DEVELOPMENT ETHOS AND CULTURE: TOWARDS AUTONOMOUS HUMAN AGENCY WITHIN CHRISTIAN HUMANISM

Prof Karel Th. August
September 2015

DEVELOPMENT ETHOS AND CULTURE: TOWARDS AUTONOMOUS HUMAN AGENCY WITHIN CHRISTIAN HUMANISM

Inaugural lecture delivered on 14 September 2015

Prof Karel Th. August
Department of Practical Theology and Missiology
Faculty of Theology
Stellenbosch University

BIOGRAPHY

Karel August was born as the eldest child of James and Ellen August on Sunday, 9 April 1950 in Bredasdorp. He hails from the Moravian mission settlement of Elim and owes his childhood formation and education to the communities of Elim, Bredasdorp and Genadendal.

After completing his high school education at Emil Weder High School, Genadendal, he attended the Moravian Seminary in Port Elizabeth and finished his basic theological formation and training at Moravian Hill, District Six. He subsequently studied at UNISA for his BA (Theology) and B Theology degrees, which he completed in 1976. During this time he served Pella mission station and Elim as assistant minister.

He was ordained in 1978 and was called to serve Moravian Hill as minister and as one of the indigenous lecturers of the seminary. As his ministry here was terminated by the apartheid regime in 1980, he was called to Bridgetown congregation and continued his work at the seminary as a part-time lecturer.

It was during this time that he studied for his Master's in Systematic Theology under Profs Jaap Durand and Dirkie Smith at the University of the Western Cape, specialising in the Theology of the Cross (Luther, Zinzendorf and Moltmann).

Leading up to his ordination in 1978, he ministered to two rural congregations, followed by seven urban congregations, whilst he even served as manager of two crèches. He served on various nursery school, primary school and high school boards. Besides his service in different synodic commissions of the church, he served on the Provincial Board of the Moravian Church of SA (MCSA) for two terms and currently also is serving on the Board. He also had the opportunity to serve as member of the presidium of synod of the MCSA for three terms. In 1981 and 1987 he attended two world synods of the Unitas Fratrum in Herrnhut (DDR Germany) and Antiqua (West Indies) respectively.

In 1988 he was appointed as the first indigenous full-time rector of the seminary (1988-1993) and, during this period, he served in the Lutheran World Federation Committee (African Theological Desk) with Dr Y. Irene from Ethiopia; and with Prof John Pobie from Ghana in the African Theology by Extension desk of the World Council of Churches (WCC). He further was engaged with the work of the South African Council for Theological Education (SACTE) as vice-chairperson, the Association of Southern African Theological Institutes, and the Joint Board for Theology in South Africa, and as regional coordinator of the Theological Education by Extension College (TEEC). Through SACTE he also served on the Council for Theological Education in Africa (CATI).

In 1993 he qualified as a high school teacher at UNISA with a postgraduate diploma in Higher Education and, after having received leave from the church, he taught at Voorbrug Senior Secondary School for the following four years. From 1996 to 1998 he studied Public Administration and Development Management part time through the School of Public Management of the Stellenbosch University (SU). This qualification prepared him for the post in Theology of Development Science at the Faculty of Theology at SU – a post he has held since his appointment in 1988 (1988-2015).

He has filled the position of head of department in the department of Practical Theology and Missiology with pride for seven years. After he acquired his doctoral degree in Missiology (2003) in the area of Public Church, he first was appointed as senior lecturer, followed by his appointment as associate professor. During this time, apart from the many students that passed through his undergraduate and licentiate studies, 34 students completed their Master's studies in Theology of Development and 12 students completed doctorates. One thing he is extremely proud of is that he could grow his own timber in that his first doctoral student now is his colleague and successor at the Faculty of Theology.

He is currently serving as part-time minister of the Moravian congregation in Kuilsriver, is a member of the national Board of the Moravian Church in South Africa and chairperson of the Board of the Moravian Theological Seminary.

Karel has published a great number of popular and peer reviewed articles and has produced chapters in books in the area of Development, Moravian Church and doctrine.

He is married to Blanche for 41 years; they have three children, viz. Abigail Ruth, Brigitte Clair and Emile Benedict, as well as seven grandchildren.

DEVELOPMENT ETHOS AND CULTURE: TOWARDS AUTONOMOUS HUMAN AGENCY WITHIN CHRISTIAN HUMANISM

1. INTRODUCTION

In this inaugural address I seek to explore an understanding of development and culture by reviewing definitions and sharing a concept of endogenous development that presupposes development initiated by local people. I especially want to point out that an in-depth understanding of the relationship between development and culture is central to a holistic approach and response from a theological perspective that is guided by the paradigmatic framework of endogenous development within the incarnational transformational paradigm in Christian humanism.

I shall aim to pull culture (meaning the culture of the Global South) out of the shadows[1] to which it has been condemned by mainly Western (Euro-centric) Christian thinkers; and I shall argue that culture is, and always has been, central to the understanding of development processes across the globe.[2] Culture and development have always moved hand in hand.[3] The centrality of culture and its interconnectedness with economic, political and social change have become increasingly apparent in events such as the emergence of indigenous rights movements and the rise of ethno-nationalism. Newly emerging fields of research, such as cultural studies and postcolonial studies, as well as the impact of postmodern thought, have provided us with new analytical tools that enable us to take a new look at the relationship between culture and development,[4] especially from within theology, as has been practiced here at our faculty in development studies in a progressive manner for the last 18 years.

Cultural factors are dominant in the process of development, and culture should at all times be respected in the way in which we conduct the study and process of development. All models of development are essentially cultural in that they reflect perceptions of and responses to the problems faced by society (Tanner 1997:25).[5] In what follows I shall attempt to explore an understanding of development and culture that is both holistic and central to endogenous development. I will argue that all models of development are cultural, as they reflect certain perspectives on how to respond to problems faced by society. Culture is a means to understand and achieve forms of development from which people can draw meaning and fulfilment in life.

2. DEVELOPMENT—REPRESENTATIVE PERSPECTIVES

Development is a complex term. In order to come to a broader understanding of the term I shall refer to the discussion of the term among scholars from different disciplines. The term development seems to synthesise the aspirations of humanity for more human living conditions. Development thus is a blanket term used to cover a whole range of interdependent concepts such as liberation, humanisation, growth, unfolding, renewal, transfiguration, as well as the more religious concept of transformation. It also takes its place in a cultural tradition, which has a past, and is progressing, evolving and pointing to some change (Merino in Dunne 1969:121[6]).

Kothari and Minogue[7] claim that the term development is in itself paradoxical and thus allows for a variety of definitions. Seen from an economic perspective, development is synonymous with economic growth; however, as an overall social process it includes economic, social, political and cultural aspects (Dunne 1969:123[8]).

The aim of development is to provide a better life. Therefore it is based on human well-being (Coetzee 2001:122[9]). The underlying anthropological position is that everybody has the ability to become more than they are at any particular stage. It provides the mechanism for people to become more than they are. Carmen[10] goes further and adds that **development is another word for human agency, the undoing of *envelopment.*** Development is that which exists there where people act as subjects and are not acted upon as objects, targets and beneficiaries, nor manipulated as participants in designs and projects that are not of their own doing. Development is there where there is space for the flourishing of human creativity and the right to invent one's own future.

The origin of the term is negative and came into use in opposition to the term underdevelopment, which expressed the condition and the anguish of poor countries compared to rich ones. According to Davids,[11] the body of knowledge we call development is relatively new and the scientific enquiry into the theory of development started shortly after the Second World War, during the 1950s and 1960s, which were dominated by modernisation theory.[12]

According to Heymans,[13] perspectives on growth and development have shifted markedly over the past forty years. The concept of development has undergone significant changes since the end of the Second World War.[14] Thus, during the 1950s and 1960s, development was equated with growth in gross national product (GNP), gross domestic product (GDP), or per capital GNP (income per capital) being the preferred index. However, when it became apparent that economic growth did not necessarily lead to a reduction in poverty and a better quality of life for the population at large, the concept of development was re-examined.[15]

Development, as it has developed, also encompasses better education, high standards of health and nutrition, less poverty, a cleaner environment, better opportunities, greater individual freedom and a richer cultural life.[16] It also focuses on individual freedom, self-esteem and freedom from ignorance, human usury and servitude. These determine the quality of life. Heymans,[17] like Burkey,[18] Carmen[19] and Korten,[20] further maintains that development is about people and its ultimate aim is to improve the quality of people's lives, especially those of the poor, in a sustainable manner.

Subsequently, we want to pay attention to the dictum "development is about people", which is a central and basic ethos of endogenous development thinking.

Development is about people (people-centred development)

David Korten (2001:15)[21], the director of the People-centred Development Forum, contrasts what he calls people-centred development[22] with the economic growth-centred development promoted by many Western governments. Korten believes that, at the end of the twentieth century, the world is suffering from a threefold crisis, namely poverty, environmental destruction and social disintegration. He defines development as "a process by which the members of a society increase their personal and institutional capacities and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly distributed improvements in their quality of life consistent with their own aspirations" (Korten 1990:97)[23]. This (continuing) process, driven by the three principles of sustainability, justice and inclusiveness, entails that development has to be consistent with people's aspirations, meaning that people should decide by themselves what improvements are needed and how they are to be created.[24]

This development process is directed at improving standards of living and self-reliance. It is a process by which groups, communities and individuals are enabled to be responsible for their own livelihood, welfare and future.[25] According to Dawood,[26] this is especially true of African people and governments striving for empowerment and self-reliance.

It is important to note that development is about people, and this must help us understand the core values of the meaning of development in context. Development acts as a vehicle for the transformation and betterment of people's lives.[27] August[28] furthermore states that the participation of people in their own development is an essential part of human growth and a process through which people themselves become aware of and understand their problems and the social reality within which they live in order to affect lasting solutions for themselves at the grassroots level.

Whereas people have the potential and ability to improve their own lives, the goal to reach is humanness, which means to strive for social justice, full participation in decision making, alleviation of suffering and sustainable development.

Development initiatives should stress the principle that progress depends on the continuous affirmation of meaning—the will to lead a meaningful life. Therefore, development is more likely to succeed if people are allowed to incorporate the specific meaning of their social reality (as they themselves give meaning to it) into their desire to improve their situations.[29] Thus, development initiatives that accommodate these sensitive issues and contexts most probably will be more legitimate and successful than others.

In line with this thinking, Speckman[30] argues that development is integrally linked to the release of human potential. There neither can be successful economic growth without human empowerment and motivation, nor can there be human empowerment without it being translated into economic advantages. There is a clear link between economic and human development.

Finally, to argue that development is about people is to acknowledge that development is fundamentally about relationships. Human relationships are one of the determinants of human development. These relations, from a normative point of view, have to be embedded in an ethos of equity, justice, human dignity, cultural fit, participation, freedom, hope, sustainability, reciprocity, ecological soundness and spirituality.[31]

For Anderson,[32] development is essentially about change and continuity. He argues that, for change to take root, it must have something in common with the people and be in line with their values and their capacity. Development therefore must be appropriate, i.e., culturally, socially, economically, technologically and mentally relevant. Therefore, let us take a look at the local development environment.

The local development environment

Communities organise and carry out projects locally. The local context influences development, while, at the same time, being influenced by development taking place within its borders. As the development environment consists of or presents itself in a number of different environments, it is of strategic importance to acknowledge that these types of environment have a profound influence on communication and thus on development.

On the basis of De Beer and Swanepoel,[33] I hereby propose seven types of environment in my attempt to clarify the concepts "development" and "local".

i. Political Environment

The political environment consists of leaders and political groups, with political activities such as meetings and marches. Political communication consists of messages regarding political orientation and policy preferences. Political forces are at work in all communities. In rural areas, traditional leaders still play an important role in reorganising and deciding events and activities within the community.

ii. Social Environment

According to De Beer and Swanepoel,[34] the social environment consists of institutions such as the primary institution of the family, and secondary institutions such as schools, the church, clubs and interest groups. There also are informal institutions such as friendships. Families are represented in many of the secondary institutions and tend to communicate with one another. All communities are well organised; they have, for instance, power structures, schools, interest groups and civic organisations. The actual structure of the organisations is important, as is how they relate to one another as they form the social environment within which community development takes place.

iii. Cultural Environment

The cultural environment consists of the values and morals of society. These values and morals are often spoken of as the traditions of the people. With tradition, people have a place in society and certain obligations toward society, while they can expect society to guide them and provide a living environment for them as long as they are true to the traditions.[35] Moreover, culture creates or contains taboos and provides a framework according to which people act and react in daily life. In most communities, cultural practices are beneficial to the success of development efforts.

iv. Economic Environment

Every community has its own economy that is manifested to a large extent in the informal system, but also in employment in the formal system. The economic context refers to the rate of employment, and the presence and activity of commerce and industry. Society also is layered in terms of the economy, so that one finds very poor people, poor people and those who are better off. The economic environment is very important in community development and in the management of scarce resources.

v. Natural Environmental Dimension

The natural dimension, such as the availability of natural resources and disasters, represents contextual elements that could affect development.

vi. Psychological Dimension

The psychological dimension differs from one society to another, e.g., the psychological dimension of a rural area is different to that of an urban area. It is important to know people's histories, because past experiences are part of their ecology of ideas and will influence their perception and understanding of development, and if and how they participate in development activities.[36]

vii. Religious Dimension

In the global South, the religious factor has become an acknowledged and strategic dimension in development thinking and practice. The South African government has emphatically stated that "(i)n striving for political and economic development, the ANC recognizes that social transformation cannot be separated from spiritual transformation."[37] When using the inclusive concept "religion" we include the church, which in the global South is a dominant force. In South Africa, eighty percent of the population according to census statistics categorises themselves as Christian. Statistics show that, in the global South, the church is an acknowledged institution that is close to the poor and, in most cases, the church of the poor.[38] It therefore stands to reason that the religious dimension is of strategic importance for the development debate in the global South when we refer to context.

3. CULTURE AND CULTURAL FIT

Development must be appropriate to the culture that is to be transformed. Nonetheless, modernisers have all too often ignored customs and social patterns in an attempt to bring material benefit to those who were regarded as "backward". They regard local tradition as an obstacle to change and technology, without understanding the rationality of society's accumulated wisdom. The results have been cultural imperialism and the destruction of indigenous values, and even of entire cultures. We can deduce, therefore, that no form of social transformation can be achieved without culture, and if any culture is destroyed, a part of creation and humanity dies.[39]

In this context, Davids [40] argues that the focus of a development initiative should be prompted by people's own experience. Intervention at the micro-level should incorporate indigenous knowledge systems and appropriate development technology based on the specific cultural environment. Awareness plays a major role in this context. People must be both the target of development and the tools (subject) with which to attain it. In becoming the tools to shape their own development, people create a world of meaning that enables them to understand their social reality. For this reason, development should focus on people's aspirations and needs as defined by them. Development grounded in consciousness implies that people confronted with development should have the right to make decisions for themselves.

Perspectives on culture

According to Bell,[41] cultural systems organise and reproduce the material forces of production (labour, natural resources, technology) without which they are merely a set of physical possibilities and constraints lacking order or integration. The cultural system determines the kinds of goods produced, the way in which work is organised and how labour is apportioned between men and women.

Moreover, in tribal cultures,[42] economy, polity, ritual and ideology do not appear as distinct systems, nor can relationships easily be assigned to one or another of these functions. Society is ordered by a single consistent system of relationships, which should be mapped out at the level of social action.

As Dawood[43] emphasises, culture is a core part of development in Africa. We need to protect and effectively use indigenous knowledge and share it for the benefit of humanity. Indigenous knowledge includes tradition-based literacy, artistic and scientific works, invention and scientific discoveries, designs, names and symbols, genetic resources and knowledge, and all other tradition-based creations from intellectual work in the fields of industry, science, literature and art. Speckman[44] warns that, when tradition is discarded or reformed, interference with the basics of the community begins. **This warning is of great value for the identity and human dignity of a community.** It therefore stands to reason that those who abandon their cultural practices in favour of foreign cultures do not only upset the living, but they also change the appearance of what was known to the dead when they were alive.

The concept of culture

The concept of culture is at the centre of modern thought and practice. Since the eighteenth century, the definition of culture has undergone considerable changes. It is used here in the sociological and anthropological sense to denote a process that shapes specific and distinct ways of life. It therefore subsumes the arts and all systems of meanings and values associated with inner development.[45]

Moreover, used in this sense, culture challenges the Marxist tendency to reduce culture to the super-structural—a realm of mere ideas, beliefs, arts and customs—determined by basic material history, while the anthropological concept of culture has been one of the most important and influential ideas in twentieth-century thought. The use of the term culture has spread to other fields of thought, with profound impact.[46]

Culture as used in anthropology of course does not mean cultivation in the arts and social graces. It refers, rather, to learned, accumulated experience. Structured and cultural features are in fact closely intertwined, and while structured interest group analysis is relevant to our understanding of social processes, so too are the patterns of loyalties and cultural norms, which influence the response of the people in the global South to changing circumstances, and which in turn condition the means by which social change is achieved.

Therefore, it is important to emphasise that, when we speak about culture, we are not just referring to customs, beliefs, attitudes, values and art, but also to the whole way of life of a people, which also embraces a complexity of economic and political activities, science and technology.[47]

According to Barker,[48] **culture is therefore the lived experience, texts, practices and meanings of all the people as they conduct their lives**. Such meanings and practices are enacted on a terrain not of our making, even as we struggle to shape our lives creatively. Culture does not float free from the material condition of life; on the contrary, whatever purposes cultural practice may serve, its means of production are always unarguably material. The meanings of culture are to be explored within the context of their conditions of production, thus forming culture as a whole way of life.[49] In this case, culture may be seen as consisting of the following:

- The sum total of knowledge, attitudes and habitual behaviour patterns shared and transmitted by the members of a particular society
- All the historically created designs for living, explicit and implicit, rational, irrational and non-rational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behaviour of human beings
- The learned and transmitted motor reactions, habits, technologies, ideas and values and the behaviour they induce
- Patterns, explicit and implicit, of behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, consisting of the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artefacts.

In this address I shall operate strategically with a broad definition of culture. This means that culture is not viewed as being in opposition to development, but as something that is continuously changing and being created in step with changing social processes while, at the same time, constituting a common point of reference in global development.

Culture therefore can be defined broadly as that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by individuals as members of society or community.[50] **In short, we can summarise and define culture in relation to development as the complex of spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterise society.** Culture is the mental structures, the general patterns of understanding prevalent in a given social group, i.e., conceptions of the world, religion, gender role patterns and the management of resources. However, culture also comprises more specific forms of expression through works of artistic/cultural value.

Operationally, this twofold definition means that work with the cultural dimension involves (i) culture as the sum of social practices in the form of, for example, religion, language, education and social family practices; and (ii) culture as an artistic expression in the form of, for example, literature, dance, music and films. The cultural dimension offers especially good opportunities for genuine partnerships in that it holds out more prospects for cooperation on an equal footing than does the economic dimension. The link between development and the cultural dimension often will initiate a process in which all parties exert an ongoing influence on one another.

The cultural dimension of development

According to Serageldin and Taboroff, the "cultural dimension of development is a concept that has emerged gradually over a long period of time, and to a large degree as a consequence of studies carried out by UNESCO and some others in the interface of culture and social affairs",[51] and of culture and development. The concept is ultimately linked to the wider anthropological definitions of culture, which includes "the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group". **It includes not only arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being's value systems, traditions and beliefs.**

The planners of UNESCO's World Decade for Cultural Development (spanning 1988–1997) came up with the following four objectives:
- Acknowledging the cultural dimension of development

- Affirming and enriching cultural identities
- Broadening participation in culture
- Promoting international cultural cooperation

One of the reasons for the failure of various development strategies was that the cultural dimension had long been a neglected aspect of development.[52] People do not commit themselves to a development undertaking unless that undertaking corresponds to their deeply felt needs (Eade 2002: 169[53]). People should be able to derive the means for and motivate their development from their own cultural roots.

Culture as a life pattern: Local culture and development

People in the global South are rarely consulted on the kind of development they would want. They have been subjected to various models of development, which only rarely have increased their supplies of food or improved their state of health. They have been the people others would like to see changed, whether through Christianity, civilisation, research or development projects. They are seldom regarded as having a religion, culture or trading system of their own. Rather, it is assumed that they have to be initiated into all of these, and need to be helped, assessed and given aid (Eade 2002:168).[54]

In contrast to this degrading approach to the culture of the global South, Anderson[55] views development from the perspective of Christian transformational development as a process by which indigenous people are given the opportunity to upgrade their own way of life, challenging the physical and social environment in which they find themselves. This is so because local communities and people have their own concept of development (Eade 2002:168).[56] It also is a process that provides access to the resources required for removing such constraints and acknowledges their right to plan and control their destiny in accordance with the resources available to them. People do not need others to define their needs for them; they can do it for themselves.

Anderson[57] further cautions that, because people are not developed but develop themselves, they have to be convinced that the changes envisaged will not merely experiment with their lives but actually mean change for the better.

It is important to note that people participate in what they know best. Practically, all rural communities still cherish their culture as manifestations of their traditional knowledge, skill, values, customs, organisation and management systems and institutions. These are what have enabled them to survive as communities in a specific physical and social environment. Thus, for people to participate in decisions that affect their lives, they must start from where they are and with what they know. What most people know is their own culture and values.[58]

Integrating the cultural dimension into development can lead to the adoption of a less reductive and a more comprehensive approach (Eade 2002:9).[59] This means that development partners, especially the people affected, have to make special efforts to integrate culture from the earliest stages. For the purpose of development work, it is useful to look at culture as both an aid and a coping strategy, with negative influences and pressures as well as a creative and joyous response to people's relationship with themselves, others, the community and the environment (Eade 2002:10).[60]

Moreover, culture does not only belong to the past. It evolves in response to outside influences and to the fact that people innovate and create new cultural traits. In a given culture, therefore, some elements are inherited while others are adopted and created. Culture therefore is the whole complex of knowledge, wisdom, values, attitudes, customs and multiple resources that a community has inherited, adopted or created in order to flourish in the context of its social and natural environment. It contains the local perception of the meaning of life and of what constitutes the good life for a local population. Culture gives meaning and direction. Any development process must be embedded in local culture, otherwise development simply will not take place. Culture means a great deal in people's life, as it provides the means to understand and interpret the meaning in human society.[61]

Thus such cultural trends as cooperation in the community, participation, inclusiveness and consensus need to be taken into consideration. When development builds on indigenous values it extracts lower social costs and imposes less human suffering and cultural destruction than when it copies outside models. This is because indigenously rooted values are the matrix from which people derive meaning in their lives, a sense of identity and cultural integrity.[62]

A more authentic engagement with theology, development and culture should determine what development that brings transformation should be like. It must recognise that the value system of local communities has inherent, God-given strengths that can be harnessed to achieve sustainable development. Local values provide a dynamism that supports new ways to approach development.

Promoting cultural identity in development

Serogeldin and Taboroff[63] state that regional cultural manifestations strike deep, responsive chords in people. This occurs partly because they draw upon an authentic heritage that helps define the shared image of self and society that creates a collectivity. The clarity of cultural identity and its evolving continuity are essential to create an integrated and integrating cultural framework, which is the *sine qua non* for relevant,

effective institutions rooted in authenticity and tradition, yet open to change and modernity.

Cultural identity is essential for the self-assurance that society needs for (endogenous) development. Without such institutions, no real development can take place.

This is especially evident in economic development, the principal engine of which is people's work and creativity.[64] What induces them to strike and invent is a climate of liberty that leaves them in control of their own destiny. If individuals feel that others are responsible for them, their effort will ebb. If others tell them what to think and believe, the consequence is either loss of motivation and creativity, or a choice between submission and rebellion. Submission leaves a society without innovators, and rebellions divert energies from constructive efforts to resistance, posing obstacles and causing destruction. To trust the individual, to have faith in the individual, is one of the elements of a value system that favours development.

Goals for culture and development

The goals for a conscious and systematic incorporation of culture in development cooperation can be summarised as follows:

Promotion of the cultural dimension as an important component of poverty reduction. An awareness of the cultural context is necessary in the planning and implementation of all development cooperation. To achieve this result, culture must be incorporated as a resource rather than be allowed to function as an obstacle to the process. At the same time, local culture and knowledge must be taken into account as integral components of development programmes, both for the benefit of local communities and as a contribution to continued global cultural diversity.

Promotion of culture as an active instrument in strengthening the very poor. Cultural projects, in general, can be used as an active instrument in promoting understanding for values such as social justice, equality of opportunity and sustainability, and to promote the identity and dignity of poor people and hard-pressed population groups. As part of this process, special attention must be devoted to the situation of women and indigenous peoples.

Promotion of cultural diversity on the basis of human rights and tolerance. The keener focus on the cultural dimension in endogenous development cooperation must contribute to the preservation and development of cultural diversity, and an active effort must be made to strengthen mutual cultural respect. Tolerance and respect for human rights and for different cultures must be promoted as an important element in securing the cultural identity of the developing countries.

4. ENDOGENOUS DEVELOPMENT

This section discusses endogenous development, its difference from other development approaches, and its meaning. Endogenous development is based on local people's criteria of development, and takes into account people's material, social and spiritual well-being.[65]

The importance of participatory approaches and of integrating local knowledge into development interventions has become broadly recognised. However, many of these approaches run into difficulties in attempts to overcome an implicit Western bias. Endogenous development seeks to overcome this bias by using people's worldviews and livelihood strategies as the starting point for development. Many of these worldviews and livelihood strategies reflect sustainable development as a balance between material, social and spiritual well-being.

The main difference between endogenous development and other participatory approaches is its insistence on the inclusion of religious (spiritual) aspects in the development process, in addition to the ecological, social and economic aspects. Endogenous development is based mainly on local strategies, values, institutions and resources. Therefore, priorities, needs and criteria for development may differ in each community and may not always be the same as those of the development worker.

Key concepts within endogenous development include local control of the development process, taking cultural values seriously, appreciating worldviews and finding a balance between local and external resources. The aim of endogenous development is to empower local communities to take control of their own development process.

The background and value of endogenous development

The most striking feature of "another development" is its emphasis on endogenous development. The concept is rooted in the global South's experiences and it arose as an antithesis to the dependence syndrome. According to Bragg,[66] experiences in Gandhi's India, in pre-1900 Japan and, more recently, in Tanzania,[67] China and Sri Lanka and other places, point the way to self-reliance. Endogenous development proponents consider self-reliance as an important political strategy against domination and exploitation by the West. The search for a new international economic order required a reformulation of the basis for the overall system of relationships between the global South and the international system.

However, Carmen[68] states that to transform dependence into autonomy requires deep structural changes in the relationship between the state and civil society in the global South. Thus, the global South cannot become self-reliant by imitating global North, but by being able to set its own agenda and using its own forces, including economic ones. Moreover, it entails, in essence, the empowerment of people to involve themselves effectively in creating the structures and in designing the policies and programmes that serve the interest of all, as well as to contribute effectively to the development process and share equitably in its benefits.[69]

Thus, endogenous development is a means for achieving the social, cultural and economic transformation of society based on the revitalisation of traditions, respect for the environment and equitable relations of production. This makes room for turning natural resources into products that may be used, distributed and exported to the whole world. Endogenous development aims at incorporating people and communities previously excluded from the educational, economic and social system by building productive networks with easy access to technology and knowledge. It is through endogenous development that organised communities are given the power to develop the potential of every region in the areas of social, economic, cultural and spiritual well-being.[70]

Endogenous development aims at improving quality of life and creating a new economic and social model of development in which the aspects of development neglected by other development models are considered. The collaboration of many institutions also dedicated to the principle of solidarity with local communities is encouraged. Endogenous development policy is based on the process of change and promotes the active participation of the entire population in the destiny of the nation, the democratisation of resources, the creation of a fair society, and the improvement of living standards for neglected communities. People's participation in the formation, execution and control of public negotiation is the necessary means to achieve complete development.[71]

Above all, in the words of the Cocoyoc Declaration, this autonomous capacity means "trust in people and nations, reliance on the capacity of people themselves to invent and generate new resources and techniques, to increase their capacity to absorb them, to put them to socially beneficial use, to take a measure of command over the economy, and to generate their own way of life."[72]

Endogenous development entails a kind of development that originates from the heart of each society without any outside interference and imitation; in other words, that the society, community or individual defines in sovereignty its values and its vision of the future.[73] The same idea is expressed by Carmen,[74] when he states that development is not something done to people in the usual interventionist mode by outside agencies and self-proclaimed experts, but **is and can only be the product of an ever-present inventive, creative, autonomous human agency.**

Linked to the above, development ought to become a project of people's own autonomous agency. People, as subjects, need to be free of the process of change, inventing their own future as authors of a culturally embedded gender-permeated, economic and political process of transforming and humanising the landscapes they inhabit.

Thus, the endogenous approach to development is a strategy for more appropriate development, based not on external constraints and political dependency, but rather structurally on internal needs and criteria. Endogenous development equalises and distributes power among nations, as well as among people and nations.

The concept of endogenous development within a nation involves the decentralisation of power, which would allow the concerned at every level of society to exercise all the power they are capable of. It also allows for the participation of all members of society, equal opportunities and the right to control one's own destiny.[75]

The philosophy of endogenous development is crucial to people-centred development, as it forms the non-negotiable foundation for the whole method and process of development in the global South. My argument is based on the premise that meaningful development is endogenous by nature because it is born out of local initiatives, and people themselves become the drivers of their own development agenda and in their own cultural context and situations.[76]

Finally, theories of development born out of the modernisation paradigm as discussed above have been a let-down as far as promoting a kind of development that is driven by local people. In the interest of enriching the élites, most individuals, societies, communities and especially the global South have been adversely affected in one way or another. Any plan for transforming human existence must provide adequate life-sustaining goods and services, which most models of development have failed to address.

Bragg[77] notes that, in other development models, such as modernisation, dependency and global reformism, issues of participation, dignity, freedom and justice are alienated from the people. Endogenous development, on the other hand, seeks especially to promote the idea of encouraging people to participate in their own development agenda. People at every level are encouraged to participate in events and generate new resources and techniques to increase their capacity to absorb them and shape their own way of life.

Endogenous development stresses the need for culture and development to move together, but too often modern theorists have ignored customs and social patterns in an attempt to bring material benefits to the fore.[78] Local traditions are often regarded as an obstacle to change and technology, without any attempt

at understanding the rationality of society's accumulated wisdom. Proponents of the New International Economic Order also tend to view merely the benefits of increased wealth. According to Samuel and Sugden,[79] they sacrifice the cultural heritage of their own people for the progress of industrialisation and extractive economies. We need to bear in mind, therefore, that if any culture is destroyed, a part of creation and humanity dies.

Transformational and endogenous development theory acknowledges the vital importance of the cultural heritage and creativity of all people as a biblical (theological) concept. In this kind of development, any change must be appropriated because it would arise out of the culture endogenously. Therefore, this gives a justifiable reason to explore endogenous development in context as an alternative approach to doing development that values multidimensionality, transformativity and sustainability over time.

5. THE HOW OF DEVELOPMENT ETHOS

If one were to ask how a development ethos emerges, engrains and sustains in contact with local culture and religion, the following would serve as trailblazers:

i. Endogenous and Self-reliant Development

In the words of the Cocoyoc Declaration, autonomous capacity means trust in people and nations, and reliance on people's capacity to invent and generate new resources and techniques, increasing their capacity to absorb them, put them to socially beneficial use, take a measure of command over the economy and shape their own way of life.[80]

One of the most remarkable features of endogenous development is that it promotes self-reliance and human development there where individuals and communities become subjects of their own development process. Self-reliance is doing things for oneself, maintaining one's own self-confidence, and making independent decisions – either as an individual or in the context of a collective group with which each member has voluntarily allied him/herself.[81]

Self-reliance comes from within, but it is directed outwards. It is based on social relationships in which like-minded people with the same core values come together and voluntarily pool their efforts and resources in small groups, and ally themselves with other small groups working toward the same goals. Accordingly, decisions and actions taken at all levels are based on self-confidence and self-determination. Self-reliance in this sense is not intended to lead to complete sufficiency, such as the ability to manage one's own resources completely without interacting with others. Rather, in the economic sense, self-reliance is the ability of the family, community or nation to produce its basic needs as well as surpluses

with which to trade for those commodities and services that it does not produce effectively.[82]

Moreover, no development activity, whether initiated by outsiders or by the indigenous people themselves, can hope to succeed unless it contains a strong element of human development. Human development involves the strengthening of the personality and the acquisition and internalisation of knowledge and information.[83]

If the indigenous people are to manage and control their own development, then they must gain self-confidence, learn to be assertive, have faith in their own abilities and learn to discuss among themselves and with others. The discussion will involve what they already know, especially about development activity, what skills individual members of the group have and how these can be utilised most productively. In addition, the aspect of self-confidence is crucial in the whole process of self-reliance. Although self-confidence cannot be taught, it must be acquired through positive experiences such as small successes. Self-confidence therefore can be promoted through expressions of confidence and encouragement.[84]

Thus, the self-reliance approach to development is a strategy for more appropriate development, based not on external constraints and potential dependency, but rather on internal-needs criteria. This would equalise and redistribute power among nations and through development at both the macro- and micro-levels. The concept of self-reliance within a nation involves the decentralisation of power, which would allow those concerned at every level of society to exercise that power which they are capable of exercising. Thus, self-reliance is sought in order to promote the participation of all members of society.[85]

ii. Reclaiming ownership and control

Endogenous development empowers people to regain ownership of and control over the resources that originally were theirs, and those that are a result of own invention and creativity.[86] Initiatives for development and endogenous sustainable development can be sustained through more systematic and comprehensive societal dialogues between scientists, policy makers, development agencies and local actors, which include dialogues on differences in values, worldviews and ways of knowing.

Reflecting on the relationship between the different worldviews and the related forms of knowledge allows people jointly to learn that, in principle, no form of knowledge is universal or *a priori* better than any other one. Knowledge is a human product and thus fallible and never complete. Experiences and insights from local people all over the world show the great diversity of values, worldviews and ways of knowing that have relevance for development and the sciences.

Carmen,[87] quoting Manfred Max-Neef, a classical economist and exponent and spokesperson of what came to be known as ecological economics,[88] states that people are as they always have been and ought to be, namely the real protagonists of their own development and future. In this sense, development cannot be built on impositions, transfers, plans or interactions. The essence of development is creation, and not just pre-planned and pre-targeted economic growth, and people are full of unreleased potential waiting for an opportune time to be birthed.

In its actual sense, development indicates growth, but also, and above all, invokes creation, culture and everything involving autonomous human agency.

iii. Local Participation

Participation is an essential part of human growth, that is, the development of self-confidence, pride, initiative, creativity, responsibility and cooperation. Without such development within people themselves, efforts to alleviate their poverty will be immensely more difficult. This process whereby people learn to take charge of their own lives and solve their own problems is the essence of development.[89]

The meaningful participation of the indigenous people in the process of development is concerned with direct access to the resources necessary for development and active involvement in and influence on the decisions affecting resources. To participate meaningfully implies the ability to influence the course of events positively. Thus, participation in this context leads to greater control by the indigenous people over their situation. Through the acquisition of knowledge and awareness, they are better able to understand the causes of their poverty and in a better position to mobilise and utilise the available resources to improve their situation.

A key element in this process by which the indigenous people gain control over their own lives is a collective effort, such as organising activities in like-minded groups. It is generally accepted that participation is meaningless outside the collective context. People must come together and pool their human and material resources (capital) in order to attain the objectives that they set for themselves. Participatory development implies a collective process of self-improvement.[90]

Participation is a continuous educative process, a process of progress in conscientisation (based on Paulo Frere's theory). Through collectively reflecting on their personal experiences and problems (PLA),[91] people become increasingly aware of the different aspects of their reality and of what they can do to transform it. They decide upon and take collective action and analyse its results to promote their awareness further, and thus move on with a better knowledge of their evolving reality.

iv. Sustainability

According to Chambers, "[s]ustainability means that the long-term perspectives should apply to all policies and actions, with sustainable well-being and sustainable livelihood as objectives for present and future generation."[92] Any plan for transforming human existence must provide adequate life-sustaining goods and services to the members of society. When a society has minimal goods and services, existence, especially from a religious perspective, becomes sublimation, distorting God's provisions for humanity's well-being.

Samuel and Sugden[93] note that the provision of life—sustaining necessities and an overall increase in wealth—provides a qualitative change. This is so because sustainable development is seen as a development strategy that manages all assets, natural resources and human resources, as well as financial and physical assets, for long-term wealth or well-being. Sustainability deals with the continuous flow of benefits.[94]

Moreover, from a religious point of view, most communities are already sustainable in some manner because God has been and is at work among and through them. This implies that the community's understanding and vision of sustainability must include physical, material, social and spiritual well-being.[95] Physical sustainability means enabling the poor to create wealth, but mental sustainability implies that they must come to believe in themselves. With social sustainability, people need to develop a sense of belonging and, with spiritual sustainability, everyone would need not only to depend on, but also to acknowledge, God for sustenance.

v. Empowerment

August[96] views empowerment as the process that makes power available to communities in order that they can use it for the manipulation of access to and use of resources in terms of achieving certain development goals. Empowerment enables people to express and assert what development is to them.[97] The empowerment approach also places emphasis on local decision making, self-reliance, participation in democratic processes and social learning. This perspective further stresses the participation of individuals and communities in defining and solving their own problems without outside interference.[98]

Other characteristics of empowerment include capacity building and evaluation, as the community is empowered to anticipate and influence change, make informed decisions, attract resources, manage resources, review performance, make an impact and make appropriate assessments.

vi. Gender, WAD/WID and Development[99]

Today, when we speak of integrated, participatory development in the context of the global South, gender is an integral part of the debate on the emergence of, and engraining and sustainability in development. Gender relations in development can be defined as the social (cultural) construction of roles and relationships between women and men.[100] Especially in the global South, these socially constructed roles are usually unequal in terms of power, decision making, control and freedom of action and ownership of resources. For this reason gender is fundamentally about power, subordination and inequality, and therefore also about ways of changing these to secure for women greater equality in all its manifestations, especially within development.

Traditionally, women have been excluded from development discourse and practice; there where they came into the picture it was mainly for training and indoctrinating, as if they were empty slates, devoid of culture or understanding. Although the gender approach recognises the vast diversity of relations between men and women across cultures, it nonetheless asserts the lessening (eradication) of the social inequalities experienced by women as an overriding goal.

6. CONCLUSION

The type of development I am advocating can only emerge in local communities in relation to local culture and religions. In view of our critique of modernisation theorists' view of the "backwardness" of the culture of the global South, I acknowledge that, in the practice of all development projects and programmes, the conviction (meta-theoretical framework or policy) and approach (method) of the theoreticians and practitioners are informed by Eurocentric principles and values (ethos). However, when we speak from the context of local communities in the global South, I base my convictions on two related and integrated systems, viz. the Christian transformational and the (humanistic) participatory, people-centred, integrated development approaches, which are both endogenous in nature and directed at human well-being. This means that development has to be consistent with people's aspirations, ensuring that it is contextually and culturally relevant. In other words, people should decide for themselves what improvements are needed and how they are to be created.

From this conviction, with its values, we find the ethos that suits development best and that will engrain the same ethos to sustain development imbedded in endogenous development principles as spelled out above.

- We are proponents of an ethos of which the basic tenets are human dignity and quality of life and are aimed at outcomes of improved standards of living that will create the capacity for self-reliance and, ultimately, contentment. This is a time-consuming and expensive exercise, but then again our ethos is informed by a normative position from within the theology of the cross—Christ sacrificed his life so that people may have life and life in abundance (cf. Jn. 10:10).

I conclude with the well-known quote from James Yen, which corresponds with our incarnational (cross-form), transformational perspective (Phil. 2: 5-8):

Go to the people; live with them

Love them

Learn from them; work with them

Start with what they have

Build on what they know

And in the end when the work is done

The people will rejoice:

"We have done it ourselves!"[101]

....

1 I am referring to the modernisation theorists. by whom Western culture is portrayed as the dominant culture at the cost of other cultures.

2 Susanne Shech and Jane Haggis, *Culture and Development: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), xI.

3 J. Andrew Dearman, *Religion and Culture in Ancient Israel* (Peabody: Hendrikson, 1992), 3.

4 Ibid. 3.

5 K. Tanner, *Theories of culture: A new agenda for theology.* (Minneapolis; Fortress, 1997).

6 Merino in G.H. Dunne (ed.), *In search of a theology of development* (Sodepax) (Geneva: WCC, 1969).

7 Uma Kothari and Martin Minogue, *Development theory and practice* (New York: Palgrave Publishers, 2002), 1.

8 G.H. Dunne (ed*.), In search of a theology of development* (Sodepax) (Genève: WCC, 1969).

9 C.J. Coetzee (ed.) *Sustainable social development critical issues* (Menlo Park: Network Publishers, 2001).

10 Raff Carmen, *Autonomous development: Humanizing the landscape* (London: Zed, 1996), 2.

11 Davids Ismael, Theron Francois and Maphunye Kealeboga, *Development in South Africa: A development management perspective* (Paarl: Van Schaik Publishers, 2005), 4.

12 In the history of development as expounded by the global North, modernisation theorists have largely neglected and ignored the culture of the indigenous people of the global South. Since the modern industrial and technological era ushered in unparalleled economic growth and prosperity for the global North, the altruistic notion of making its fruits available to the rest of the world has motivated governments, intergovernmental institutions and private voluntary organisations (e.g. churches and mission societies) to engage in development. Modernisation theorists sought to spread the fruits of prosperity by attempting to replicate the Western process of industrialisation and technological growth in other parts of the world. In the words of Francis Perroux, "Modernization is the combination of mutual and social changes of a people which enable them to increase, cumulatively and permanently their total production." Rostow saw the process of development as a succession of natural stages from "traditional" to modern, in which societies develop from a "backward" stage through the evolutionary process until the "take off" into sustained economic growth. This process accelerates, according to the theory, through the transfer of knowledge, technology and capital from "advanced" to "less-advanced nations . ..until it reaches the final stages of high production and mass consumption (Wayne G. Bragg, "From development to transformation," in Vinay Samuel and Christopher Sugden, *The church in response to human need* [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1987], 20–51, here 22, 48.)".

13 Chris Heymans, *Infrastructure: A foundation for development report* (Midrand: DBSA, 1998), 4.

14 Damien Kingsbury, Joe Remeny, John Mickay and Janet Hunt, *Key issues in development* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2004), 22.

15 Heymans, op. cit. (note 9), 4.

16 *The IGD guide to the Southern African Development Community* (Johannesburg: Institute for Global Dialogue, 2001); Heymans op. cit. (note 9), 4.

17 Heymans, op. cit. (note 9), 5.

18 Steve Burkey, *People first* (London: Zed Books, 1996).

19 Raff Carmen, *Autonomous development: Humanizing the landscape* (London: Zed Books, 1996).

20 David C. Korten, *Getting to the 21st century. Voluntary action and the global agenda* (West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1990).

21 David C Korten, *When corporations rule the world* (Sterling: Kumarian Press/San Francisco: Berret- Koehler Publisher, 2001), 15.

22 Also Davids, op. cit. (note 7), 23, expresses the notion that development is about people. This implies that people should be at the centre of development efforts, and that development efforts should be meaningful to them. Moreover, the idea that development is about people **obliges us to accept that development involves millions of people who live in poverty and who experience inequality as far as access to economic, political and symbolic power is concerned**. These people must be made the focus of development action and intervention (Davids *et al*, op. cit. [note 7], 23). It is important to note that development is about people, and this must help us understand the core values of the meaning of development in context. Development acts as a vehicle of transformation towards a better life for people (Davids, op. cit. [note 7], 106). Karel Th. August, *A curriculum for community development in practical theology.* Unpublished Master's thesis (Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch, 1999), 24, also states that the participation of people in their own development is an essential part of human growth and a process in which people themselves become aware of and understand their problems and the social reality within which they live in order to affect lasting solutions for themselves at the grassroots level.

23 David C. Korten, *Getting to the 21ˢᵗ century. Voluntary action and the global agenda* (West Hartford: Kumarian Press 1990)

24 Bryant L. Meyers, *Walking with the poor* (New York: Orbis Books, 2003), 97.

25 Kingsbury, op. cit. (note 10), 22.

26 Zora Dawood, *The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)*, at http://osf.org.za/wp/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/NEPADINPLAINLANGUAGE1.pdf, 17.

27 Davids, op. cit. (note 7), 105.

28 August, op. cit. (note 17), 24.

29 Davids, op. cit. (note 7), 106.

30 McGlory T. Speckman, *Biblical vision for Africa's development* (Pietermaritzburg: Clusters Publications, 2007), 243.

31 These principles are what Bragg, op. cit. (note 8) calls characteristics of transformational development.

32 Mary B. Anderson, *Development and social diversity* (UK: Oxfam, 1996), 63, at http://www.developmentinpractice.org/sites/developmentinpractice.org/files/DiP%20Reader%20SocDiv%20text.pdf

33 Hennie Swanepoel and Frik de Beer, *Community development. Breaking the cycle of poverty* (Lansdowne: Juta and Co. Ltd., 2006), 11.

34 Ibid.

35 Ibid., 12.

36 Ibid., 12.

37 Quoting Mandela, the African National Congress made this statement in *The moral renewal of the nation* in 1998, http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=2666 .

38 Cf. Karel Th. August. *Equipping the saints: God's measure for development* (Bellville: The Print-man, 2010), xiii.

39 Vinay Samuel and Christopher Sugden, *The church in response to human need* (Grand Rapids/Oxford: Eerdmans, 1987), 45.

40 Davids, op. cit. (note 7), 106–108.

41 Morag Bell, *Contemporary Africa: Development, culture and the state* (London/New York: Longman, 1986), 53.

42 Ibid., 52.

43 Dawood, op. cit. (note 20), 46.

44 Speckman, op. cit. (note 24), 42.

45 Bell, op. cit. (note 36), 53.

46 Roger M. Keesing and Andrew J. Strathern, *Cultural anthropology. A contemporary perspective* (London: Harcourt Brace, 1998), 14.

47 Cf. Anderson, op. cit. (note 26), 47. Culture has been understood in different ways. Firstly, culture has been used to refer to the pattern of life within a community—the regularly recurring activities as well as material and social arrangements that are characteristic of a particular human group. In this sense, culture refers to the realm of observable phenomena, of things and events out there in the world. Secondly, culture has been used to refer to the organised system of knowledge and beliefs into which people structure their experience and perceptions, formulate acts, and choose between alternatives. This sense of culture refers to the realm of ideas (Keesing and Strathern, ibid., 16). Eade (2006:10), in turn, speaks of the three "dimensions" of a given culture; first, the symbolic, which includes values, symbols, archetypes, myths, spirituality, religion or often several different religions. Second, the society, which includes organisational patterns for family and community linkages and support, a system for management, and political systems for decision making and conflict resolution; and third, the technological dimension, which includes skills, expertise, technology, agriculture, cooking and architecture. These dimensions often overlap; for example, in the fields of art, law, and language (Eade 2002:10).

48 Chris Barker, C*ultural studies: Theory and practice* (New Delhi: SAGE Publication, 2000), 40.

49 Ibid., 40.

50 Keesing, op. cit. (note 41), 14.

51 Ismail Serageldin and June Taboroff, *Culture and development in Africa* (Washington DC: The World Bank, 1994), 545.

52 Ibid., 9.

53 Deborah Eade, *Development and culture* (England: Oxford, 2002).

54 Ibid., 168

55 Anderson, op. cit. (note 26), 69.

56 Deborah Eade, *Development and culture* (England: Oxford, 2002).

57 Ibid., 69.

58 Ibid., 71.

59 Deborah Eade, *Development and culture* (England: Oxford, 2002).

60 Ibid., 10

61 Philip N. Cooke and Luciana Lazzeretti (eds.), *Creative cities, cultural clusters and local economic development* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2008), 48; note that culture provides a specific way in which a community understands the world and defines reality. Furthermore, good development therefore must take into account the cultural values held by the community. Cultural beliefs harbour within them dynamism, which, when properly respected, can serve as the springboard for models of development that are more humane than those drawn from outside paradigms. Matthew Clarke, *Development and religion: Theology and practice* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2011), 10.

62 Ibid., 11.

63 Op. cit. (note 46), 19.

64 Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington, *Culture matters. How values shape human progress* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 47.

65 Antonio Vázquez-Barquero, *Endogenous development: Networking, innovation, institutions and cities* (London: Routledge, 2002), 73.

66 Wayne G. Bragg, "From development to transformation," in Samuel, op. cit. (note 34), 20–51, here 34.

67 **In 1967, the TANU party met in Arusha, Tanzania to develop strategies for the recently independent country. The Arusha Declaration spelled out the Ujama ideal, "In order to maintain our independence and our people's freedom, we ought to be self-reliant in every possible way and avoid dependency on other countries for assistance." Tanzania wanted development on its own terms and by its own initiative. President Julius Nyerere considered withdrawing from the world capitalist system as the only way for the country to act autonomously and develop on its own terms. Cf. Samuel, op. cit. (note 54), 34.**

68 Op. cit. (note 15), 84.

69 Ibid., 87.

70 Barguero, op. cit. (note 55), 73.

71 Ibid.

72 Cf. Samuel, op. cit. (note 54), 35.

73 Stan Burkey, *People first* (London: Zed Books, 1996), 30.

74 Op. cit. (note 15), 31.

75 Bragg, op. cit. (note 56), 35.

76 Samuel, op. cit. (note 54), 36.

77 Op. cit. (note 56), 44.

78 David Reid, *Sustainable development. An introductory guide* (London: Earthscan, 1995), 71.

79 Op. cit. (note 54), 45.

80 Ibid., 35.

81 Burkey, op. cit. (note 63), 50.

82 Ibid., 51.

83 Ibid., 52.

84 Ibid., 53.

85 Samuel, op. cit. (note 54), 36.

86 Carmen, op. cit. (note 15), 83.

87 Ibid., 139.

88 Manfred Max-Neef (1999) is also the designer of the basic human needs approach.

89 Burkey, op. cit. (note 53), 56.

90 Ibid., 59

91 Participatory learning and action (PLA) moves the external (change) agent to ascribe to the principles and the learning that takes place in the process of the peoples' own reflection and praxis. Cf. August, op. cit. (note 32), 9–11.

92 Robert Chambers, *Whose reality counts?* (London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 1997), 11.

93 Op. cit. (note 54), 40.

94 August, op. cit. (note 17), 27.

95 Bryant L. Myers, *Walking with the poor* (New York: Orbis Books, 2003), 128.

96 August, op. cit. (note 17), 27.

97 Myers, op. cit. (note 84), 141.

98 Davids, op. cit. (note 7), 40.

99 The history of development in the 1980s reveals that the debate developed from the topic of women and development (WAD) to the involvement of women in development (WID). Today the debate is about gender and development, which acknowledges that women are an integral part and equal partner (if not the most prominent) of the development process in the global South.

100 Frank Ellis, *Rural livelihood and diversity in developing countries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 139. Cf. the discussion on gender in (and) development by August, op. cit. (note 32), 70–86.

101 Y.C. James Yen was the founder of a movement to combat illiteracy, poverty and hunger in developing countries on three continents .In 1960, Yen, a Chinese-born and Yale-educated teacher, founded the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, a network that coordinates his programme to promote self-help for the poor in dozens of countries. ''We do not offer relief to the poor, but release,'' Yen said when he was awarded a People to People Eisenhower Medallion recognising his more than sixty years of work with the world's destitute. Yen was born Yen Yang-ch'u on 16 October 1893, in the province of Sichuan, then a remote region, to an aristocratic family whose members were traditionally scholars and officials. He was taught English as a child and became a Christian at the age of 12. Unable to enter Hong Kong University because he was not a British subject, he was sent to Yale University, where he supplemented a scholarship with earnings as a choir singer and added the name James to his Chinese initials.