which further investigation is deemed essential, is in fact a composition of several interrelated normative issues pertaining to the role of culture in civil society. Given the preceding discussions over concerns about the destructive or corrosive influence that certain cultures of development might have on local or minority cultures, it is important that researchers continually frame the issue of a programmatic engagement with culture in reference to the potential problems such an engagement is liable to engender. Concerning the issue of culture as a hindrance and lever to empowerment in civil society, three avenues for research will be highlighted: culture and autonomy; culture and ownership; and, tensions in political and cultural legitimacy.

#### *The institution/endogenous debate over autonomy*

As regards to the question of autonomy with regard to culture and development, a tension clearly exists between, on the one hand, proponents of community-focused and locally-based endogenous models, and, on the other hand, proponents of policy-focused and nationally-based institutional models, wherein a balance must be struck. On one hand, those arguing for endogenous models of developing local and minority culture hold that such cultural artifacts are better developed, maintained and promoted via means internal to the groups and communities that produce them. Too much participation with national political institutions and policy-constraints, it is claimed, limits the control that the original practitioners of a certain culture have over its production, distribution, preservation, and management in general. Cultural authenticity is thereby eroded through a process of national institutional appropriation. On the other hand, those arguing for a form of cultural development that is based on policy and national political institutions claim that endogenously formed models limit their chances for success in that they lack both the political legitimacy and the fiscal financial support needed to engineer sustainable projects.

Correspondingly, research must verify to what extent institutional incorporation *does* pose threats to cultural autonomy. If such is the case, further research might investigate the question of whether these threats can be overcome through participatory models of policy-formation wherein the community concerned is involved in the drafting of proposals and priorities. Conversely, the demonstrable ways in which purely endogenous cultural development might hinder the political legitimacy of minority groups in national contexts, thereby impeding fiscal funding and support, might be appropriate for investigation. Is such an account verifiable? Moreover, to what extent do local community leaders (who are often not necessarily the very practitioners or producers of a given 'cultural resource') speak for their communities? Researchers should remain sensitive to the issue of internal cultural censorship within groups: do certain communities deliberately hinder the output of certain cultural products deemed incompatible with their self-identity? If so, within liberal democracies, a tension worthy of consideration clearly exists between the autonomy of self-censoring *groups* at the community level and, the *individual* citizen's rights to freedom of expression and of movement between groups at the national level.

### *Minority rights, nationhood and subnational cultures*

Such questions touch inevitably upon the tension between minority rights and nation-building. Developmental practitioners concerned with culture do not come upon minority groups constitutive of a culture within a vacuum. Rather, such groups are often formed and constituted in legal terms by their representation in constitutions and treaties detailing their rights as sub-national or autochthonous minorities. Will Kymlicka, in his 2001 publication *Politics in the Vernacular* and elsewhere, clearly explicates a tension that arises from this situation. On the one hand, nations who institutionally support the concerns of minorities and grant them rights legally protect against monocultural hegemony, thereby fostering their own diversity through an inclusive model of national-identification. The flipside of this concern with pluralism, on the other hand, is that nations by their very definition are occupied with the ongoing task of nation-building. As Kymlicka makes clear, this task is never 'ethnoculturally neutral', nor can it be, for in constructing a national-identity nation-builders must select a certain national language with which to conduct all governmental affairs, in addition to the significant prioritizing of certain cultural identities through various forms of cultural representation, such as flags, national anthems, state-recognized religions, and so on.

Researchers therefore need to continually bring attention to the stakes of any engagement with the promotion and development of minority cultural identities in contexts of nations anxious to prevent secessionism through a unified sense of solidarity. For example, in the context of a developing nation where notions of national-unity are still very fragile, and where the seeds of ethnic-cleansing and balkanization persist, what are the stakes of a development NGO's empowering of a certain minority group and the development of its 'difference' with relation to other groups? In what cases, if any, does the sovereignty of a minority group take precedence over national sovereignty? Researchers might better explicate the links (if links there indeed are) between conflict and the 'development of cultures' in such contexts.

Questions of certain kinds of 'cultural development' made in developing contexts might be construed as controversial, and this controversy may be in some part mitigated by sensitivity to the stakes of such engagements. Specifically, the stakes involved in decisions to divert fiscal revenue to cultural projects that would otherwise be going to infrastructure, health and education



are very high. Is there a quantifiable 'base' of material well-being to which a state should attain before it can give attention to cultural concerns, or is it possible to develop all sectors at once? Who should make such decisions – policy-makers at the national, international or regional level? Undoubtedly, this is an issue as much for those versed in geopolitics and nation-building as it is for researchers interested in artistic production and the preservation of local practices from embroidery to cheese-making.

### *Ownership and the stakes of heritage*

Significantly intertwined with the preceding concerns over the stakes of cultural autonomy for minorities in civil society in a national context is the issue of ownership. The stakes of this problem cannot be left ignored by researchers. Certain questions should be kept at the forefront of research, namely: when culture is employed in, or is the focus of, development projects, to whose benefit are these efforts addressed? To whom does culture belong: those who originally produced it; those who inherit it; those who consume or share in it; those who fund it; those that have a legal claim to it?

Researchers should confront the issue of the right of a certain group to destroy parts of its own culture. Who could make and legitimate decisions to forget certain cultural practices? Are such decisions ever legitimate? Research might assess whether the forgetting and leaving behind of some aspects of culture is as equally important to the dynamic life of a culture as the remembering and preservation is. If so, in what ways might a model of indicators and criteria for such actions be developed? Conversely, researchers might more closely analyse the precise criteria and priorities by which heritage to be preserved is made eligible for preservation in a given project. Are there ways in which mechanisms of accountability and reform can be built into such projects of preservation? The question decentralization (to be addressed shortly) will be essential to such considerations. If cultural practices are now diffused and practiced globally, for example, to what extent must definitions of who 'owns' culture be re-assessed?

The ongoing framing of issues with regard to the question of heritage is essential to ensuring a complementary link between development and culture. Researchers might therefore investigate – in addition to the question of that which is included – that which is *excluded* from any given heritage project. What degree of falsification or of the 'prioritizing of historical facts' goes into such projects? Can these issues be resolved through models of 'living heritage'? How might feedback mechanisms play a role in ensuring that any grievances relating to such politics of remembrance are given proper due? Again, many of these questions foreground the larger issue of how it is established empirically *to whom* the cultural heritage 'being used' *belongs*. For concrete judicial examples of such issues, researchers might seek to draw out the precise relation between minority rights, nation-building, and the formation of cultural policy.

### *Tensions in political and cultural legitimacy*

Finally, the issue of political legitimacy is a pertinent one for researchers interested in the link between culture and development, in that it underlies the tensions manifest in the three previously mentioned areas: endogenous vs. institutional models for cultural autonomy; minority rights and nation-building, and; the ownership, practice and preservation of cultural heritage. 'Political legitimacy' may seem like an inappropriate issue for applied research, as the notion by definition is something contained and constituted in the world of unconscious perceptions,



unwritten acknowledgements (or lack of acknowledgement), and socially pervasive ideas or attitudes. However, the presence or the absence of political legitimacy quite clearly have very real – and in some cases, disastrous – consequences in empirically quantifiable terms.

This is particularly true with regard to the sorts of transient populations being made increasingly more common by processes specific to that which we call ‘globalisation’. Such processes include: displacement of environmental refugees, global economic disparities, informal transportation networks, and changing immigration laws. Mario Azzopardi’s Malta-based case study (this volume) provides a telling example of how a widespread lack of legitimacy can create economic, social and legal plight for immigrant communities. Here Azzopardi draws a direct link between the immaterial cultural prejudices against immigrants and the consequent material hardships in which they are put. In this case, efforts to draw on the culture of the dance group in question, in conjunction with a Maltese legal avenue that allows for the forming of private enterprises from collectives, were made as a way to form a recognised and profitable enterprise from within the immigrant community. Such actions, had they been successful, would have undoubtedly improved the political legitimacy of those involved, not only with regard to their legal and economic status, but also socially, by virtue of the increased exposure of their cultural identity to the Maltese public.

Unfortunately such efforts failed due to the fact that those who would have constituted the collective were only using Malta as a ‘transit point’ to the rest of Europe, and as such could not maintain the stable demographic base required for the collective to succeed. Global phenomena such as this (the transboundary flows of people) pose significant challenges for applied research in that they are widespread yet locally-specific. Furthermore, they pertain to a causality in which long social, ecological, political and cultural histories combine to produce effects that endure over equally long timeframes, and are in turn recapitulated materially in the economic disenfranchisement, urban-geographical segregation, and high-ratio imprisonment of certain groups of people. Azzopardi’s case represents, nevertheless, a quite clear example of how the ‘categorical’ manifestations of culture (dance) may have helped to better the standing of immigrants with regard to ‘reflexive’ culture (public attitudes) and may have, through this dual approach, fostered empowering political legitimacy for these groups. Research into such cases might reveal potential models for creating political legitimacy and the empowerment that attends it through a careful engagement with cultures in the ‘categorical’ and ‘reflexive’ senses.

## **Theoretical Orientations**

The three broad theoretical orientations of reflexivity, interdisciplinarity, and decentralization, informed by the preceding sections, will structure the following propositions for avenues into research of substantive issues. Arguably, a propitious basis for exploiting these orientations already exists in that they are found to some extent in any instance of developmental practice. Firstly, development has, at least since the post-WWII period, included some degree of reflexivity, as suggested in the preceding discussions of self-conscious processes of institutional reform. However, research into participative and democratic models of reflexivity is deemed essential to the task of forging culture productively with development, in that the guarantee of an ability to self-correct and reform is the most effective way of ensuring against a form of development that is completely deaf and blind as regards the cultures of the ‘recipients’ of development. A state of

reflexivity is understood herein to be one in which an individual actor, an institution, a political group, or a nation, acts at the same time that it evaluates the legitimacy of this action with regard to the objectives and likely consequences of this action.

Secondly, insofar as nearly every development project has required the cooperation of actors from divergent disciplines (such as structural engineers, economists, anthropologists, political scientists, geologists, representatives of local governments, and so on), it has always been to some extent interdisciplinary in nature. As such, it may seem somewhat unnecessary to suggest interdisciplinarity as a broad theoretical orientation for research. Nonetheless, the complexity of the considerations that go into meeting the challenges demanded of development today requires more than ever, an increasingly integrated approach that takes advantage of the available diversity of perspectives from the very initial stages of project conception and implementation. Interdisciplinarity is understood here to describe a form of research and action that combines the specific expert knowledges of different disciplines in order to provide a more comprehensive analytic and pragmatic approach to the undertaking of a shared task.

Thirdly, development has exhibited with increasing intensity the traits of decentralized organization, such as the dispersed participation of experts, NGO actors, government representatives, and endogenous local actors within single projects. However, the potential for increased communication and sharing through the interlinking of actors according to such designs is not fully exploited. Indeed, the research into conceptual frameworks for action that function in a decentralized manner is essential to connecting otherwise-isolated cultural practitioners with the intellectual and economic resources they require. In this discussion decentralization refers to a form of administration or organization of an enterprise in which authority and autonomy are dispersed throughout several geographically-diverse points that nevertheless constitute a group united in its objectives and principles.

## **Problems of scale and duration in a context of globalization**

As is evident in the directly preceding discussion of Azzopardi's case, the development field today addresses itself to a historically unique and rapidly changing context, within which reside both opportunities and challenges for a form of culturally integrated development. Two areas for applied research are deemed essential in determining whether this new potentiality is to be largely beneficial or detrimental: firstly, the fostering of durable linkages forming decentralized networks of actors and groups on a scale that spans from the global to the local; and secondly, the development of a shared interdisciplinary conceptual vocabulary that can facilitate increased communication and sharing amongst actors within such networks.

### *Fostering of global/local linkages*

Considerable research remains to be done on precisizing the opportunities and stakes for cooperation between actors at the various scales that presently interact and commingle in virtually any contemporary development project. Pertinent to this issue is the question of place-based culture in a context of global scales. Local cultures are often depicted as the last bastions of a certain way of life that the modern world has surpassed and in doing so rendered obsolete. Research needs to explicate the nature of this dynamic, determining the extent to which such

accounts are indeed generally accurate. Research might reveal for instance whether new forms of cultural hybridity actually allow for a different model of interaction on this scale, one that escapes the traditional/modern binary where one is attained only at the expense of the other. Noteworthy is the way in which, for example, internet communities provide avenues for keeping alive minority languages and place-oriented religions far beyond the original geographical anchorage from which the constituents of these communities have been distanced. With such cases, researchers might identify ways in which – contrary to accounts where ‘islands’ of local culture are slowly eroded – ‘traditional’ cultural identities are actually perpetuated and fostered by the same phenomena that purportedly work to undermine them. Research should be done into whether networks of communication could bring global attention (and the necessary economic and intellectual resources that accompany this) to such struggles for cultural survival. Moreover, according to Touraine, ‘Achieving the goal of linking across the globalization and localization of world society – the coexistence of global culture with localized and indigenous cultures – implies at the very least, some consolidation or cross-linking of perspectives on the past, present and the future – through broadened education and knowledge of the ‘Other’ – if ‘the cultures of the world are to coexist with the culture of the global village’. (Touraine, 1993, p. 478) Central to this last question, therefore, will be the degree to which reflexive and inclusive models of self-perception and reform can be ensured between ‘globally-based’ and ‘locally-based’ actors.

Territorial competitiveness is another of the dynamics amplified by the global information economy in relation to which development actors must coordinate their projects. Often this dynamic is said to stifle the growth of cultures, as the economically focused and competitive environment is unforgiving, and works according to a logic that does not intrinsically value certain ‘non-categorical’ instances of culture (i.e., non-commodifiable aspects that would come under our ‘reflexive’ definitions of culture, such as, certain familial structures, nuptial rituals, etc.). Reinterpreting this challenge however, researchers might investigate to what extent territorial competitiveness might prove to be a tool for diversity and place-based empowerment. If, for example, it is alleged that territorial competitiveness creates the causal architecture for monocultural environments, how can one explain the intense cultural diversity found in territorially competitive cities, such as London? In addressing these stakes and questions, the notion of linkages should be kept in mind. Research into the formation of durable and compatible cross-regional linkages that utilise new information technology (such as networks for sharing case-studies, widely accessible electronic databases of development literature, and so on) will undoubtedly go some way towards helping to mitigate the ‘culturally-corrosive’ effects of global modernity.

### *Interdisciplinary conceptual vocabulary*

In a context of globalization, developmental actors are presented with a considerable conceptual challenge, constituted by problems whose origins and effects are at once local and global, and whose causality is an intertwining of cultural, ecological, economic, political and other factors. Practitioners of development without an analytic framework equal to the complexities of the context in which they work might find themselves continually undermined by problems of which the causality escapes them. Furthermore, it is one thing to develop the sort of networks suggested in the preceding paragraph. However, when these networks link actors of different disciplines (structural physicists, anthropologists, economists, local community leaders, cultural event organisers, artists, politicians, and so on), actors of different languages, and actors of different

cultural backgrounds, the potential for miscommunication is considerable. In addition, the requirements of fostering communication and increased sharing across diverse regional contexts mean that such networks need to be at once resilient and open to cross-compatibility with other such networks.

It is to these demands that researchers could respond in developing an interdisciplinary conceptual vocabulary capable of explicating causes and providing models to practitioners in diverse development contexts. Within developmental literature, a clear and reciprocally compatible sense of what exactly is being referred to when discussing concepts such as 'transnational flows', 'cross-regional networks' and 'cultural resources', for example, seems currently unapparent. At least on a much smaller scale, such has not always been the case. Tony Smith, for instance, speaks of the 'golden age of developmentalism', characterised by 'a proliferation of books written by teams of specialists, often from different backgrounds or dealing with very distinct issues, whose unity presupposed or confidently anticipated commonly shared models'. (1985, p. 536) Crucially, for Smith, the spirit in which such collaboration took place 'anticipated not simply a better understanding of the Third World, but the growing unification of the social sciences around their increasingly common understanding of a set of particular issues' such that 'The various "cultures" of sociology, anthropology, economics, history, political science, and psychology might keep their separate identities, but their interdisciplinary pursuits would allow them to draw strength from one another, to pull them... to the level of the wholeness of social life'. (p. 536)

Seemingly, the eclecticism and divergence of viewpoints within the contemporary development field hinder the feasibility (if not the desirability) of any 'utopian' visions of epistemological unification. There is nevertheless reason to believe that the increased sharing of interdisciplinary research on precise economic, geological, political, social and cultural threads of causality might go a long way towards mitigating issues of incommunicability, which would in turn increase the chances for success for development projects. Quantitative economic and geological research into the transboundary flow of peoples, for example, cross-referenced with a localized analysis of political, social and ecological factors and trends would represent a significant step towards furnishing the sort of globally-aware perspective and frame of action that is necessary to understand both the objectives and potential cultural consequences of development action in a globalized context.

## The development of feedback mechanisms

As has been both implied and directly suggested throughout this article, the fostering of reflexive trends is one of the best ways to ensure a complementary incorporation of development and culture, as actors who are obliged to reflect upon their own position and the stakes of this position are better enabled to make any appropriate adjustments regarding a proactive and reciprocally beneficial interaction with other cultures. To repeat a point stated in the case 'for', the process of becoming reflexive as it is herein defined is by nature also a process of ensuring accountability. However, normative assertions of the need for reflexivity are ineffective without the accompanying research into concrete ways in which the enterprise of development can be made more reflexive both at an institutional level and at the level of individual projects.

To this end, it is necessary to address the question of how we might take the normative assertions of the need for such orientations, beyond mere intuitions, and proffer direct avenues for applied research for implementation in the field. Research into the development and implementation of 'feedback mechanisms' – binding and self-imposed mandates requiring the review and evaluation of policy pertaining to institutions and individual projects – might go some way to creating a more reflexive, and therefore, more culturally adept, form of development.

### *Institutional level*

One advantage of conducting research into the potential for the development of feedback mechanisms at the institutional level in development is that various institutions, such as UNESCO, have already set the precedents for such action. This sort of institutional change is the result neither of organic nor accidental processes. Rather, such changes are the deliberate outcome of a feedback effect set up between the internal policy-makers and institutional architects, on the one hand, and the unforeseen reappraisals arising from various technological and sociological failures highlighted by mechanisms of auditing and evaluation, on the other hand. Such being the case, researchers might look into exactly how such reform is brought about, and investigate ways that such feedback mechanisms could be deliberately replicated in institutional architecture. Research needs to precise the very legal and procedural means by which mechanisms of accountability, transparency, and reform become embedded in institutions in which they were previously found lacking.

### *Project level*

Applied research into the development of feedback mechanisms is particularly applicable at the project level. Work remains to be done on the discrepancy between the theoretically high-level of importance attributed to qualitative socio-cultural indicators in the perspective of their low frequency of usage in the various stages of development projects (conception, implementation, impact assessment and evaluation). This may be a question of reform. Bliss et. al., in speaking of Germany's efforts to incorporate the 'cultural factor' into their developmental projects, highlight the problematic fact that 'instead of launching a comprehensive reform of project work that might serve to incorporate a project more satisfactorily within the culture of the partner concerned, those responsible for planning draw up purely normative models without there being at the same time any indication of a change in development-policy tools'. (1988, p. 101)

Correspondingly, numerous avenues for modeling, evaluation and readjustment of projects are open to researchers with such issues in mind. The following questions, for example, could indicate such avenues: in what ways can planners be sure, at the very definition of the issues at stake in designing a project that some sort of consensus has been reached among all those involved, including the recipients? What are potential mechanisms by virtue of which planners can be sure disputes have the chance to be submitted and the appropriate changes to project-design made? Are coherent, comprehensive qualitative and quantitative indicators being included throughout all stages of a given project? If not, why not? In what ways might this gap be reconciled and how might the merits of this reconciliation be assessed in the light of cultural good practices? In what ways can binding mandates ensuring these policies be embedded into the project architecture at inception?

## Conclusion

An awareness of debates over the history of the link between development and culture helps to understand better the ways in which development itself might constitute a culture of its own, which in turn supports a receptivity to the potentially corrosive effects certain forms of development might have on cultural diversity. Despite these helpful insights rendered visible through a consideration of the cases 'against', however, from the perspective of an alternative historical account in which development is held to be a self-accountable enterprise, capable of reflexive methods of reform, the gloomy prognoses of the cases against are not altogether convincing. Not only is the empirical feasibility of a form of culturally-incorporated development objectively demonstrable, but further research into this link is also clearly indispensable. Further research furnished by appropriate action might help culture and development 'work for one other', in two senses: in a 'categorical' sense, culture can work for development by providing both a source of investment and political awareness; and, in a 'reflexive' sense, development can work for culture by playing a central role in the support of global cultural diversity. A brief sketch of the contemporary context in which development and culture interact reveals in equal part opportunities for success and risks of failure. Ensuring that this encounter remains mutually beneficial requires that researchers foster sensitivity to the political and cultural consequences that reside within this point of juncture. Clearly numerous avenues exist for deeper sustained research into a form of development in which the relation of cultural diversity to material human well-being is not that of a compromise, but a durable partnership between the two.

## REFERENCE LIST

- Apthorpe, Raymond (2005) 'It's [the] Culture, Stupid!' Why "Adding Culture" is Unlikely to Make Any Serious Difference to International Developmentalism. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 6 (2), pp. 130-141.
- Apthorpe, Raymond (1970) African Rural Development Planning and the Conceptions of 'The Human Factor'. *Journal of Development Studies*, 6 (4), pp.140-151.
- Beck, Ulrich (2008) 'Risk Society's "Cosmopolitan Moment"'. Lecture at Sciences Po, Paris, November 7th2008.
- Beck, Ulrich (1992) *Risk Society: towards a new modernit.*, New York, Sage Publications.
- Bliss, Frank et al. (1988) The Cultural Dimension in West German Development Policy and the Contribution of Ethnology [and Comments and Reply]. *Current Anthropology*, 29 (1), pp. 101-121.
- Clammer, John (2005) Culture, Development, and Social Theory: On Cultural Studies and the Place of Culture in Development, *The Asia Pacific Journal*, 6 (2), pp.100-119.
- Escobar, Arturo (2000) Beyond the Search for a Paradigm? Post-Development and beyond, *Development*, 43 (4), pp.11-14.
- Escobar, Arturo (2004) Beyond the Third World: Imperial Globality, Global Coloniality and Anti-Globalisation Social Movements, *Third World Quarterly*, 25 (1), 207-230.
- Escobar, Arturo (2008) *Territories of difference: place, movements, life, redes*, Durham, Duke University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will (2001) *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Latouche, Serge (1993) *In The Wake of the Affluent Society: An Exploration of Post-Development*, London, Zed.
- Pieterse, Jan N. (1998) My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post-Development, Reflexive Development, *Development and Change*, 29, 343-373.

---

Portes, Alejandro and Kincaid, A. Douglas (1989) Sociology and Development in the 1990s: Critical Challenges and Empirical Trends, *Sociological Forum* , 4 (4), 479-503.

Smith, Tony (1985) Requiem or New Agenda for Third World Studies? *World Politics* , 37 (4), 532-561.

Touraine, Alain (1993) Presentation to the World Commission on Culture and Development, Paris, UNESCO.

UNESCO (1982) Mexico Declaration on Cultural Policies, *World Conference on Cultural Policies*, Mexico City.

UNESCO (1947) *Report of the Director-General for 1947*, Paris.

UNESCO (2007) *UNESCO and the Question of Cultural Diversity 1946-2007: Review and strategies*, Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (1946) *UNESCO General Conference, first session*, Paris.