
Culture and development: taking culture seriously in development for Andean indigenous people

Sarah A Radcliffe

Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge CB2 3EN, England; e-mail: sar23@cam.ac.uk

Nina Laurie

School of Geography, Politics and Sociology, University of Newcastle, Newcastle upon Tyne, England; e-mail: nina.laurie@ncl.ac.uk

Received 29 July 2004; in revised form 15 October 2004

Abstract. In this paper we develop a critical analysis of the new paradigm of culture and development, in which culture is taken seriously as a factor in development thinking and policy. Our analysis aims to understand how and where concepts of culture have come into development thinking and planning. Viewing cultures as multiple and development as a set of culturally embedded practices and meanings, our approach raises issues about how development paradigms have adopted explicit concepts of culture and/or carried within them implicit cultural norms. In this paper we develop a postcolonial and poststructuralist account sensitive to the historically and geographically variable and contested nature of the connections of culture with development, and analyze the ways in which ‘culturally appropriate development’ is thought and practiced in the Andes.

Cultural assumptions and hierarchies have always underpinned ideas of progress and development interventions. Although the concept of culture is ambiguous and subject to fierce debate, development policy and interventions have often assumed that successful development enhances economically and socially beneficial patterns of behavior and attitudes, while downgrading what it sees as ‘inappropriate’ culture. If we define development as intentional practices to produce broad-based and sustained change, culture—a way of life, material products, and structures of feelings—is clearly crucial to the implementation of development. In recent years development has undergone a cultural turn in which culture is given due significance as a factor in development projects and programs. Increasingly, development looks to culture as a resource and as a significant variable explaining the success of development interventions. The new culture and development paradigm is highly diverse but shares a multidisciplinary perspective that culture, in connection with other factors, plays a role in development outcomes. The cultural paradigm is not unconnected to other shifts in development. “Culture comes into development studies at a time of retreat from structural and macro approaches in favor of micro and actor-oriented approaches” (Nederveen Pieterse, 2001, page 60), as well as feminist and postdevelopment critiques that question the masculinist and Western positionality of much development (Chua et al, 2000). Culture thus has to be situated firmly within an analysis of the grids of power inherent to development and the hierarchies between world regions, races, cultures, and modernity or tradition.

The new culture and development paradigm draws on specific theoretical and conceptual frameworks as well as on a complex history of development thinking about how culture and development come together in specific social, political, and economic settings (Arizpe, 2004). We engage in this debate in two major ways. First, we put culture and development thinking into a broader context than do recent reviews. Previous reviews tend to engage only one aspect of the breadth of the culture and development paradigm, viewing it as the outcome of the shifting cultural values of

development, or of local initiatives, or of the recognition of complexity in development thinking (Allen, 2000; Nederveen Pieterse, 2001; Rao and Walton, 2004). By contrast, in this paper we advocate a postcolonial development geography approach in which the culture and development paradigm is seen to emerge from ongoing contestatory efforts to ensure that development ‘deals with culture’, either implicitly through underlying normative ideas (that is, normalizing certain cultural behaviors and attitudes) or—in certain moments and places—by making culture an explicit part of the toolbox of development. The culture and development paradigm introduces ‘culture’ not only through its specific paradigm and working definitions of culture (held variously—sometimes at odds—by planners, practitioners, and beneficiaries), but also through a broader field of different cultural registers (including state and popular cultures, youth and organizational cultures, etc). Second, we explore *how* and *where* culture becomes central in development interventions, by examining the case of Andean ‘culturally appropriate’ development for indigenous people. Viewing cultures as multiple and development as a set of culturally embedded practices and meanings, our approach raises questions about how development paradigms have adopted explicit concepts of culture and/or carried within them implicit cultural norms.

In the last decade the explicit turn of development studies to the cultural has occurred for a number of reasons. In many respects the West is arguably no longer a privileged interlocutor in development and modernity (Nederveen Pieterse, 2001). Development economics looks to culture as its placeless and asocial analysis is increasingly questioned (Clague and Grossbard-Shechtman, 2001; Sen, 2004). Labor segregation caused by perceptions of cultural attributes impedes flexibility and wastes human capital (Kliksberg, 1999). Moreover, cultural difference represents a potential global market. In addressing issues about social and political development, policy encompasses a regard for cultural diversity and a concern for cohesion (Allen, 2000). From a distinct perspective, postdevelopment writers view the Western domain of the power and knowledge inherent to development as dangerous for multiple popular cultures in the South (Escobar, 1995a; Rahnema and Bawtree, 1997).

In these diverse—and often incommensurate—moves to recognize cultural difference, development treats culture as a significant facet of its goals and means. However, culture has no agreed definition as it remains a highly ambiguous concept notoriously difficult to define (Fox and King, 2002; Gardner and Lewis, 1996; Mitchell, 2000). Williams defines culture as “a constitutive social process, creating specific and different ways of life, ... with an emphasis on a material social process” (1977, page 19); he also attributes significance to structures of feelings, namely “meanings and values as they are actively lived and felt, ... the relations between these and formal or systematic beliefs are in practice variable” (page 133). At the crux of definitional difficulties lies the need to combine an understanding of contested meanings (elite versus popular culture) with material culture (which embodies socioeconomic organization, meanings, and inequalities), structures of feeling, and forms of social organization (such as kinship or religion). Such a multifaceted notion of culture implies that fixed definitions are difficult to achieve but provide a working definition (Allen, 2000). Whereas culture became established in academic anthropology as a separate category to relations of class, race, nation, and history (Trouillot, 2002, page 41), analysts have recently begun to combine more open definitions of culture with an understanding of racial formations, political economies, and history.

Taking on board a view of culture as multifaceted and embedded in power relations, we first provide an overview of current development debates on culture, and, by means of a critique of postdevelopment perspectives, propose a conceptual framework by which the broad and multiple facets of culture and development can be understood.

From a poststructuralist and postcolonial perspective, this paper analyzes what ‘taking culture seriously’ entails for policy, development outcomes, and subaltern empowerment in the context of globalizing power relations and political economies. Then this framework is utilized to analyze culturally appropriate development for indigenous people—Indians⁽¹⁾—in Ecuador and Bolivia. By exploring how Indian culture has been brought into recent policy called ‘development with identity’, we analyze the implications of the cultural turn in development for policy on the ground. Drawing on original research, we identify two key aspects of mainstream culture and development policy and thinking, namely their instrumental treatment of Andean indigenous culture as a product and as an institution. After the Andean case, we end by arguing for the interpretation of culture as a contested arena and as the basis for creativity and innovative flexibility, which are discussed in the final section.

Culture and development beyond postdevelopment

In order to understand the recent mainstreaming of culture in development policy, in this paper we argue for a new approach to be taken to cultural issues in development. Rather than view culture as intrinsically beneficial or obstructive to development, we argue for development to be considered in relation to the “kinetic, mutable and non-consensual character” of culture (Larson, 1995, page 19), and to the constantly shifting views of culture in development. Our approach views cultures as multiple and views development as a set of culturally embedded practices and meanings, and thus raises issues about how development paradigms have adopted explicit concepts of culture and/or carried within them implicit cultural norms. Asking the questions about *how* and *where* culture has been brought into development thinking, we offer a post-colonial and poststructural account sensitive to the historically and geographically variable and contested nature of the connections of culture with development.

Implicit assumptions about which *type* of culture accompanies development have, through much of the 20th century, been informed by colonial and then by broadly Western assumptions about the beneficial influence of certain cultural traits and beliefs, and about the inappropriateness of Other meanings and forms of organization. During the 1950s and 1960s, policymakers were encouraged to promote modern cultural traits following Talcott Parsons’s functional sociology (Turner, 1999). Modernization theories of development were premised upon the need to change how people act, think, and live, dragging them away from ‘traditional’ practices and introducing them to modern or Western culture (Schech and Haggis, 2000, pages 11, 33). While W W Rostow’s modernization model implied that US cultures of consumerism represented the epitome of development (Rostow, 1960), Parsons argued that certain habits of mind and behaviors would benefit modernization. In this way, development thinking took on board the notion that culture can be acquired and learned. Development was the task of removing what were perceived as cultural barriers to progress; the failure to develop was attributed to cultural characteristics such as agricultural involution, family and kin ties, specific cognitive maps, and the culture of poverty (Allen, 2000; on cultures of poverty, see Lewis, 1959). Non-Western—‘traditional’—cultures were perceived as fading relics that would inevitably and unproblematically be replaced by modern cultures and identities.

For many years after modernization, the engagement of mainstream development in issues of culture was denied because of its colonial legacy and the culturalist

⁽¹⁾ Andean indigenous people trace their ancestry from pre-Conquest populations, which were densely settled in this region. In this paper the terms ‘Indian’ and ‘indigenous’ are used interchangeably.

explanations of modernization (Worsley 1999, page 30).⁽²⁾ However, culture has become a significant—and acknowledged—facet of development thinking in recent years, as it focuses attention on diversity and complexity and deals with issues of cohesion (Kliksberg, 1999; Worsley, 1999, page 30). Whether in terms of the role of traditional institutions in natural-resource management (Watson, 2003), indigenous culture as a tourist attraction (Wilson, 2003), or indigenous culture as the ‘missing link’ in African development (Prah, 2001), culture is increasingly viewed as a factor in development outcomes, increasing the meaningfulness of policy interventions. A number of conceptual aspects have contributed to the rising importance of culture in mainstream development. First, the concept of social capital—referring to embedded meaningful forms of social organization—has become widely used in development, especially by economists and neoliberal development studies (Fine, 2001). Second, the recruitment of anthropologists into social development is reflected in new thinking about culture (Davis, 1999; Eyben, 2000).⁽³⁾ Third, major international initiatives placed culture and development together, as in the United Nations Decade for Cultural Development (1988–97), and began to talk about ‘culturally appropriate development’ (Davis, 1999, page 28; UNDP, 2004). This ‘cultural lens’ places culture at the center of development, viewing it as neither inherently damaging nor inherently beneficial (Rao and Walton, 2004).

Outside mainstream development, postdevelopment approaches articulate a distinct perspective on culture, whereby the languages and practices of development are deconstructed as an example of Western dominance. Viewing development as a singular domain of thought and action, postdevelopment writers critique the arbitrary, cultural-historically specific and dangerous application of Western categories to diverse peoples of the global South (Escobar, 1995b; Sachs, 1992). Rejecting the management ethos and scientific techniques of the modernity of development, postdevelopment critiques development as a monolithic imposition of Western notions of modernity, progress, and knowledge upon distinct belief systems and cultures. Postdevelopment writers in turn favor local and popular non-Western cultures and domains of knowledge, through which alternatives to development are seen to emerge (Escobar, 1995b; Sachs, 1992). In the words of Escobar, one of the exponents of postdevelopment, “The greatest political promise of minority cultures is their potential for resisting and subverting the axiomatics of capitalism and modernity in their hegemonic form” (1995b, page 225).

However, despite its widespread influence on development thinking, postdevelopment provides a misplaced poststructuralist framework for approaching issues of culture in development. Here we highlight three key limitations in postdevelopment thinking about culture, and offer an alternative approach. First, although the tools of discourse analysis and deconstruction adopted by postdevelopment writers serve to unpack the cultural assumptions of development, this has often been at the expense of understanding the shifts in development paradigms over time and the contradictory incompleteness of the actions of development (Corbridge, 1998; Power, 2003). Postdevelopment critiques overgeneralize about the pernicious effects of Western development, contrasting the evil North and the noble South (Kiely, 1999) and dichotomizing the cultural options as either Westernization or local cultures. “While [postdevelopment] champions cultural diversity and difference as a source of resistance against Western

⁽²⁾ Culturalist explanations of development have not disappeared (for example, Harrison and Huntington, 2000; compare Hart, 2002).

⁽³⁾ By the late 1990s the new World Bank social development office employed over 100 social scientists, most of them anthropologists and most of them from the global South. Between 1988 and 1990 the number of social development advisors rose in number from two to nearly sixty in the UK Department for International Development.

domination, development itself is portrayed in terms of a monolithic hegemony” (Kiely, 1999, page 38). The postdevelopmentalist reduction of the complex histories of development has been widely critiqued (Lehmann, 1997). As an alternative, post-structuralist analysis of culture and development deconstructs the ‘mainstream’ modernization or neoliberal approaches, providing a full account of complex and historically sensitive genealogies of development thinking. Such an analysis can trace the intellectual histories of development that predate and inform the current turn to culture (Kothari, 2001; Power and Sidaway, 2004).

Second, postdevelopment approaches to development tend not to acknowledge the recent mainstreaming of the cultural turn in development. As a “neo-traditionalist reaction against modernity” (Nederveen Pieterse, 1998, page 343), postdevelopment denies the engagement of development thinking with cultural issues, seeing culture as everything that development is not. In celebrating local cultures as alternatives to ‘standard’ development, Escobar’s early writing, for example, fails to recognize the cultural turn in development (Escobar, 1995b; compare Lehmann, 1997). By contrast, the critic of postdevelopment, Nederveen Pieterse, views culture and development as an interpellation between grassroots development initiatives, community-bound definitions of tradition, and an “enacted post-colonial strategy” (2001, pages 63–65). However, even Nederveen Pieterse’s approach underestimates the degree to which current—primarily neoliberal—development views culture as a key factor and how international organizations devise cultural policies (Rao and Walton, 2004). From the mid-1990s, World Bank President Wolfensohn argued there was a “need for greater sensitivity to and investment in national and local culture in the Bank’s new development agenda” (Davis, 1999, page 26). Critical poststructuralist accounts of culture and development thus need to analyze how global development policy “contain[s] a more pro-active vision of incorporating a cultural dimension into the development process” (page 27). In this sense, Nederveen Pieterse’s account of culture and development as local, scaled at the ‘grassroots’ level, and bounded by traditional communities fails to acknowledge the multiscale and overlapping spaces within which culture and development policy is deployed.

Third, postdevelopment thinking tends to focus on Western culture as the alpha and omega of interventions, downplaying the role of nationalism in development programs, and the global arena of action which development spans. Postdevelopment reduces development to a monolithic Western construct, thereby overlooking how it “is indigenized by different localities” (Kiely, 1999, page 48). In contrast to postdevelopment, we can recognize the dialectic and iterative relationship of nationalism with shifting development agendas, narratives, and projects. Development modernities combined with invented tradition and identities create a hybrid national development trajectory, resulting in diverse development–cultural connotations and content. Postcolonial national imaginaries are often intricately bound up with development, whereby national self-realization is to be achieved through development success (Abercrombie, 1991; Gupta, 1998). Moreover, by opposing Western and local cultures, postdevelopment downplays the increasingly global field in which cultural issues are debated, as well as the divisions and inequalities in ‘indigenous’ cultures (Lehmann, 1997).

By deconstructing a monolithic Western development paradigm, postdevelopment elides the issue of how best to analyze culture in a globalizing world, and global–national inflections of development. By romanticizing alternatives to development—albeit to recognize grassroots struggles for rights—postdevelopment creates a disabling dichotomy between pristine grassroots cultures on the one hand and the homogenizing impulses of a universal Western culture on the other. The postdevelopment framework does an

injustice to regionally and context-specific development thinking about culture. For example, in Latin America conditions of urban poverty prompted Oscar Lewis (1959) to consider the role of a 'culture of poverty' in perpetuating marginalization, whereas in sub-Saharan Africa the cultural meanings around herding were explored in the 'cattle complex' development paradigm (Allen, 2000). Postdevelopment thinking over-generalizes about the relationship of development with the global South, attributing development with no ability to transform the way it approaches culture. Consequently, postdevelopment fails to recognize the recent cultural turn in development thinking and policy, attributing grassroots cultures alone with an ability to combine cultural appropriateness and development goals.

Analysis of the significance of culture for development requires a nuanced, historico-geographical account of the cultural assumptions informing development thinking, as well as an account of the specific paradigms and dimensions of culture that are called upon in recent culture and development policy. Questions about culture and development must be concerned with political economies, inequalities, and how "discourse itself is intensely material" (Blunt and McEwan, 2002, page 5; Power, 2003). Building on postcolonial geographies of development (Radcliffe, 2005), we argue for a grounded account of culture and development that takes the recent cultural turn in development into account. A critical account also examines how development is resisted and adapted in national–regional contexts, varying with political economies, histories, and geographies (Crush, 1995). Development thinking can learn much from recent debates on the nonbounded and deterritorialized cultures and meanings that circulate in a global field (Buroway et al, 2000). Development is not 'Western'; it is engaged with various forms of cultural thinking and regional cultures. Acknowledging that development interventions are always site specific and culturally distinctive highlights the insertion of development into broader cultural and geographical grounding making it ineluctably "cultural geographic" (Watts, 2002, page 435). Development thinking arises from, and contributes to, specific social definitions, assumptions, and mental maps: as such, it constitutes a part of diverse sociocultural milieus. Development thinking and policy do not transcend their cultural embeddedness and the ways in which diverse cultural attributes and attitudes are contested, judged, evaluated, or taken for granted. In this account, development can be considered in a globalized field of multiple meanings, practices, and cultures, where cultural difference is not an alternative *to* development but informs the contested relations upon which development is built and policy prescriptions are devised. Culture has never gone out of development (Watts, 2002) but where it has gone *in* and *how* have varied geographically, culturally, and historically.

Culture and development in the Andes: from cultural hierarchies to culturally appropriate development

Having outlined an analytical framework, we now examine the recent move to take indigenous culture seriously in Andean development. After sketching out the view of Indian cultures from the perspective of development during the 20th century, the recent rise in significance of indigenous cultures in the region's development policy is described. In the context of Andean indigenous development,⁽⁴⁾ our account places the recent shift to culture and development thinking within a historically and geographically specific, kinetic and global field of cultural, social, economic, and political negotiations.

⁽⁴⁾ Indigenous development is used here as a shorthand for development with indigenous people as beneficiaries; it makes no assumptions about the ability of Indians to define the terms of this development intervention.

Culture is being taken seriously in the South American countries of Ecuador and Bolivia, where policies for culturally appropriate development for indigenous people have come to the fore. In both countries—as in other Latin American countries with substantial indigenous populations—a paradigm of development with identity has emerged. In other words, Andean development with identity provides a regionally specific example of the broad culture and development paradigm. In these new approaches, indigenous culture—once seen as an obstacle to social and economic development—has become central to poverty-alleviation and empowerment policies. Around 40% of Ecuador's population speak an Indian language, self-identify as indigenous, and/or live their lives by indigenous social organization, in one of nine major groups. In Bolivia, Indians constitute 59% of the population, in 36 linguistic groups, although Aymara-speaking and Quechua-speaking people constitute 25% and 33% of the highland population, respectively. In both countries, Indian groups are highly diverse culturally and economically, yet have often been sidelined by state and international development programs. Whereas during most of the 20th century it was assumed that indigenous cultures would disappear as development progressed (Hettne, 1996, page 15), development policy shifted significantly in the 1980s to mid-1990s when the contribution—not the barrier—of diverse indigenous cultures was recognized. In the next section we briefly outline how development in the region historically viewed (Indian) culture in order to contextualize the cultural turn that gave rise to development with identity, described in the next section.

Indigenous cultures as a block to development in the Andes

Although indigenous populations represent a majority in Bolivia and a large minority in Ecuador, their presence has been perceived as problematic in most development thinking by governments and elites. After independence from Spain, Andean social and political elites equated modernity with Western economies, politics, and societies. Racial anxiety about Indians, African-Americans, and Latin Americans compounded the fear among elites that the only solution to these countries' problems was to adopt European—and later North American—modes of social organization, values, and forms of economy (Graham, 1990). Government and state concern about the lack of indigenous engagement in market-led modernity, and the ambiguous status of indigenous people in nationhood characterized mainstream development thinking (Larraín, 2000; Larson, 1995; Weismantel, 2001). Although elements of Indian cultures were appropriated as symbols in nation-building and national imaginaries,⁽⁵⁾ these were largely divorced from the business of development and modernity. In Ecuador and Bolivia mainstream development argued that, through agricultural modernization and industrial development, Indians would be converted into culturally homogeneous farmers (*campesinos*) and urbanites. By means of education, hygiene measures, control of markets, and discourses of race and gender, Indian populations were erased from national development imaginaries at the same time that diverse spaces were reconfigured to marginalize them spatially and socially (Radcliffe, 1999). For example, Ecuador's mostly female market sellers were treated by development planning as dirty, out of place, and morally suspect (Weismantel, 2001). Development was envisioned as a form of cultural integration in which urbanization and nationalism would forge citizens with shared cultural reference points.

Such an account of Indians' troubled relationship with the prevailing notions of (racialized) culture in development is mediated not merely by a 'Western' development agenda. Despite the United States' cold war treatment of the region as its backyard,

⁽⁵⁾ For example, pre-Colombian ruins were restored, and indigenous costumes were used in folkloric national parades and dances (Abercrombie, 1991).

culture and development were mutually informed in Ecuador and Bolivia by a complex layering of national, elite, and regional cultural influences. While elites and intellectuals argued for Hispanic authoritarian culture to be replaced by (European or North American) modernity and industrialization, the development crisis of the 1980s gave rise to regional responses including new romantic views of Indians, as well as religious transformations and postmodernism (Larraín, 2000). Moreover, a powerful imaginative geography known as Andeanism, which attributes the Andes with a distinctive regional culture (with distinctive unmodern Indians, and isolation from markets and the nation), remained in place throughout the 20th century, and informed attitudes of development planners, states, and popular cultures to the region's possibilities and problems (Zoomers and Salman, 2003). As a result of the materially influential discourse of Andeanism the goal of development was to bring 'ignorant' Indians into commerce and labor markets (Zoomers and Salman, 2003, pages 4–5), as the blame for underdevelopment lay squarely on indigenous shoulders.⁽⁶⁾ Last, Andean development cultures have been shaped by distinctive Latin American forms of modernity that combine (masked) racism, social conservatism, and limited civil society (Larraín, 2000). In this context, indigenous groups have faced racist exclusion from political power and development decisionmaking, while dealing with restricted opportunities to generate a public debate in civil society. In the wake of peaceful civil protest by indigenous organizations and widening measures to establish indigenous rights at international and national levels (Brysk, 2000; Sieder, 2002), including global neoliberal development agendas to address social difference (Tulchin and Garland, 2000), development thinking and practice around Indian culture began to change.

Development celebrates Andean indigenous culture

In a radical departure from prevailing development thinking, the adoption of a cultural framework has shifted Andean development paradigms and practice. Although culture never went out of development, in this section we examine how and where (Indian) culture has been drawn into the current reconfigurations of development. In the 1970s, diverse experiments in culturally appropriate development were funded and supported by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and indigenous organizations before they were adopted and celebrated by states and international agencies in the 1990s. Development with identity thus remains highly diverse in its frameworks, foundational concepts, and specific interventions. A continuum exists between postdevelopment approaches fighting for pre-Conquest cultures, on the one hand, and neoliberal promotion of entrepreneurial 'cultural reformers', on the other. From a postdevelopment perspective, the Peruvian NGO PRATEC (Proyecto Andino de Tecnologías Campesinas) criticizes development for destroying indigenous knowledge and society. By recuperating pre-Colombian organization and technology, PRATEC fights for decolonization and autochthonous solutions (Apfell-Marglin, 1998). At the other end of the continuum, cultural reformers and new entrepreneurs are encouraged by market incentives to create favorable environments for economic growth (Hojman, 1999).

In Bolivia and Ecuador, culturally appropriate development primarily aims to alleviate the widespread poverty experienced by Indian groups, which results from historic exclusion and recent neoliberal restructuring (Pacari, 1996), and to enhance—rather than destroy—Indian culture (Kleymeyer, 1995). Andean Indians are among the poorest groups in their respective countries. Around 64% of Bolivia's Indians are under the poverty line, compared with around 50% of the total population, whereas in Ecuador 77% of Indians are poor. Although targeted measures to alleviate the impact of adjustment

⁽⁶⁾ For a discussion of how Andeanism influenced development with identity in neoliberal policy circles see Radcliffe et al (forthcoming b).

on poorer populations are widespread (Segarra, 2000), the development paradigm that addresses Indians' *specific* position and/or which attempts to adapt indigenous culture in some way to development objectives is only found in certain countries. Such policies exemplify the wider cultural turn in development thinking, illustrating how culture and development thinking takes on regional patterns.

Projects drawing on indigenous culture vary greatly in their staffing, definition of beneficiaries, origins, funding, and criteria for success, which provides an opportunity to examine the ways in which diverse groups and actors deploy culture. Culture has come into indigenous development in a number of ways. Most significantly, culture—often substituted for the term 'tradition'—is now perceived as an engine for growth and social development. The discussion here is based on numerous examples of development that draw upon one or more aspects of indigenous culture. These vary from the Otavalo group's grassroots action to capture successfully international textile markets, to the World Bank funded nationwide project in Ecuador where state-employed indigenous professionals galvanize and then fund local projects in production and cultural recuperation.

In the words of an Inter-American Development Bank report, "strengthening cultural identity and sustainable development are mutually reinforcing" (Deruyttere, 1997, page 9). For example, the major PRODEPINE project in Ecuador—*Proyecto de Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas y Negros del Ecuador* (the Development Project of Indigenous and Black Peoples of Ecuador)—funds the recuperation of indigenous culture, which is equated with festivals, rituals, and archaeological sites. Funded by the World Bank and IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development), PRODEPINE funded festivals, video work, and crafts to "rescue and strengthen a rich cultural patrimony". The Bolivian CONAMAQ (Consejo Nacional de Ayllus y Markas del Quollasuyu) indigenous organization also galvanizes the energies from indigenous cultural recuperation with transnational funding. By reinforcing Indian political and social structures such as *ayni*, *mink'a*, and *choqo* (reciprocity arrangements and collective labor), the organization enacts an anticolonial strategy of de-Westernization. Such shifts in development thinking also occur in state policies (Andolina et al, 2005). Responding to international negotiations with indigenous peoples and NGOs, the Bolivian government passed indigenous rights legislation and made 'development with identity' the basis of the Indigenous Ministry policy. In Ecuador, the Indigenous Council (with indigenous and nonindigenous staff) encourages the government to adopt Indian customs in administration. Government budgets have been channeled into indigenous development: the Bolivian Social Fund and the Campesino Fund allocate 10% of funds to cultural recuperation, which is similar to the Ecuadorian government's funding of PRODEPINE.

The concept of social capital has been highly influential in making forms of indigenous social organization visible and useful for neoliberal development thinking (Radcliffe et al, forthcoming a). Culture as social capital is brought into the heart of culture and development debates, adopted by analysts on both left and right eager to outflank the market and the state, respectively (Nederveen Pieterse, 2001, page 124). For multilateral agencies, indigenous social capital provides a platform for development, as it is "the start-up capital for sustainable social and economic development" (Deruyttere, 1997, page 10; also authors' interviews, Washington and La Paz, 2000; 2004). According to the architects of a major World Bank indigenous development program, "social exclusion, economic deprivation and political marginalization are sometimes perceived as the predominant characteristics of Ecuador's indigenous people. But as they often remind others, indigenous people also have strong positive attributes, particularly their high level of social capital" (van Nieuwkoop and

Uquillas, 2000, page 18; also interviews Washington and Quito, 2000; Quito, 2000). Andean indigenous culture is associated with Parsonian traditional attributes of social trust, moral economy, nonfinancial exchanges, stability, people orientation, strong connection to the natural world, and a sense of place. According to a major development NGO, Andean Indians “really maintain their culture, their own identity. There’s really a lot of vigor in their culture, their technologies, their wisdom” (interview, Lima, 2000). Parson’s modernization vocabulary reappears, albeit as a mirror image, as Indian societies’ previously negative features have now become their positive attributes. What development wanted to eradicate in the 1960s is now the holy grail of indigenous development projects. Neoliberal development presumes that social capital strengthening will expand other forms of capital while retaining indigenous groups’ cultural specificity (Davis, 2002; van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas, 2000, page 4).

In addition to social capital attributes, culture is brought into indigenous development as gendered, and in relation to the figure of the entrepreneur. Planners and (primarily male) beneficiary groups view Indian women as the embodiment of cultural specificity. In an interview with us a senior World Bank anthropologist argued that “women, in effect, are the culture, where the [Indian] culture is made”, and an international development NGO spokesperson said that indigenous women are “the reserves really, the possessors of ancestral cultures” (interviews, Washington, 2000, and La Paz, 1999). In this context the mobilization of women responds as much to organization and donor support for female cultural leadership and development knowledge as to female empowerment (Radcliffe et al, 2004). Additionally, indigenous culture is judged in terms of whether it is entrepreneurial, able to exploit market opportunities. According to a senior World Bank staffer in La Paz, “we think now that there may be a significant role for culturally based—if you want—business initiatives”, exemplified by the “highly successful business people”, Ecuadorian Otavalos Indians and Bolivian Aymara traders (interview, La Paz, 1999). In the same vein, the Inter-American Development Bank provided a grant of \$1 million to encourage the business capacity of Ecuadorian indigenous people.

Culture and development policies in the Andes cannot be understood outside the context of subnational, national, and regional inflections of cultures. The specific manner of bringing culture into Andean development policy is, we argue, profoundly influenced by this multiscalar milieu rather than merely by ‘Western’ development paradigms or ‘local Indian cultures’ (Radcliffe et al, forthcoming b). Multilateral and bilateral agencies designate indigenous people as beneficiaries, but find it difficult to identify Indians on the ground. At the local level, Indian intellectuals and political organizations rearticulate tradition in ways that scale up to influence resource allocation. National-level development imaginaries and invented traditions intervene in the mix, shaping the types of Indian-ness that gain recognition and development attention. Pro-indigenous development has been adopted under neoliberal political economies and a constitutional politics of multiculturalism (Sieder, 2002). Moreover, neoliberal restructuring of Andean states around decentralization and citizen participation as well as around multicultural constitutions and reforms has shaped regional responses to culture and development. At the regional Andean scale, interviews and development literature contain strong echoes of Andeanism, demonstrated in the discourses used to describe Indians’ nonmarket economies, their lack of multiethnic contact, and cookie-cutter versions of culture. Development projects tend to treat Indians as novices in capitalism and as cultural isolates without intercultural engagements. Consequently, the broader ‘development with identity’ agendas of antiracism and interculturalism are sidelined particularly in multilateral projects (Laurie et al, 2003). Alternative economic models and organizational strengthening aspects tend not to receive equivalent

amounts of funding. At the global scale the International Labor Organization Convention number 169 on indigenous rights legitimated an agenda of indigenous legal rights to collective territory, decisionmaking powers over development, and respect for cultures. Such multiscale interactions shape the very terms of the culture and development debate, making a simple Western development versus local cultures dichotomy meaningless.

Culture as product and institution: an analysis of the cultural turn in Andean development

Drawing on the substantive case of Andean development with identity, in this section we develop an analysis of the insertion of culture into current policy. Specifically, we argue that culture has been brought into development primarily as a product and as an institution. If we look across social-capital-influenced projects two key strands are notable: namely the emphasis on Indian products and services, and the role of indigenous institutions in development. As development appropriates culture as a resource or as an institution, each understanding entails a particular articulation of tradition and modernity, while each interpretation offers distinct templates for development interventions (table 1).

Table 1. The use of culture in Andean indigenous development [source: prepared from interviews, project documents, and Carrasco et al (1999)].

Indigenous group and experience	Culture as institution	Culture as product	Culture as creativity
<i>Bolivia</i>			
Quinoa producers	✓	✓ (health food)	X
FACOPI ayllu group	✓	X	✓
FASOR ayllu group	✓	X	✓
Gremiales El Alto	X	na (local trade)	✓
Abapó-Camirihway	X	✓ (women's handicrafts)	?
<i>Ecuador</i>			
Guamote Municipality	✓ (partial)	na	✓
PRODEPINE	✓	(✓) varies with project	✓ (varies with project)
Otavaleños (trade/production)	X	✓ (ethnic crafts)	✓
Pijal (customary law)	✓	N/A	✓
Simiátug (education)	N/A	N/A	✓

Notes: ✓ aspect found; X aspect not found; ? evidence not clear; na not applicable.

Culture as product

Many culture and development projects emphasize a product or service which is distinctively 'Indian' or which is associated with a simpler or healthier lifestyle. Moreover, neoliberal development projects explicitly aim to generate income from indigenous culture (Davis, 2002). Development and state officials alike recognize the attractive niche represented by indigenous lifestyles and products. A romantic association with Indian lifeways contributes to a product's or service's value and attractiveness (Kaplan, 1995). According to Bolivia's minister of indigenous affairs, ethnotourism offers non-Western goods such as "generosity, goodness, communalism, participatory democracy and strong values" (quoted in Grey Postero, 2000). According to a report on Bolivia, there are several international and national niches for indigenous goods, yet the "economic advantages of living indigenous culture, whether native or vernacular"

(2000) have not been exploited. Advocates of indigenous development are highly attuned to such possibilities. Nontraditional exports, including organic cocoa, quinoa (an Andean grain), clothing, and wood products, have outlets in world markets, and ethnotourism and music exports are slowly expanding. In NGO-dominated alternative development, similar niches include ethno-agriculture, organic agriculture, indigenous crafts, and education and communication for diverse groups. Reasonable access to markets is a crucial precondition for indigenous productive enterprises (North and Cameron, 2000). Where considerable levels of infrastructure, information, and credit exist, Indian producers have been able to overcome problems of market access and control. In cases such as the Otavalos, indigenous producers have been able to retain a degree of control over such production and ethnic marketing, and Bolivian indigenous women have created international trade links (see table 1). Whereas these examples illustrate the possibility of Indian ownership of production and distribution, the fields of biotechnology, bioprospecting, intellectual property rights, and exploitation of medicinal plants offer less secure ownership (interviews, New York and Quito, 2000).

Culture as product treats culture as a set of material objects and distinctive behaviors. When this interpretation of culture is inserted into development thinking, it promotes the orientation of culturally distinctive products and services onto the market. These interpretations are embedded within the awareness of a post-Fordist global economy in neoliberal development (Davis, 2002; Encalada et al, 1999), where, in globalized markets for niche products in late-modern political economies, culturally distinctive ethnotourism and craft products appeal to the Western search for authentic lifestyles.⁽⁷⁾ Recognizing how global political economies work through difference, the concept of culture as product plays to the market opportunities opened up for culturally unique goods and services. Culture as product thus represents neither an alternative to globalization nor the protection of pristine unique cultures. Rather, in this interpretation of culture and development, cultural difference—illustrated by handicrafts, folklore, and ethnotourism—generates income through sales to a series of fragmented and increasingly global set of markets. Accordingly, cultural diversity becomes an engine for economic growth as it is intrinsically connected to the market.

In its emphasis on material culture, culture as product tends to suggest that the 'traditional' or 'classic' forms of culture are more appropriate for the market than are hybrid or modern styles. Ethnotourists wish to buy pottery or textiles, not plastic or synthetic fabrics. By ignoring cultural hybridity and dynamic material cultures, the policy prescription of culture as product rests upon a problematic nostalgia for a clearly defined culture. Moreover, such development thinking reveals a strong antistatist thread: the market is perceived as the arena where cultural diversity might be preserved. Whereas under modernization the invention of tradition by nonstate actors was *inauthentic*, in presentday culture and development, culture as product is seen to originate with *nonstate* groups whose authenticity rests precisely on a perceived distance from the state. The PRODEPINE project for Ecuador's indigenous people exemplifies such thinking in its encouragement of culturally authentic crafts and tourism. As the second phase of the project was being designed, the craft component was expected to constitute an even larger component than in the first stage.⁽⁸⁾

⁽⁷⁾ By viewing culture and development as a grassroots initiative, Nederveen Pieterse misreads the policy shift and views it as a policy that relegates capitalism to the background (2001).

⁽⁸⁾ Pilar Larreamendy, personal communication by e-mail, February 2003.

Culture as institution

Culture in Andean development with identity appears often as an institution, a form of organization that provides structure and stability to indigenous culture and society (compare Watson, 2003). Social stability and networks are often viewed in the context of “democratic village assemblies, rotating leadership and an egalitarian ethos” (van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas, 2000, page 3). According to a senior NGO director, Andean communities have “a [clear and strong] structure that really acts, has power” (interview, Lima, 2000). A number of diverse projects draw upon so-called traditional Indian forms of social organization for project implementation and/or management. Culture and development policy using the concept of social capital searches for locally embedded traditional authorities and institutions with legitimacy and authority, as illustrated by Ecuador’s PRODEPINE and Bolivia’s *ayllu* communities. In Ecuador the PRODEPINE is based on the territories of indigenous ‘peoples’ and uses traditional leaders as its interlocutors for the design of local development plans. Moreover, local leaders organize traditional communal labor parties to complete projects. According to the World Bank, community assemblies and traditional organizations represent participatory decisionmaking (van Nieuwkoop and Uquillas, 2000), despite the well-documented exclusion of women and marginal groups. The Bolivian ethnic territories of *ayllus* have received a considerable amount of international development funding in recent years. Denmark’s development agency argues that “the *ayllu* is social capital”, and it funds the organization and land-titling of *ayllus* (interviews, La Paz, 1999; 2000; 2004). By the turn of the 21st century, *ayllus* had generated considerable transnational funding and support on the basis of cultural authenticity and closeness to grassroots groups, from donors as varied as Oxfam America (\$128 000 in 2000), the IBIS development NGO (\$288 000 in 2000), as well as the World Bank (see Andolina et al, 2005).

In a similar vein, Bolivia’s new Learning and Innovation indigenous development project, implemented by the Indigenous Ministry, plans to build on indigenous cultural knowledge to generate projects in ethnotourism, ethnobiology, and agriculture which are designed to be marketable and competitive (World Bank, personal communication, 2000, and 2001). Convergence between indigenous movement goals and international funding for indigenous institutions is understandable in the context of neoliberal agendas to decentralize states and increase citizen participation in grassroots governance agendas, as well as Indian gains in rights and constitutional reform and a willingness to negotiate with transnational actors.

When development calls upon culture as an *institution*, culture combines the idea of stability and incorruptibility (a prelapsarian moment) associated with a form of tradition that nevertheless connotes a modernist order. As a means of legitimating authority and local power relations, culture as institution appears to offer templates for the regulation of social groups in diverse fields such as natural-resource management and credit organization. Although “culture tends to be viewed as... the structure of the informal” (Nederveen Pieterse, 2001, page 60), in effect it represents a nonstate *formality* which carries considerable legitimacy in multilateral and agency thinking to promote civil society and participation under neoliberal ‘good governance’ policies to encourage organized civil society (Leftwich, 1996). Such is the legitimacy of these institutions that *ayllu* authorities are now cogoverning the World Bank’s \$5 million indigenous development program in Bolivia (interviews, Bolivia, 2001, and 2004).

Andean indigenous culture has been explicitly seen as a (nonstate) institution that guarantees social trust, moral economies, and a sense of place. *Ayllu* culture, according to an Oxfam document, is based on principles of “reciprocity... cooperation in exchange work... and a complementary relation between the individual and the group”

(Oxfam grant application, 1999). According to the Inter-American Development Bank, indigenous social capital “builds upon peoples’ [grassroots] values, aspirations and potential” (Deruyttere, 1997, page 10). As such, indigenous development is a type of development untainted by party politics and state interference (interviews, La Paz, 1999, and Quito, 2000). These features provide a bulwark against corruption and politicization, while satisfying an antistatist impulse in which governance is located in cultural institutions rather than in the state, making it effectively a quasi-state. Culture as institution may be established precisely to underpin new forms of governance such as decentralization, as in Ecuador and Bolivia. Funding for ayllus coincided with a swathe of harsh neoliberal reforms, state disengagement from the once-powerful peasant confederation, and a radical process of decentralization.

In Andean culturally appropriate development projects the new paradigm of culture and development draws explicitly on culture as a product and as an institution. For indigenous culture to be identified as a resource rather than as a brake, development builds on these interpretations of culture. As such, development with identity represents a profound shift in development agencies’ and the state’s treatment of indigenous cultures. Yet this shift occurs in the context of the poverty alleviation, political decentralization, and grassroots participation targeted by neoliberal development. Taking indigenous culture seriously is a response not only to decades of advocacy work for Indian rights, but also to the rolling back of the state and the granting of legitimacy to nonstate institutions and reductions in social welfare by neoliberal governmentality (Leftwich, 1996; Shore and Wright, 1997). However, the treatment of indigenous culture as marketable and governable does not remain uncontested; rights-based and antiracist struggles to reconfigure culture and development attempt to empower indigenous groups on the basis of flexible conceptions of (multi)culture.

A framework for culture and development: culture as creativity

Another potential interpretation of culture for culture and development policy is to treat it as creativity, as a way of ‘thinking outside the box’. Although this application of culture has been less frequently analyzed (compare Appadurai, 2004), viewing culture as flexible innovation releases development from the disempowering forcing of cultures into markets or forms of political engineering. Instead, culture can speak to adaptable political economies and open forms of governance in which tradition or distinctiveness is not held to a rigid template but reflects the bricolage and hybridity of livelihood responses. Defining culture as a flexible resource offers a way of drawing on social structures and meanings to offer innovative solutions—often in combination with existing social organization—to development problems.

Culture and development thinking has only begun to examine and explore the potential implications of viewing culture as creativity. When recognized at all, culture as creativity has been pictured as existing in nonstate groups whose deployment of culture challenges and reconfigures political and economic relations. The participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil and shantytown organizations in Villa El Salvador, Peru have been offered as examples of how grassroots social actors rework tradition with positive development outcomes (Kliksberg, 1999). Various Andean experiments in development with identity demonstrate how culture can be used creatively. Although not widely recognized, the nongovernmental Inter-American Foundation worked widely from the 1980s to release the ‘cultural energy’ of grassroots popular culture in the Andean region (Kleymeyer, 1995).

As creativity, culture has informed some of the experiments in Andean development with identity (see table 1; Carrasco et al, 1999). If it is treated as creativity, culture can be the basis for innovative forms of social organization and meanings that can be

adapted over time as they represent a dynamic template for action. For example, the Bolivian ayllu groups engage with a mesh of transnational actors to put into place neoliberal decentralization while reestablishing traditional forms of authority and cultural practices (Andolina et al, 2005). Ecuador's Guamoto municipality adapted local forms of participation and used the indigenous language, Quechua, to extend its 'tradition' of consultation creatively. By deliberately reaching out to indigenous women and poorer Indians, this practice challenged the power relations found in both 'tradition' and 'modernity.' Culture as creativity engages with the power relations that lie behind notions of tradition and modernity, and engages with efforts to mobilize subalterns' concepts of culture and social change. Ecuador's Otavalos combine long-standing forms of cultural production with European aesthetics while reworking local forms of family and community life. Compared with antistatist product and quasi-statist institution, culture as creativity arguably offers a less tradition-bound notion of cultural difference, whose engagement with modernity is not prejudged. In Ecuador, the Pijal customary law project reworks Napoleonic law in light of values embedded in customary ways of dealing with disputes and infringements. Diverse social and political grassroots groups perceive culture as a resource, a flexible combination of tradition and modernity providing an alternative viewpoint on development.

When culture is viewed flexibly, indigenous people make choices that would surprise many culture and development proponents. Indigenous people welcome PRODEPINE's institution strengthening and donor support for ayllus, insofar as these projects further income distribution and antiracism. Projects such as these offer opportunities to think constructively about cultural legacies, while ensuring that agendas such as intercultural understanding and empowerment are pursued. Nevertheless, culture as creativity requires further analysis in order to understand how culture acts as a toolbox for lateral thinking and empowering action. To highlight the potentially creative and problem-solving aspect of dynamic culture is not to sideline economic injustice or exclusionary racial formations that often compound uneven development outcomes in the global South. Treating culture as creativity entails dealing simultaneously with the structural inequalities of political economies, and with the damaging effects of racial formations on subalterns' development opportunities.

Conclusions

In this paper we develop a critical analysis of the new paradigm of culture and development, a paradigm which informs policy and projects in the Andes. This analysis has been extended over a broad field of enquiry, in order to understand how and where concepts of culture have come into development thinking and planning. Viewing cultures as multiple and development as a set of culturally embedded practices and meanings, our approach explores how development paradigms have adopted explicit concepts of culture and/or carried within them implicit cultural norms. Developing a postcolonial and poststructural account sensitive to the historically and geographically variable and contested nature of the connections of culture with development, we have analyzed the ways in which culturally appropriate development has been thought and practiced in the Andes. Culture has to be situated firmly within an analysis of the grids of power inherent to development and the hierarchies between world regions, races, cultures, and modernity or tradition that act to differentiate social actors. Understanding the culture and development paradigm thus necessitates the analysis of the specific content of development's cultures prevailing in a particular time and place.

Applying this approach to the case of culturally appropriate development for Andean indigenous people, we identify two instrumentalist uses of culture in ethno-development, namely as a resource and as an institution. In the Andes, culturally appropriate indigenous development has occurred in a contradictory context defined by social capital models, postdevelopment romanticism about Indian culture, state multiculturalism, and neoliberal global–state reforms. In the culture and development paradigm, culture is “a process, a set of relationships that gain efficiency as they are reified” (Mitchell, 2000, page 287). However, we also suggest that culture can be viewed as a source of creativity, which relies not on instrumentalist understandings but on local bricolages of modernity and tradition to construct culturally embedded and empowering solutions to development problems. Whether as product, institution, or creativity, further research remains to be done on the distinct implications for development beneficiaries of each of these readings of culture (Radcliffe, 2006). Although indigenous Andeans have what an Oxfam policymaker termed ‘their ancestral cultures’, the means by which these empower them in a globalizing world remain to be established.

Acknowledgements. The paper is based on research funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (#L214 25 2023), which is gratefully acknowledged. We also thank the American Association of Geographers audience in 2003, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

References

- Abercrombie T, 1991, “To be Indian, to be Bolivian: ‘ethnic’ and ‘national’ discourses of identity”, in *Nation-states and Indians in Latin America* Eds G Urban, J Sherzer (University of Texas, Austin, TX) pp 95–130
- Allen T, 2000, “Taking culture seriously”, in *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century* (Oxford University Press, Oxford) pp 443–468
- Andolina R, Radcliffe S A, Laurie N, 2005, “Culture and development: transnational identity making in Latin America” *Political Geography* **24** 678–702
- Apfell-Marglin F, 1998 *The Spirit of Regeneration: Andean Culture Confronting Western Notions of Development* (Zed Press, London)
- Appadurai A, 2004, “The capacity to aspire: culture and the terms of recognition”, in *Culture and Public Action* Eds V Rao, M Walton (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA) pp 59–84
- Arizpe L, 2004, “The intellectual history of culture and development institutions”, in *Culture and Public Action* Eds V Rao, M Walton (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA) pp 163–184
- Blunt A, McEwan C (Eds), 2002 *Postcolonial Geographies* (Continuum, New York)
- Brysk A, 2000 *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA)
- Buroway M, Blum J A, George S, Gille Z, Gowan T, Haney L, Klawiter M, Lopez S H, Riain S, Thayer M (Eds), 2000 *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections and Imaginations in a Postmodern World* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA)
- Carrasco T D, Iturralde D, Uquillas J, 1999 *Doce Experiencias de Desarrollo Indígena en América Latina* [Twelve experiments in indigenous development in Latin America] (Asociación Nacional de Productores de Quito, Quito)
- Chua P, Bhavnani K, Foran J, 2000, “Women, culture, development: a new paradigm for development studies?” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **23** 820–841
- Clague C, Grossbard-Shechtman S (Eds), 2001, “Special issue: Culture and development: international perspectives” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **573** (January)
- Corbridge S, 1998, “Review of Escobar 1995” *Journal of Development Studies* **34**(6) 138–148
- Crush J (Ed.), 1995 *Power of Development* (Routledge, London)
- Davis S, 1999, “Bringing culture into the development paradigm: the view from the World Bank” *Development Anthropologist* **16**(1–2) 25–31
- Davis S, 2002, “Indigenous people, poverty and participatory development: the experiences of the World Bank in Latin America”, in *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy* Ed. R Sieder (Palgrave, Basingstoke, Hants) pp 227–251
- Deruyterre A, 1997 *Indigenous People and Sustainable Development: The Role of the Inter-American Development Bank* (Inter-American Development Bank, Washington, DC)

- Encalada E, Garcia F, Ivarsdotter K, 1999 *La Participación de los Pueblos Indígenas y Negros en el Desarrollo del Ecuador* [The participation of indigenous and black peoples in development in Ecuador] (Inter-American Development Bank, Washington DC)
- Escobar A, 1995a *Encountering Development* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ)
- Escobar A, 1995b, "Imagining a postdevelopment era", in *Power of Development* Ed. J Crush (Routledge, London) pp 211–227
- Eyben R, 2000, "Development and anthropology: a view from inside the agency" *Critique of Anthropology* **20**(1) 7–14
- Fine B, 2001 *Social Capital versus Social Theory* (Routledge, London)
- Fox R, King B (Eds), 2002 *Anthropology Beyond Culture* (Routledge, London)
- Gardner K, Lewis D, 1996 *Anthropology, Development and the Post-modern Challenge* (Pluto Press, London)
- Graham R (Ed.), 1990 *The Idea of Race in Latin America, 1870–1940* (University of Texas Press, Austin, TX)
- Grey Postero N, 2000, "Bolivia's Indígena citizen: multiculturalism in a neoliberal age", paper presented at the Latin American Studies Association Congress, Miami; copy available from S Radcliffe
- Gupta A, 1998 *Postcolonial Developments* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
- Harrison L, Huntington S (Eds), 2000 *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress* (Basic Books, New York)
- Hart G, 2002, "Geography and development: development/s beyond neoliberalism? Power, culture, political economy" *Progress in Human Geography* **26** 812–822
- Hettne B, 1996, "Ethnicity and development: an elusive relationship", in *Ethnicity and Development: Geographical Perspectives* Eds D Dwyer, D Drakakis-Smith (John Wiley, Chichester, Sussex) pp 15–44
- Hojman D, 1999, "Economic policy and Latin American culture: is a virtuous circle possible?" *Journal of Latin American Studies* **31**(1) 167–190
- Kaplan C, 1995, "A world without borders: the Body Shop's trans/national geographic" *Social Text* **43** 45–66
- Kiely R, 1999, "The last refuge of the noble savage? A critical assessment of postdevelopment theory" *European Journal of Development Research* **11**(1) 30–55
- Kleymeyer C, 1995 *Cultural Expressions and Grassroots Development* (Inter-American Foundation/Abya-Yala, Quito)
- Kliksberg B, 1999, "Social capital and culture: master keys to development" *CEPAL Review* **69** 83–102
- Kothari U, 2001, "Feminist and postcolonial challenges to development", in *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives* Eds U Kothari, M Minogue (Palgrave, Basingstoke, Hants) pp 33–51
- Larraín J, 2000 *Identity and Modernity in Latin America* (Polity Press, Cambridge)
- Larson B, 1995, "Andean communities, political cultures and markets: the changing contours of a field", in *Ethnicity, Markets and Migration in the Andes* Eds B Larson, O Harris (Duke University Press, Durham, NC) pp 5–53
- Laurie N, Andolina R, Radcliffe S A, 2003, "Indigenous professionalization: transnational social reproduction in the Andes" *Antipode* **35** 463–491
- Leftwich A (Ed.), 1996 *Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice* (Polity Press, Cambridge)
- Lehmann D, 1997, "An opportunity lost: Escobar's deconstruction of development" *Journal of Development Studies* **33** 568–578
- Lewis O, 1959 *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty* (Basic Books, New York)
- Mitchell D, 2000 *Cultural Geography: A Critical Introduction* (Blackwell, Oxford)
- Nederveen Pieterse J, 1998, "My paradigm or yours? Alternative development, postdevelopment, reflexive development" *Development and Change* **29** 343–373
- Nederveen Pieterse J, 2001 *Development Theory: Deconstructions/Reconstructions* (Sage, London)
- North L, Cameron J, 2000, "Grassroots rural development strategies: Ecuador in comparative perspective" *World Development* **28** 1751–1766
- Pacari N, 1996, "Taking on the neo-liberal agenda" *NACLA Report on the Americas* **29**(5) 23–32
- Power M, 2003 *Rethinking Development Geographies* (Routledge, London)
- Power M, Sidaway J, 2004, "The degeneration of tropical geography" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* **94** 585–601

- Prah K, 2001, "Culture: the missing link in development planning in Africa" *Présence Africaine* **163** – **164** 90 – 102
- Radcliffe S A, 1999, "Popular and state discourses of power", in *Human Geography Today* Eds D Massey, J Allen, P Sarre (Polity Press, Cambridge) pp 219 – 242
- Radcliffe S A, 2005, "Development and geography: towards a postcolonial development geography?" *Progress in Human Geography* **29** 291 – 298
- Radcliffe S A (Ed.), 2006 *Culture and Development in a Globalizing World* (Routledge, London)
- Radcliffe S A, Laurie N, Andolina R, 2004, "The transnationalization of gender and reimagining Andean indigenous development" *Signs* **29** 387 – 416
- Radcliffe S A, Laurie N, Andolina R, forthcoming a, "Development with identity: social capital and culture", in *Multiethnic Transnationalism: Indigenous Development in the Andes* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC) chapter 2
- Radcliffe S A, Laurie N, Andolina R, forthcoming b, "Re-working development: transnationalism and indigenous people", in *Multiethnic Transnationalism: Indigenous Development in the Andes* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC) chapter 1
- Rahnema M, Bawtree V (Eds), 1997 *The Post-development Reader* (Zed Press, London)
- Rao V, Walton M, 2004, "Culture and public action: an introduction", in *Culture and Public Action: A Cross-disciplinary Dialogue on Development Policy* Eds V Rao, M Walton (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA) pp 3 – 36
- Rostow W W, 1960 *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-communist Manifesto* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge)
- Sachs W, 1992 *The Development Dictionary* (Zed Press, London)
- Schech S, Haggis J, 2000 *Culture and Development: A Critical Introduction* (Blackwell, Oxford)
- Segarra M, 2000, "Redefining the public/private mix: NGOs and the Emergency Social Investment Fund in Ecuador", in *The New Politics of Inequality in Latin America* Ed. D Chalmers (Oxford University Press, Oxford) pp 489 – 515
- Sen A, 2004, "How does culture matter?", in *Culture and Public Action: A Cross-disciplinary Dialogue on Development Policy* Eds V Rao, M Walton (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA) pp 37 – 58
- Shore C, Wright S (Eds) 1997 *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power* (Routledge, London)
- Sieder R (Ed.), 2002 *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and Democracy* (Palgrave, Basingstoke, Hants)
- Trouillot M-R, 2002, "Adieu culture: a new duty arises", in *Anthropology Beyond Culture* Eds R G Fox, B King (Routledge, London) pp 37 – 60
- Tulchin J S, Garland A M (Eds), 2000 *Social Development in Latin America: The Politics of Reform* (Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO)
- Turner B S, 1999 *The Talcott Parsons Reader* (Blackwell, Oxford)
- UNDP, 2004 *Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World* (United Nations Development Program, New York)
- van Nieuwkoop M, Uquillas J, 2000 *Defining Ethnodevelopment in Operational Terms: Lessons from the Ecuador Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian Peoples' Development Project* (World Bank, Washington, DC)
- Watson E E, 2003, "Examining the potential of indigenous institutions for development: a perspective from Borana, Ethiopia" *Development and Change* **34** 287 – 309
- Watts M, 2002, "Alternative modern—development as cultural geography", in *Handbook of Cultural Geography* Eds K Anderson, M Domosh, N Thrift, S Pile (Sage, London) pp 433 – 453
- Weismantel M, 2001 *Cholas and Pishtacos: Stories of Race and Sex in the Andes* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL)
- Williams R, 1977 *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford University Press, Oxford)
- Wilson P, 2003, "Ethnographic museums and cultural commodification: indigenous organizations, NGOs and culture as a resource in Amazonian Ecuador" *Latin American Perspectives* **30**(1) 162 – 180
- Worsley P, 1999, "Culture and development theory", in *Culture and Global Change* Eds T Skelton, T Allen (Routledge, London) pp 30 – 42
- Zoomers A, Salman T, 2003, "Straying Andean ways: reflecting on Andean-ness in a globalizing world", in *Imaging the Andes: Shifting Margins of a Marginal World* Eds T Salman, A Zoomers (Aksant, Amsterdam), pp 3 – 14

Conditions of use. This article may be downloaded from the E&P website for personal research by members of subscribing organisations. This PDF may not be placed on any website (or other online distribution system) without permission of the publisher.