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ABSTRACT

WORLDS APART:
An Exploration of the Impact of World View
On The Development Process

by Greta Regan
October, 1994

Documents from development agencies and grassroots groups are analyzed by qualitative and quantitative means, in order to determine how world view influences goals and values in relation to development; and in order to determine how differences in world view between those who direct development and those who are targeted by it, affect the development process and its outcomes.
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INTRODUCTION

For most of the past fifty years, the wealthier countries of the world have been engaged in the enterprise of "developing" the poorer countries of the world. Yet, for all the money and ingenuity poured into this enterprise, it has not been a notable success in terms of improving living conditions for the majority of the citizens of these countries, which is one of its putative goals.

According to United Nations estimates, the gap between the richest and the poorest sectors of the world's population widened between 1960 and 1990. The wealthiest fifth of the world's population increased its share of global gross domestic product (GDP) from 70% to 82.7% during that period, while the share of the poorest fifth of the world's population fell from 2.3% to 1.3% (Jaura 1994). Indigenous populations continue to suffer from contact with the society of the industrialized world (Bodley 1989, Burger 1987, Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues 1987), and many large scale development efforts have been shown to have actually worsened living conditions for effected populations (Bodley 1989, 1990; Burger 1987).

Many explanations have been offered for the failure of the development enterprise, and in recent years the concept
of development has itself come under increasing fire by those who argue that it represents a goal which is inherently misguided (Esteva 1985a; Sachs 1990, 1992; Seabrook 1993). The research presented in this thesis was prompted by the belief that one of the reasons for the failure of the development enterprise is the fact that the concept of development is culture-specific; that it is native to and dependent upon a particular world view, and that the development process as it exists imposes that world view on other societies.

In this thesis, world view refers to the structure a society imposes on experience so as to lend it order and meaning. By this definition, understandings of time, space, the nature of humans and their relations with each other and to everything else, are shaped by world view. It is world view that gives a people its rules for reality, and its definition of humanity.

In the context of development, this means that the conceptual and social structures which have given rise to the concept of development, to the values upon which it is based, and to those it seeks to communicate, are not shared by some of those "targeted" by development efforts. In such cases, the "targets" can perceive development as an attack; as a form of "cultural imperialism".
In instances in which "developer" and "developee" operate under different world views, and in which the "developer" does not seek to understand and adapt to the world view of the recipient population, can positive development result? Which world view should define positive development? Is it possible to find a definition and a process which makes sense within the world views of both sides? These are a few of the questions which arise if one accepts that world view shapes perspectives on development. Questions also arise as to how world view influences development policy and practise, if it does to any significant degree.

These are questions which have not been addressed in the development literature in any concerted fashion. The intent of this study is to show that these sort of questions should be addressed, by demonstrating the relevance of world view to the development process. This will be done by analyzing documents from development agencies and grassroots groups in order to determine evidence of world view, its influence on ideas about development, and possible conflicts arising from difference in world view.

Chapter 1 will outline some features of the world view of the Industrial society (Industrial society will be defined), and review the literature concerning these
features and their relationships to development. In chapter 2, the methods used in this study will be laid out in detail. In chapter 3, the results of qualitative and quantitative analysis carried out on documents from development agencies and grassroots sources will be presented. Chapter 4 will present the conclusions of the study.
Chapter I
LITERATURE REVIEW

1 WORLD VIEW

In this thesis, "society" refers to a level of social organization which encompasses that of "culture"; i.e., different cultures can exist within one society. Membership in a given society is determined by a shared world view. Cultural and other variations in world view are subsumed under societal world view. As an example, France and Germany have different cultures, but both belong to the industrial society. Different cultures can exist within one country, all sharing the same societal world view, and different societies can exist within one country; as can be the case when Indigenous peoples live within nation states belonging to the Industrial society.

The society which initiated and controls the development process can be characterized by its dependence on industrial production. It goes by many names: the developed world, the west, the north, the first world, the industrialized world; in this thesis it will be referred to as the Industrial society.
Eva Hunt has written of the power of world views held at the societal level; of the tendency of societies to "...imagine themselves as projected into the divine cosmic landscape."; that they "...imagine their collective condition as (sic) natural, immanent condition of the universe, of divine origin" (1977:143).

In other words, societies each define their particular world view as reality. This fact is of especial interest when examining relationships between societies in which one partner is very dominant in terms of power; as is the case between Industrial society and the various societies it seeks to develop.

The world view of the Industrial society, strongly influenced by the Enlightenment and the industrial revolution, sees the Earth, plant and animal (including human) life as resources, measures virtue in terms of cost-effective use of these resources, holds that human well-being is dependent upon an ever escalating growth in the rate of economic production, and believes in its own rationality and neutrality. In this chapter, some aspects of this world view, and their relationships to the development process, will be explored.
There are no shortage of definitions of this concept, but I believe that what the concept represents can be seen quite clearly in an excerpt from the famous speech in which U.S. president Harry Truman is generally accepted to have launched the development era.

'We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.' (qtd. in Esteva 1992:6)

Here we have the development enterprise in a nutshell; its goal, as well as the relationship it creates between nations. As Edward Horesh points out,

'Developing', especially when juxtaposed with 'developed', has a teleological implication - the progress of the former turns them into the latter. Images of this kind abound; the developed countries are portrayed as being not merely richer and more powerful than the rest but older, wiser and more experienced. (1985:510)

Despite this, and despite undeniable ulterior motives which have frequently tainted development efforts, the good intentions behind the ideology are genuine. The United States, as Britain and Rome before it, saw itself after World War II, the richest, most powerful country in the world, as a society singularly blessed by divine providence,
with the moral responsibility to share its good fortune with those less fortunate, and to guide other countries along the evolutionary path which led to the pinnacle of social evolution represented by its own power and prosperity.

Countries came to be designated along a development continuum, from underdeveloped to developing to developed; with further labels such as "least developed" being added to allow for ever finer distinctions of just where a country stood. The criteria for deciding who belonged where were simple; the more a country appeared to share the world view of the United States - particularly as represented in its economic and political structures - the further it was along the continuum. Of course, the United States was by no means the only country which took on the role of developer, but as the most powerful, it set the standard, and the core values of the American world view were shared by all countries which were members of the Industrial society, which included, despite political differences, the Soviet Union.

III THE ECONOMIC IMPERATIVE

Perhaps the most central of these core values is the economic imperative - the belief that the viability of virtually any enterprise can properly be measured only by
judging its economic value. Many of the other core values of the Industrial society have arisen to serve this one. The way time is understood and used, the way personal relations are perceived, the way performance as a responsible adult is judged; all these are largely shaped by adherence to the economic imperative.

Development policy and practice are also shaped by this imperative. Consider this excerpt from a World Bank publication concerning the design of nutrition programmes. "A reduction in mortality generates a value to society equivalent to the discounted value of the future production of each individual saved" (Austin qtd. in Hancock 1989:128).

This is merely an extreme example of a general principle; that ethical issues will be translated into economic terms, as Frank Cancian notes:

Programs which will bring new dignity to women and the poor are supported by the argument that they will increase productivity and that present conditions (sic) waste resources - and the dignity itself is eventually allocated on the basis of productivity. For better or worse we revert to our material well-being when in doubt, and this leads us again to an objective stance and evaluation in terms of technological competence, by which time we have lost sight of the human concern that first impelled us down the road. (1979:154)
The centrality of economic values can also be seen when the World Bank writes of rural development policy as being "...concerned with the monetization and modernization of society, and with its transition from traditional isolation to integration with the national economy" (qtd. in Escobar 1992:139).

Some interesting associations are made in this statement; between modernity and monetization, between tradition and isolation; but especially revealing is the opposition suggested between being integrated into the national economy, and traditional isolation. This opposition implies more than providing better access to credit and to markets; it implies that rural communities exist outside the structure of the national economy, and must change their own structures so that they can be absorbed into that national economy. These changes would involve primarily social structures - family and community relations, and structures of belief regarding such things as attitudes towards money, how it should be used, and the responsibilities incumbent upon those who have more than is required to meet their own needs - as well as the measure of "need".

Moreover, there is an implication in all this of tutelage, of target groups needing to be directed towards
their own best interests. This attitude is basic to development, as is the desire to bring isolated communities into the global economic community. Gerald Berthoud writes of some the difficulties in achieving this integration for communities whose world views differ from those of the Industrial society.

To produce such a result in traditional societies, for whom the supposedly primordial principle of boundless expansion in the technological and economic domains is generally alien, presupposes overcoming symbolic and moral 'obstacles', that is, ridding these societies of various inhibiting ideas and practises such as myths, ceremonies, rituals, mutual aid, networks of solidarity, and the like. (1992:72)

Karl Polanyi recognized that there was nothing natural to our species about economic motives, and that, on the contrary, our obsession with economic activity is of very recent vintage (1968:67), but his insight tends not to be shared by those who direct development. Rather, as Wolfgang Sachs has observed, the aspirations of our society are projected on to all humans, so that "...societies which choose not to put all their energy into production and deliberately accept a lower throughput of commodities become unthinkable" (1992:36).
ILLITERACY AND CONSCIENTIZATION

The connection made by developers between the perceived irrationality of the so-called Third World and its poverty, is noted by Jan Knippers Black.

All too often, U.S. officials in the post-World War II period have structured events in the Third World on the assumption that the problems in Africa, Asia, and Latin America lay in the quality of Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans...It has followed, then, that the imposition of foreign models on their societies has been for their own good. (1991:4)

While there is an obvious correlation between national levels of wealth and industrialization and levels of formal education and literacy, formal education is not the only kind of education and illiteracy is not the same as ignorance, much less irrationality. Our assumption that non-Westernized folk are less rational than we are says more about our rationality problems than about theirs, and our assumption that the illiterate are ignorant is a projection of our own ignorance of them. (1991:5)

Literacy tends to be understood within the Industrial society as an evolutionary characteristic of human society. Societies without a tradition of writing are therefore seen as somewhat backward; the same holds true for individuals. It is possible for a human to be "illiterate", but it is a condition which should be corrected, for it indicates a deficiency. Those suffering this deficiency are labelled "illiterates"; the perceived deficiency thus becoming the
identifying characteristic of the person - the person, in fact, becoming completely identified with the deficiency.

Paulo Freire is widely admired among those who work in the areas of popular education and participatory action research as the father of conscientization, or consciousness-raising. Freire defined conscientization as a process "...whereby people come to better understand their reality" (1970).

This was to be accomplished through the acquisition of literacy. Freire's method for teaching reading and writing is simple and sensible, designed to take advantage of the syllabic structure of languages like Spanish and Portuguese; and to engage the students' interest by making the reading material relevant to their lives, and by involving them in a dialogue rather than rote learning. But married to this linguistic method is the goal of convincing those who are learning to read that they have not properly understood reality, and that only by doing so, can they overcome oppression.

Briefly, this process involves leading students (or as Freire invariably refers to them, illiterates) through various stages of consciousness, until they reach the highest level, that of critical consciousness, which, claims
Freire, "...represents things and facts as they exist empirically, in their causal and circumstantial correlations..." (1973:44). This raises some interesting questions as to who does, or should, decide which answers represent critical rather than merely naive consciousness.

Freire's world view is very Eurocentric. His view of history is epochal, with each epoch consisting of new aspirations to be fulfilled. The ability of individuals to perceive and "...act upon the reality within which these themes are generated will largely determine their humanization or dehumanization..." (1973:5).

In Freire's view, illiterate societies (his term) have no sense of past, present, and future. They are "detemporalized", and only with the help of literacy and critical consciousness can they be brought into the flow of history.

One of the benefits of conscientization, in Freire's view, is that "...the participants arrive at the distinction between two worlds: that of nature and that of culture" (1973:63). This dichotomy between nature and culture, or as it has been phrased for centuries, Nature and Man, is very much a perspective specific to the Industrial society, and one that will be explored in greater detail below.
Paulo Freire is a prime example of the beneficent model of development; that which does not seek to develop for the sake of economic gain or political power, but for the good of the recipient. But, the good of the recipient is judged from the perspective of the developer's world view, and thus tends to be seen as lying in the adoption of elements of that world view. The presumably unconscious condescension of Freire, ("It is remarkable with what enthusiasm these illiterates engage in debate and with what curiosity they respond to questions implicit in the codifications" [1973:47].) can be startling, but it is not exceptional. The exception is to be found in a background paper prepared for the U.N. Human Rights Conference of 1993, which, at least acknowledges, without critical qualification, the existence of "...societies with a non-literate (verbal) tradition" (Dias & Gillies 1993:13).

Russell Means challenged the value of literacy in a statement to the International NGO Conference on Indigenous Peoples and the Land in 1981.

"...I detest writing. The process itself epitomizes the European concept of 'legitimate' thinking; what is written has an importance that is denied the spoken. My culture, the Lakota culture, has an oral tradition and so I ordinarily reject writing. It is one of the white world's ways of destroying the cultures of the non-white...peoples, the imposing of an abstraction over the spoken relationship of a people." (qtd. in Burger 1987:27)
The belief remains in the Industrial society, however, that literacy and a basic "formal" education are of universal value. This belief has led to the universal provision of an elementary formal education as one of the primary goals of development.

Some authors have questioned this goal, arguing that it is not at all clear what benefit is to be derived from giving all children, regardless of what they need to know to lead successful lives in the context of their particular realities - cultural, social, environmental, political, economic, linguistic, etc., a few years of standardized and generally poor quality "western" education which may well have no relevance to the lives they will lead, which inculcates foreign values which alienate them from their parents and their culture, and which leaves them with the desire, but not sufficient skills, to participate in the job market (Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues 1987; Burger 1987; Bodley 1988; Moody 1988, Vols. I & II).

They argue that this process, does, however, accomplish two goals of development; it inculcates these children with the values of Industrial society, and it makes them dissatisfied with their lot, which may, or may not, have been disadvantaged. Dissatisfaction is taken as an
The subject of economics is difficult, if not impossible, to escape when discussing the world view of the Industrial society. The concept of growth (i.e., economic growth) is surely the most curious of its core values. Industrial society believes its success, and even its survival, to rest ultimately on a concept which expresses an impossibility. Simply put, production must increase. Continuously. Forever.

In order for production to increase in the required exponential fashion, consumption must also increase exponentially. If consumption increases, production will increase, and there will be more money to spend on consumption, so that production will increase.

This model ignores two important facts; there is a limited amount of production which can be consumed, and
there is a limited resource base from which to draw materials for production. These facts have done nothing to lessen the hold of the concept of growth on the Industrial society because it is too basic to its world view. Removing growth from the world view of the Industrial society, would require a complete reconstruction of its framework for understanding reality. As Gerald Berthoud writes,

The idea of growth is essential to our modern way of viewing human life. Economic expansion based on constant technical innovation is widely thought of as the only way to solve the world's problems. Growth, beyond its immediate economic meaning, is a core cultural complex of ideas and beliefs which organizes the whole of modern life. It is simultaneously a universal truth and the only possible normative means of concerning (sic) the good society. (1992:72)

Thus, the logic of holding growth as a virtue unto itself is not open to question in the centres of industrial power. For with the industrial revolution, production became one of the core values of the Industrial society, and other values were reshaped to serve it. As Marianne Gronemeyer writes,

The human being has to become fit for the machine...Henceforth he is conceived as *homo laborans*; he can realize his nature as a human being only through work. What is appropriate to his nature, and is therefore virtuous, is taken from the requirements of mechanical production. The new catalogue of virtues is dictated by the operating laws of the machine, as exemplified by that most perfect of machines, the clock -
discipline, accuracy, order, diligence, neatness, stamina and punctuality. (Gronemeyer 1992:57)

This conception of human valuation is, above all else, what must be passed on to developing societies if they are to join the Industrial society; and no small effort and expense are expended in the effort to do that. A dubious gift, perhaps. Otto Ullrich has described something of the price recipients must pay for this gift.

They are forced gradually to absorb an alien industrial work ethic, to subordinate themselves completely to unaccustomed time rhythms, to value objective relations higher than human relations, to experience increasing stress and to regard it as normal, and to accept jobs without regard to motivation or meaning. Wage labour and commodity fetishism expand, and they define the competitive struggle of all against all as the social synthesis. (1992:285)

This process was wrenching to the basically agrarian society in which it first occurred at the time of the industrial revolution. But the changes to this society were generated internally, and built on existing elements and previous changes in world view. Together, these factors allowed the early Industrial society to survive deep and extensive changes to its world view.

The countries of the so-called developing world do not have these advantages, and for some communities within these
states, the changes in world view required to adapt to the Industrial society into which they are rapidly being absorbed have proven overwhelming. Such communities have disintegrated, and their members have fallen to disease, addiction, prostitution, poverty, and despair. For those forced to live a life which negates the world view native to their own society, and who are unable or unwilling to adopt the world view of the society which has come to dominate their lives, the disorientation can be devastating (Bodley 1988; Burger 1987; Moody 1988, Vol. I; Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues 1987).

The most obvious instances of this social disintegration are to be found among Indigenous tribal cultures, whose world views lie farthest from that of the Industrial society; indeed, they are often diametrically opposed. The history of attempts to integrate tribal cultures into "civilized society" is a long one, and certainly did not begin with Columbus. His attitude to the tribal cultures he found represented his era's version of an historical pattern; a mixture of admiration and disdain, envy and pity, self-interest and a genuine desire to give something of great value. For the Romans, the gift was law, for Columbus the gift was Christianity, for the Industrial society the gift is economics.
In each case, the gift represents the key to integration, and rejection of the gift, proof of the inferiority of the recipient society. The reaction of the dominant society to such a rejection tends to take one (or both) of two forms; the belief that these people are less than fully human, and thus killing or abusing them is not as serious a matter as killing or abusing real people; or the belief that they need guidance, which the dominant society has a responsibility to give them, even if they do not realize they need it, and even if they do not want it (Burger 1987; Bodley 1988,1990; Moody 1988, Vols. I & II; Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues 1987; Diaz 1963).

vi NATURE AS ADVERSARY/NATURE AS LIVING BEING

Perhaps the most significant conflict between the world views of Indigenous peoples and that of the Industrial society is to be found in their respective views of nature; as a living being, on the one hand, and as a commodity, on the other. Even the recent concern within the Industrial society for the future of the environment is framed in terms of a diminishing resource which must be carefully managed; this is very different from worrying about the health of one's mother.
The Industrial society's view of the relationship between humans and nature has roots that go deeper than the industrial revolution. Christian Bay quotes Francis Bacon at the start of the 17th century, "Only let the human race recover that right over nature which belongs to it by divine bequest, and let power be given it; the exercise thereof will be governed by sound reason and true religion" (Bay 1988:267).

Bacon could point to the Old Testament for evidence of this divine bequest.

And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. Genesis 1:26

The French Enlightenment, that great humanist movement, retained the belief that Man's destiny lay in the conquest of nature. Mastery of science and technology replaced "true religion" as the means of fulfilling that destiny, and as Christian Bay notes, "...subsequent generations of liberals as well as marxists have been following this lead" (1988:267).

In contrast to this view of nature as adversary, a report published by the Secretariat of the Independent
Commission On International Humanitarian Issues notes that Indigenous societies typically have powerful psycho-emotional bonds to land, and that, "It is anathema to them that land can be owned or treated as a commodity to be exploited and abandoned" (1987:10).

It is a view, however, which should be familiar to anyone raised in Canada or the United States; it is central to the mythology of the pioneer. The belief that nature must be dominated converges easily with the belief that productivity is the prime imperative, and is reflected in the fact that homesteaders were required to clear and cultivate any land to which they wished to receive title. This view also had its impact on relations with Indigenous communities, which were perceived as belonging to the category of nature, and as standing in the way of progress (i.e., productive use of the land). - These attitudes are still evident in relations between governments and Indigenous communities (Ibid).

The image of nature as an adversary to be conquered depends upon a dichotomy. Reality is divided into two spheres, nature and culture (Nature and Man); and it is the role of the latter to subdue the former, within the individual, and in the external world. Paulo Freire's understanding of reality was shaped by this belief, and it
led him to see those who did not organize reality in this way as lacking a key component of rationality. To Freire, as to most people, whatever their world view, the organization of reality according to a particular set of rules is not a matter of choice, but an immutable fact. Anyone who does not operate under these rules appears to suffer from a flawed rationality.

As noted above, many in the Industrial society have begun to express some concern over the future of the environment; but this is not to say that they are coming to see the relationship between humans and nature the way Indigenous societies see it; for the distinction between an animate and an inanimate earth remains, and from this distinction arise very different understandings of what constitutes responsible behaviour.

The enlightened "ecological" view within the Industrial society is that we are dependent on this planet's natural environment, which must therefore be managed wisely. The view of Indigenous societies is that we are all children of a living earth, and that we must, therefore, show the earth the love, care, and respect due to one's mother. As noted by the Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues,
What is shared by most indigenous peoples is a world view which incorporates as its dearest principle a custodial concept of land and natural resources: Mother Earth. Indigenous people regard the land or earth as sacred. It is a living entity. (p.10)

The practical difference between the actions called for by these two philosophies is basic, because the difference in what is understood as needing management is basic.

The central problem addressed in this thesis is this; if world view gives a people its rules for reality and definition of humanity, how do differences in world view effect the development process?

It is addressed by asking several specific questions:
1) if one examines the statements of those who direct development, and of those who are the targets of development, will one find that these two groups are articulating different goals and values, 2) if so, will these goals and values be recognizably indicative of the type of world view which produced the statement, 3) will the values and goals expressed by the two groups conflict, 4) will examination of the statements of those who direct development reveal that the chauvinism inherent in world view leads to negative attitudes and negative practises towards targets of development?
These questions will be addressed through the examination and analysis of documents produced by representatives of those who direct development, i.e., development agencies of the Industrial society, and of documents produced by representatives of those "targeted" by development, i.e., grassroots groups ("grassroots" is used in this thesis to designate the people at the bottom of the development chain; the communities which are acted upon by those who wish to create development). Methodological details of the research will be given in the next chapter.
Chapter II
METHODOLOGY

1 ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The aim of this research was to reveal something of the influence of world view on the development process. To accomplish this I chose to analyze texts produced by participants in that process. I believed that examining what "developers" and "developees" said about development, and how they said it, would reveal differences which could be explained by reference to world view.

Documents produced by development agencies and grassroots groups were first subjected to a qualitative analysis in order to determine whether the influence of world view could be discerned in these documents, and if so, to try to establish the nature of that influence. Documents were then subjected to a quantitative analysis as a check on researcher bias. Such quantitative analysis of texts is generally referred to as content analysis, and will be so defined in this thesis.

The content analysis was secondary to the qualitative analysis, but it was nonetheless very important, offering an
objective means of supporting or contradicting the findings from the qualitative analysis. The content analysis was done after the qualitative analysis so that it could provide a check on that analysis, rather than influence it, as would have occurred had the content analysis been done first. As a second check, an agency document not included in the qualitative analysis, or even read, was subjected to content analysis, and the results were compared with those from the quantitative analysis of the other agency documents.

Development agencies were chosen for this research because they set the agenda of the development enterprise, and through both direct involvement in development activities and through the funding of executing agencies' activities, they maintain control of that agenda. Documents from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) were subjected to qualitative and content analysis. A document from the United States Agency For International Development (USAID) was subjected to content analysis, and although it was not subjected to a thorough qualitative analysis, this document is cited occasionally within the qualitative analysis of the other documents, for purposes of contrast.

UNDP was chosen as an example of an international development agency, because it is the most powerful and
influential development agency in the world, and because it represents the greatest number of countries. CIDA was chosen as an example of a national development agency because it represents a middle power; rather than focusing on what might seem the most obvious choice - the most powerful of the industrialized countries - the United States. This was done in order to see whether the world view ascribed in this thesis to the Industrial society would be evident in the development policy of such a middle power.

The USAID document was included in the content analysis as a further check on the reliability of the findings from the analysis of the CIDA and UNDP documents. The production of a list from the USAID document allowed a quantitative comparison to be made between this document and the other agency documents to determine whether or not they showed substantial agreement in use of terminology. If so, and if the quantitative data was shown to support the findings from the qualitative data, this would open the possibility of using content analysis to perform broader surveys of discourse within development agencies, NGOs, etc.

Documents were chosen which had been produced for the purpose of presenting the agency's policies to the general public, in the belief that the most informative sources of data would be documents written for the purpose of public
information/public relations - documents intended to please the widest possible audience, while offending no one. I believed that examining the picture that an agency wanted to present of itself as a participant in the development process, and of its relationship with those at the other end of the development process, would reveal much about the world view which shaped that picture.

The Indigenous organizations represented in this research are not homogenous. Different peoples are represented, as are different degrees of contact with, or involvement in, Industrial society. Likewise, the documents show different degrees of adaptation to the style and forms of discourse in the Industrial society. These documents include everything from personal statements, to resolutions passed at local meetings, to those passed at international congresses.

The non-Indigenous documents come primarily from Guatemala, by way of the Comité de Unidad Campesina (CUC). Clearly, many of the campesinos of Guatemala are indigenous to that country, and their particular needs are addressed in these documents, but overall, the perspective expressed is one of conflict within a society, rather than between societies.
The search for grassroots documents was conducted primarily through computer networks. Publishing notices alerted me to the two directories of grassroots organizations from which I subsequently drew addresses to which I sent information requests; one of South East Asian organizations, and another of Indigenous women's organizations (although these organizations were not, in fact, necessarily concerned solely or primarily with women's issues), mostly located in Latin America. On the networks, documents were also found from grassroots organizations and meetings of organizations, as well as news articles in which grassroots sources were interviewed.

Rather than choose a single grassroots document for analysis, as much material as possible was gathered, and as much of that material as possible was included in the analysis. The grassroots documents are considerably shorter than the agency documents, so the volume of material available for analysis was one factor in this decision.

The problem of representativeness was also a factor. While I did not attempt to take statistically representative samples from any category - international agencies, national agencies, or grassroots organizations; the proportions involved in taking one example from all existing international agencies, or even one example from all
national agencies, were far more acceptable than those involved in taking one grassroots organization as a representative example of all grassroots organizations.

Most of the material received directly from grassroots organizations came from Latin America, creating a regional focus in my data. However, material was also collected representing other regions, and inter-regional settings, allowing for a test of the broader relevance of this data. As well, most of the grassroots material came from Indigenous sources, although, again, some material expressing non-Indigenous perspectives on development was obtained.

The fact that a statistical sample of the grassroots documents was not taken, means that the particular interests of the various organizations represented by the documents included in the research could affect the analyses; especially the content analysis. The small volume of grassroots data could make the impact of such idiosyncrasies greater, particularly once that data was broken down into sub-categories.

So, for instance, most of the material for the English language Indigenous documents word frequency list was drawn from a document produced by an Indigenous women's
organization, which likely accounts for the fact that the word "women" tops that list. Similarly, the inclusion of an excerpt from a document produced by the Episcopal Conference of Guatemala may account in part for the prominence of apparently religious terminology in the Spanish language list; and the fact that most of the non-Indigenous material came from Guatemala would certainly affect the content of the non-Indigenous list.

In reading the word frequency lists, differences in the volume of words should be noted; as the greater the total volume of words in a list, the greater the potential significance of the word frequencies in that list. Despite these qualifications, the word frequency lists proved useful not only as a check on researcher bias, but also as an effective summary of the differing perspectives of the various categories of documents. Examined on a comparative basis, the idiosyncrasies of individual documents do not skew the overall patterns of the lists.

The one criterion for inclusion in the analysis was that the material be not only about the grassroots, but from the grassroots. Since the purpose of the analysis was to compare world views and their impact on views about development, it was critical that the views of outsiders working with grassroots communities not be confused with the
views of those communities themselves.

This meant that some complete documents were analyzed, while in other cases, quotes from grassroots sources were drawn from documents written by others; from news articles, or from documents produced by grassroots support organizations. Documents written about grassroots issues, but not written by grassroots sources, were excluded from the analysis, as were those for which authorship was unclear.

Quotes drawn from news articles are, by their nature, somewhat pre-selected, in that a journalist selects from an interview such quotes as will best illustrate the intended point of an article. Nonetheless, given the difficulty of finding material written by grassroots sources, and the exploratory nature of this research, I considered the inclusion of direct quotes from news articles and similar documents to be acceptable and worthwhile.

The sets of documents used for the qualitative and the quantitative analyses are not identical. Some documents containing both grassroots statements and other material were included in the qualitative analysis, using only the grassroots statements, but were excluded from the quantitative analysis, as the small amount of relevant
material which could have been extracted from them would have made the time-consuming work of that extraction unprofitable.

**II THE CONTENT ANALYSIS**

Documents were input into a text analysis computer programme for generation of word frequency lists (i.e., lists showing the number of occurrences of each word in the document). Documents obtained from the internet were simply uploaded from the discs on which they were stored, while hard copy texts were transcribed to disc and then uploaded. Documents typed on to disc were typed without upper case letters, eliminating the separate counting of upper and lower case versions of the same word. Electronic documents retained upper case letters, so the lists generated from these documents do have separate entries for upper and lower case versions of the same word. Stop lists (i.e., dictionaries listing words which should not be included in the search) were used to eliminate punctuation marks, prepositions, conjunctions, etc. from the word frequency lists.

Documents from Indigenous sources were merged to create two files; one of English language documents, and one of
Spanish language documents. Documents from non-Indigenous grassroots sources, all of which were Spanish, were merged to form a single file. This was done because the grassroots documents were generally quite short; the agency documents were quite long, and I kept them separate so that I could compare the agency documents with each other – especially CIDA and UNDP.

The lists generated from the documents were examined and compared to see the relative frequency of occurrence of various terms related to development, or revealing of worldview. When there was doubt as to the meaning of a word (an occurrence of the word "developing" can refer to developing countries, or developing confidence, for instance), or if I wanted to determine whether the context in which a word occurred was positive or negative ("development", for instance, might be written of in positive or negative terms), each occurrence of the word in question could be extracted from the document, along with surrounding text, generating key word in context, or KWIC lists.
CHAPTER 3
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

1 INTRODUCTION

For the reasons outlined in the previous chapter, the qualitative analysis was carried out before the quantitative analysis. In this chapter, however, the quantitative analysis will be presented first, because the results of that analysis provide a good overview of the issues raised by the more in-depth, qualitative analysis.

The qualitative analysis will be introduced with an examination of some of the key words and phrases which came out of that analysis. From the results of this examination, combined with the results of the quantitative analysis, a preliminary categorization of the conflicts evident in these documents will be offered.

This will be followed by a more detailed examination of the qualitative data, organized around several themes. Finally, the conclusions drawn from the body of data generated by the qualitative and the quantitative analysis will be presented.
The Quantitative Analysis

The word frequency lists generated from the documents (see Appendix D for a complete list of the documents included in this analysis) reveal clear differences in the language being used by development agencies, Indigenous grassroots sources, and non-Indigenous grassroots sources (see Appendices A & B). The difference between the Indigenous lists and the agency lists is striking. The language of the non-Indigenous list has elements in common with both the Indigenous (an emphasis on struggle, for example) and the agency documents (an emphasis on economic concerns), but is clearly distinct from each.

Some words prominent in the agency lists are:
project(s), assistance, growth, resources, help/helping, economic, aid, program/me(a), and business.

Some words prominent in the Indigenous lists are:
life/vida, children, struggle/lucha, peoples/pueblos, mother/madre, culture(al)/cultura, identidad, earth/tierra, communities/comunidades.

Some words which are prominent in the non-Indigenous list are:
sindical (union, adj.), privatización,
maquila(s)/maquiladoras, trabajadores (workers).

The three agency lists show very significant agreement in vocabulary, as well as some revealing distinctions among the three; for instance, the USAID emphasis on democracy, and the fact that while the acronyms for USAID and UNDP top their respective lists (UNDP would actually be second if "development" and "Development" were counted together), CIDA appears as the eleventh entry in that agency's list. It would seem that instead of mentioning its own name, CIDA preferred to refer to Canada and Canadians.

One potentially misleading entry in the USAID list is "indigenous". A KWIC (key word in context; see methods) check of the twenty-nine occurrences of this word in the USAID document showed that only seven of these occurrences refer to Indigenous peoples, and that the rest refer to indigenous NGOs, institutions, etc.; meaning native to the host country.

"Development", which is near the top of all the agency lists, is not prominent in either the English or the Spanish language Indigenous documents list, and does not appear at all in the list of non-Indigenous documents.
The Indigenous lists support the argument that the Indigenous concept of earth as mother, and of the relationship between humans and the earth as a personal relationship, is of considerable importance to an understanding of Indigenous world view and its influence on views about development. KWIC tests showed seven occurrences of the phrase "madre tierra" in the Spanish Indigenous documents, twenty-seven occurrences of the phrase "mother earth" in the English Indigenous documents, five other references to the earth as mother, and several other possible references to earth as mother (the context was insufficient for a clear determination of meaning in these cases). In addition, the word "pachamama", which means mother earth, occurred eight times in the English Indigenous documents. The phrase did not appear in the agency lists.

The fact that the word "women" tops the English language Indigenous list could be misleading in terms of its significance. As noted in Chapter 2 of this thesis, this list was generated primarily from a document produced by an Indigenous women's organization, and the frequent occurrence of "women" should be viewed in that light.

In summary, the agency lists display the technocratic thrust of the development enterprise, the importance of the concept of "development" to the agencies (not evident in the
grassroots lists), the importance of economic terms, and
despite references to partnership and participation, no
evidence that the concerns of Indigenous or non-Indigenous
developers have been seriously addressed (judging by the
absence of words which might be taken to reflect or respond
to the concerns expressed in the grassroots documents). The
agreement among the agency lists in terminological style is
significant.

Terms such as "aid" and "assistance", which are
prominent in the agency lists, are not so in the Indigenous
lists; more prominent are terms such as "struggle", which
suggests that Indigenous communities do not accept the roles
assigned to them in agency discourse. References to culture
and identity are very prominent in the Indigenous lists,
suggesting that cultural identity is of great importance to
Indigenous communities. The non-Indigenous list would seem
to suggest that the non-Indigenous documents reflect the
same societal world view as the agency documents, but from a
very different position in the society.

The Qualitative Analysis

"Development" is a highly subjective concept; yet, the
many visions which may be embodied by this concept are
represented by a single word. Documents rarely provide explicit definitions of this word; the vision represented by "development" must be extrapolated from the content of the document.

As one reads a document, certain words and phrases tend to assert themselves. These words and phrases play a key role in forming the reader’s impression of the vision of development which is being communicated. Some of the key words and phrases in Sharing Our Future are:

- partnership, global interdependence, international cooperation, human resource development, and Canadians care.

Some of the key words and phrases in the UNDP document are:

- partnership, participation, grassroots, mobilization, empowerment, community-based, sustainable, capacity, statistics, and human development.

Some of the key words and phrases in the Indigenous documents are:

- respect, rights, peoples, harmony, self-determination, autonomy*, values, impose*, and equilibrium/balance.

(An asterisk denotes a word stem which may occur in different forms; eg., autonomy, autonomous.)
Comparing these key words and phrases, it would appear that the agency documents are in basic agreement about their visions of development, but that the Indigenous documents present a different, and perhaps antagonistic, vision. Much of the Indigenous list seems to be a response to the position in which Indigenous peoples perceive themselves to be in the development process—words such as "respect", "impose", rights". These words would seem to conflict with the agency ideal of "partnership"; but if one looks further into the UNDP list, at such words as "participation", "mobilization", and "empowerment", and considers their implications, particularly in the context of development, one can see some reasons for this conflict.

In that context, "participation" refers to including target populations, one way or another, in a process initiated and ultimately controlled from outside that population. "Participatory development" does not refer to groups acting on their own behalf. The nature, the degree, and even the fact of "participation" is under the control of developers—who control development funds.

"Mobilization", and "empowerment" also imply outside agency. Developers seek to mobilize target populations to achieve the developers' goals. The term is not used to refer to groups which mobilize themselves to achieve their
own goals. As for empowerment, this term does not take into account the fact that power is relative; that it exists only in a relationship, and that increasing the power of one party to that relationship must decrease the power of another. "Empowerment" refers to a power that is additive; implying that developers can increase the power of developees without relinquishing any of their own power in the development process. Nor, when this term appears in agency documents, is there any accompanying acknowledgement or discussion of the potential consequences to a society (or to the individuals being empowered) of having its power structure altered by external intervention.

The indication from the Indigenous key words and phrases, is that the development relationship envisioned in the agency documents is rejected in the Indigenous documents. The presence of the term "impose" would suggest that the writers do not see themselves as partners in the development process, while the terms "self-determination" and "autonomy" suggest a desire for internal control of development. Checking the word frequency lists, one finds that the terms "self-determination" and "autonomy" do not occur in agency documents.

Also revealing is the presence in the Indigenous list of such terms as "harmony", "values", "equilibrium", and
"balance". The term "values" might be, like the terms discussed above, a basically responsive term, indicating a conflict of values between the Industrial society and Indigenous societies. The other terms might indicate something of an Indigenous vision of development. Terms such as "harmony" and "balance" are also absent from agency word frequency lists.

These preliminary qualitative observations suggest that while there is basic agreement between UNDP's and CIDA's visions of development, the visions of these agencies seem to conflict on a number of points with the visions presented in the Indigenous documents. Perhaps most significant is the difference in perceptions about the nature of the development relationship. For if developers see the relationship as one of partnership, and developees see it as one of imposition, it is unlikely to yield positive results.

Taken together, the quantitative data and the key words and phrases suggest two basic conflicts; that between developers and developees, whether Indigenous or non-Indigenous; a relationship which seems to be perceived by developees as involuntary and exploitive; and that between the world views and associated values of the Industrial and Indigenous societies.
Throughout each of these documents, certain themes are dominant. By far the largest section of the UNDP report is that titled "Human Development At Work". In fact, this section constitutes the main body of the report; the sections which follow it are intended to show how the agency is putting the principles introduced here into practise. This could lead one to conclude that in the lexicon of UNDP, human development is synonymous with development, but nowhere in this document is such a suggestion made. On the contrary, it is stated that the concept was introduced by UNDP "...as a measure of people's well-being" (p.7).

The document goes on to define human development thus:

Human development means widening the range of people's choices by enhancing their capabilities in health, education and access to resources. It means promoting human rights and political participation. It promotes development that is sustainable and that truly makes an impact on people's lives. (p.7)

So, rather than being a replacement for the term "development", human development is intended as a concept to be applied to development plans, etc., as a means of judging whether the benefits of development are, or will be, going to the right people (p.7). It is also clear that UNDP wants to claim credit for changing the standard thinking about development to the point that the idea of putting people at
the centre of development, "...is definitely taking root" (p.7).

_Sharin_ _g Our Future_ is intended not only to state what the Canadian government intends to do in the area of official development assistance, it is also intended to encourage support for these policies. Two themes are dominant in this effort; an attempt is made to justify the expenditure of Canadian tax dollars by reference to Canadian self-interest, and an attempt is made to appeal to the self-image of Canadians as being a caring people with a strong interest in social welfare and social justice.

Consider the following quotes from _Sharing Our Future_;

"It has been said that aid is a Canadian vocation. Certainly, working for international development is part of Canada's national heritage" (p.88).

"Canada's capacity for dispassionate judgement and its vocation for constructive involvement have won respect throughout the world" (p.87).

"On the humanitarian side, Canada has always been a leader in providing development assistance to promote our foreign policy objective of sharing our wealth with those
who need it most" (p.88).

Two of these quotes appear in a section titled "Aid: A Canadian Vocation". The phrase "Canadians Care" also appears as a heading, as well as occurring in many other contexts throughout the document. In the above excerpts, we have the essence of how Canadians view themselves in relation to the rest of the world, or at least, how CIDA believes Canadians wish to see themselves in relation to the rest of the world. The suggestion is of an aid policy motivated by a sense of social justice rather than self-interest. This impression is deepened by statements such as the following:

Canada’s development activities can be and often are supportive of other important foreign policy objectives, including support for social justice, the pursuit of global peace and security, and the building of a strong international trading system.(p.25)

Thus, even when acknowledging that aid policy can have, as it were, ulterior motives, the suggestion is that these motives are also, for the most part, disinterested. Note the order in which the foreign policy objectives are listed; social justice receives the first mention, and certainly, it represents an unquestionably noble goal; then global peace
and security, another unassailable goal, but one sometimes used to justify actions less palatable; trade is mentioned last, and then it is embedded in a phrase which expresses the Canadian interest in benefitting from international trading opportunities as a desire to benefit the common good.

In line with this postulated concern for social justice, Canadians, according to this document, have a strong interest in human rights, which is reflected in their foreign policy. On page thirty-one, it is stated that, "A basic principle of Canada’s foreign policy is the promotion of human rights." While on page thirty, it is stated that, "Canada’s development assistance programs strengthen the cause of human dignity and deepen international awareness of the principles of greater respect for human rights." This expressed commitment to human rights is supported by specific policies which lay out how development aid will be used to support human rights, while guarding against a situation in which a people in need pays for the crimes of its government (pp.31,32).

So, the theme of human development is dominant in the UNDP report, the themes of rights and values dominate the Indigenous documents, while the dominant theme running through Sharing Our Future is the portrayal of Canada as a
moral agent in the development process.

In the Indigenous documents, two broad themes can be discerned; the exposition of Indigenous values, which are contrasted with the values seen to be imposed by outsiders; and the demand for recognition of rights. It is impossible to separate these two themes, except as an analytical convenience; the rights demanded by any group will be informed by the values of that group, and many of the concerns discussed in these documents arise directly from the clash of values between Indigenous societies and Industrial society.

The rights in question are numerous and varied: rights to ancestral lands (docs 1,3,4,10,13,20,21,23), rights to control activity within those territories (docs 3,9,10,12,21,24), rights to ownership of the resources within those territories (docs 22,24), rights to bilingual education, and to a curriculum which teaches the values and knowledge of the students' cultures (docs 4,13,14,15,22); rights to representation on the international bodies which make decisions which impact upon Indigenous communities (docs 1,13,14,21,22,23), and the right to be recognized and dealt with as people, rather than as minorities or as Indigenous people (docs 1,3,4,6,7,13,19, 21,22,23,24). The significance of the distinction between peoples and people
has been the cause of much debate within the U.N. system, particularly in reference to the renamed Year of Indigenous People and work on the Declaration of Indigenous Rights.

The other major theme expressed in the Indigenous documents, and which often is intertwined with the rights theme, is the expression of the values of Indigenous peoples as they relate to development. The prominence in the qualitative list of key terms of such words as harmony, equilibrium, and balance is very significant in this respect. These words might be said to represent the counterpart of the Industrial society's core belief in economic growth. The conflict between these views is obvious. While it would be possible to have a world view which favoured growth in so far as it could be achieved while maintaining balance, a world view which favours growth without qualification must conflict with a world view which sees balance as the prerequisite for well-being.

The demand for the recognition of rights is also the predominant theme in the non-Indigenous grassroots documents. In this case, however, these demands do not reflect a cultural clash of values, but rather, a struggle internal to the Industrial society; a conflict of classes, rather than world views.
iii MEASURING DEVELOPMENT

Accepted measures, or indicators, of development tend to be presented somewhat more explicitly in these documents than the concept of development, itself. But, just as one is unlikely to find space in a document devoted to clearly defining what the term "development" is intended to convey; so one is unlikely to find anything like an exhaustive analysis of how the vision of development presented might be subjected to measurement. Instead, one finds short diagnostic lists of some aspect of development, such as human development or under-development; or statements that imply something about how development is measured; or in the case of grassroots documents, statements of goals - something not quite the same as either stating a vision, or as proposing a means of measuring development.

UNDP’s annual report focuses on human development, and lists three key human development indicators: life expectancy, educational attainment (adult literacy and mean years of schooling), and real GDP per capita (pp.9,12,17,20). CIDA’s Sharing Our Future provides a definition of least developed countries as "those in which the Gross Domestic Product... per capita is equal or less than U.S. (1984) $350, literacy levels are 20 per cent or less of the population of reading age, and the share of manufacturing in
total GDP represents 10 per cent or less of total production (p. 24)."

This definition encapsulates perfectly the world view which drives development. It is instructive to note that factors such as life expectancy, mother/infant mortality rates, percentage of population receiving minimum required daily calorie intake, access to medical care, or freedom from political violence are not included. This is not to say that all these factors are totally ignored; hunger, infant mortality rates, and life expectancy are mentioned alongside primary school enrolment, adult literacy, and production of goods and services as indicators of development (pp. 24, 37, 55); but they are not sufficiently important to the concept of development to be used in defining it - or in defining its absence. Literacy is sufficiently important, because "formal" education is considered to be directly relevant to productivity. Thus, the emphasis on literacy and school enrolment figures (pp. 14, 24).

It could be argued that factors such as health are equally relevant to questions of productivity, and indeed, it is stated on page thirty-seven of Sharing Our Future that, "Sick farmers grow less food". It might also be argued that there are jobs, in the developed as well as in
the developing world, for which having enough energy to do a full day's work is of considerably greater relevance than literacy. But, this is not acknowledged in the agency documents.

*Sharing Our Future* contains many references which might lead the reader to expect an aid policy guided by, and measured in terms of, principles of social justice. Aside from the frequent references to partnership, and those to human rights, we are told that poverty is inequity (p.23), that it is lack of access to decision-making power (p.23), and that it is the real cause of hunger (p.55). We are told that, "...many human needs are met in the Third World by a vast subsistence economy not even reflected in the economic statistics we see" (p.24).

But, these points, once raised, are not addressed. It is particularly interesting that the last point should be raised, because it calls into question much of what is taken for granted in the development process. Certainly, it raises serious questions about the relevance of the economic yardstick which serves as the primary gauge of development, as well as that of the economic rationale for pursuing development; both of which are prominent in this document.
A resolution drafted at the third Inter-American Indigenous Congress on the Environment and Economic Development states:

...that indigenous peoples retain the right to preservation and development of ethnic and cultural characteristics and distinct identities, including the right to maintain traditional economic structures, livelihoods and ways of life... (doc 7).

Another document speaks of the "...need to work on defining an alternative Indigenous economic policy" (doc 6). While another argues for a development fund to finance projects initiated by Indigenous communities (doc 20).

The Women's Commission of the first Continental Meeting of Indian Peoples, in Quito, Ecuador, stated:

We are working for self-development which reflects our values and our needs - training in organizing, an end to illiteracy, eradication of addictions and vices such as alcoholism and drug abuse, reestablishment and development of the use of our traditional medicine without rejecting those technologies that have been developed for the good of humanity, and the revival of our systems of nutrition and agriculture (Alderete et al 1992:17).

This statement, typical in many respects of the positions presented in the Indigenous documents, is untypical in its reference to eliminating illiteracy. Unlike the statement by Russell Means, quoted in the literature review, these documents do not reject literacy.
It does not receive the kind of emphasis it is given in the agency documents, but it is accepted as a necessary tool in dealing with the dominant society, so long as it is not used to assimilate the Indigenous culture into the dominant culture. There is commonly an emphasis in these documents on ensuring that children are educated in their own language, as well as the dominant language in their country.

The term "illiteracy", however, is very rarely used; and its use in this excerpt suggests that, in this instance, an element of the Industrial world view has been absorbed into an Indigenous world view.

Among the resolutions from a meeting of Indian women in Lima, Peru, is stated the goal:

To assert our identity as Indian people, by rescuing and protecting our cultural and ancestral heritage; to promote and struggle for the implementation of bilingual and inter-cultural education in each country, so that our cultural identity will be strengthened. This must include teaching our traditional heritage: crafts, history, music, traditional medicine and ways of life; literacy must be taught in our languages, according to our culture and ways of life. (Alderete et al 1992:14)

Thus, positive development, as identified in the grassroots documents, is development directed by those who are to benefit from it; and for Indigenous communities, it emphasizes the continued development of their own ways, in response to the needs of the present and future; recognizing
the necessity of finding ways to adapt to the dominating force of the Industrial society (docs 6, 7, 20, 25).

In summary, the grassroots documents tend to define and measure development in terms of the needs and values of the group represented by the document; the agency documents tend to be written as though the vision of development presented therein is the universally accepted vision of development, and thus needs no explanation or examination. But, given that there is no universal vision of development, any organization intending to put its vision into practice should be very clear on what that vision is, and on how it can be measured. The recent trend of producing mission statements is useful, but does not address the question of how ideals are translated into projects, or of how the achievement of these ideals can be effectively measured.

V THE ECONOMICS OF DEVELOPMENT

In chapter 1 of this thesis, it was argued that the Industrial world view is strongly influenced by economic principles. The agency documents lend support to this argument by the prominence given in them to economic issues and economic reasoning. The grassroots documents give
little prominence to economics, limiting economic reasoning to obviously economic issues such as wages and family income. The non-Indigenous grassroots documents give more space to economic issues, but all issues are not analyzed from an economic standpoint. In the case of the agency documents, the analysis of virtually any issue will have an economic component, and this component is likely to be dominant.

The influence of the Canadian version of the Industrial world view can perhaps be seen most clearly in the curious manner in which *Sharing Our Future* attempts to appeal to the self-interest of the Canadian public to justify aid expenditures. This justification is shaped by the self-image discussed above, which makes for a rather conflicted message. Certainly, a connection as direct as using food aid to create new markets for Canadian wheat is never suggested; unlike USAID, which includes business interests in its criteria for sustainable development (USAID Strategy Paper 1). Instead, the benefits are generally projected into an undefined future.

"International development is vitally important to the future of our interdependent world" (p.7).
"Aid must be regarded not just as charity, but as an investment in our shared future" (p.7).

"It is an essential investment in our own future prosperity, which will depend upon the economic health of our trading partners" (p.11).

Only in the last quote is trade actually mentioned, and then in terms of healthy partners, lending a somewhat altruistic shading to an argument directed at the reader’s self-interest. Nowhere in this document will a reader find mention of aid offering immediate or direct benefits to Canadians through creation of new markets, awarding of contracts, or by any other means.

Only when discussing tied and untied aid is this topic approached at even a distance, and then it is not to tell of benefits coming to Canadians, but rather to say that, "Tied aid reflects the legitimate concern of Canadians that their tax dollars should not end up subsidizing competitors in other industrialized countries"(p.51). It is interesting that even when appealing to self-interest, there should be a reluctance to appear self-interested.

While the argument is not made that Canadians will receive immediate, direct benefits from aid expenditures, it
is noted that, "Events in distant lands can have immediate impact on Canadian profits and prospects" (p. 11). So, hopes are not raised to expect a quick, tangible pay off from aid, but it is implied that a failure to give aid could directly threaten Canadian well-being. Although not as directly as USAID, which warns of a time when "...desperate people with little to lose attempt to take what they want by force" (USAID Strategy Paper 1).

It is also stated that, "Canadian influence in the international financial institutions varies according to Canada's level of subscribed capital, contributions and consequent voting percentage" (p. 75). This is a particularly interesting statement, speaking as it does to several concerns. There is a straightforward financial justification of government expenditures, there is a moral justification to the effect that the ability of Canadians to bring their fraternal philosophy of aid to bear on institutions which hold tremendous power over developing countries is dependent on contributions to those institutions by the Canadian government, and there is an appeal to the Canadian desire to rise above middle power status and be taken seriously by the major powers.
Tied/Untied Aid

The topic of tied and untied aid was mentioned above; Sharing Our Future devotes a section to this topic. This section presents justification for tied aid, i.e., "...the practise of requiring that aid funds provided to a developing country be used to procure goods and services in the donor country." (p.51); and then presents justification for untying aid. The justification being that many recipient countries now have the capacity to provide goods and personnel that previously had to be obtained elsewhere, and that a more flexible policy on tied aid will allow for more effective and efficient use of aid dollars.

However, this new policy amounts to raising the allowable level of untied aid from twenty percent to fifty percent of bilateral assistance to those countries considered worst off, and from twenty percent to thirty-three and one third percent of assistance to other countries. Food aid is excluded from the new rules, however; bilateral food aid is untied to a level of five percent, and multilateral food aid to a level of twenty percent (p.53). In other words, ninety-five percent of bilateral food aid, and eighty percent of multilateral food aid, must be purchased in Canada. On page fifty-five, it is stated that, "Food aid will be provided in ways that avoid
discouraging local production, while meeting the needs of recipient countries by respecting local food preferences."

It is, perhaps, difficult to reconcile this statement with a food aid policy which specifies that almost all food aid must be purchased in Canada. Rules which require up to eighty percent of bilateral aid monies to be spent in Canada might also seem to conflict with the idea of partnership, or that of self-sufficiency. Such discrepancies would, however, go some way toward explaining why development aid has led to so little development.

The strongly economic nature of the world view of the Industrial society is clearly reflected in UNDP's report, which tells of a human development initiative in Botswana, one of the goals of which was to improve the quality of life, the other goal of which was to "...accelerate human capital formation through training and apprenticeship programmes" (p.9). It is pointed out that "...economic growth alone does not guarantee human progress", rather, "What matters is how that growth is managed and distributed for the benefit of the people" (p.21). So, programmes which bring social benefits are translated into economic terms, and persons are translated into human capital - or rather, potential human capital, into which they must be formed; and human progress (itself a concept specific to the Industrial
society) is defined as economic growth, properly managed and distributed.

Elsewhere, UNDP acknowledges the adverse effects of structural adjustment programmes (p.12), noting, for instance, the Honduran case, which "...resulted in deteriorating living conditions and an increase in unemployment and underemployment" (p.30). UNDP's response is to set up programmes with the relevant governments for the purpose of ameliorating the effects of SAPs on the most vulnerable sectors of the populace. There is no questioning of the ultimate effects of SAPs on human development, and despite UNDP's apparent concern for political justice (pp.5,6,7,8,10), there is no questioning of the justice of making those who neither had any voice in contracting loans, nor received any benefit from them, bear the greatest burdens of their repayment.

For all its talk of political freedom, etc., UNDP, like CIDA, shows no inclination to acknowledge that the preponderantly economic world view of the Industrial society produces winners and losers, or that any of the problems faced by "developing" societies arise from the fact that in dealings between the Industrial society and other societies, the other societies have generally lost. Ultimately, UNDP, like CIDA and like the Bruntland Commission (pp.74,75 this
UNDP does make some references to the need for equitable distribution of resources, (p.21) and decentralization of power (p.13), but only within the country being discussed; these principles are never carried through to the level of international relations. Nor, among the many development initiatives described in this report is there any mention of legal assistance, or training in legal literacy; both of which would be useful to poor people in any country, and most especially in those with the greatest gap between rich and poor (because social power is determined largely by economic power), and in which the organs of civil governance and social welfare are not hospitable to poor people. (Legal training is mentioned, however, in Indigenous documents [Alderete et al 1993]).

Instead, one reads about projects in literacy, environmental management (pp.6,20), job training, etc., along with some basic health initiatives; projects which “may or may not succeed in helping people, but which do not address the actual causes of poverty. UNDP prefers to rely on statistics to define realities (pp.8,14,15), and on the free market to ultimately improve lives, even if the transition to a market economy, or the effects of structural adjustment
programmes, may first lead to a deterioration of living conditions (pp.12,16).

At the same time, by, for instance, citing "...the ultimate linkages between environmental deterioration, escalating population growth and problems of poverty and underdevelopment" (p.5), UNDP implies that poverty is the fault of the poor - if only they would not have so many children, their environments would not be overstressed, and they would not get caught in the downward spiral of poverty. Again, the unconscious nature of this belief must be stressed, for while, in an organization the size of UNDP, there are no doubt individuals who quite consciously hold views even more extreme than this, such is not the picture UNDP would wish to present of itself in a public document.

The fact that the agency documents are aimed at an audience of the general public is very significant to the analysis of their contents, and particularly to the analysis of inconsistencies in the position the documents take on various issues. The agencies wish to portray themselves in a certain light; they would not wish to compromise the credibility of their chosen portrayals by revealing any insincerity. Thus, any inconsistencies which are revealed by analysis probably indicate differences between the "ideal" (i.e., self-perceived) and the "real" (i.e.,
observable) behaviour of the given agency. Explaining such inconsistencies simply as evidence of hypocrisy or "hidden agendas" on the part of the agencies is insufficient.

The ubiquity of economic considerations throughout agency descriptions of development policy; the very interest of the industrial powers in encouraging development, could be attributed to ulterior motives of economic gain. But any explanation which fails to recognize the complexity of human motivation, will fail to clarify the dynamics of the development relationship.

It would be naive to suggest that the industrial powers' interest in development is not to a greater or lesser degree motivated by a desire for economic gain. Political motivations also play a part in the development process; but so does the desire to make the world a better place. This is the most problematic aspect of the development relationship, and the one in which world view plays the most significant role.

If a society's world view is permeated by an economic perspective, it follows that that perspective will be evident in that society's ideas about how to make the world a better place. Problems arise when that world view is not shared by all parties to the relationship, when the economic
perspective clashes with particular goals, or when it limits the vision of development to that which can somehow be linked to that economic perspective.

Such problems are evident in the above section, and throughout the data. The logic of self-interest is also evident in these documents, but I would argue that much of the apparent hypocrisy of the agency documents is actually evidence of efforts to make observed needs fit into the framework of reality dictated by the Industrial world view.

The need to understand reality as something bounded and defined by immutable and unarguable rules makes it difficult to accept that other societies have other sets of rules, equally immutable and unarguable. This in turn makes it difficult to understand the nature of world view and its influence on our thinking. But, without at least recognizing this influence, it is impossible to understand many of the conflicts inherent in the development process, or to completely understand the influence of economics on development policy.
The agency documents speak of the development process as a cooperative venture, in which developers must be fully involved. Terms such as "consultation", "self-sustaining", and "partnership" are used frequently in these documents. They are not often used in the grassroots documents, in which terms such as "struggle" and "rights" are more prominent. What does this indicate about the relationship at the centre of the development process? In this section, the agency view of this relationship will be examined. The Indigenous view will be examined in the next section.

UNDP emphasizes people’s participation in determining their own destinies (p.8); a community "...being given a voice in determining the kind of social development it receives" [italics added](p.21). But, being given a voice is by no means equivalent to having control, and participation in determining one’s own destiny is by no means the same as having the power to make the decisions which will direct that destiny.

The UNDP report tells of a programme in Bolivia "...to improve the quality of life of indigenous groups consistent with their wishes and culture" (p.22), and that, "the indigenous people were directly involved..." in designing
the programme (p.22). While it would seem a logical necessity that the former could not occur without the latter, such a connection is not self-evident in the practise of development, as evidenced by the fact that it was considered worthy of mention.

But, there is something more revealed by the second statement, in its reference to "the indigenous people"; a general descriptive term given a definite article, which is a rather demeaning usage, unless we are to understand that each Indigenous individual involved in the programme participated in its design. This is unlikely, however, as we are told that it "...will benefit some 190,000 indigenous peoples of 29 different ethnic groups" (p.22).

One can only wonder how many individuals there are altogether in these 190,000 peoples. Or perhaps one might wonder why a document produced by the world's most important development agency is so sloppy. It would be a mistake, however, to dismiss this as mere grammatical sloppiness. I believe it unlikely that such grammatical sloppiness would have escaped notice and editorial correction if the reference had been to persons of European descent.

The act of consultation is emphasized throughout *Sharing Our Future* as an important element in the formation
and execution of aid policies; indeed, it constitutes one of the four pillars of Canada's ODA charter (pp.3,4,23). This follows logically from a concept of aid as fraternal rather than paternal, as does the associated concept of partnership, which is also prevalent in this document.

The importance of consulting with partners is cited repeatedly in this document, but while Third World governments are mentioned as partners (pp.25,63), and even grassroots groups are mentioned once, they are not mentioned in the context of consultations - with the exception of one reference to consultations by ICOD, an agency which no longer exists. Consultations take place with the Canadian public, through the use of opinion polls, etc.; with non-governmental organizations, businesses, and non-governmental institutions; but not with the people getting developed. Consultation is, in fact, primarily aimed at ensuring that Canadian aid policy is in line with the Canadian public's image of Canada's role in the world (pp.19,22,83).

The desire to encourage development that is self-sustaining is expressed throughout the document; the idea that real development must derive most of its impetus from the people who are to benefit from it. Yet despite this, and despite the emphasis placed on such concepts as poverty alleviation, cooperation, etc., the people from whom this
impetus is desired are left out of the loop. Nowhere in this document is mention made of consulting with those "targeted" by CIDA. There is nothing in the text to suggest intentional, or conscious exclusion; rather, these people are simply invisible.

The contradiction between emphasizing the concepts of partnership, cooperation, and self-sufficiency, and consulting only with those at one end of the development process seems not to have occurred to anyone involved in preparing this document. Particularly revealing in this respect is the following quote, "...CIDA has been involved in a continuing and steadily growing stream of consultations with its development partners, to gain valuable input from all parts of Canadian society"(p.17).

Beyond the exclusion of "developees" from the consultation process, the adequacy of consultation as a means of inclusion must be questioned. Consultation does not imply shared decision-making; it implies that those who make the decisions will receive opinions from others, with no obligation to base their decisions on those opinions.

The gap between the rhetoric and the reality of participation and partnership is noted in Indigenous documents:
They speak of indigenous peoples and their incorporation as active participants in development, but our millenary knowledge for preserving the environment is never incorporated or taken as something scientific. (doc 12)²

They have many congresses and international meetings to analyze and determine how to protect and exploit in a rational manner, the biodiversity of Amazonia, but all that follows is the commercialization of its wealth, and the transformation of our peoples into slaves of the companies. (doc 12)³

Another document, critical of the work of NGOs, calls for genuine support from NGOs, from the churches, and from civil society in general "...respecting always the leadership and self-determination of these [i.e., Indigenous] peoples" (doc 25).⁴

A section of a pastoral letter from the bishops of Guatemala, devoted to the presentation of opinions from Indigenous members of the church, is clear in its condemnation of the effects of contact on Mayan peoples; and this condemnation is not limited to the influence of the church and multi-nationals, or to the neglect or pressures to assimilate from the state. The document is scathing in its censure of what it describes as the practise of using Indigenous peoples as a means to attract foreign capital:

...to solicit foreign investment, the generosity of egoists, the compassion of the unjust, for projects which go against the identity of these very indigenous people... this is another face of exploitation and
The invisibility in *Sharing Our Future*, a document intended to present the best possible picture of the aid process in which Canada involves itself, of the people whom aid is supposed to benefit, suggests that CIDA is not as enlightened as it would like to believe. This impression is intensified by a number of statements. On page sixty-three, we are told about "... helping illiterate, landless peasants to plant trees at the edge of the desert...", which is presented as one end of a wide range of Canadian aid which covers the spectrum from low to high technology.

The labels which are applied to those people presented as needing simple technologies to improve their lot are not, however, neutral. They identify these people by what they do not have; they are illiterate, they are landless. These lacks, given the fact that they are mentioned in this context, were apparently considered relevant by the author(s) in identifying users of low-technology aid. But what is the relevance to the act of planting trees for forage, of being able, or unable, to read; of owning, or not owning, land?

I would argue that the relevance is in the nature of a psychological connection - simple things for simple people.
It is worth noting that the question of landlessness is not addressed as a social or political issue, but only as a label of personal deficiency.

The same sort of thinking is betrayed in an excerpt from the Bruntland Commission report, Our Common Future, quoted on page forty-five of Sharing Our Future, which states that one of the two fundamental concepts of sustainable development is "the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs."

The concept of the environment's capacity to provide for a society's needs being impeded by the state of that society's technology, is typical of the world view of the Industrial society, but it is alien to the world view represented in the Indigenous documents analyzed for this thesis. The difference rests on different perceptions of the relationship between humans and the environment in which they live.

The relationship portrayed in the excerpts from Indigenous documents quoted in this study is that of a relationship between individuals. From this perspective, if a society impedes the ability of the environment to meet its needs, it is by the lack of respect and care that society
shows for the environment upon which it depends. "Respect" being intended not, as it is sometimes used in ecological discussions, metaphorically, but as the description of a relationship between individuals.

Apart from the cultural specificity represented by the above excerpt from Our Common Future, it also suggests that the different levels of well-being experienced by different societies are the consequence of different levels of technological and social competence. Or, to put it bluntly, that poverty is the result of technological and social incompetence.

The suggestion of incompetence is clear in the following quote from Sharing Our Future. "Whether they are living on subsistence farms, in small rural villages or in sprawling urban slums, people need to learn how to provide for themselves and their families"(p.38). Once again, poverty is presented as the result of personal deficiencies rather than political and economic imbalances.

On page seventy-two, we are told that, "For the poor who cannot afford rice or wheat, sorghum and millet can be a staple in their diet." In fact, for a very great many people, sorghum and millet have been as integral to their daily diet as wheat is for Europeans and North Americans,
and rice is for Asians.

Unfortunately, food aid practices have often flooded local markets with wheat which is cheaper than anything local farmers can produce, while simultaneously carrying the cachet of wealth. As a result, food preferences in some areas have been altered, benefitting donor countries which gain new markets, if not recipient countries which gain more problems with their balance of payments. But even in these areas, this change in preference is the result of marketing, rather than an expressed desire of the people (Hancock 1989).

So, on the one hand, CIDA puts forward an image of Canadian development aid as aid between equals; an image of partnership, cooperation, interdependence. But, in elaborating its policies, a different image emerges; one which is firmly linked to the world view of the industrial society and deeply influenced by societal chauvinism, and which presents a picture of top down, take what we give you, we know best development aid.
Intertwined with Indigenous concerns about recognition of land rights and territorial control are concerns about the invasion and imposition of alien values, and the impact this has had, and continues to have, on their societies. Indigenous women see the invasion of alien values as having had a devastating impact on their lives by disrupting the equilibrium which had existed between the roles of male and female. "Before the Spanish invasion, women were considered as having the same rights as men, and their workload was equal...now they say that the woman is only good for raising children and cooking" (Amaguana 1992:13).

This equality between the sexes was not of the same nature as that being pursued today in the Industrial society, in which distinctions between the roles of men and women are seen by many women as being limiting and discriminatory. The roles of men and women in pre-contact Indigenous societies tended to be clearly defined, and clearly different, but this did not serve to maintain a one-sided power relationship. The balance of power would shift according to which role was dominant in any given situation, and in some situations these roles might conflict, but the ultimate goal was to achieve balance.
For the Indian people of what was once the Tawantinsuyo, the Inca confederation of Indian nations, men and women have equal rights and duties within the community. Our ideology is dominated by the dual perception of life; there is not one creator as in the patriarchal Christian religion. Instead the figures of the Creators are personalized by a man and a woman, Manco Kapaj and Mama Ocllo, who emerged from Lake Titicaca, both at the same time; each had their own qualities and tasks. They were both wise, and went on to populate the land and pass on their knowledge to their children. Men and women are different, even opposed, but they are complementary, not antagonistic. This conception is a reflection of the duality present in nature, where opposite forces like day and night, the sun and the moon, summer and winter, fire and water, complement each other to maintain the harmony of the universe. (Alderete et al 1992:27)

The Indigenous women speaking in these documents see this balance as having been destroyed by contact with "white" society.

A great disequilibrium arose in our societies. Before, the men in our village did not have this idea of the sexes, but instead considered women with respect, as companions, an idea in balance that we are each half of this world. This was destroyed by the contact. (Idiorie 1992:13)

This idea was also emphasized at a meeting of Indigenous peoples in Quito, Ecuador:

The invasion of non-Indigenous values has adversely affected the relation between the woman and man in the home, and the role of the woman in the communities and nations. All of us have been victims of this oppressive system, of the western vices such as addictions, and of the violence of a culture that is anti-life. We state clearly that the first step is to re-establish our Indigenous identity so that we can join men and women together once again. To lose our identity is to lose the balance of nature, which has
always been a balance between the masculine and the feminine. We have to recoup our traditional values, our Indigenous ways of organization, and act as a community. Before the arrival of western values, the women made up half of the cosmos. To reestablish the balance in our home and to realize self-determination and liberation as oppressed peoples, women and men must participate equally, according to the traditional values of our Indigenous nations. (Alderete et al 1992:16)

The invasion of alien cultural values is seen to have upset the various balances which Indigenous cultures managed to maintain, and in so doing to have struck at the very heart of those cultures.

October 11, 1492 was the last day of freedom for the indigenous peoples of America and the beginning of another way of life, which distanced the values of culture from those of nature. (Doc 20:20) *

Daniel Matul, of the International Maya League, emphasizes the need "...to restore the lost balance" (doc 5). But, the disruption caused by alien influences is not seen solely as the after-effect of past colonization processes; it is seen as an ongoing problem. A treaty addressing the role of non-governmental organizations in this process states:

'We, the indigenous peoples of the world since the times of our ancestors, have constructed a culture, a civilization, a history and a vision of the world that has allowed us to coexist in a harmonious way with nature.'
This process was interrupted by the invasion of Indigenous territories in various parts of the world, which has caused genocide, negation and destruction of our culture, violations of human rights and racial discrimination. At the present time, the Indigenous Peoples are being affected by the imposition of economic-development models by the West. In this context, some NGO's have imposed their models through different projects, contributing to the destruction of the environment and the cultures of Indigenous Peoples. (doc 13)

The problem of development aid which does not address the needs of the supposed beneficiaries is specifically addressed elsewhere, as well (doc 25). But, in general, these documents show no great interest in whether any given problem originates with governments, corporations, churches, or any other organ of the Industrial society; for they are all identified simply as organs of that society. The pertinent relationship is that between the dominant Industrial society and Indigenous societies - singly and collectively.

viii LAND RIGHTS

The points of conflict between the core beliefs of the Industrial and Indigenous societies are many. One of the more visible points of conflict occurs around the issue of land rights; one of the primary issues addressed in these documents. Bill Namagoose, executive chief of the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec, speaking against the
proposed second phase of the James Bay hydro project, stated:

For us, speaking of land ownership, we can’t buy, sell, or own the land, or buy water, or own the air. For a man to say he owns the land is like a flea on a dog trying to say he owns the dog. They can’t own the land. This is a fundamental issue. This is Cree land, it is used for Cree culture, Cree nation. Its been used like that for thousands and thousands of years. (doc 3)

So, Namagoose asserts "this is Cree land", while also asserting that land cannot be owned. From the perspective of the Industrial world view, he seems to be contradicting himself. The key to understanding the Indigenous world view on this issue is the metaphor of the flea and the dog; from the Indigenous perspective, land does not belong to people, people belong to the land, and "...belonging to the Earth, we cannot be separated from our lands and territories" (doc 13).

According to the Industrial world view the relationship between people and land is simple; land is a thing, people own it. According to the Indigenous world view the relationship is much more complex, because it is a relationship between persons; more specifically, between a mother and her children. Thus, the relationship is perceived as being two-way; the mother provides for her children, and the children must care for their mother. The influence of this view on the Indigenous understanding of
the land rights issue is profound, as evidenced by the frequent references to the relationship, the responsibilities it entails, and the feelings it evokes (docs 6, 13, 15, Alderete et al 1992).

As Indigenous people our lives are intertwined with the natural world. Our creation stories tell of our emergence in traditional homelands, which continue to nurture and give meaning to our lives. We are inseparable from the lands in which we as peoples were created.

We view our responsibilities to care for the earth as our mother. As Indigenous peoples, we are witnessing the destruction of our sacred Mother Earth. The suffering and pain of Mother Earth is felt by us as if it were our own. (Alderete et al 1992:21)

In the Indigenous world view, the relation between people and the earth is both personal and sacred, and violation of the territory in which a people live, and for which they hold themselves responsible, inflicts emotional and spiritual damage entirely alien to the Industrial world view of land being valuable in so far as it has the potential to be financially productive or strategically significant in a political sense.

Unfortunately, it is too often the case that values or beliefs which are not part of the Industrial world view are seen to have little or no validity by the industrial powers that control development, and so are not seriously considered in development decisions. Jorge Silva, director
of the Programa de Apoyo a los Pueblos Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazonica del Tratado de Cooperacion Amazonica, speaks pointedly about the double standard applied by Industrial society; "If I plant a bomb in the Vatican I'll be put in prison, because that place is a symbol of western culture. Then why aren't those who destroy Amazonia, which is our shrine, imprisoned?" (Doc 12).

The lack of respect for their values and their feelings concerning the land, in part explains the emphasis in Indigenous documents on control of their territory and of the resources which are found there (Docs 10,9,12,3,21,24, Alderete et al 1992). It is not uncommon for governments to acknowledge an Indigenous claim to a territory, but deny their rights to decide what will be done to, or taken from that territory, or to control access to it (Bodley 1990, Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues 1987). Arguments from the Indigenous inhabitants of the territory tend to be brushed aside with the rationale that a small number of people cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the needs of an entire country (Ibid).

From the Industrial world view, objections could be raised to this rationale, of the "a man's home is his castle" variety, and also from the economic standpoint of
fair compensation. But, the Indigenous viewpoint, as expressed in these documents, emphasizes the injury, disrespect and humiliation inflicted upon Mother Earth; speaking in terms of rape, prostitution, physical injury, and death (docs 15, Alderete et al 1992), and ties the suffering and destruction of the earth to the suffering and destruction of Indigenous peoples.

It is not only environmental destruction that is feared, but also cultural, social and spiritual destruction; the loss of autonomy, and assimilation. This fear is expressed by Jorge Silva:

With the legalization of the exploitation of the resources of Amazonia, it follows that indigenous communities will be incorporated into market economies and our peoples transformed into slaves of domestic and foreign companies. (doc 12)\(^8\)

Furthermore, as noted in a declaration drafted at a meeting of representatives of Indigenous peoples in Paris in 1992; "Many of our communities have been displaced to inhospitable and unproductive areas as a consequence of the exploitation of natural resources on the part of the dominant societies" (Doc 20:19)\(^9\).

The Indigenous concern with exploitation of resources on their lands by the Industrial society is particularly interesting in relation to the U.N.'s Revolving Fund for
Natural Resources Exploration (UNDP:39), which responds to country requests for assistance in this area. The brief description of this programme in the UNDP annual report has nothing to say about the possible impact of such exploration on Indigenous peoples; nor are they mentioned as having any role in decision-making regarding resource exploration or exploitation, despite the fact that Indigenous territories are often richly endowed with resources greatly valued by Industrial society; a fact which has led to a great deal of trouble for a number of Indigenous communities (Secretariat of the Independent Commission On International Humanitarian Issues 1987). This is curious given the UNDP rhetoric about partnership and participation for Indigenous communities.

Land distribution is a major concern in the non-Indigenous grassroots documents (doc 14). This is not the same as the Indigenous concern with recognition of land rights, which seeks legal recognition of title to ancestral territories; the concern in this case is with the lack of land available to campesinos to farm, due to the vast majority of the arable land of Guatemala being held by a tiny percentage of the population (72% of arable land is owned by 2% of the population, [Doc 14]).

So, the argument in this instance is not for state recognition of historical boundaries, but for the
redistribution of land on the basis of need. - It should be noted that, in these documents, Indigenous territories are not disputed; it is the fincas of large landowners which are targeted for re-distribution. In other words, this is not a conflict between Indigenous and non-Indigenous societies, but rather a conflict within the Industrial society.

It may seem inappropriate to refer to campesinos, who work as migrant farm labour because they cannot get land of their own, and who have to fight even to get three meals a day (Doc 17), as members of the Industrial society, but nonetheless, it is so. They are dispossessed members of the society, but they are members. In the Indigenous documents, the Industrial society and its world view are considered alien, whereas in these documents, problems are not expressed as the result of one society imposing itself on another, but as the result of certain sectors of a society denying other sectors the benefits of that society. Thus, within the context of the land issue, one can see the two major conflicts of the development relationship at play; the conflict between world views, and the conflict of power within one world view.
Education represents one of the focal points of the conflict between the Indigenous and Industrial world views (docs 4, 13, 15, 25, 27, Alderete et al 1992). As mentioned above, one of UNDP’s three key human development indicators is educational attainment, which is measured by years of schooling and levels of literacy. These two categories allow for simple measurement, which is certainly convenient; but the definition it provides is both narrow and culturally exclusive. It does not acknowledge the existence, let alone the value of, education other than that provided by the Industrial society’s education system. This particular example of education is seen as defining what education is; and it is given exceptional importance in the development process.

It is stated in UNDP’s annual report, for instance, that, "UNDP believes that primary education is a basic human right..." (p.18), and that, "An important human development target is universal primary education for boys and girls by the year 2000" (p.18). A description of a health programme which uses school systems to improve children’s access to deworming drugs and nutritional supplements, notes that these supplements "...will contribute to the health of the children, improving their prospects for learning" (p.37), as
though this fact provided justification for the programme.

Any idea that education as it is perceived in the Industrial society, defines education, is laid to rest by the Indigenous documents. The "western" education system is portrayed in these documents as creating a rift between Indigenous children taught in that system, and parents taught in an Indigenous system (Alderete et al 1992). It is also seen as a means of transferring values of the dominant society into Indigenous communities; in other words, a means of assimilating Indigenous cultures into the dominant society, and thus destroying the Indigenous cultures (doc 15).

Before the Spanish conquest, we had our own education that was only passed down from fathers to sons, from the greatest scientists, such as Yachac Taitas, Yachac Camayuc, Tachac Mamas, and others. In these ways we Indians gave practical education with the emphasis on teaching, seeing, and making ourselves learn. (Amaguana 1992:13)

The woman is the generator of culture, education, and spirituality. Beginning in the home, she plays an important role in the education of the children. She begins to teach the children to speak our native language, and to teach them good manners and how they should conduct themselves with the elders. The woman also plays an important role in the teaching of music and spiritual ways because she begins to sing to the children. She imitates the birds or the sounds of nature; it is a way of communicating with the Gods and the forces. The woman teaches art in the same way she observes nature. She teaches mathematics when she begins to teach her son or daughter how to weave or string the loom. There is a day in our calendar, Axma, which is the day of weaving, to weave and unravel. It is like the beginning of life, when she teaches a child
to count. That is where the children learn to count and to sing.

In spite of all the oppression of women, we have remained strong spiritually, because if that didn’t exist all respect would have been lost. With western education, we would all be dead. (Gabriel 1992:11,12)

The education system of the Industrial society is seen as a threat to the survival of Indigenous cultures and to the well-being of Indigenous individuals. "They taught us a little ABC, a little of that, but they trained us for servitude, to serve the white people. We weren’t trained for anything but servitude" (doc 4).

These documents express a desire by Indigenous peoples to take what they find to be positive from the educational system of the Industrial society, along with elements of their own education systems, and from these create curricula which will equip their children to live as Indigenous persons in world dominated by the Industrial society.

Unfortunately, the agency documents analyzed for this study, for all their talk of participation and partnership, still clearly reflect distinctly ethnocentric attitudes. Thus, the importance of the goal of universal primary education by the year 2000 (p.18) is introduced by the information that millions of children around the world "...currently receive no basic education" (p.16). What this means is that millions of children around the world
currently receive no "western" education; education from their own cultures is the same as no education at all.

In neither the UNDP or the CIDA document is the distinction made that the "formal" education offered in the Industrial society is simply one of many that arose in response to the needs of a particular human context. It is also revealing to note the distinction which is made between "traditional knowledge" and knowledge which has been generated within the Industrial society and its antecedents.

Although the knowledge of Pythagorus and Aristotle has been handed down from one generation to the next, for tens of centuries, this knowledge is not referred to as traditional; it is referred to as science and philosophy. Only knowledge generated outside the forms and, ironically, the traditions, of Industrial society are labelled as traditional; and they are consistently labelled as such, in distinction from the knowledge of Industrial society, which requires no label.

Aside from creating the false impression of there being something qualitatively different in the processes which lead to these two types of knowledge, this labelling practise leads to the false impression that there are, in fact, two types of knowledge. Furthermore, the implication
is, as in the case with most labelling practises that separate "us" from "them", that "we" represent the norm, and "they" represent the deviation from it.

Thus, if one does come across a reference to native languages or other aspects of a local culture's knowledge being included in the curriculum for that culture's children, it will be as an add-on to the "standard" curriculum. One will not see descriptions in these documents of communities taking what seems useful from the knowledge and educational practises of the Industrial society and adapting it to their own needs and practises; one certainly will not read of agency projects designed to assist communities to do this, despite the prodigious number of consultants sent by agencies into the "developing world" each year (Hancock 1989).

In the case of non-Indigenous campesinos, there is no conflict in educational models; and yet, the goals expressed by UNDP in this area seem painfully simplistic and naive when considered in the context of these people's lives.

It is unlikely that the landlords for whom these campesinos work have any interest in seeing the children of the campesinos educated, nor do they have any interest in seeing the campesinos achieve any sort of self-sufficiency -
quite the opposite. One can be reasonably sure that they would not support the goal of literacy for all by 2000.

Literacy, along with years of schooling, is one of UNDP's two measures of educational attainment. It is often tied to other concerns, such as the "empowerment" of women, and improvement of primary health care (p.37), but the same could be done with many other factors, such as access to, and distribution of, resources; accountability of government, and freedom from political violence. Why, then, the fixation on literacy, out of all possible factors?

I would argue that it is because literacy is so central to the world view of the Industrial society. Paulo Freire believed that those who were not literate were "detemporalized" and that their understanding of reality was flawed; he also believed that through the acquisition of literacy, people could enter into the flow of history and come to understand the true nature of reality.

Likewise, I would contend that the reason for the emphasis within the development establishment on literacy and years of schooling over other factors of arguably equal or greater importance, lies in the perceived power of a formal education to bring people into the modern world, and to open their minds to a more rational view of that world.
Thus, according to *Sharing Our Future*, even in "...isolated villages never reached by the Industrial Revolution." (p.39) people can "...learn how to provide for themselves and their families." (p.38), and see that "...a new balance is established between the people and the environment." (p.63).

There is no arguing with UNDP’s assertion, mentioned above, that a child’s ability to learn is directly affected by the state of that child’s nutritional health. But, consider the reasoning behind this statement. In the paragraph devoted to this programme in the UNDP report, it stands out as the only instance of this sort of justification; i.e., offering a reason why it is a good thing to give malnourished children nutritional supplements. Why the need to offer such a justification? Is not the fact that the children are malnourished, reason enough to try to treat the problem?

Perhaps the answer to this question can be found in Frank Cancion’s comments about the monetization of humanitarian aid (chapter 1, p.9, this doc). In a milieu in which the monetary value of a life saved can be, and is, calculated (chapter 1, p.9, this doc), it should come as no surprise to see efforts to improve children’s health justified in terms of projected economic returns, which is
where the reasoning for this statement ultimately leads. Basic schooling is regarded as a prerequisite for a productive workforce in the Industrial society; better nourished children have a better chance of successfully completing their primary schooling, so they can become a more productive workforce for that society. Any other advantages which might accrue to a child as a result of a primary education, let alone as a result of improved nutrition, are not entered into this calculation.

Possible reasons for the Industrial society's especial obsession with literacy have already been discussed; these follow through to the society's belief in the importance of primary education. Within the Industrial society, this belief extends through secondary schooling, as witnessed by the considerable thought, effort, and money spent on trying to convince young people to complete high school; not to mention the social stigma associated with dropping out.

The concern with schooling is well founded for anyone wishing to succeed within the Industrial society, because schooling involves much more than the acquisition of certain technical skills, such as the abilities to work with words and numbers, or the acquisition of certain facts about geography, chemistry, etc. Regardless of whether or not such skills and knowledge are in fact acquired, or to what
degree they are acquired, this education system provides initiation into the society; and the higher the level at which one exits the system, the higher the level at which one enters into the society.

At the time of writing, the Industrial society is going through a crisis as it tries to come to grips with the fact that its education system is no longer serving this function with complete success, due to the absence of jobs for graduates. Young people who find that their educational investment does not pay the expected returns can be, and have been, a disruptive force in a society; as was the case in Paris in the spring of 1994, when recent graduates forced a change in government policy regarding minimum wages. Similarly, a generation of young people inculcated with values and beliefs alien to their community, as well as expectations which cannot be met, are unlikely to be a positive force in that community.

The "western" educational system has evolved to prepare children to live in an industrialized society; the education system exported to the "developing" world is meant to do the same. This is only logical given that development has meant, and still does mean, industrialization. Donor countries also provide money for projects involving health care, environment, even democratization; but the connection
is always made to providing a stable environment for economic growth.

It is certainly true that no youth could have much hope of finding a place in a newly industrialized society without at least a primary level education in the education system of the Industrial society; and for an impoverished youth, a primary level education could be sufficient to get a job that would vastly improve both their economic situation and that of their family. Education can be seen as the one chance to a better future; and "in" to the security, and maybe even to some of the luxuries, associated with the "developed" societies.

Neither the CIDA nor the UNDP documents discourage the idea that receiving a "western" style education, even in the truncated form of a primary education, is the road to a better life. Unfortunately, apart from the question of whether there are jobs to absorb graduates; as the Indigenous documents quoted above indicate, the education itself can be an alienating force.

But, the eagerness to export "western" education should be expected, because at its heart, development is about making "them" as much as possible like "us", because "we" are, after all, the developed world, while "they" are
developing, or under-developed, or least developed. How better to teach "them" to be like "us" than by giving them our education system?

There are many references in the UNDP document to participation, empowerment, partnership, etc; inclusive references all, giving the impression of people seriously involved in charting the course of their development, but as with the CIDA document, this impression does not hold up under examination. It is stated that it is "...important that they [i.e. the people] decide what type of development they want and participate in the process" (p.22). Yet, when it is stated that something called the Education for All Programme (UNDP sponsored), "...recommends that education be tailored to national and local realities and needs" (p.18), this information is immediately followed by the assertion, "Thus, 'useful' education relates to income-generation, family life and gender equity, environmental awareness, technology use and community participation" (p.18).

It is difficult to understand how education can be tailored to local realities and needs if the definition of useful education is not left open to local determination, and if those without a "western" education are considered to have no education. It is also interesting how well the UNDP definition of useful education reflects the current
preoccupations of the development community.

The human species has evolved in such a way that its offspring must be educated to survive; different ways of educating children have evolved in response to different survival needs. Development policy which fails to recognize this fact, and which, instead of assisting communities in the evolution of their educational systems, imposes an alien system with all the cultural baggage that that entails, is likely to do at least as much harm as good. Those who continue to disregard the value of non-industrial education systems can expect that they will continue to be regarded as cultural imperialists.

X CONCLUSIONS

The documents analyzed for this study reveal a great deal about the different perspectives on development held by different parties to the process; on the definition of development, on the role of "the other" in the process, and on the definition of self. These differences in turn reveal something about weaknesses in the development process; weaknesses based in the fact that this process is not interactive.
In brief, this analysis has shown that the influence of world view is evident in the documents, that the world views of those who direct the development process and of those who are targeted by it sometimes clash; that Indigenous societies often see the Industrial society as imposing elements of its world view upon them, that there is no understanding evident in the agency documents of world view as such, or of the implications of a society with one world view seeking to "develop" a society with a different world view; and that elements of the Industrial society’s world view, combined with the chauvinism inherent in world view, and the power the Industrial society holds in its relationships with other societies, leads to negative attitudes and practises by development agencies.

The Indigenous grassroots documents analyzed indicate a rejection of the role assigned to developees, especially Indigenous developees, in agency documents. Clearly, Indigenous peoples do not see their choices as being limited to assimilation or a return to life as it was before contact. There may be a tendency in industrialized countries to see Indigenous cultures as relics, whether in a positive or negative light; but Indigenous persons see their cultures as vital, despite the wounds which have been inflicted upon them. More than that, they see themselves and their cultures as important players in world which has
become "a global village".

What one finds in these documents is not a desire to withdraw from contact with the rest of the world, but an insistence upon being recognized as equal in status and rights to any other culture or society. This means the right to identity - Mayan or Cree or Penan, or whatever the case may be; the right to representation on international bodies, the right to equal access to the resources enjoyed by members of the dominant society of the state in which an Indigenous community finds itself; and the right to make the final decisions as to what will or will not be done within their territories (docs 1,3,4,6,7,9,10,12,13,19,21,22,23,24). Control of education becomes of crucial importance to these goals (docs 25,27, Alderete et al).

The speakers represented in these documents see Indigenous peoples as having suffered greatly as a result of contact and colonization; and see them as suffering still from the imposition of alien values and models of development. They do not, however, see Indigenous societies as mortally wounded, and they do not seem interested in the role assigned to them in agency rhetoric, as junior partners in the development process. These speakers do not ask for a consultative role in their development; they demand the right to decide how their communities will be developed, and
an equal role in determining broader issues affecting those communities.

Sharing Our Future includes a charter for official development assistance endorsed by the Mulroney government (pp.3,4,23) which reads as follows:

1. Putting poverty first: the primary purpose of Canadian official development assistance is to help the poorest countries and people of the world.

2. Helping people to help themselves: Canadian development assistance aims to strengthen the ability of people and institutions in developing countries to solve their own problems in harmony with the natural environment.

3. Development priorities must prevail in setting objectives for the aid program. As long as these priorities are met, aid objectives may take into account other foreign policy goals.

4. Partnership is the key to fostering and strengthening the links between Canada’s people and institutions and those of the Third World.

Clearly, some of the policies outlined in Sharing Our Future conflict with the principles contained in the ODA charter. Beyond that, many of the ideas presented in the CIDA document about what constitutes development, and how it is to be achieved, conflict with one another.

Although UNDP is a different sort of development agency than CIDA, and its annual report is not equivalent in style or intent to a policy document like Sharing Our Future,
nonetheless, the pattern of its discourse is basically the same. Although intended to present an inclusive view of development, the inclusive terminology, and the inclusive initiatives described, are contradicted by descriptions of how these initiatives are carried out, and by the narrow and pre-determined definition of development goals.

The documents from non-Indigenous grassroots sources show that some of those "targeted" by development share the same world view as those who direct it, but that, nonetheless, development policies which ignore the social and political contexts of these people's lives, and the many ways these factors are intertwined with each other and with economic factors, will fail to achieve the goals of the agencies, or of the people.

Indeed, the overall impression one gets after reading the non-Indigenous documents is that while they express goals that could be easily understood within institutions of the Industrial society, and approved of within development agencies, the ability of these institutions to help achieve these shared goals is critically compromised by their failure to address the root causes of the problems expressed in these documents. Simply put, these problems are the result of a wealthy and consequently powerful minority depending on the cheap labour of a poor and consequently
insecure majority.

What these campesinos need in order to achieve "development" are laws requiring decent wages and working conditions for migrant labour, and offering protection from violence and intimidation from landlords. They need further that these laws be enforced, and they need an end to the political violence which has kept them trapped in its crossfire. These are minimum conditions for development, but they are not the sort of issues addressed by development agencies.

Thus, while the goals of development agencies, and the policies and programmes which they inform, can be damaging to non-industrial societies; to targeted sectors of Industrial society, which share these goals, the policies and programmes can be irrelevant, due to their failure to address political and economic constraints on action. The prospects for this situation improving are slight so long as developers and developees are separated by the communications gulf evidenced in this study.

The onus in correcting this matter must be placed on the development agencies; the voices of the people targeted by development are not silent, it remains only for those who control development to listen. Listening attentively to
these voices could reveal much about not only the world view of the speaker, and its relation to development; it could be as revealing of the listener's world view and its influence on the listener's ideas about development. Such increased understanding would not guarantee a positive relationship, but it is difficult to see how a positive relationship can exist in the absence of such understanding.
Chapter IV
CONCLUSIONS

At the beginning of this thesis it was argued that world view provides society with its rules for reality and definition of humanity, and that this makes world view significant to the development process. It was argued that the development enterprise is itself the offspring of a particular world view; that of what has been termed in this thesis the Industrial society, and that it involves the imposition of that world view on other societies. It was argued that this is one of the major reasons for the failure of this enterprise to achieve significant success in improving the lives of its supposed beneficiaries.

These arguments were tested through analysis of documents produced by development agencies and by grassroots groups, and this analysis illustrated that values and, by extension, development goals, are shaped by world view, as are attitudes towards those "targeted" for development. The analysis showed that agencies used inclusive terminology when stating their broad policy goals and guiding principles, but that descriptions of specific policies, projects, and practices failed to follow through on this inclusive language; that beyond the general statements of purpose, the "targets" of development are largely absent
from these documents, except when appearing as victims of their own inadequacies.

The analysis also showed that Indigenous peoples differ from the Industrial society in world view, that they are conscious of having another world view imposed upon them, and that they are fighting this imposition. It showed that Indigenous peoples want to control (and define) their own development, that they have firm ideas about what they do and do not want to adopt from the Industrial society, and that they see their own societies as having much to contribute to the world community.

Comparing the agency and grassroots documents, one finds clear discrepancies between the goals of grassroots groups, and agencies’ goals for them. Even non-Indigenous groups which have the same societal world view as the agencies seem nonetheless ill-served by that world view, which locates the causes of poverty in the persons of those who are poor, and which through the medium of the development agency seeks to alleviate these inadequacies within the person, without taking into account the social and economic conditions within which these persons must manoeuvre.
The agency documents betray a belief that being a part of the modern world means being a part of the Industrial society, and that to be outside that society is to be backward. This belief lies at the heart of the development enterprise, and is the ultimate motivation for efforts such as that to bring a "basic elementary education" to all by the year 2000. It is this belief, and the associated belief that poverty indicates personal incompetence, that excludes "developees", and makes them invisible beyond the roles of development recipient, in agency documents.

These beliefs, so evident in these documents, also explain, not only the absence of "developee" perspectives from debates within the development community, but also the failure to note this absence or its significance. I believe that the differences found in the preceding chapters between grassroots documents and agency documents, in terms of world views, values, goals, and the roles of "developees" in the development process, show that discussions as to the best path for development which do not include the people targeted for that development, are unlikely to succeed in improving the lives of these people, but may only succeed in imposing world views, values, goals, and roles upon them. Whether these discussions involve supporters of development through creation of free markets, supporters of socialist ideals, or supporters of the ideals of participatory
development, if they exclude the people targeted for that development, they are equally flawed.

The lesson to be learned from this research is not that development agencies should change their world views. Even so far as that might be desirable, world view cannot be changed by fiat. The lesson to be learned is that voices from the grassroots need to be heard and respected in the agencies, conferences, universities, and other sites of development dialogue in the Industrial society.

This observation leads to three recommendations. Direct meaningful contributions (i.e., more than observer status, or being invited to open the proceedings with an Indigenous blessing) to the conferences and bodies which chart the course of the development enterprise, should be solicited from grassroots groups. It seems likely, however, that if real, meaningful representation from the grassroots does find a place in the centres of development influence and decision-making any time soon, it will likely only be the result of dogged lobbying on the part of grassroots organizations.

The second recommendation concerns development education. Whether aimed at students in development studies programmes, or the general public, development
education should incorporate more input from grassroots sources.

Organizations concerned with educating the public about development related issues sometimes sponsor tours for speakers from grassroots groups, but the expense of such undertakings would never allow for anything like the breadth or frequency of contact required to make a real dent in our ignorance about grassroots perspectives on development issues. But, there is nothing preventing such breadth or frequency of contact; it requires some work to find and establish contacts with grassroots groups, and it would require some work and imagination to find the best ways to integrate input from grassroots sources into public education programmes, but this is by no means an impossible task.

As for the curricula of development studies programmes, there is no reason why such programmes could not solicit contributions from grassroots sources for inclusion in students’ required readings. It is unacceptable that the range of viewpoints to which students are exposed while studying development issues should be limited to one side of the development process, and that they should be able to go into the field, or into the world with a degree which labels them as experts on development, without having had first to
read and grapple with viewpoints from the people most
directly effected by development.

Nor is it acceptable that contributions from grassroots
sources should be made solely through the mediation of work
done by outsiders - students writing masters theses, for
instance. Such work, whatever its value, still filters the
views of the original sources through those of the author
drawing upon these sources. There is value in such
analyses, but it is separate from, not a substitute for,
direct input from grassroots sources to the development
dialogue.

The third recommendation also concerns development
education. Given that by its very nature, development work
involves inter-cultural contact - and as has been shown in
this study, contact between world views - development
studies curricula should include courses dealing with these
issues, and these courses should be required of all first
year students.

There is increasing debate over the viability of the
concept of development. "Development" is used, however, by
all sides in the development process, and while a term
without the implication of 'making them like us' would be
preferable, I believe that it is far more important to
change the substance of what is being done, than it is to change the label that we apply to it.

Such change can only be achieved with the recognition and inclusion of those "targeted" by the development process, not merely at the level of individual projects, but at the primary level of education, debate, and decision-making. Only with this recognition and inclusion do we stand a chance of answering the call of the Coordinación de Organizaciones Mapuches for "...a new relationship based on respect for unity in diversity, with no one dominating or being dominated; without the imposition of one culture on another... (doc 19)"10.
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2. "Se habla de los pueblos indígenas y su incorporación como actores activos del desarrollo, pero jamás nuestros conocimientos milenarios para preservar el ambiente son incorporados o tomados como algo científico." Jorge Silva Doc 12.

3. "Se hacen muchos congresos y encuentros internacionales para analizar y ver la forma de proteger y explotar en forma racional la biodiversidad de la Amazonía, pero lo único que se persigue es comercializar sus riquezas y transformar a nuestros pueblos en esclavas de las compañías." Jorge Silva Doc 12.

4. "Los sectores solidarios, de las Iglesias, de las ONGs y de la sociedad civil en general, tendrán que cualificar y adecuar su apoyo en base a las exigencias que plantea el acompañamiento a los pueblos indígenas, respetando siempre el protagonismo y la autodeterminación de estos pueblos." Doc 25.

5. "La mujer, el niño, el huérfano, la viuda, la aldea, el modo de vida cultural, el pobre son justificaciones eficaces para solicitar la inversión extranjera (sic), la generosidad de los egoísmos, la compasión de los injustos, para los proyectos aun en contra de la identidad de los mismos indígenas. Se crean necesidades, se tranquilizan las conciencias. Esta es otra cara de la explotación y de la injusticias." Doc 15:47.

6. "El 11 de octubre de 1492 fue el último día de libertad para los pueblos indígenas de América y el inicio de otra forma de vida, con el distanciamiento entre los valores culturales y los valores naturales." Doc 20:20.

7. "Si colocara una bomba en el Vaticano me meterían preso, porque ese lugar es un símbolo de la cultura de occidente. Entonces porque no meten presos a aquellos que destruyen la Amazonía que es nuestro santuario?" Jorge Silva Doc 12.
8. "Con la legalización de la explotación de los recursos de la Amazonía, se persigue incorporar a las comunidades indígenas a las economías de mercado y transformar a nuestros pueblos en esclavos de las empresas nacionales y extranjeras." Jorge Silva Doc 12.


10. "...una 'Nueva Relación' basada en el respeto a la unidad en la diversidad, sin dominados ni dominadores, sin imposición de una cultura sobre otra y en el apoyo y reconocimiento al DERECHO FUNDAMENTAL que como NACIÓN ORIGINARIA nos corresponde y que se expresa en el Derecho a la AUTONOMIA Y AUTODETERMINACION MAPUCHE. Doc 19"
### Appendix A

**WORD FREQUENCY LISTS FOR DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES**

**First Ninety-Three Words**

(With some words excluded as noted on page 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP #</th>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>CIDA #</th>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>USAID #</th>
<th>WORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>development</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>canada</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>countries</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>countries</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>canadian</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>developing</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>UN</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>assistance</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>programme</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>international</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>aid</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>program</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>cida</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>third</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>assistance</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>canadians</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>programs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>projects</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>help</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>programmes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>policy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>project</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>business</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>humanitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>governments</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>projects</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>resources</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>bilateral</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>cooperation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>developing</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>economic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>oda</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>health</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>efforts</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>institutions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>sector</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>africa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>population</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>partnership</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>sector</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>basic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>partners</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>helping</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>needs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>ngos</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>management</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>population</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>policy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>resources</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>public</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>multilateral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>poverty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP WORD</td>
<td>CIDA WORD</td>
<td>USAID WORD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td>need</td>
<td>problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td>bank</td>
<td>supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>initiatives</td>
<td>agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>organizations</td>
<td>efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elections</td>
<td>rights</td>
<td>world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established</td>
<td>health</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>global</td>
<td>address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nations</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>policies</td>
<td>markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>foreign</td>
<td>provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>environment</td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary</td>
<td>project</td>
<td>encourage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>information</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>fund</td>
<td>host</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electoral</td>
<td>issues</td>
<td>impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional</td>
<td>poorest</td>
<td>sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainable</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>strengthen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>better</td>
<td>access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international</td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td>centres</td>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td>ensure</td>
<td>private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rights</td>
<td>official</td>
<td>PVOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td>regional</td>
<td>coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy</td>
<td>resource</td>
<td>enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td>debt</td>
<td>government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>systems</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>role</td>
<td>prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>respond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>structural</td>
<td>women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas</td>
<td>students</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better</td>
<td>environmental</td>
<td>country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td>growth</td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td>progress</td>
<td>human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private</td>
<td>universities</td>
<td>basic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reform</td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>contribute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehabilitation</td>
<td>funding</td>
<td>crises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology</td>
<td>goods</td>
<td>practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>national</td>
<td>small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies</td>
<td>asia</td>
<td>civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth</td>
<td>improve</td>
<td>emergency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>launched</td>
<td>involved</td>
<td>mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
WORD FREQUENCY LISTS FOR GRASSROOTS DOCUMENTS
First Ninety-Three Words
(with some words excluded as noted on page 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous (Eng.)</th>
<th>Indigenous (Spa.)</th>
<th>Non-Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># WORD</td>
<td># WORD</td>
<td># WORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 women</td>
<td>35 vida</td>
<td>45 trabajadores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136 indigenous</td>
<td>33 indígenas</td>
<td>40 derechos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 people</td>
<td>24 pueblos</td>
<td>38 compañeros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 indian</td>
<td>17 comunidades</td>
<td>35 guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 work</td>
<td>15 pueblo</td>
<td>34 lucha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 children</td>
<td>12 derechos</td>
<td>31 gobierno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 men</td>
<td>12 historia</td>
<td>31 humanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 organizations</td>
<td>12 identidad</td>
<td>30 nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 communities</td>
<td>12 mujer</td>
<td>27 ejército</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 community</td>
<td>11 madre</td>
<td>25 campo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 life</td>
<td>11 mundo</td>
<td>24 trabajo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 peoples</td>
<td>11 sistemas</td>
<td>23 fincas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 world</td>
<td>9 experiencia</td>
<td>20 popular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 organization</td>
<td>9 mayas</td>
<td>20 salario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 woman</td>
<td>9 muerte</td>
<td>19 contra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 together</td>
<td>8 tierra</td>
<td>17 mínimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 traditional</td>
<td>7 comunión</td>
<td>17 sindical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 earth</td>
<td>7 corazón</td>
<td>16 civil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 time</td>
<td>7 crecimiento</td>
<td>16 comunidades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 culture</td>
<td>7 espíritu</td>
<td>16 pais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 rights</td>
<td>7 evangelización</td>
<td>16 represión</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 struggle</td>
<td>7 Guatemala</td>
<td>16 unidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 international</td>
<td>7 mapuche</td>
<td>15 paz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 live</td>
<td>7 mujeres</td>
<td>15 población</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 way</td>
<td>7 religioso</td>
<td>15 sectores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 problems</td>
<td>7 unidad</td>
<td>14 campesinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 working</td>
<td>6 construir</td>
<td>14 empresas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 cultural</td>
<td>6 cultura</td>
<td>14 movimiento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 mother</td>
<td>6 cultural</td>
<td>14 situación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 need</td>
<td>6 desicion</td>
<td>13 acción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 education</td>
<td>6 hijos</td>
<td>13 organización</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 land</td>
<td>6 humano</td>
<td>13 pueblos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 national</td>
<td>6 indígena</td>
<td>13 salarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 ourselves</td>
<td>6 organizaciones</td>
<td>12 vida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 role</td>
<td>6 padre</td>
<td>11 acuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 living</td>
<td>6 proyectos</td>
<td>11 banco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 natural</td>
<td>6 realidad</td>
<td>11 condiciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 participate</td>
<td>5 acción</td>
<td>11 derecho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 same</td>
<td>5 capacidad</td>
<td>11 ley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 society</td>
<td>5 común</td>
<td>11 organizaciones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 continue</td>
<td>5 comunitaria</td>
<td>11 pac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 important</td>
<td>5 conciencia</td>
<td>11 servicio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 meeting</td>
<td>5 desarrollo</td>
<td>11 sociedad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 situation</td>
<td>5 hermanos</td>
<td>10 capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous (Eng.)</td>
<td>Indigenous (Spa.)</td>
<td>Non-Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>central</td>
<td>historica</td>
<td>internacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>lucha</td>
<td>luchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>pobreza</td>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>trabajo</td>
<td>sociales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different</td>
<td>amor</td>
<td>ciudad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
<td>autentica</td>
<td>clase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lands</td>
<td>comunidad</td>
<td>crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapuche</td>
<td>conquista</td>
<td>demandas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizing</td>
<td>creacion</td>
<td>guatemaltecos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>esperanza</td>
<td>hombres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic</td>
<td>estado</td>
<td>imunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaders</td>
<td>evangelio</td>
<td>indigenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation</td>
<td>ganancias</td>
<td>necesidades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td>hijo</td>
<td>ninos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>right</td>
<td>injusticia</td>
<td>pobreza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sisters</td>
<td>internacional</td>
<td>politica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spanish</td>
<td>libertad</td>
<td>trabajador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td>politicos</td>
<td>viudas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td>programa</td>
<td>administracion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>propia</td>
<td>apoyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level</td>
<td>propio</td>
<td>atencion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little</td>
<td>respeto</td>
<td>banco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>siglos</td>
<td>cuc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td>territorio</td>
<td>grandes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>tierras</td>
<td>habitacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect</td>
<td>vivimos</td>
<td>institucion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without</td>
<td>vivir</td>
<td>instituto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aymara</td>
<td>vocacion</td>
<td>justo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human</td>
<td>apoyo</td>
<td>militar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look</td>
<td>argentina</td>
<td>mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot</td>
<td>autoctona</td>
<td>problemas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>cambios</td>
<td>republica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual</td>
<td>caminos</td>
<td>solidaridad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training</td>
<td>capaces</td>
<td>tierra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unity</td>
<td>concreta</td>
<td>trabajadora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ways</td>
<td>constituye</td>
<td>violencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bolivia</td>
<td>contra</td>
<td>vivir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>creyente</td>
<td>cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>culturales</td>
<td>comunidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pain</td>
<td>culturas</td>
<td>control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according</td>
<td>dignidad</td>
<td>dirigentes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against</td>
<td>distintas</td>
<td>eaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>care</td>
<td>distintos</td>
<td>elementos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>dolor</td>
<td>estado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day</td>
<td>encarnacion</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defend</td>
<td>esencia</td>
<td>hermanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destruction</td>
<td>experiencias</td>
<td>laborales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult</td>
<td>familia</td>
<td>luchas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Documents Used in Qualitative Analysis

(Missing numbers indicate documents not used in this analysis.)

Doc 1 "Primera Resolución de la Cumbre de los Pueblos Indígenas Para la Organización de las Naciones Unidas".
Native-L, n.d.

Doc 2 "Innu Challenge Nfld Hydro".

Doc 3 "Bill Namagoose (of the Cree) speech at Tufts".

Doc 4 Untitled (excerpts from Voices of Resistance).
Native-L, n.d.

Doc 5 "Brecha: International Maya League".

Doc 6 "Panama Commission document".

Doc 7 "Resolutions: Inter-Amer Indig Conf".

Doc 9 "Ecuador: Indígenas Acusan A Transna".

Doc 10 "Ambiente/Ecuador: Indios rechazan la expansión petrolera".

Doc 12 "Amazonia: Indígenas Rechazen Acuerdos Regionales de Explotación".

Doc 13 "NGO/Indigenous Treaty".


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author/Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Lucha Sindical y Popular Epoca II, No.8, Agosto.</td>
<td>Equipo de Apoyo Sindical (EAPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Boletín Informativo, Octubre.</td>
<td>Comité de Unidad Campesina (CUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>&quot;Los Organismos Del Estado Deben Atender El Clamor Del Pueblo&quot;</td>
<td>Guatemala: Comité de Unidad Campesina (CUC), photocopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>&quot;Comunicado: Dia Nacional Mapuche&quot;</td>
<td>Comité de Unidad Campesina (CUC), photocopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Alderete, Wara et al., eds. Daughters of Abya Yala:</td>
<td>Testimonies of Indian Women Organizing Throughout the Continent. Oakland: Women's Committee of the South and Meso-American Indian Information Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1987 Sharing Our Future: Canadian International Development Assistance. Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
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1992 Alderete, Wara et al., eds. Daughters of Abya Yala: Testimonies of Indian Women Organizing Throughout the Continent. Oakland: Women's Committee of the South and Meso-American Indian Information Center.


1987 Sharing Our Future: Canadian International Development Assistance. Minister of Supply and Services Canada.


1993 "Los Organismos Del Estado Deben Atender El Clamor Del Pueblo" 7 de Septiembre. Guatemala: Comité de Unidad Campesina (CUC), photocopy.


1993 "Comunicado Urgente de los Sectores Surgidos por la Represión y la Impunidad Ante los Últimos Hechos de Represión" Marzo. Guatemala: Sectores Surgidos por la Represión y la Impunidad, photocopy.
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