

Anthropology and development

Arturo Escobar

Introduction

Since its inception, anthropology has not ceased to teach us a lesson of great importance, which was as vital in the nineteenth century as it is today, even if in a strikingly different way: namely, the profound historicity of all social arrangements, and the arbitrary character of all cultural orders. Having been assigned the study of 'savages' and 'primitives' in the intellectual division of labour at the dawn of the modern period, anthropology has nevertheless remained an instrument of critique and contestation of what is given and established. Faced with the panorama of differences with which anthropology confronts them, the modern orders of European origin cannot but admit a certain instability in their foundations, no matter how hard they might try to eliminate or domesticate the ghosts of alterity. By emphasizing the historicity of all existing and imaginable orders, anthropology presents the dominant modern orders with a reflection of their own historicity. The notion of the 'West' itself becomes radically questioned. Notwithstanding, this discipline continues to derive its *raison d'être* from a deeply Western historical and epistemological experience that still shapes the relations that Western societies can have with all cultures of the world, including itself.

Arturo Escobar was born and grew up in Colombia. He was educated at the Universidad del Valle (Cali, Colombia), Cornell University and the University of California at Berkeley (PhD 1987). Among his interests are political ecology and the anthropology of development, social movements, and new technologies. He is the author of *Encountering Development: the Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (1995). Address: Department of Anthropology, Machmer Hall, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA01003, USA, email: aescobar@anthro.umass.edu.

Few historical processes have fueled this paradoxical situation in which anthropology seems to be enmeshed – at once inextricably wedded to Western historical and epistemological dominance and a radical principle of critique of the same experience – as much as the process of development. Let us define development, for now, as it was understood in the early post-World War II period: the process to pave the way for the replication in most of Asia, Africa

and Latin America of the conditions that were supposed to characterize the more economically advanced nations of the world – industrialization, high degrees of urbanization and education, technification of agriculture, and widespread adoption of the values and principles of modernity, including particular forms of order, rationality and individual orientation. Defined in this way, development entails the simultaneous recognition and negation of difference; Third World subjects are recognized as different, on the one hand, whereas development is precisely the mechanism through which that difference is to be obliterated, on the other. That this dynamic of recognition and disavowal of difference is endlessly re-enacted in each project or strategy is not only a reflection of the failure of development to fulfil its promise but an essential feature of the development enterprise. If the colonial encounter determined the power

structure in which anthropology took shape, the development encounter has similarly provided the overall context for contemporary anthropology. Only recently has the discipline begun to account for this fact.

Anthropologists have generally shown great ambivalence regarding development. In recent years, it has become almost axiomatic among anthropologists that development is a problematic and often invasive concept. This view is accepted by scholars and practitioners on all sides of the scholarly and political spectrum. The last decade, as we shall see, has witnessed a very active and productive debate on this issue; as a result, we have a more nuanced understanding of the nature of development and its modes of operation, even if the relationship between anthropology and development continues to be a matter for heated discussion. However, while the anthropology-development equation is understood and dealt with in many different ways, it is possible to distinguish, in the late 1990s, two broad schools of thought: those who favour an active engagement with development institutions on behalf of the poor, with the aim of transforming development practice from within; and those who prescribe a radical critique of, and distancing from, the development establishment. This article examines these perspectives and explores possible agendas (and limitations) for the future of anthropological engagement with the demands of academic and applied research and intervention in this area.¹

Part one of the article analyses the work of anthropologists working in the self-defined field of development anthropology – that is, those working within development institutions and in anthropology departments training students for applied anthropology jobs in development. Part two outlines a critique of development and development anthropology which has been elaborated since the late 1980s by a growing number of anthropologists inspired by post-structuralist theories and methodologies; we shall refer to this critique as the anthropology of development. It will become apparent that development anthropology and the anthropology of development originate in contrasting theories of social reality (one largely based on established theories of culture and political economy, the other on relatively new forms of analysis

that give primacy to language and signification), with their concomitant divergent prescriptions for practical and political intervention. In part three, various strategies for moving beyond the impasse created by these two positions are visualized by focusing on the work of several anthropologists who seem to be experimenting with creative ways of articulating anthropological theory and practice in the development field. Indeed, these authors can be seen as articulating a powerful theory of practice for anthropology as a whole. Part four extends this analysis by discussing the requirements for an anthropology of globalization and post-development.

In the conclusion, we come back to the issue with which we began. Can anthropology escape the predicament in which it seems to be trapped by the historical determinants of both itself and development? To put it in the words of two of the scholars on whom we will draw in the third part, 'is anthropology hopelessly compromised by its involvement in mainstream development or can anthropologists offer an effective challenge to the dominant paradigms of development?' (Gardner and Lewis, 1996, p. 49). This question, outlined in the third part, is being formulated in hopeful ways by a small but perhaps growing number of anthropologists who are attempting to steer a course between development anthropology and the anthropology of development, as they embark on a task that all anthropologists concerned with development seem to share: to contribute to a better future by engaging with the critical issues of the day – from poverty and environmental destruction to class, gender and ethnic domination – while strengthening at the same time a progressive politics of cultural affirmation in the midst of globalizing tendencies. In the process of crafting an alternative practice, these anthropologists are redefining the very notions of 'academic' and 'applied' anthropology, rendering the distinction between development anthropology and the anthropology of development newly problematic and perhaps obsolete.

Culture and economy in development anthropology

The question of development, needless to say, remains unresolved in any modern social or

epistemological order. By this I mean not only 'our' (modern expert knowledge and policy-making apparatus) inability to deal with situations in Asia, Africa and Latin America in ways that lead to lasting improvement – socially, culturally, economically, environmentally – but that the constructs on which we rely for explanation and prescription no longer enable satisfactory answers. Moreover, the crisis of development also puts in evidence the obsolescence of the functional domains with which modernity has equipped us to enunciate our social and political concerns – the domains of nature, society, economy, polity, and culture. Societies are not the organic wholes with structures and laws that we thought them to be until recently but fluid entities stretched on all sides by migrations, border-crossing and economic forces; cultures are no longer bounded, discrete, and localized, but deterritorialized and subjected to multiple hybridizations; similarly, nature can no longer be seen as an essential principle and foundational category, an independent domain of intrinsic value and truth, but as the object of constant reinventions, especially by unprecedented forms of technoscience; and, finally, nobody really knows where the economy begins and ends, even if economists, in the midst of neo-liberal frenzy and seemingly overpowering globalization, steadfastly adhere to their attempt to reduce to it every aspect of social reality, thus extending the shadow that economics casts on life and history.

It is well known that the theory and practice of development have been greatly shaped by neo-classical economists. In his retrospective look at development anthropology at the World Bank, Michael Cernea – one of the foremost figures in the field – referred to the econocentric and technocentric conceptual biases of development strategies as 'profoundly damaging' (Cernea, 1995, p. 15). For Cernea, this 'paradigmatic bias' is a distortion that development anthropologists have done much to correct. Fighting this bias, indeed – again in Cernea's view – has been an important part of the process by which anthropologists have carved a niche for themselves in prestigious and powerful institutions, such as the World Bank. It was not always the case. The recognition of the potential contribution of anthropological knowledge and skills to the development process was slow in

coming, although once it started, it took on an important momentum of its own. Most accounts of the development of development anthropology concur with this vision of its history: prompted by the apparent failure of top-down, economically-oriented approaches, a re-evaluation of the cultural and social aspects of development started to take place in the early 1970s, which opened unprecedented opportunities for anthropology. 'Culture' – which until then had been a residual category, since 'traditional' societies were thought to be in the process of becoming 'modern' – became inherently problematic, calling for a new type of professional capable of relating culture and development. This marked the take-off of development anthropology (Hoben, 1982; Bennet and Bowen, eds, 1988; Horowitz, 1994; Cernea, ed., 1985; Cernea, 1995).²

Development anthropologists argue that a significant transformation in development thinking took place in the mid-1970s, bringing to the fore the consideration of social and cultural factors in development activities. The new sensitivity towards social and cultural factors came about as the poor results of top-down, technology and capital-intensive interventions became widely recognized. This reformulation was most clearly manifested in the shift in World Bank policy towards 'poverty-oriented' programming – announced by its President, Robert MacNamara, in 1973 – but it was being advanced at many other sites in the development establishment, including the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and several of the United Nations technical agencies. Experts began to accept that the poor themselves – particularly the rural poor – had to participate actively in the programmes if these were to have a reasonable margin of success. It was a question of 'putting people first' (Cernea, ed., 1985). Projects had to be socially relevant and culturally appropriate, for which they had to involve the direct beneficiaries in a significant way. Such new concerns created an unprecedented demand for anthropological skills. Faced with dwindling employment opportunities within the academy, anthropologists avidly seized the opportunity to participate in the new venture. In absolute terms, this resulted in a steady increase in the number of anthropologists working for development

organizations of various kinds. Even at the World Bank, the bastion of economism, the social science staff grew from the first lone anthropologist hired in 1974 to about sixty today; in addition, hundreds of anthropologists and other social scientists from developed and developing countries are employed each year as short-term consultants (Cernea, 1995).

As Cernea adds, 'beyond the change in numbers, there has also been change in substance' (Cernea, 1995, p. 5). The cultural dimension of development became an important part of theory building and project design. The role of anthropologists became institutionalized. Writing in the early 1980s, Hoben could say that 'anthropologists working in development have not created an academic subdiscipline, "development anthropology", for their work is not characterized by a coherent and distinctive body of theory, concepts, and methods' (1982, p. 349). This view has been completely reassessed in recent years. To begin with, development anthropology has developed a significant institutional basis in a number of countries in North America and Europe.³ A 'Development Anthropology Committee', for instance, had been created in 1977 in the United Kingdom 'to promote the involvement of anthropology in development in the Third World' (Grillo, 1985, p. 2). In 1976, three anthropologists created the Institute for Development Anthropology in Binghamton, New York; since its inception, the Institute has been a leading place for development anthropology theory and applied work. Similarly, graduate training in development anthropology is now offered at a growing number of universities, especially in the United States and England. But the most significant reassessment of Hoben's position has come from leading practitioners in the 1990s, like Cernea (1995) and Horowitz (1994), who consider that while the number of anthropologists in development is still small in relation to the task, development anthropology nevertheless is well on the way to becoming consolidated as both discipline and practice.

What are the factors that substantiate Cernea's and Horowitz's assessment of their discipline? Chief among them – besides the obvious referent of continued increase of anthropologists in the development world, which has extended in the 1990s to the growing network of non-

governmental organizations (NGOs) – is their view of the role that anthropologists fulfil within development, the importance of this role for development theory as a whole, and its impact on particular strategies and projects. Let us review these three arguments briefly. Writing in the mid-1980s, a group of development anthropologists practitioners put it thus:

The anthropological difference is apparent at each stage of the problem-solving process: anthropologists design programs that work because they are culturally appropriate; they correct interventions that are underway but that will be economically unfeasible because of community opposition; they conduct evaluations that contain valid indicators of program results. They provide the unique skills necessary for intercultural brokering; they collect primary and 'emic' data necessary for planning and formulating policy; and they project and assess cultural and social effects of intervention. (Wulff and Fiske, eds, 1987, p. 10).

Serving as cultural intermediaries ('brokers') between the worlds of development and community; collecting the local knowledge and point of view; placing local communities and projects in larger contexts of political economy; and viewing culture holistically – these are all seen as important, if not essential, anthropological contributions to the development process.

The result is the induction of development 'with larger gains and fewer pains' (Cernea, 1995, p. 9). This perceived effect has been particularly important in some areas, such as resettlement schemes, farming systems, river basin development, natural resource management, informal sector economies, etc. However, development anthropologists consider that their role goes well beyond particular areas. Their role stems from their ability to provide sophisticated analyses of the social organization that circumscribe projects and that underlie local people's actions, linking them to applied research. In doing so, they transcend the dichotomy between theoretical and applied research; and while most applied work continues to be regulated by the needs of the project cycle, in some instances anthropologists have nevertheless won support for longer-term research. This is why, in their view, development anthropologists are becoming central actors in the development process; by demonstrating that anthropologists make a difference, they are

increasingly welcome partners in project design and implementation (Cernea, 1995; Horowitz, 1994).⁴

There are two final aspects to be discussed in relation to the engagement between anthropology and development enacted by development anthropology. Their practice can be said to rely on mainstream views of both development and anthropology and to be largely immune to the critiques that have shaken both fields, particularly since the second half of the 1980s. They do not question the overall need for development, but accept it as a fact of life and as a true descriptor of reality. There are, of course, those who push the debate to its limits within the institutional set up. Yet to undertake a radical questioning of development would require engaging with recent trends in anthropology that problematize anthropology's ability to represent cultural difference. Most development anthropologists, however, adhere to a realist epistemology that characterized 1960s cultural anthropology and political economy. As we shall see, these assumptions are precisely what the anthropology of development puts to the test. Internal disagreement on these matters usually takes the form of questioning the very fact of intervention. In this debate, development anthropologists are found to be 'doubly dammed' – both by developers as a nuisance, or incurable romantics and by academic anthropologists on moral and intellectual grounds (Gow, 1993). Debates on the 'dilemma' of development anthropology – to get or not to get involved – is thus dealt with and usually resolved in favour of involvement on practical and political grounds. The most interesting arguments advocate a firm commitment to speaking truth to power (Gow, 1993), which might put the anthropologist in a difficult position, or for visualizing a variety of roles for anthropologists – from active interventionism to rejectionist positions (Grillo, 1985; Swantz, 1985). This dilemma is accentuated by the encounter between development anthropology and the anthropology of development. We now turn to reviewing this second articulation of the relation between anthropology and development.

Language, discourse, and the anthropology of development

There are bridges to be built and mutual critiques between development anthropology and the anthropology of development that will be discussed at the end of this section. It is time to characterize what we have called the anthropology of development. As will become apparent, the anthropology of development is based on a very different theoretical corpus, of recent origin and largely associated with the label 'post-structuralism', leading to a strikingly different view of development. While it would be impossible to summarize here the basic tenets of post-structuralism, it is important to emphasize that – in contrast to liberal theories based on the individual and the market, and production-based Marxist theories – post-structuralism highlights the role of language and meaning in the constitution of social reality. Language and discourse are seen not as a reflection of social reality, but as constitutive of it; it is through language and discourse that social reality inevitably comes into being. The concept of discourse enables theorists to transcend the persistent binarisms inherent to most social theory, those between the ideal and the real, the symbolic and the material, and production and signification since discourse embraces them all. This insight has been taken into a variety of fields in recent years, from anthropology and geography to cultural studies and feminist studies, among others.

Since its inception, 'development' has been considered to exist in reality, 'out there', solid and material. Development has been taken to be a true descriptor of reality, a neutral language that can be utilized harmlessly and put to different ends according to the political and epistemological orientation of those waging it. Whether in political science or sociology, economics or political economy, development has been debated without questioning its ontological status. From modernization theory to dependency or world systems; from 'market-friendly development' to self-directed, sustainable, or eco-development the qualifiers of the term have multiplied without the term itself having been rendered radically problematic. This seemingly uncritical tendency has held throughout the development era despite the fact that, as a com-



Mass in the Chanal region of Chiapas, Mexico, using a thurible of a traditional Maya form. Pascal Maître/Cosmos

mentator on the trend towards the study of languages of development put it recently, 'as an arena of study and practice, one of the fundamental impulses of those who write development is a desire to define, categorize and bring order to a heterogeneous and constantly multiplying field of meaning' (Crush, 1995, p. 2). No matter that the term's meaning has been hotly contested; what remained unchallenged was the very basic idea of development itself, development as a central organizing principle of social life, and the fact that Asia, Africa and Latin America can be defined as underdeveloped and that their communities are ineluctably in need of 'development' – in whatever guise or garb.

The anthropology of development starts by questioning the very notion of development by arguing, in a post-structuralist fashion, that if we want to understand development, we need to examine how development has been understood historically, according to what perspectives, with what principles of authority, and with what

consequences for what groups of people. How did this peculiar way of seeing and constructing the world – 'development' – arise? What regimes of truth, and what silences, did the language of development bring into being? For the anthropology of development, then, is not so much a question of providing new grounds for doing development better, but of examining the very grounds on which development emerged as an object of thought and practice. The aim? To destabilize those grounds in order to modify the social order that regulates the language production process. Post-structuralism provides new tools for fulfilling a task that was always at the heart of anthropology, even if seldom realized: to defamiliarize the familiar. As Crush puts it, 'the discourse of development, the form in which it makes its arguments and establishes its authority, the manner in which it constructs the world, are usually seen as self-evident and unworthy of attention. The primary intention [of discursive analysis] is to try and make the self-evident problematic' (Crush,

1995, p. 3). Another set of authors, more wedded to this defamiliarizing task, sought to render the language of development unspeakable, to turn the basic constructs of the development discourse – markets, needs, population, participation, environment, planning, and the like – into ‘toxic words’ that experts could not use with such impunity as they have until now (Sachs, ed., 1992).

An important factor in posing the question of development from a post-structuralist perspective was the critique of Western representations of non-Europeans encouraged by Edward Said’s book, *Orientalism*. His initial statement is still powerful: ‘My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse’, wrote Said, ‘we cannot possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage – and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period’ (Said, 1979, p. 3). Similarly, the Zairian philosopher Valentin Mudimbe could raise the question of studying ‘the foundation of a discourse about Africa ... [how] African worlds have been established as realities for knowledge’ (Mudimbe, 1988, p. xi), while Chandra Mohanty (1991) interrogated the rapidly proliferating ‘women in development’ texts of the 1970s and 1980s in terms of the power differential they inevitably enacted in their depiction of Third-World women as implicitly lacking what their first-world counterparts had achieved. Building on these insights, Ferguson made the most general case for the anthropology of development:

Like ‘civilization’ in the nineteenth century, ‘development’ is the name not only for a value, but also for a dominant problematic or interpretive grid through which the impoverished regions of the world are known to us. Within this interpretive grid, a host of everyday observations are rendered intelligible and meaningful. (Ferguson, 1990, p. xiii)

Building on these and related works, the discursive analysis of development – and the anthropology of development in particular, since anthropologists have been central to this critique – took off in the late 1980s and has continued throughout the 1990s. Analysts have offered ‘new ways of understanding what devel-

opment is and does’ (Crush, 1995, p. 4), particularly the following:⁵

(1) To begin with, a different way of posing ‘the question of development’ itself. In what ways was the ‘Third World’ constituted as a reality for modern expert knowledge? What was the order of knowledge – the regime of representation – that came into existence with the language of development? To what extent has this language colonized social reality? These questions could not be asked by relying on the realist paradigms of the past, those that took for granted development as a descriptor of reality.

(2) A view of development as invention, that is, as a historically singular experience that was neither natural nor inevitable, but very much the product of identifiable historical processes. Even if its roots extend back to the development of capitalism and modernity – development has been shown to be part of an origin myth at the heart of occidental modernity – the late 1940s and the 1950s brought with them a globalization of development and an explosion of institutions, organizations, and forms of knowledge all concerned with development. To say that development was an invention does not mean that it is a lie, a myth, or a conspiracy; it is to assert its strictly historical character and, in traditional anthropological fashion, to diagnose it as a peculiar cultural form embedded in a set of practices that can be studied ethnographically. The view of development as invention also suggests that the invention can be unmade or reinvented in multiple ways.

(3) A ‘map’ of the discursive regime of development, that is, a view of the apparatus of expert knowledge forms and institutions which organize the production of forms of knowledge and types of power, linking one to the other in a systematic manner, resulting in specific diagram of power. This is the central insight of the post-structuralist analysis of discourse in general: the organization of the simultaneous production of knowledge and power. As Ferguson (1990) put it, mapping the apparatus of knowledge-power made visible those ‘doing the developing’ and their role as culture producers. The gaze of the analyst thus shifted from the so-called beneficiaries or targets of development to the allegedly neutral social technicians of the development apparatus. What are they actually

doing? Are they not producing culture, ways of seeing, transforming social relations? Far from neutral, the work of the apparatus is precisely intended to achieve particular goals: the state organization of social life; the depoliticization of issues; the linking of countries and communities to world economies in specific ways; the transformation of local cultures in line with modern standards and orientations, including the extension to Third World communities of cultural practices of modern origin based on notions of individuality, rationality, economy, and the like (Ferguson, 1990; Ribeiro, 1994a).

(4) Also important for these analyses was to provide a view of how the development discourse has changed throughout the decades – from its emphasis on economic growth and industrialization of the 1950s to the focus on sustainable development of the 1990s – managing, nevertheless, to maintain a certain core of elements and relations intact. As the apparatus incorporated new domains into its scope, it certainly changed, yet its basic orientation went on unchallenged. Whatever the modifier that was attached to it, the fact of development itself was not placed under radical questioning.

(5) Finally, the relation between development discourses and identity is receiving increasing attention. In what ways has this discourse contributed to shape identities among people everywhere? What differences can be detected among classes, genders, ethnicities, and places in this respect? Recent work on cultural hybridization can be interpreted in this light (García Canclini, 1990). Another aspect of the question of subjectivity that has attracted some attention is the anthropological investigation of the circulation of concepts of development and modernity in Third World settings. How are these concepts used and transformed? What are their effects and modes of operation once they enter a Third World locality? What is their relationship to local histories and global processes alike? How are global conditions processed at the local level, including those of development and modernity? In what concrete ways do people use them to negotiate their identities? (Dahl and Rabo, eds, 1992; Pigg, 1992).

The analysis of development as discourse has succeeded in creating a sub-field, the

anthropology of development, related to, but distinct from, those inspired by political economy, culture change, or other frameworks of recent decades. By applying theories and methods developed mostly in the humanities to long-standing social science problems (development, economy, society), the anthropology of development has enabled researchers to situate themselves in other spaces from which to look at reality differently. Attention is currently being paid to aspects such as the following: the historical predecessors of development, particularly the transition from the colonial to the development encounter; ethnographies of particular development institutions (from the World Bank to progressive NGOs), languages, and sub-fields; investigation of the contestation and resistances to development interventions; and critical biographies and autobiographies of development practitioners. These investigations are producing a more nuanced view of the nature and modes of operation of development discourses than analyses of the 1980s and early 1990s at first suggested.

Finally, the notion of 'post-development' has become a heuristic for relearning to see the reality of communities in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Post-development refers to the possibility of lessening the dominance of development representations when looking at situations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. What happens when we do not look at that reality through development agendas? As Crush put it, 'is there a way of writing (speaking and thinking) beyond the language of development?' (Crush, 1995, p. 18). Post-development is a way to signal this possibility, an attempt to carve out a space for thinking other thoughts, seeing other things, writing in other languages. As we shall see, post-development is actually always under construction in every act of cultural resistance to dominating discourses and practices of development and economy. The defamiliarization of development descriptions on which the idea of post-development is based contributes to two other processes: to reassert the value of alternative experiences and ways of knowing; and to unveil the sites and mechanisms of knowledge production and this latter as inherently political – that is, as linked to the exercise of power and the creation of lifeworlds. The corollary of this investigation is whether knowledge can be

produced otherwise. For anthropologists and other experts who acknowledge the centrality of expert knowledge to the exercise of power, the issue becomes: how should one behave as knowledge producer? How does one articulate an ethics of expert knowledge as political practice? We shall return to this question at the end of the article.

Anthropology and development: towards a new theory of practice and a new practice of theory

Development anthropology and the anthropology of development show each other their own flaws and limitations; it could be said that they mock each other. For development anthropologists, the post-structuralist critiques are morally wrong, because they are seen as leading to non-engagement in a world that desperately needs the anthropological input (Horowitz, 1994). The focus on discourse is seen as overlooking issues of power, since poverty, underdevelopment, and oppression are not issues of language, but historical, political and economic issues. This interpretation of the anthropology of development clearly originates in a lack of understanding of the post-structuralist approach, which – as its practitioners emphasize – is about material conditions, power, history, culture and identity. In a similar vein, development anthropologists argue that the post-structuralist critique is an intellectual conceit of privileged Northern intellectuals which in no way responds to intellectual or political issues in the Third World (Little and Painter, 1995); the fact that Third World activists and intellectuals have been at the forefront of this critique, and that an increasing number of social movements find it empowering for their own struggles, is conveniently overlooked. For the critics, conversely, the development anthropology is profoundly problematic because of its adherence to a framework – development – that has made possible a cultural politics of domination over the Third World. In so doing, they contribute to extending to Asia, Africa and Latin America a project of cultural transformation shaped, broadly speaking, by the experience of capitalist modernity. Working for institutions like the

World Bank, and for processes of ‘induced development’ in general, is for the critics part of the problem, not part of the solution (Escobar, 1991). The anthropology of development makes visible the silent violence embodied in the development discourse; development anthropologists, in the eyes of these critics, are not absolved from this violence.

These differences are very significant. While development anthropologists focus on the project cycle, the use of knowledge to tailor projects to the beneficiaries’ cultures and situation, and the possibility of contributing to the needs of the poor, the anthropologists of development centre their analysis on the institutional apparatus, the links to power established by expert knowledge, the ethnographic analysis and critique of modernist constructs, and the possibility of contributing to the political projects of the subaltern. Perhaps the weakest point of development anthropology is its lack of a theory of intervention, beyond rhetorical statements of the need to work on behalf of the poor. Similarly, development anthropology suggests that the weakest point of the anthropology of development is not that different: how to make practical political sense of its critique. The politics of the anthropology of development relies on its ability to suggest alternatives, on its connection with struggles for the right to be different, on its ability to examine communities of resistance capable of recreating cultural identities, and on its intent in making visible a source of power previously hidden; but none of this amounts to a fully worked out programme for ‘alternative development’. The stakes at play in the two trends, finally, are similarly different; for development anthropologists they range from high consultant fees and salaries to their desire to contribute to a better world; for the anthropologist of development, the stakes include academic positions and prestige as well as the political goal of contributing to transforming the world, hopefully in conjunction with social movements.

Despite the fact that there is some overlap between these two contrasting trends – necessarily simplified in this brief exposition – convergence between them is not easy. There are, however, several trends that point in this direction, and they will be reviewed in this section of the article as a step towards imagining a

new practice. A collection on languages of development on which we have already drawn (Crush, ed., 1995), for instance, takes on the challenge of analysing the 'texts and words' of development, while rejecting 'that language is all there is' (Crush, 1995, p. 5). 'Many of the authors in this volume' – writes the editor in his introduction – 'come out of a political economy tradition that argues that politics and economics have a real existence that is not reducible to the texts that describe them and represent them' (p. 6). He finds, nevertheless, that the textual turn, post-colonial and feminist theories, and critiques of the dominance of Western knowledge systems provide crucial ways for understanding development, 'new ways of understanding what development is and does, and why it seems so difficult to think beyond it' (p. 4). Most of the geographers and anthropologist who contributed to the volume engage, to a greater or lesser extent, with the discursive analysis, even if most of them also remain within a tradition of academic political economy.

The most hopeful and constructive argument for a convergence of development anthropology and the anthropology of development has been made recently by two anthropologists with significant experience in development institutions and a complex understanding of the post-structuralist critique (Gardner and Lewis, 1996). Their point of departure is that both anthropology and development are facing a postmodern crisis, and that such a crisis can be the basis for a different relation between them. While accepting the discursive critique as valid and essential to this new relation, they nevertheless insist on the possibility of subverting mainstream development 'both by supporting resistance to development and by working within the discourse to challenge and unpick its assumptions' (p. 49). Theirs is thus an effort to build bridges between the discursive critique and concrete planning and policy practices, particularly in two arenas they find hopeful: poverty and gender. The deconstruction of the assumptions and power relations of development is seen as essential to this task for applied practitioners. While recognizing that anthropological involvement in development is 'fraught with difficulty' (p. 77) and 'deeply problematic' (p. 161) – given ethical dilemmas, the risks of co-option, and the 'quick and dirty' ethnographies that

development anthropologists often have to perform – they nevertheless believe that anthropological insights are important in the planning, execution and assessment of non-oppressive development interventions. Let us recall their concluding remarks:

By now it should be clear that anthropology's relationship to development is riven with contradiction ... In the post-modern/post-structuralist context of the 1990s, however, the two approaches [post-structuralist and applied] appear to be further apart than ever ... this need not necessarily be the case. Indeed, while it is absolutely necessary to unravel and deconstruct 'development', if anthropologists are to make politically meaningful contributions to the worlds in which they work they must continue to make the vital connection between knowledge and action. This means that the use of applied anthropology, both within and outside the development industry, must continue to have a role, but in different ways and using different conceptual paradigms than previously. (Gardner and Lewis, 1996, p. 153)

This is an ambitious but constructive suggestion for moving on beyond the current impasse. What is at stake is a new connection between theory and practice – a new practice of theory and a new theory of practice. Which 'different conceptual paradigms' are to be created to make this proposal viable? Do these new paradigms demand a significant transformation of 'applied anthropology', as it has been known until today, perhaps even a radical reinvention of anthropology outside of the academy – and of the connections between both – resulting in the dissolution of applied anthropology itself? A number of anthropologists working in various fields – from political ecology and transnationalism to gender and ethnicity – have been striving towards such a practice for some time. We will review briefly the work of four such anthropologists in order to derive some further lessons for a reimagined articulation between anthropology and development, and between theory and practice, before concluding with some general thoughts on the anthropology of globalization and its implications for the discipline as a whole. These anthropologists work from different sites and with varying degrees of experience and engagement; however, they all push at the boundaries of our thinking concerning the anthropological theory and practice of development, suggesting different analyses of the articulation of culture and development in today's complex world.

With a body of work extending over almost four decades in the Chiapas region of Southern Mexico, June Nash represents the best of the anthropological tradition of long-term engagement with a community and a region in a context that has seen dramatic changes since the time of her first fieldwork experience in the late 1950s. Capitalism and development, as much as cultural resistance, have been constant factors during this period, and have been the anthropologist's concern and growing involvement with the fate of the Chiapas communities. Her analyses have been not only essential to understanding the historical transformation of this region since pre-conquest times to the present, but extremely important in explaining the genesis of the reassertion of indigenous identity during the last two decades, of which the Zapatista uprising of the past few years represents only the most visible and dramatic manifestation. Through her studies Nash unveils a series of tensions central to the understanding of the current situation: between change and the preservation of cultural integrity; between resistance to development and the selective adoption of innovations to maintain a degree of culture and ecological balance; between shared cultural practices and significant heterogeneity and internal class and gender hierarchies; between local boundaries and the increasing need for regional and national alliances; and between the commercialization of traditional craft production and its impact on cultural reproduction. These, along with a long-standing concern with the changing landscape of gender, ethnic and linguistic relations in Chiapas and Latin America as a whole, are among the most prominent aspects of Nash's work (Nash, 1970, 1993, 1997; Nash, ed., 1993, 1995).

Already in her first major work, Nash redefined fieldwork as 'participant observation combined with extensive eliciting' (Nash, 1970, p. xxiii). This approach grew in complexity as she returned to Chiapas in the early 1990s – after other fieldwork projects in Bolivia and Massachusetts – in many ways presaging the Zapatista mobilization of 1994. She also played a role as an international witness of the negotiations between the government and the Zapatistas and disseminated information about the movement in specialist publications on indigenous affairs (Nash, ed., 1995). Her reading of

the contemporary Chiapas situation suggests an alternative meaning of development in the making as the region's social movements press for a combination of cultural autonomy and democracy, on the one hand, and the construction of material and institutional infrastructure to improve local living conditions, on the other. The emerging 'situational identities' (Nash, 1993) are a way to signal, after 500 years of resistance, the arrival of a hopeful postmodern world of pluri-ethnic and pluri-cultural existence (Nash, 1997). Nash's exemplary work as an engaged anthropologist concerned with development is complemented by her active sponsorship of students in her fieldwork projects, the publication of her works in Spanish, and her attempt at bringing to her home country some of her concerns with class, gender and race in her study of the impact of changing corporate practices on local communities in Massachusetts, including community development efforts in the wake of corporate downsizing (Nash, 1989). Also very important are Nash's contributions to feminist anthropology and studies of class and ethnicity in Latin American anthropology.

Nash's concern with the larger contexts in which local communities defend their cultures and rethink development becomes a focal one for Brazilian anthropologist Gustavo Lins Ribeiro. Among his first works was a study on a classical development anthropology subject, namely the effect of a large-scale hydroelectric project on local communities, perhaps the most sophisticated ethnography of its kind to date. Unlike most anthropological resettlement studies, however, Ribeiro's included a substantial ethnography of all concerned interest groups including – besides the local communities – developers, elites and government agencies and the regional and transnational processes linking them all. Believing that 'in order to understand what the development drama is' one needs to explain the complex structures laid down by the interaction of local and supra local frameworks (Ribeiro, 1994a, p. xviii), Ribeiro moved on to examine the emerging 'condition of transnationality' and its impact on social movements and the environmental arena as a whole (Ribeiro, 1994b; Ribeiro and Little, 1996). In his view, new technologies are central to an emerging transnational society that is best visualized in mega media events such as rock



Multicultural kitsch: Hindu gods, Jesus Christ and Indian film stars share a stall in a Calcutta street. Snowdon/Imapress

concerts and UN world conferences such as the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, which for Ribeiro marked the rite of passage to the transnation state. Along the way, Ribeiro shows how neo-liberalism and globalization – while creating a complex political field – do not have uniform effects and outcomes but are negotiated significantly by local actors. Focus-

ing on the Amazon region, he examines in detail the kinds of agency fostered among local groups by the new discourses of environmentalism and globalization (Ribeiro and Little, 1996).

Ribeiro's ethnography of the Brazilian environmental sector – from the government and the military to transnational and local

NGOs and social movements – centres on the power struggles in which local agency and global forces become inextricably tied to each other in ways that defy any simple explanation. Issues of representation of ‘the local’; the local understanding of global forces; collective mobilization often aided by new technologies including the Internet (1997); and the power struggles and entirely new realms of interaction at all levels among the actors making up the Amazon environmental arena – these are all endowed with new theoretical and practical meaning in Ribeiro’s pioneering analyses. Along the way, he goes back to his early concern with showing why prevailing development strategies and economic calculations do not work and, conversely, how Amazonian peoples, and others in Latin America, may emerge as powerful social actors shaping their destiny if they are able to craft and utilize new opportunities in the two-way local/global dynamic fostered by the condition of transnationality that is upon them.

The role of development discourses and practices in mediating between transnationality and local cultural processes is at the heart of Stacy Pigg’s work in Nepal, which uses fieldwork and ethnography as a basis for a persistent theoretical inquiry on key questions of health, development, modernity, globalization, and identity. What accounts for the continued existence of cultural difference today? What ensemble of histories and practices explain the continuous re-creation of differences in localities as seemingly remote as villages in Nepal? The explanation of difference, in Pigg’s hands, is not at all simple, taking the form of an original account in which processes of development, globalization and modernity are interwoven in complex ways. For instance, contested notions of health – shamanic and Western – are shown to be constitutive of social difference and local identities. ‘Beliefs’ are not opposed to ‘modern knowledge’ but both are fragmented and contested as people rework a variety of health notions and resources. Similarly, while notions of development become effective in local culture, Pigg admirably shows how they are subjected to a complex ‘nepalization’; as development introduces new markers of identity, villagers reorient themselves in the more complicated landscape linking village to nation and the world; Pigg’s ethnography shows

how people simultaneously adopt, deploy, modify and question the languages of development and modernity. A different modernity is created, which also qualifies the meaning of globalization. In her work Pigg also gives importance to the consequences of her analysis for the training of local health practitioners, whose ‘local knowledge’ – usually instrumentalized and devalued in conventional development training programmes – can now be taken seriously as a dynamic and real force in shaping local worlds (see Pigg, 1996, 1995a, 1995b, 1992).

Political ecology – broadly speaking, the study of the interrelations among culture, environment, development and social movements – is one of the key arenas in which development is being redefined. The work of Soren Hvalkof with the Ashéninka of the Gran Pajonal area of the Peruvian Amazon is exemplary in this regard. Perhaps better known for his critical analysis of the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Hvalkof’s work in the Amazon spans two decades with very substantive fieldwork and ranges from historical ethnography (Hvalkof and Veber, forthcoming) to local constructions of nature and development (Hvalkof, 1989), to theorizing political ecology as anthropological practice (in press). Equally important, Hvalkof’s interventions, in coordination with the Ashéninka, have been very important in putting pressure on the World Bank to stop its support of development projects in Gran Pajonal and sponsor instead collective titling of indigenous lands (Hvalkof, 1986), and in securing support from the Danish Agency for International Development for collective titling among neighbouring communities in the late 1980s.⁶ These titling projects were instrumental in reversing the situation of virtual slavery of indigenous people at the hands of local elites that had existed for centuries; they set in motion processes of indigenous cultural affirmation and economic and political control almost unprecedented in Latin America. Hvalkof’s emphasis has been on the contrasting and interactive views of development at local and regional levels by indigenous people, mestizo colonists, and institutional actors; conceptualizing collective land titling in a regional context as a prerequisite for reversing genocidal policies and conventional development strategies; documenting Ashéninka’s long-standing strategies for dealing

with outside exploiters – from colonizers of the past to today's military, coca bosses, guerrillas, and development experts; and providing an interface for the dialogue of disparate worlds (indigenous people, development institutions, NGOs) from the perspective of the indigenous communities.

If anthropologists are to mediate between these worlds, Hvalkof maintains, echoing the three anthropologists just reviewed, they must forge a sophisticated theoretical and epistemological framework that includes an account of development actors and institutions. Otherwise, the task of development anthropologists and well-meaning NGOs – who spend only short periods of time with local groups – is likely to be counterproductive for the local populations. Local and regional ethnography are equally central to this process, as are emotional and political clarity and commitment in relation to local cultures. These three elements – a complex theoretical framework, significant ethnography, and political commitment – can be seen as constituting a different anthropology of development as political practice. The theoretical framework surpasses the notion of social organization of development anthropologists to conceptualize conditions of modernity, globalization, collective mobilization and identity; the ethnography must be predicated on examining local negotiation of such conditions beyond the project cycle and development situations; and the political commitment must depart from the stance of inducing development – even when cultural considerations might assuage development's impact – to contributing conditions to support the cultural and political agency of the subaltern.

Could it be said that these examples suggest elements towards a new theory of practice and a new practice of theory in the engagement between anthropology and development? If so, could we glean from these elements a novel vision of anthropology outside the academy, indeed, a new traffic between theory and practice and of anthropologists between different spaces? A new breed of anthropologists seems to be emerging, for instance in the environmental field, who would theorize their practice in relation to their crossing different domains – field, home, institutions, media, academy, and a multiplicity of communities – and according

to the multiple roles and political tasks they take on – interventionist, facilitator, ally, translator, witness, ethnographer, theorist, and the like. The deployment in these various domains, and according to a variety of roles, of the expert discourses which they hold in tension could be seen as constituting a new ethics of anthropological knowledge as political practice.

Towards an anthropology of globalization and post-development?

The various analyses of development reviewed here – from development anthropology to the anthropology of development and beyond – suggest in their own ways that not everything that has been subjected to the operations of the development apparatus can be said to have been irremediably transformed into a modern, capitalist instance. They also highlight a difficult question: do we know what there is 'on the ground' after centuries of capitalism and five decades of development? Do we even know how to look at social reality in ways that might allow us to detect elements of difference that are not reducible to the constructs of capitalism and modernity and that, moreover, could serve as nuclei for the articulation of alternative social and economic practices? And, finally, even if we could engage in such an exercise of alternative vision, how could alternative practices be fostered?

As the works of Nash, Pigg, Ribeiro and Hvalkof indicate, the role of ethnography can be particularly important in this respect. In the 1980s, a number of ethnographies focused on documenting resistance to capitalism and modernity in various settings, thus starting the task of making visible the fact that development itself was being actively resisted in manifold ways (Scott, 1985; Ong, 1987). Resistance by itself, however, is only the starting point in showing how people have actively continued to create and reconstruct their lifeworlds. Successful works characterized the local models of the economy and the natural environment that have been maintained by peasants and indigenous communities, in part embedded in local knowledge and practices that ethnographers have begun to explore in depth (Gudeman and

Rivera, 1990; Dahl and Rabo, eds, 1992; Hobart, ed., 1993; Milton, ed., 1993; Descalo and Pálsson, eds, 1996). Another hopeful trend has been the attention paid, particularly in Latin American anthropology, to the processes of cultural hybridization on which rural and urban communities necessarily embark with greater or lesser degree of success in terms of cultural affirmation and social and economic innovation. Cultural hybridization makes visible the dynamic encounter of practices originating in many cultural and temporal matrices, and the extent to which local groups, far from being passive receivers of transnational conditions, actively shape the process of constructing identities, social relations, and economic practices (García Canclini, 1990; Escobar, 1995).

Ethnographic research of this sort – which will certainly go on for a number of years – has been important in illuminating discourses of cultural, social, and economic difference among Third World communities in contexts of globalization and development. Although much remains to be done in this respect, this research already suggests ways in which discourses and practices of difference could be used as the basis for alternative social and economic projects. It is true, however, that neither the transformed anthropology of development visualized in the previous section of the article, nor Third World social movements predicated on a politics of difference, will put an end to development. Is it possible to say, however, that together they adumbrate a post-development era and the end of development as we have known it until now – that is, as a hegemonic and overpowering organizing principle of social life and the ultimate arbiter of thought and practice? There are some final suggestions to be drawn from this possibility concerning the relation between knowledge production and post-development, offered here as a conclusion to this article.

Anthropological analyses of development have given development an identity crisis in the social science field. In a similar vein, are not many Third World social movements saying loud and clear that the world according to the development discourse is not all there is? Are not a multiplicity of communities in the Third World making it equally clear through their practices that capitalism and development –

despite their strong and perhaps growing presence in the same communities – have not succeeded in shaping completely their identities and models of nature and the economy? Is it possible, then, to visualize a post-development era and to accept, indeed, that post-development is already (and always has been) under continuous re-construction? To dare to give serious consideration to these questions certainly presupposes a different politics of reading on our part as analysts, with the concomitant need to contribute to a different practice of representation of reality. Through the cultural politics they enact, many social movements – from the rainforest and the Zapatista to women's and squatter movements – seem to have accepted this challenge.

What this shift in the assessment of the nature, extent, and modes of operation of development entails for anthropological development studies is still unclear. Those working at the interface of local knowledge and conservation or sustainable development programmes, for instance, are becoming increasingly adept at inducing a significant rethinking of development practice; they insist that successful and sustainable conservation can only be achieved on the basis of a careful consideration of local knowledge and practices of nature, perhaps in combination with certain (retooled) forms of expert knowledge (Escobar, 1996; Brosius, forthcoming). It might be the case that in the process anthropologists and local activists 'become co-participant in a project of resisting, representing and rethinking' and that both culture and theory 'become, in some measure, our joint project'. As local people become adept at using cosmopolitan symbols and discourses, including anthropological knowledge, the political dimension of this knowledge becomes inescapable (Conklin and Graham, 1995).

There is, of course, no grand solution or alternative paradigm that is going to work once and for all. Today there seems to be growing awareness worldwide as to what does not work, but much less clarity about what does or might work. Many social movements are actually faced with this dilemma as they both oppose conventional development and try to formulate alternative paths for their communities, often against all odds. A lot of experimentation is in order, and it is indeed taking place in many

localities, in terms of trying out combinations of knowledge and power, truth and practice that incorporate local groups actively as knowledge-producers. How is local knowledge to be translated into power, and this knowledge power into concrete projects and programmes? How can local groups build bridges with expert forms of knowledge when necessary or convenient, and how can they widen their social space of influence when confronted, as it is most often the case, with dominating local, regional, national and transnational conditions? These are questions that a renewed anthropology of and in development should tackle.

The Malaysian anthropologist Wazir Jahan Karim put it bluntly in an inspired piece on anthropology, development and globalization from a Third World perspective, and we can fittingly end this section with her words: 'Is anthropological knowledge generated to enrich the Western intellectual tradition or destitute populations from which this knowledge was appropriated? ... What does the future hold for the use of social knowledge of the kind produced by anthropology?' (Karim, 1996, p. 120). While the choice does not have to be either/or, the stakes are clear. Anthropology needs to concern itself with projects of social transformation, lest we become 'symbolically dissociated from local processes of cultural reconstruction and invention' (p. 124). In Karim's view anthropology has an important role to play in conveying the global potential of local knowledges; this has to be done consciously, otherwise anthropology might contribute to making Third World knowledge even more local and invisible. Her call is for reconstructing anthropology by focusing on popular representations and struggles, projecting them onto the level of social theory. Otherwise, anthropology will continue to be a largely irrelevant and provincial conversation among academics in the language of Western social theory. For anthropology to become truly universal, we may add, it needs to transcend this provincialism, which we highlighted in the opening paragraphs of this article. Only then will anthropology become truly post-modern, post-savage and – one might add – post-development.

Conclusion

The idea of development, it would seem, is losing some of its hold. Its failure to fulfil its promises, along with resistance by many social movements and communities, are weakening its imaginative appeal; practitioners of critical development studies are attempting through their analyses to give form to this social and epistemological weakening of development. It could be argued that if development is losing its grip it is because it is no longer necessary to capital's strategies of globalization, or because the rich countries simply no longer care. These explanations are true to a certain extent. Nevertheless, they do not exhaust the possible interpretations. If it is true that post-development and forms of noncapitalism and alternative modernity are always under construction, there is hope that they could get to constitute new grounds for existence and significant re-articulations of subjectivity and alterity in their economic, cultural and ecological dimensions. In many parts of the world, we are witnessing an unprecedented historical movement of economic, cultural, and ecological life. It is necessary to think about the political and economic transformations that could make such a movement a hopeful turn of events in the social history of cultures, economies and ecologies. In both theory and practice – indeed simultaneously – anthropology has an especially important contribution in this imaginative exercise.

For anthropology to take on this role, it must reconceptualize its engagement with the world of development in a significant manner. It must identify socially significant instances of difference that can operate as points of support for the articulation of alternatives; and it must make visible the local frameworks of production of cultures and identities, of economic and ecological practices, that are continually emerging from communities worldwide. To what extent do they pose important, and perhaps original, challenges to capitalism and Eurocentred modernities? In what ways do they hybridize with transnational forces, and what types of hybridization seem politically promising in terms of fostering a degree of cultural and economic autonomy? These are important questions for strategies of knowledge production that self-

consciously examine their own contribution to making visible and possible subaltern, marginal, dissident or emerging constructions of identity and lifeworlds. Along the way, 'development' will perhaps cease to exist as the overriding concern it has been until now.

Notes

1. This article focuses chiefly on literature in the English language; it thus reflects principally debates in North America and the United Kingdom, although some consideration is given to parts of Europe and Latin America. To consider the relation between the varied Third World Anthropologies and development would require a separate paper and a different treatment.
2. A more thorough examination of development anthropology would need to consider the history of applied anthropology, which is beyond the scope of this paper. For a recent statement on this history and its relation to development anthropology, see Gardner and Lewis (1996).
3. For a survey of development anthropology in Europe, see the special issue of *Development Anthropology Network* 10(1), 1992, devoted to the topic.
4. We might take at face value development anthropologists' view of their contribution to development, and yet point out that some times this view is selective. Cernea, for instance, credits social scientists at the World Bank with changes in this institution's resettlement policies. Nowhere does he mention the role played in these changes by the widespread opposition and local mobilization against resettlement schemes in many parts of the world.
5. Among the 'first wave' of book-length works with anthropological contributions to the analysis of development as discourse are: Ferguson (1990); Apffel-Marglin and Marglin (1990); Sachs, ed. (1992); Dahl and Rabo, eds (1992); Escobar (1995); Crush, ed. (1995). For a more complete bibliography on the subject, see Escobar (1995). This analysis is branching out in many directions, as discussed below.
6. Ashéninka organizations were recently awarded the prestigious 1996 anti-slavery award by Anti-Slavery International for their collective titling project, in which Hvalkof's participation, together with the International Workgroup on Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), was very significant. Hvalkof and Escobar are contributing to a similar project for the Pacific Coast rainforest of Colombia in conjunction with activists from the social movement of black communities in the region.

References

- BENNETT, J.; BOWEN, J. (eds), 1988. *Production and Autonomy*. Lanham, MA: University Press of America.
- BROSIOUS, P., forthcoming. 'Mere Observers: Writing in the Ethnographic Present in Sarawak, East Malaysia,' *Identities*.
- CERNEA, M., 1995. 'Social Organization and Development Anthropology,' 1995 Malinowski Award Lecture, Society for Applied Anthropology. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- CERNEA, M. (ed.), 1985. *Putting People First*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- CONKLIN, B.; GRAHAM, L., 1995. 'The Shifting Middle Ground: Amazonian Indians and Eco-Politics', *American Anthropologist* 97(4), pp. 695-710.
- CRUSH, J., 1995. 'Introduction: Imagining Development.' In *Power of Development*, ed. J. Crush, pp. 1-26, New York: Routledge.
- CRUSH, J. (ed.), 1995. *Power of Development*. New York: Routledge.
- DAHL, G.; RABO, A. (eds), 1992. *Kam-up or Take-off. Local Notions of Development*. Stockholm: Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology.
- DESCOLA, P.; PÁLSSON, G. (eds), 1996. *Nature and Society. Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- ESCOBAR, A., 1996. 'Constructing Nature: Elements for a Poststructuralist Political Ecology'. In *Liberation Ecologies*, ed. R. Peet and M. Watts, pp. 46-68, London: Routledge.
- ESCOBAR, A., 1995. *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- ESCOBAR, A., 1991. 'Anthropology and the Development Encounter: The Making and Marketing of Development Anthropology', *American Ethnologist* 18(4), pp. 658-82.

- FERGUSON, J., 1990. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GARCÍA CANCLINI, N., 1990. *Culturas Híbridas: Estrategias para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad*. México, D.F.: Grijalbo.
- GARDNER, K.; LEWIS, D., 1996. *Anthropology, Development and the Post-modern Challenge*. London: Pluto Press.
- GOW, D., 1993. 'Doubly Dammed: Dealing with Power and Praxis in Development Anthropology,' *Human Organization*, 52(4), pp. 380-97.
- GRILLO, R., 1985. 'Applied Anthropology in the 1980s: Retrospect and Prospect'. In R. Grillo and A. Rew, eds, pp. 1-36. London: Tavistock Publications.
- GUDEMAN, S.; RIVERA, A., 1990. *Conversations in Colombia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOBART, M. (ed.), 1993. *An Anthropological Critique of Development*. London: Routledge.
- HOBEN, A., 1982. 'Anthropologists and Development', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 11, pp. 349-75.
- HOROWITZ, M., 1994. 'Development Anthropology in the Mid-1990s', *Development Anthropology Network* 12(1), (2), pp. 1-14.
- HVALKOF, S., in press. 'Outrage in Rubber and Oil. Extractivism, Indigenous Peoples and Justice in the Upper Amazon.' In *Peoples, Plants and Justice: Resource Extraction and Conservation in Tropical Developing Countries*, ed. Charles Zerner. New York: Columbia University Press.
- HVALKOF, S., 1989. 'The Nature of Development: Native and Settlers View in Gran Pajonal, Peruvian Amazon,' *Folk* 31, pp. 125-50.
- HVALKOF, S.; VEBER, H., forthcoming. *Guía Etnográfica de la Alta Amazonia*. Vol. III. *Los Ashéninka del Gran Pajonal*. Panama: Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute. (Series editors: Fernando Santas and Federica Barclay.)
- KARIM, W. J., 1996. 'Anthropology without tears: how a "local" sees the "local" and the "global."' In *The Future of Anthropological Knowledge*, ed. H. Moore, pp. 115-38. London: Routledge.
- LITTLE, P.; PAINTER, M., 1995. 'Discourse, Politics, and the Development Process: Reflections on Escobar's "Anthropology and the Development Encounter"', *American Ethnologist* 22(3), pp. 602-609.
- MILTON, K. (ed.), 1993. *Environmentalism: The View from Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- MOHANTY, C., 1991. 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses.' In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. C. Mohanty, A. Russo and L. Torres, pp. 51-80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- MUDIMBE, V. Y., 1988. *The Invention of Africa*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- NASH, J., 1997. 'The Fiesta of the World: The Zapatista Uprising and Radical Democracy in Mexico', *American Anthropologist* (in press).
- NASH, J., 1993. 'The Reassertion of Indigenous Identity: Mayan Responses to State Intervention in Chiapas', *Latin American Research Review* 30(3), pp. 7-42.
- NASH, J., 1989. *From Town to High Tech. The Clash of Community and Industrial Cycles*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- NASH, J., 1970. *In the Eyes of the Ancestors*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- NASH, J. (ed.), 1995. *The Explosion of Communities in Chiapas*. Copenhagen: IWGIA.
- NASH, J. (ed.), 1993. *Crafts in the World Market*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- ONG, A., 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discipline*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- PIGG, S., 1986. 'The Credible and the Credulous: The Question of "Villagers' Beliefs" in Nepal,' *Cultural Anthropology* 11(2), pp. 160-201.
- PIGG, S., 1995a. 'Acronyms of Effacement: Traditional medical Practitioners (TMP) in International Health Development,' *Social Science and Medicine* 41(1), pp. 47-68.
- PIGG, S., 1995b. 'The Social Symbolism of Healing in Nepal,' *Ethnology* 34(1), pp. 1-20.
- PIGG, S., 1992. 'Constructing Social Categories through Place: Social Representations and Development in Nepal,' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34(3), pp. 491-513.
- RIBEIRO, G. L., 1997. 'Cybercultural Politics and Political Activism at a Distance in a Transnational World.' In S. Alvarez, E. Dagnino and A. Escobar (eds), *Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin American Social Movements*. Boulder: Westview Press (in press).
- RIBEIRO, G. L., 1994a. *Transnational Capitalism and Hydropolitics in Argentina*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.
- RIBEIRO, G. L., 1994b. 'The Condition of Transnationality,' Brasília: Universidad de Brasília, Departamento de Antropologia, *Séria Antropologia* no. 173.
- RIBEIRO, G. L.; LITTLE, P., 1996. 'Neo-Liberal Recipes, Environmental Cooks: The Transformation of Amazonian Agency.' Unpublished manuscript.
- SACHS, W., ed., 1992. *The Development Dictionary*. London: Zed Books.

SAID, E., 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

SCOTT, J., 1985. *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

SWANTZ, M.-L., 1985. 'The Contributions of Anthropology to Development Work.' In *Anthropological Contributions to Planned Change and Development*, ed. H. Skar, pp. 18-33. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothenburgensis.

WULFF, R.; FISKE, S. (eds), 1987. *Anthropological Praxis: Translating Knowledge into Action*. Boulder: Westview Press.