Germond-Duret, CV

 Tradition and Modernity: An Obsolete Dichotomy? Reflection on Binary Thinking and Indigenous Peoples

http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/2794/

Article

Tradition and Modernity: An Obsolete Dichotomy? Reflection on Binary Thinking and Indigenous Peoples

By Celine Germond-Duret, Liverpool John Moores University

ABSTRACT. The debates over Indigenous peoples and development are often framed within the discussion on the shift towards modernity, the imposition of economic liberalism, and the resistance against external interventions, with a tendency to see Indigenous peoples as a possible alternative to the world economic order. However, looking at many development agencies' discourses, the idea that Indigenous peoples would actually benefit from modernity prevails. The literature is divided along these two conflicting views and dominated by binary oppositions: traditional/modern; backward/advanced; sustainable/unsustainable, etc. This article discusses the tradition/modernity dichotomy and raises the following questions: is it relevant to think in terms of modernity/tradition in the case of Indigenous peoples? What does the use of such a dichotomy imply? What is the alternative? This article demonstrates that this binary opposition is neither relevant nor desirable, and that a new analytical framework is required. Instead, it proposes to use a Normalisation framework, which focuses on the attempts made to 'normalise' Indigenous peoples and encourage them to comply with existing social and economic models.

KEYWORDS. Indigenous peoples; modernity; tradition; binary thinking; normalisation

Introduction

According to the United Nations, there are 370 million Indigenous peoples in the world (United Nations, 2010: 1).[1] The absence of official statistics makes an accurate number difficult to estimate at the global level. The very definition of Indigenous peoples itself has engendered numerous debates. While they are generally non dominant at the economic, political and cultural levels, and mostly live in rural areas[2], Indigenous peoples constitute a very heterogeneous group of people. For instance, they include groups as diverse as the Mentawai of Indonesia, Micmacs of Canada, Mapuche of Chile and Argentina, Aborigines of Australia, Ainus of Japan, and Karen of Burma, to name a few. Anteriority, non-dominance, cultural distinction, and self-identification are the criteria usually accepted by the literature and international institutions[3]. But Indigenous peoples themselves consider that a general definition is neither necessary nor desirable, and favour a more subjective approach. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples does not give any definition nor identification criteria. Identification criteria can nevertheless facilitate the recognition of collective rights. Some states are indeed reluctant to recognise the presence of Indigenous peoples on their territory because of the political and legal implications this would entail, and prefer considering them as minorities[4]. While the concept of Indigenous peoples can be considered as ambiguous from an anthropological point of view, it has a political usefulness for people claiming this status to obtain rights[5]. The expression "Indigenous peoples" is used throughout the article for reasons of simplification but the contentious nature of the concept is fully acknowledged[6].

Indigenous peoples have always suffered from derogatory representations. In many collective imaginaries, they are still associated with terms such as 'backward', 'uncivilised', sometimes even 'violent' and 'bellicose'. But for others, they represent the idea of living in harmony with Nature, and benefit from a positive, even a bit naive, representation. Literature and

cinema provide numerous examples illustrating one or another representation, from Injun Joe in Tom Sawyer and Tex Avery's Half Pint Pygmy, to Walt Disney's Pocahontas and James Cameron's Na'vi in Avatar. From derogatory to idealisation, Indigenous peoples have been the object of stereotypes.[7] Their political mobilisation dates back to the 1970s and they achieved large success at the international level. But they still face conflicting discourses that ascribe them different needs and aspirations. Indigenous peoples' territories are places of conflicts, opposing interests, tensions, and exercise of power. The Indigenous place is conflictual and contested, be it through resource exploitation, encroachments, conservationist initiatives, or as academic objects of studies, and as the object of fights between opposing ideologies. Different motives and inspirations are indeed projected on them by different agents, who claim a better understanding of their situation and needs.

The trend today for many actors (including academics) is to see Indigenous peoples as a possible alternative to the world economic order and as models of sustainability. In this view, Indigenous peoples are often presented as opposing the economic system, considered as harmful to their culture. As exemplified by Mander's statement: 'we need to celebrate the clear reality that indigenous societies are a *living alternative* [our emphasis] to the current economic, political and philosophical models of our time and a successful one'.[8] The underlying idea is that 'Development' is harmful. Any intervention on their territory would lead to more integration to the market, and initiatives to 'modernise' are consequently criticised. Indigenous peoples would constitute a force against 'modernity' and symbolise the fight and the resistance of the local against the global.[9] The debates over Indigenous peoples and development are often framed within the discussion on the shift towards modernity, the spread and imposition of capitalism and economic liberalism, and the resistance against external interventions and influences. However, looking at many development agencies' discourses (as well as some development economists and governments), one finds the opposite positioning, i.e. the idea that Indigenous peoples' traditional lifestyle cannot improve their conditions and that they would actually benefit from modernity. The literature (from both academics and practitioners) is often divided along these two conflicting views and dominated by binary oppositions: Traditional/Modern; Backward/Advanced; Sustainable/Unsustainable; Diverse/Homogenous, etc.

This article discusses this dichotomy and raises the following questions: is it relevant to think in terms of modernity/tradition in the case of Indigenous peoples? What does the use of such a dichotomy imply? What is the alternative? I first discuss the inevitability argument according to which Indigenous societies *will* become 'modern' societies. Looking into the recurring binary oppositions that prevail in collective imaginaries on Indigenous peoples, I then explore binary thinking and how it results in hierarchisation and value judgement. With these considerations in mind, I develop three reasons as to why the use of the modernity/tradition dichotomy is problematic. This binary opposition is neither relevant nor desirable, and a new analytical framework is required. Instead, I propose to use a Normalisation framework, which focuses on the attempts made to 'normalise' Indigenous peoples and encourage them to comply with an existing model, whatever it is.

Indigenous peoples and Modernity: an inevitable path?

Political mobilisation of Indigenous peoples at the international level became more visible in the 1970s (notably with the United Nations commissioning a study on their situation) and saw its first successes in the 1980s with the creation of the UN Working Group on Indigenous peoples. However, assimilation was still at that time the dominant idea, as reflected by a World Bank report on its policy on Tribal peoples, which highlights the inevitability of assimilation into the dominant

society[10]. Among the four fundamental needs of tribal societies, the author notes the need for 'time to adapt to the national society'.[11] He considers the creation of tribal reserves as probably the best way to protect Indigenous peoples from external intrusions, as they would give enough time to adapt. Assimilation was the finality contemplated, and Indigenous peoples were classified into distinct phases according to their level of integration, and thus of adaptation to modernity. Rights had to be granted to tribal peoples, since 'it is only when [they] are accorded equality under the law [...] and have the capability to choose their own destiny that they can *contribute* [our emphasis] fully to the national society'.[12] For Goodland, it is only through a large degree of autonomy and cultural choice that 'not only does tribal culture survive, but the tribe becomes a *productive contributor* [our emphasis] to the nation, rather than a ward of the state'.[13] These ideas echo the 'inevitability argument'. Bodley develops this expression to refer to, and criticise, the underlying idea that tribal cultures will either acculturate, or disappear. He makes a parallel with Herman Merivale, a British expert in colonial policy, who affirmed in 1861 that 'native races must in every instance either perish, or be amalgamated with the general population of their country'.[14] Bodley denounces the assertion of a superiority of the industrial civilisation that claims a moral right to assimilate what it considers as obsolete cultural systems. For him, the incorporation of tribal societies into the economy does not result from an inevitable process engaged by tribes themselves, but from expansionist policies of industrial states.

Thinking in terms of inevitability implies the (conscious or subconscious) lack of consideration for people's aspirations and specificities, since whatever they are, the finality remains the same, that is to say the assimilation into the dominant society. This conception of Indigenous peoples has actually evolved, due to a change in perception and the dissemination of more open-minded ideas, political mobilisation, as well as successes at the international level regarding the recognition of their rights. In practice, development interventions among Indigenous peoples have mainly consisted, or resulted, in modifying the Indigenous economy and bringing it closer to the market.[15] Talking about the World Bank, Tauli-Corpuz considers that, for the institution, 'economic growth only comes about [...] if subsistence lands are rapidly converted into large-scale, capital-intensive, export-oriented commercial production'[16], i.e. dispossessing Indigenous peoples from their traditional practices. Different interpretations of the nature of the 'problems' faced by Indigenous peoples result in different interpretations of the solutions to implement. For example, for Uquillas and Nieuwkoop (from the World Bank) rural poverty is characterised by a 'lack of education, little access to land, a low degree of market integration, and a lack of employment in the vibrant nonfarm rural sector'[17], that is to say that it is the lack of integration to the market (and, in a sense, the traditional system itself) that is an indicator of poverty. The Indigenous Peoples' Declaration on Extractive Industries makes a more political analysis of poverty, as it is associated with the 'exclusion and lack of access to decision-making at all levels'[18]. Solutions envisaged can vary accordingly, from further integration to the market, to more rights and decision power.

Nowadays, modernity and tradition are still envisaged as complete opposites. Modernity is generally associated with 'a certain set of attitudes towards the world [...]; a complex of economic institutions, especially industrial production and a market economy; a certain range of political institutions'[19]. Our focus here is mainly economic development and social organisation within modernity, as it is usually these aspects that are the object of intervention within Indigenous societies. The modernity thesis (notably emerging from Rostow's ideas of all societies undergoing the same path towards mass-consumption) is still largely contemplated as a valid model by the development industry[20]. The modernity thesis is still strongly influencing development models, thinkers and practitioners. For instance, Jeffrey Sachs (notably advisor to the UN on the Millennium Development Goals) has compared economic development to a ladder, and sees

external financial assistance as necessary to help poor people to successfully climb it.[21] Considering that all societies will go through the same stages of development or will ultimately 'develop' and become 'modern' clearly reinforces the inevitability argument. For some, this everlasting distinction perpetuates the idea that external interventions are required to modernise 'traditional peoples'. For others, it reinforces the idea that Indigenous peoples are and must remain 'different'. These two conceptions are highly problematic and highlight a danger of essentialisation of Indigenous peoples. It is not only irrelevant to attribute similar characteristics, opinions and projects to 300 million people; it is also hazardous to consider that they have fixed identities (e.g. essentially traditional, anchored in the past and static, and opposed to being open to modernity and change). The same applies to those considering Indigenous peoples as fundamentally against globalisation and constituting a force of social and economic change. This is what can be called 'negative and positive essentialisms'; attributing to Indigenous peoples immutable negative or positive characteristics. Considering that all Indigenous peoples do and think the same is as simplistic and inaccurate as saying that all non-Indigenous peoples do and think the same. While the pre-modern/modern thinking is still prevalent in sociological research, the question of Indigenous systems in relation to the tradition/modernity dichotomy is not widely discussed. Exception is made of Teubner, who specifically discusses the responsivity of modern law to Indigenous cultures and calls for 'shared sovereignty', aiming at 'the co-existence of modern political rule and indigenous "internal self-determination"'.[22]

Comments primarily associating Indigenous peoples with a "lack of" (consumption goods, basic services, instruction, currency, etc.) and arguing in favour of modernist interventions are numerous. Newspapers contribute to the tenacity of stereotypes. For example, The Times published an article in March 2013 comparing some tribes with the movie characters The Croods, insisting on characteristics that are not necessarily representative of Indigenous peoples but contribute to the survival of stereotypes: 'a man's wealth is measured by how many wives and pigs he possesses'; 'they perform sacred rituals where they commune with the forest spirits'; 'they [aimed] their bows and arrows at the spy plane that went to check on them!'.[23] Botswana President Ian Khama described Kalahari Bushmen as 'backward' and living 'a primitive life of deprivation co-existing alongside wild animals' and 'a primeval life of a bye gone era of hardship and indignity'.[24] In October 2013, the Indian newspaper The Hindu pledged to no longer use the term 'primitive' to refer to tribal people.[25] It is clear that criticising or mocking Indigenous people's perceived 'lack of modernity' is still widespread, as is the idea that outside interventions could help them improve their living conditions.

At the other end of the spectrum, the academic literature has a rather complacent look on Indigenous peoples and highlights the harmful impacts of external interventions on their territories, and their right to maintain a traditional way of life. Delgado and Zwarteveen conceive Indigenous peoples' counter-discourse as part of the 'alternatives to modernity'. Looking at the struggles of an Indigenous community around rights to water in Peru, they show that there was no space for them in the model of modernity that emanated from the irrigation project implemented in their region, and that they were resisting 'the hegemonic discourses of development and modernization'. [26] Studying the Pewenche resistance to the Ralco dam in Chile, Hakenholz considers they were 'facing modernity'; for him, they were confronted with the progress of Western modernity and values that ignore otherness and diversity of cultures and territories.[27] The opposition, and nearly conflicting nature, between Indigenous peoples and modernity also stands out from Havemann. He argues that modernisation 'has always produced and legitimated atrocities and suffering' and that exclusion is central to modernity[28]. For him, Indigenous peoples have always been an obstacle to modernisation. This is a point of view shared by Tauli-Corpuz (former Chair of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous peoples): 'the neocolonizers

[…] teach us that indigenous political, economic, cultural, and knowledge systems are obstacles to their "progress"'.[29] She also talks about the right of Indigenous peoples to 'remain separate and distinct'. For her, 'the survival of authentic indigenous tradition is diametrically opposed to economic globalization'.[30] Blaser et al., using development and modernity as synonymous, oppose Indigenous peoples' 'life projects' to development projects. In their classification of actors according to their consideration for environmental issues and social justice, Hopwood et al. classify Indigenous peoples as supporters of a transformation of the system, and as strongly concerned with equality and environmental issues.[31] The development concept has surely evolved so as to be more inclusive and more comprehensive (defined as human, participatory, sustainable, etc.). The 1986 United Nations Declaration on the Right to Development states that the right to development is an 'inalienable human right' (article 1), the 1989 Brundtland report claims that 'overriding priority' should be given to the essential needs of the world's poor, and Principle 3 of the 1992 Rio Declaration refers to the 'right to development'. So the protection of vulnerable people and their development needs have been recognised and any development intervention should be conducted with their needs in mind. However, the development concept remains very much the same in practice and the economic dimension often takes precedence over the rest[32].

Indigenous peoples' political mobilisation at the international level resulted in noticeable progress. It would then be legitimate to think that they are now better equipped to express their need and advance their interests. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) recognises Indigenous peoples' right to self-determination (article 3), self-government (article 4), and development (article 23). But Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States all voted against, while the Russian Federation, Bangladesh and several other countries abstained. And the Declaration is not legally binding, although it reflects commitment of states to comply with these principles. In practice, international development institutions do not necessarily recognise or apply the principles mentioned in the UNDRIP. For instance, while the Declaration recognises Indigenous peoples' right to 'Free, Prior and Informed *Consent*' (FPIC) on decisions affecting them, the World Bank has so far recognised their right to 'Free, Prior and Informed *Consultation*' instead. This may change with the new safeguard policy that is currently under discussion. However, the first draft suggests that borrowing governments could decide not to apply the policy if they are concerned that identifying Indigenous peoples would 'create a serious risk of exacerbating ethnic tension or civil strife, or […] is inconsistent with the provisions of the national constitution'[33]. Finally, its status prevents the Bank from taking into account any political considerations to make its decisions, so it cannot comment on a borrowing government's violation of human rights or rights to self-determination. So, despite progress in international law, these principles are not necessarily dominant in practice.

In summary, the idea of an inevitable path towards modernity is still widespread, and one can distinguish between two opposite views on Indigenous peoples, with a debate generally framed within the Tradition/Modernity opposition. Development and modernist policies have certainly been harmful to Indigenous peoples. But systematically opposing tradition to modernity is not that relevant. Criticising interventions that are harmful or not desired is necessary; conceptualising societies in a sort of objectionable essentialism is in itself dangerous. However, the modernity/tradition opposition may itself be difficult to avoid given the prevalence of binary thinking, as discussed below.

Binary thinking

In binary thinking, modernity is a concept that positions itself in opposition to Tradition. In its simplest and most basic expression, modernity is characterised by a few elements at the

economic, social, political and cultural levels. Depending on the positioning of the observer, one of the two systems will appear as the best and as the model to follow, as illustrated in Table 1. The table shows some commonly attributed characteristics of both modernity and tradition. Depending on the section of the table, one system may appear as 'better' than the other. The modern system may appear as the best in the first half of the table, while the traditional system may look more attractive in the second half. One may consider that market economy and private property are better than subsistence economy and collective property, or that a system based on sharing practice and centred on the community is better than a system based on class exploitation and governed by a powerful economic elite. Similarly, one may favour a system where materialism and consumption prevail over a non-materialistic one, or on the contrary find that focusing on the satisfaction of needs is more appropriate and less destructive than an over-consumption frenzy. This example is interesting because materialism appears in both parts of the table, as it can be considered as a positive or a negative term depending on the observer's stance. The same applies to "sacred" and "rationality".

Table 1. Simplistic representation of myths and oppositions related to modernity and tradition in the context of Indigenous peoples

	Modernity	In opposition to	Tradition
Economy	Market economy		Subsistence economy
	Private property		Collective property
	Industrial		Rural
Society	Sedentarism		Nomadism
	Equal rights		Hierarchies
	Order		Disorder
	Peace		Violence
Politics	Representative system		Chief
	Liberalism		Tribalism
	Freedom		Oppression
Culture	Mass-consumption		No surplus
	Materialism		Non-materialistic
	Rationality		Sacred / Custom

versus

	Modernity	In opposition to	Tradition
Economy	Class exploitation		No exploitation
	Powerful economic elite		Community
	Private property		Sharing
Society	Individuality		Sense of Community
	Loneliness		Belonging Feeling
	Competition		Harmony
Politics	Parties and Personal interests		Common interest
	Political conflicts		Collective decision making
Culture	Over-consumption frenzy		Satisfying needs
	Materialism		Non-materialistic
	Homogenisation of cultures and tastes		Cultural Diversity
	Rationality		Sacred

These characteristics of modern and traditional systems are voluntarily simplified, as they aim at showing how the use of reductionist binary oppositions can reinforce sets of representations and have practical consequences on people's thinking, and ultimately on development policies.

The identification and deconstruction of binary oppositions is a frequent tool of discourse analysis. Jakobson highlighted binary oppositions using previous work conducted by de Saussure, and developed his theory of markedness: 'Every single constituent of any linguistic system is built on an opposition of two logical contradictories: the presence of an attribute ("markedness") in contraposition to its absence ("unmarkedness")'.[34] For instance, the notion of day is understood relatively to the notion of night, the notion of order relatively to the notion of disorder. This idea of binary couples has been used and redeveloped by authors in the discursive field, such as Derrida, proponent of the deconstruction approach.[35] Binary oppositions allow 'positive self-representation and negative other representation'.[36] They imply a classification and hierarchisation, 'placing human beings into the categories in which they "naturally" belong'.[37] The main issue associated with binary couples is the hierarchy between the two terms that arises from their use (e.g. 'light' being better than 'dark', 'normal' better than 'abnormal', 'modern' better than 'traditional', 'us' better than 'them', etc.). Binary oppositions also presuppose the unity of each group, are somehow steeped in essentialism, and imply 'a sense of otherness and exclusion'.[38] The deconstruction of binary identities has been widely used to demonstrate exclusion of groups, for example immigrants[39] and gays[40]. In his *History of Sexuality*, Foucault considers that sex 'is placed by power in a binary system: licit and illicit, permitted and forbidden'.[41] Other binary oppositions associate sex with a 'mechanics devoid of reason': body/soul; flesh/spirit; instinct/reason; drives/consciousness.[42] In nursing studies, Crowe highlighted the use of binary couples ('good/bad, normal/abnormal, illness/health'), and the usefulness of the process of deconstruction, which 'leads to possible alternative reconstructions that are not underpinned by binary oppositions, e.g. a person may have an illness but not be unhealthy'.[43]

Binary oppositions have been massively used in the development field, starting with the distinction between 'developed' and 'underdeveloped', 'backward' versus 'enlightened', 'rich' versus 'poor', but also 'abundance' versus 'scarcity' and 'new' versus 'outdated', to name a few. The origin of 'Development' (generally written with a capital D) and of the distinction between the notions of developed and underdeveloped is attributed by anti-development scholars to the inaugural address by Harry Truman in January 1949, who launched the idea that 'underdeveloped areas' (where 'more than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery' and the economy is 'primitive and stagnant') should benefit from the progresses of more advanced Nations: 'Underdevelopment began, then, on January 20, 1949. On that day, two billion people became underdeveloped. […] They ceased being what they were […] and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others' reality'.[44] The aid regime emerged from this distinction, and according to Arturo Escobar, transformed the poor into dependants of the State. For him, as early as 1948, when the World Bank defined poor countries as those who had a *per capita* revenue inferior to 100 dollars, two thirds of the world population were classified as poor: 'that the essential trait of the third world was its poverty and that the solution was economic growth and development became self-evident, necessary, and universal truths'.[45]

As to the reason why the use of binary identities is so widespread in society, in many different domains, and in our daily lives, it would be wrong to assume that this originates in Western culture. In a sense, binary oppositions steeped in Manichaeism, whose dualist cosmology opposes a good and an evil fighting against each other; moral dualism was already present in ancient Egyptian religion and in Taoism, that is to say well before Christian dualism. Binary oppositions were also found in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, as illustrated by his 'Pythagorean table of opposites', highlighting couples like limited/unlimited, odd/even, one/many, straight/curved, etc., composed of a 'good' and a 'bad' term. Looking at binary thinking throughout history and societies, Lloyd foresees three reasons for its prevalence: first, nature exhibits a certain duality

(distinction between day and night, between male and female, and bilateral symmetry of bodies in many species); second, opposite groups form an important part of religious beliefs; and third, dualism is the simplest framework of classification of complex phenomena.[46] One could also add to these explanations the life/death opposition, which governs all living creatures, as well as binary oppositions being an essential element of linguistic systems, as advocated by the like of Jakobson[47] and Lyons.[48]

Whatever the set of explanations and whether they emanate from philosophy, religion, psychology or linguistics, binary thinking seems inevitable. But it is necessary to recognise binary oppositions, and to be aware of the consequences of employing them, which can be done through deconstruction. The main problem with the (conscious or subconscious) use of binary oppositions is the hierarchy and value judgment that derive from them, and the social practices that aim at either passing from one negative term or category to the other, or simply eradicating the negative ones. This can not only lead to dramatic social consequences, but can also deny the wide array of possibilities that often exist outside of these binary poles.

Problematizing the modernity/tradition dichotomy

In addition to the resulting hierarchisation and value judgement, there are three main reasons why one should be cautious when using the modernity/tradition dichotomy, especially in the case of Indigenous peoples.

It is irrelevant

The modernity/tradition dichotomy is a simplification that is consequently irrelevant when applied to the real world. These two terms are, in addition, not mutually exclusive. This irrelevance was highlighted decades ago. As early as 1968, Kothari questioned the 'ideal-type' view of development, conceptualised in a linear way, and which identifies societies that 'lag behind'.[49] This is what he called the 'teleological concept of social sciences', where modernity *replaces* tradition. Alongside an idealisation of modernity, he also identifies an idealisation of tradition, neither of them reflecting the reality. For Shiner, modernity and tradition should just be considered as ideal-types, while they have instead become very empirical concepts.[50] Modernity and tradition are actually not fixed, and their features and characteristics all vary in time and places. So systematically opposing them is irrelevant and useless. As to Indigenous peoples, they constantly redefine themselves to reflect changes taking place around them. For example, Omura explains that due to contacts with Western societies, drinking tea or driving snowmobiles are now considered by Inuit as being part of their customs.[51] Jorgensen already stressed in 1990 how Inuit had used modern technology to maintain their subsistence lifestyle.[52] Recently, Brazilian Surui teamed up with Google to produce a cultural map identifying their territory to help them fight illegal logging activities. Hirtz goes further by claiming that 'it takes modern means to be traditional'; for him, 'modernity needs the contrasting concept of indigeneity and tradition, whereas traditional societies in pre-modern or pre-colonial times did not need to establish their "otherness" in opposition to modernity or their own history. In other words, through the very process of being recognized as "indigenous", these groups enter the realms of modernity'.[53] Schaeffer, analysing Indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador, demonstrates that their mobilisation should be understood as an engagement with modernity, and describes resulting political conflicts as 'clashes of modernising projects'[54]. Finally, it needs to be highlighted that Indigenous peoples are also not necessarily hostile to the capitalist economic system and can use it to protect their lifestyle, as demonstrated by the Sealaska initiative, a private landowner and for-

profit association for the Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian of Southeast Alaska. Sealaska is owned by over 20,000 tribal member shareholders and its activities include commercial timber harvesting and marketing of wood products.

So are modern and traditional systems incompatible? Should social structures be only understood in terms of one or the other? Already in 1967, Gusfield was arguing that it was wrong to see modernity and tradition as polar opposites and that 'modernity does not necessarily weaken tradition'[55]. Observing the case of India, he argued that 'old' and 'new' can exist side by side, like magic and medicine, and that the revival of Indigenous traditions has often been part of independence movements and struggles against domination, even when a modernisation process was on the way. More recently, Yang provides another example of co-existence between different economic logics. Looking at the Wenzhou province in China, and using the notion of 'economic hybridity', she shows that a ritual economy (responding to non-market logics) and practices have resurfaced, as a result of industrial development and market economy.[56] Similarly, analysing Papua Guinea and the case of a small oil-palm production, Curry shows that 'elements of a market economy and modernity [become] enmeshed and partly transformed by local place-based non market practices'.[57] He notably observes how the traditional practice of gift exchange has been incorporated into the economic process driven by large multinational companies. He discusses the concept of 'hybridization', which expresses the ideas that not one, but 'a range of modernities exist, so that a universal capitalist form is more imaginary than real'.[58] Similarly, tradition as well should be thought in terms of hybridization, since a range of different traditional systems exist. As stated by Bendix, 'what is true of *all* traditional societies is by the same token not very illuminating about any one of them'.[59] Hybridity in societies has been well illustrated by Robins in the case of Kalahari San identity; he also details the discomfort of many development actors vis-a-vis hybrid societies, and how the 'Western versus traditional Bushmen' dichotomy in NGOs and donor discourses contributed to divisions and conflicts within the community.[60] The difficulty of Western observers to accept either hybridity or simply social change in Indigenous societies is perfectly summarised by Sahlins using Margaret Jolly's work on inauthenticity: 'When *we* change it's called progress, but when they do – notably when they adopt some of our progressive things – it's a kind of adulteration, a *loss* of their culture'.[61] Also, the adoption of modern practices should not be mistaken with a complete endorsement of modern society, and as stated by Bendix, 'modernization in some sphere of life may occur without resulting in 'modernity''.[62] It has also been identified that there are actually several Modernities. Lee argues that the challenges posed to modernity by postmodernism in the 1980s has actually not led to its collapse; instead, it has in a sense 'rebounded' through the emergence of new terms, such as 'reflexive modernity' (Giddens and Beck), 'liquid modernity' (Bauman) and 'multiple modernities'.[63] One can add to this list 'Indigenous modernities'[64], or the 'indegenization of modernity' that Sahlins describes as the desire to indigenize (and not refuse) the commodities and relations of the world-system.[65] Similarly, Agrawal discusses the indigenous vs. scientific (western) knowledge dichotomy. He criticizes the attempt to distinguish between the two, favouring the recognition of 'multiple domains and types of knowledges, with differing logics and epistemologies'.[66]

Finally, it is important to stress that identifying themselves as 'traditional' (and drawing on traditional practices, outfits, language, etc.) is sometimes part of a strategy by Indigenous peoples to get rights and receive funding. Robins details how Kalahari San reconstituted themselves as a 'traditional community' to get access to resources, to respond to donors' conceptions of 'real' or 'authentic' Bushmen.[67] The self-identification as 'Indigenous peoples' itself can relate to the rights this identification entails. The shift from peasant struggles (campesinista) to Indian resistance (indianista) in the Ecuadorian Andes (and from 'class politics' to 'racial politics') has been detailed by Pallares.[68] Similarly, looking at the Chiapas case, Speed explains how some Mexican

communities formulated their rights claims in terms of Indigenous identity (shifting here also from peasant to pre-Columbian natives' identification). This is something that has actually been illustrated by several studies on Indigenous movements in Latin America, but is common in other regions of the world and movements[69].

It justifies intervention

Binary couples often imply hierarchisation. As such, and especially in Western collective imaginaries, modernity is more valued than tradition; it also describes a condition that is considered as better to what came *before*. So the time element is of importance here. There is an unpleasant before, and a satisfying now. The Latin word '*modernus*' was precisely used for the first time in the 5th Century to distinguish the Christian present from the Roman and pagan past, and the concept of modernity has always related to the consciousness of a new epoch.[70] This raises questions when the two conditions (tradition and modernity) are present at the same time. Criticising the tendency to denigrate the tradition/modernity dichotomy, Gould considered that 'some social properties are prior in evolutionary status'.[71] He discusses the case of Japan and India (feudal order and caste system) to challenge the argument that traditional social structures survive in industrialised societies. Looking at the way Modernity is generally perceived, there is a time element (tradition coming before, modernity coming after), as well as a space element, with modernity "beginning" in some places and spreading to others. This is another subject of contention, as discussed by Seth in his review of Berman's work.[72] Some actually conceive a complete stasis, in which traditional societies would remain the same exotic product over time. However, a clear evolution is generally perceived, and traditional societies are seen as tending, or aspiring, to modernity and development, hence the need for intervention to push for or facilitate this move. These ideas echo in a sense the post-development argument. For Escobar, the representation of societies as poor indeed requires intervention in these societies.[73] Tucker talks of an 'imperial process' that enables developed countries to 'manage, control and even create the Third World economically, politically, sociologically and culturally'.[74] For Sardar, the true power of the West does not lie within its economy or technology, but in its 'power to define'; he speaks of the 'Eurocentric colonisation of time' in which 'the West can, and indeed has, written off the past, present and the future of the non-West'.[75] In the case of Indigenous societies, a move towards modernity can provide a reason for intervention, be it with the good intentions of increasing populations' well-being, or as an excuse for exploitation of natural resources. This is particularly problematic if traditional systems and social cohesion are at risk of severe disruptions in case of unwanted external interventions. Harmful impacts of external interventions (resource extraction, development projects, tourism projects, or conservation projects) have been widely demonstrated. The 2003 annual report of the Commission on Human Rights mentions the social and economic upheaval which can be caused by the implementation of development projects. Young demonstrated how Indigenous peoples have suffered because of the dominant society thinking it 'knows' what is good for them in terms of development.[76] Munarriz highlighted that development interventions in Latin America implemented through World Bank loan policies and market reforms have benefited transnational companies and allowed the expansion of mining activities in the territories of Indigenous communities, affecting their crops and the environment.[77] Impacts of large dams have been well documented, with the World Commission on Dams (brokered by the World Bank and the World Conservation Union) concluding on 'serious impacts on the lives, livelihoods, cultures and spiritual existence of Indigenous and tribal peoples'[78], and Rajagopal even talking of 'development cleansing'[79]. These harmful consequences result in part from the tradition/modernity dichotomy, as interventions are generally presented as an opportunity to improve Indigenous peoples' conditions, misinterpreting their needs and

aspirations. A recent editorial in Science magazine triggered debate and controversy after the authors suggested that isolated tribes were not viable in the long term and called for 'controlled contact'[80]. The idea that traditional societies (isolated or not) will perish at some point is still widespread, as illustrated by the 'Before They' project by photographer Jimmy Nelson (who produced photographic portraits of Indigenous peoples 'before they pass away'). In addition to providing a justification for intervention, labelling societies as 'traditional' can justify assimilation practices, which are still prevalent in certain places and implemented in the name of development. Inaugurating the Andaman and Nicobar Tribal Research Institute, President of India Pranab Mukherjee recently claimed that 'the marginal and highly fragile tribal communities should not be disturbed in the name of development, lest they get destroyed as has happened in the past as a result of attempts to assimilate them'[81].

What emerges from the literature is that Indigenous peoples are actually both victims and resistant. They have faced attempts to take their lands and natural resources, conversions to other religions, and assimilation into the dominant society, as part of a civilisation or modernisation mission. That said, interventions are not just by development actors and do not only occur 'on the field' but also take place at another level when NGOs, academics and 'anti-development' actors project their values and understanding on Indigenous peoples and speak on their behalf. While they can support, resistance movements, activists and engaged academics can also misinterpret or (subconsciously or not) exploit Indigenous peoples' needs and wills to advance their own agenda (e.g. denouncing the abuses of modern capitalism, or praising alternative systems). This can actually be counter-productive as this can go against an emancipatory project if Indigenous' mobilisations are driven by outsiders' plans and ideologies and are stuck in a modernity/tradition framework.

It reinforces technicality

The prevalence of binary identities related to development and to Indigenous peoples contributes to the polarity in opinions and facilitates ideological thinking. They reinforce the technicality dominating the development thinking and practice.

Technicality refers to the process of reality being reduced to simplified problems and terms, discarding any other information that may call into question the definition of the problem and the solution offered. The reality is thus translated into a specific jargon and technical terms, as summarised for example by Catherine Caufield in reference to the World Bank: 'by translating complex and messy real-life problems into numerical terms that could be broken down and analysed, the Bank's Washington experts could formulate solutions to problems in countries they hardly knew'[82]. The emphasis on numerical data and the technical definition of problems and solutions often goes hand in hand with a lack of consideration for social and political factors, and a de-politicisation of development interventions. Technicality dominates international development and environmental management. For example, Ferguson takes the idea of an 'instrumental role' developed by Foucault (to which he prefers the expression 'instrumental effects'), and applies it to rural development programmes in Lesotho[83]. He demonstrates that these effects resulted in an 'anti-politics machine' (i.e. expansion of state bureaucratic power and depoliticising of poverty and the state), that is to say a high level of technicality. Zoe Young's analysis on the Global Environment Fund (GEF) underlines the technical and far from political nature of the issues and the solutions proposed by the Fund. The work carried out is technical and pragmatic, so as to minimise the complexities posed by different political goals, values and cultures within the GEF Council: 'politically loaded issues are easier when treated as "technical" matters and "solved" from above without too many conflicting values and perspectives engaging in the discussion on equal

terms'. Interestingly, she also remarks on the presence of 'anti-politics technocrats' and 'depoliticised leadership'[84].

In the case of Indigenous peoples, binary thinking contributes to a simplification of the understanding of their situation and reinforces the technicality of interventions. Structural problems are ignored, and the wide range of social phenomena occurring within these populations is overlooked. This leads to 'needs' being predefined, and projects that are not tailored made. An anecdotal, but revealing, example includes the building of latrines as one measure to compensate Bakola Pygmies for the building of the Chad-Cameroon pipeline on their territories: 'the latrines were the finest structures the villagers had ever seen, and they had locks [so they] used them to store their most precious belongings and went on relieving themselves in the bush as they had been doing quite happily for centuries'[85]. The complaints submitted to the World Bank Inspection Panel by Indigenous groups highlight that they have often been inappropriately consulted and that their needs have been either ignored or misinterpreted. Misunderstandings and conflicts can emerge when communities do not correspond to the model development agencies have in mind (from stereotypical traditional communities to communities aspiring to modernity). The simple technical differentiation between modern and traditional societies responds to the need to categorise, and consequently simplify, societies.

Normalisation: Towards a new analytical framework

Using a modernity/tradition framework to analyse and understand Indigenous peoples is irrelevant. It is (at best) an ideal-type that ignores variations in places and time as well as hybridity in societies. It justifies external interventions and reinforces the technicality dominating the development thinking and practice. As with any binary opposition, it implies hierarchisation. In addition, it focuses the attention of (critical) scholars on the dominant discourse of modernity, instead of unravelling *any* attempt of norm imposition.

I propose to move from an understanding of Indigenous societies and challenges based on a modernity/tradition dichotomy to a Normalisation framework instead, that is to say thinking in terms of the attempts made to 'normalise'. The real issue is not what Indigenous societies are or are not, but efforts to change them and make them become similar to the dominant society (or the dominant norm of a given institution, e.g. development institutions or NGOs), or in other words, forcefully erasing their differences, and encouraging them to join the 'right' side of binary couples. I use the concept developed by Foucault when he mentions a 'normalizing judgement', a 'penalty [that] normalizes' and the 'power of the Norm'[86]. In his work, he refers to the homogenisation of a group of individuals upon which is inflicted 'a constant pressure to conform to the same model [...] so that they might all be like one another'[87]. Foucault adds an additional dimension to that of homogenisation, since for him normalisation also allows for individualisation, in the sense that it enables to rank and measure variations, and 'render the differences useful by fitting them one to another'[88].

In the case of modernity, for instance, it is rather a matter of adjusting all entities in relation to a specific model (often with a call to 'imitate the West, the best of all possible worlds' (as ironically written by Amin[89]). The norm of development, or norms within modernity, are not presented here as a penalty or sanction (although the rules imposed can sometimes be felt as such) but as a remedy to the problems of underdevelopment. So-called 'traditional' groups are considered as 'abnormal' because they have not endorsed the modern economy. To become 'normal' is for them to adapt to the model constructed by those who 'already are', who 'have evolved to'. It is about raising them to the rank of modern societies, and making them fit to the Procrustean bed. It is not about 'punishing' them, but ensuring they conform to the dominant

model. As for the disciplinary power that results from normalisation, once modernity is considered as a norm, it leads to a certain degree of self-discipline, that is to say, a desire to conform to the model promoted. Normalisation is the process by which societies are encouraged or pressed to move from a state of abnormality to a state of normality, that is to say, for example, from underdevelopment to development, or from tradition to modernity, through the application of the same development model (adjustment), the imposition of rules, and self-discipline. The concept of normalisation is narrowly linked to that of naturalisation, which 'creates background knowledge that is taken to be true'[90]. Naturalisation serves to make one understand that a situation or idea is natural or 'true' – for instance that all societies tend to be modern. Certain practices are also naturalised and normalised, because it is through practices considered natural and normal that modernity becomes a model to follow, hence the importance of examining the practice of development institutions and actors which play a fundamental role in the normalisation process.

It could be argued that a framework based on the analysis of so-called "normality"/"abnormality" is itself framed within a binary system and does what it aims to criticise. It is important to distinguish between *considering* that Indigenous peoples fall into a binary system of representation, like modernity/tradition (which we criticise), and using an analytical framework that allows to reveal such beliefs and attempts at changing others "for better". Adopting a normalisation framework has several advantages.

a. No value judgement. Adopting a normalisation framework prevents from idealising one type of society or another, and from judging attachment to traditions or sympathy for modernity. Instead, it centres on the idea of *imposition*, manifest or surreptitious, of an existing or idealised societal model or social norms[91]. What is being scrutinised is the process through which change is promoted or imposed. That said, the normalisation framework does not criticise researchers' engagement and emancipatory research. On the contrary, it offers the possibility to take position on the imposition of norms and cultural change. While it focuses on external actors and the normalisation process, its concerns are ultimately centred on Indigenous peoples (or any other group of people), their needs, and the necessity to give them a voice and the power to live according to their norms and values, whether long-lasting or newly embraced.

b. Focus on external actors. The analysis is not only done at the level of Indigenous groups. It has a strong focus on external actors instead. The framework is interested in the transformation process more than in the result of the external intervention. So there is no judgement on Indigenous groups' acceptance or rejection of certain development norms, and no assessment of how 'traditional' or 'modern' they are. Instead the analysis focuses on the influence of external actors' norms and values, and their naturalisation and normalisation practices.

c. Focus on norms. Thinking in terms of norms allows a more acute analysis than just using modernity and tradition as the prism of the study. The framework encourages us to scrutinise what is inside. Some norms are common to both systems, whereas some norms are more specific to one or the other. Instead of using this binary distinction and wondering if one is supplanting the other, or is "better" than the other, the framework invites to consider the norms and values underpinning external interventions, and which norms and values are threatened. Germond-Duret demonstrates how different actors involved with Indigenous peoples (including actors defending their rights) use and promote different norms (including not hurting nature, human rights, and market economy) through different techniques and arguments (ecological sensitivity, facts, expertise)[92]. The normalisation framework is not solely interested in 'modernity', but in the imposition of *any* norm. Indeed, the comments above are also valid for a normalisation logic operating according to an idealised model of tradition. Any attempt to incite Indigenous societies to stick to traditional practices or to prevent them from adopting changes they are aspiring to is a

form of normalisation as well. The norm imposed is not necessarily dominant in the society. It prevails in the thinking of the institutions intervening among Indigenous communities. What need to be analysed are the attempts at transforming a given society according to other actors' values and understanding of what is 'right' or 'normal'.

d. Power struggles. Power struggles are at the centre of the analysis. They not only concern external actors imposing norms, but also Indigenous peoples responding to these attempts, and diverging norms and interests within Indigenous groups. Indeed, attempts at making others "normal", i.e. complying with given norms, result in a struggle for power; power to define, power to transform, and power to control destiny and shape the world according to one's own understanding and values. Power struggles within Indigenous groups are struggles for deciding on the future of the group, its cohesion, its culture.

e. Beyond a domination/resistance framework. Understanding external interventions and normalisation dynamics in terms of power struggles at all actors' levels enables to bypass a simplistic domination/resistance framework. While Indigenous peoples are often marginalised and vulnerable, considering them as helpless victims is not necessarily true. There are some contexts where the pressure exerted by external actors to dominate and impose their views and interests is very clear and oppressing and Indigenous peoples mobilise to resist, sometimes with the help of other organisations (as illustrated by the Dongria-Kondh in India resisting Vedanta's bauxite mining project, see Jammulamadaka)[93]. But some situations are more complex, with diverging interests and reactions among Indigenous groups (as illustrated by the Pehuenche's resistance to the building of the Ralco Dam on river BioBio, see Fletcher[94]). Fletcher may go too far when he says that there is no resistance, just struggles for power, as there are situations of real oppression and unequal power relationship. But still, both examples (Vedanta mining and Ralco dam) would benefit from an analysis in terms of normalisation, as it would allow a more acute analysis than simply considering a "move towards modernity" or "attachment to traditions". Even in situations where the sole motive for the intervention is the exploitation of natural resources, using a normalisation framework is still relevant as it allows understanding the norms prevailing within the institution and underpinning the narratives for Indigenous peoples' acceptation of the project.

f. Autonomy versus self-discipline. The normalisation framework enables to question the motives of the "normalised" and the elements underlying potential diverging interests within a given group. In other words, does a successful normalisation result from individuals or groups voluntarily subjecting themselves to the norm, or does it represent a form of autonomy? Interpreting social change within Indigenous groups in terms of attraction for, or reject of, modernity or tradition may miss the complexities of group dynamics, while an analysis considering disciplinary power offers a more subtle analysis of Indigenous peoples' choices and of the complex process leading to the adoption of external norms.

The elements to analyse using the normalisation framework are summarised in Table 2. A few additional comments need to be made. A normalisation process is a dynamic process. It encompasses external attempts to change or diffuse norms, as well as responses to these attempts. The framework encourages not to envisage things in a static and immutable way (i.e. either modern or traditional), but as a dynamic process of struggles and change. Its concerns are centred on Indigenous peoples and the necessity to give them a voice, listen to them and make them the actors of their own destiny. As expressed by Yshiro leader Bruno Barras, 'who better than Indigenous peoples to defend our rights? What would be properly respectful is that we, Indigenous peoples, become the protagonists of our own future instead of having someone else speak on our behalf. Any other way of doing things diminishes us'[95]. The framework answers to

that call by proposing an approach based on the dynamic process of normative change and power struggle, and avoiding judgement on the path taken by Indigenous groups.

Table 2. Elements to analyse under the framework:

Elements	Description
Intervention	Nature and purpose
Indigenous group	Ethnography, group dynamic, decision making structures; norms and values
External actor(s)	Norms and values prevailing within the institution(s), objectives
Normalising practice	Narrative and naturalisations, relevant encounters, direct actions
Power struggles	Between the Indigenous group and the external actor(s), and within the Indigenous group
Self-discipline	Disciplinary power
Resulting social change	Visible or predicted (considering time-scale for social change); Comparison ex-ante/post- intervention; adoption of any new norms/ rejection of any old norm

Finally, the normalisation framework is aimed at academics. But it can also be used by development institutions, NGOs and any intervening actors, who would be inclined to critically assess their interventions. Indeed, the normalisation process may not be conscious. Using a normalisation framework enables to appreciate the nature, purpose and consequences of the intervention, and invites to pay more attention to the aspirations of the local populations they are intervening within.

Conclusion

An approach based on a normalisation framework is definitely critical as it is about understanding power relations and norms imposition. And it is emancipatory as it is about refraining from judging Indigenous societies, whatever path they decide to take. When analysing Indigenous peoples, or intervening within their societies, it is about refraining from looking at them through the prism of how much traditional or modern they are, or how much pro or against modernity they are, and from systematically praising or condemning external interventions and consecutive social and normative change. It is about avoiding value judgement in respect to the elements of tradition or modernity rejected or adopted. It is about identifying if there has been any attempt by external actors to normalise them, to forcefully make them change. Normalisation actually goes beyond the sole case of Indigenous peoples and applies to a range of situations, basically to any group and ideology. It applies to any normative model imposed. It is certainly linked to today's cultural homogenisation trend, but it is also more than that, as most dominant, and non-dominant, groups have historically tried, successfully or not, to make others comply with their religious, political or economic model. When Habermas mentions the 'normalizing function of tradition' and modernity being 'a rebel against the normative', referring to the Age of Enlightenment, this illustrates that normalisation can be associated with any normative system of a given period[96].

Acknowledgements

Bibliography

Agrawal, Arun. "Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge." *Development and Change* 26, no. 3 (1995): 413-439.

Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1989.

Barnard, Alan. "Indigenous peoples: A response to Justin Kenrick and Jerome Lewis." *Anthropology Today* 20 (2004):19.

Barnard, Alan. "Kalahari revisionism, Vienna and the 'indigenous peoples' debate." *Social Anthropology* 14, no. 1 (2006): 7-8.

Barras, Bruno. "Life projects: development our way". In *In the way of development: indigenous peoples, life projects and globalization,* edited by Blaser, Mario, Harvey A. Feit, and Glenn McRae, 47-51. Zed/International Development Research Centre, 2004.

Bendix, Reinhard. "Tradition and Modernity reconsidered." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9, no.3 (1967): 292-346.

Blaser, Mario, Harvey A. Feit, and Glenn McRae, eds. *In the way of development: indigenous peoples, life projects and globalization.* Zed/International Development Research Centre, 2004.

Bodley, John. "The World Bank tribal policy: criticisms and recommendations". In *Tribal peoples and development issues. A global overview*, edited by John Bodley, 406-413. Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1983.

Castree, Noel. "Differential geographies: place, indigenous rights and 'local' resources." *Political Geography* 23 (2004): 133-167.

Caufield, Catherine. *Masters of illusion: the World Bank and the poverty of Nations.* London: Pan books, 1998.

Comité de Solidarité avec les Indiens des Amériques. "L'état français et 'ses' amérindiens : réflexions préliminaires sur la seconde rencontre internationale des communautés amérindiennes" [France and 'its' Amerindian: preliminary thoughts on the second international meeting of Amerindian communities], Letter 26, July-September 2004.

Crowe, Marie. "Discourse analysis: towards an understanding of its place in nursing." *Methodological Issues in Nursing Research* 51, no.1 (2005): 55-63.

Curry, George N. "Moving Beyond Postdevelopment: Facilitating Indigenous Alternatives for 'Development'." *Economic Geography* 79, no.4 (2003): 405-423.

Delgado, Juana Vera, and Margreet, Zwarteveen. "Modernity, exclusion and resistance: water and indigenous struggles in Peru." *Development* 51 (2008): 114-120.

Derrida, Jacques. *Positions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

dna India.2014. "Development should not hit fragile tribals says Pranab Mukherjee". 12 January 2014. http://www.dnaindia.com/india/report-development-should-not-hit-fragile-tribals-says-pranab-mukherjee-1949757 (accessed 15 July 2015).

Doty, Roxane Lynn. *Imperial encounters: the politics of representation in North-South relations.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Esteva, Gustavo. "Development." In *The development dictionary: a guide to knowledge as power,* edited by Wolfgang Sachs, 6-25. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1992.

Ferguson, James. *The anti-politics machine: development, depoliticization, and bureaucratic power in Lesotho.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.

Fitzsimons, Patrick, and Graham Smith. "Philosophy and Indigenous Cultural Transformation." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 32, no.1 (2000): 25-41.

Fletcher, Robert. "What are we fighting for? Rethinking resistance in a Pehuenche community in Chile". *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 28, no.3 (2001): 37-66.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. 1991 reprint, London: Penguin, 1979.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An introduction*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.

Germond-Duret, Celine. "From Avatar to Reality: Development, Environment and the Representation of Cameroonian Pygmies." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 19 (2012): 129-151.

Germond-Duret, Celine. *Banque Mondiale, Peuples Autochtones et Normalisation* [World Bank, Indigenous Peoples and Normalisation]. Paris : Karthala, 2011.

Giddens, Anthony, and Christopher Pierson. *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Goodland, Robert. *Tribal peoples and economic development: human ecologic considerations*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 1982.

Gould, Harold A. "Is the modernity-tradition model all bad?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 5, no.29/31 (1970): 1171-1176.

Gusfield, Joseph R. "Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced polarities in the study of social change." *The American Journal of Sociology* 72, no.4 (1967): 351-362.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity versus Postmodernity." *New German Critique* 22 (1981): 3-14.

Hakenholz, Thomas. "Un peuple autochtone face à la 'modernité': la communauté Mapuche-Pewenche et le barrage Ralco (Alto Bío Bío, Chili)" [Indigenous Peoples facing 'modernity' : the Mapuche-Pehuenche community and the Ralco dam], *Cahiers d'outre-mer* Oct-Dec 2004 (2004): 347-366.

Havemann, Paul. "Denial, Modernity and Exclusion: Indigenous Placelessness in Australia." *Macquarie Law Journal* 5 (2005): 57-80.

Hirtz, Frank. "It Takes Modern Means to be Traditional: On Recognizing Indigenous Cultural Communities in the Philippines." *Development and Change* 34, no.5 (2003): 887–914.

Hopwood, Bill, Mary Mellor, and Geoff O'Brien. "Sustainable development: mapping different approaches." *Sustainable Development* 13, no.1 (2005): 38-52.

Ivison, Duncan, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders. *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Jakobson, Roman. *Selected Writings.* Volume VII. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1985.

Jammulamadaka, Nimruji. "Smart Strategy or Great Tragedy? Vedanta Alumina and the Dongria Kondhs". *Journal of Business Ethics Education* 9 (2012): 431-446.

Jorgensen J.G. *Oil Age Eskimos*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Kothari, Rajni. "Tradition and Modernity revisited." *Government and Opposition* 3, no.3 (1968): 273-293.

Lee, Raymond L.M. "Reinventing Modernity: reflexive modernization vs liquid modernity vs multiple modernities." *European Journal of Social Theory* 9, no.3 (2006): 355-368.

Lloyd, Geoffrey Ernest Richard. *Polarity and Analogy: Two types of argumentation in early Greek thought.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Lyons, John. *Semantics.* Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Mander, Jerry. "Epilogue: Summary and Final Comments". In *Paradigm wars: indigenous peoples' resistance to globalization*, edited by Mander, Jerry and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, 223-227. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2006.

Munarriz, Gerardo J. "Rhetoric and reality: The World Bank development policies, mining corporations, and indigenous communities in Latin America." *International Community Law Review* 10, no.4 (2008): 431-443.

Murphy, John. 2000. "Where oil flows, future holds promise, threat Chad: a pipeline to the Cameroon coast will change the lives of the hunters, farmers, fishermen who dwell – for good or ill, they do not know". *The Baltimore Sun*, September 3.

Nelson, John, and Lindsay Hossack. *From Principles to Practice: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas in Africa.* Moreton in Marsh: Forest Peoples Programme, 2003.

Omura, Keiichi. "Construction of Inuinnaqtun (real Inuit-way): Self-image and everyday practices in Inuit society." *Senri Ethnological Studies* 60 (2002): 101-111.

Pallares, Amalia. *From Peasant Struggles to Indian Resistance: the Ecuadorian Andes in the late twentieth Century.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

Park, Yoosun. "Constructing Immigrants: A Historical Discourse Analysis of the Representations of Immigrants in US Social Work, 1882–1952", *Journal of Social Work* 6, no.2 (2006): 169-203.

Patterson, Katie. "Overcoming Barriers to Indigenous Peoples' Participation in Forest Carbon Markets." *Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 22, no.3 (2011): 417-445.

Perrot, Dominique. "Les empêcheurs de développer en rond" [The development troublemakers], *Ethnies* 6, no.13 (1991): 4-11.

Peters, Evelyn J., and Chris Andersen. *Indigenous in the City: Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2013.

Robins, Steven. "NGOs, 'Bushmen' and Double Vision: The ≠Khomani San Land Claim and the Cultural Politics of 'Community' and 'Development' in the Kalahari." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27, no. 4 (2001): 833-853.

Robins, Steven. "Whose Modernity? Indigenous Modernities and Land Claims after Apartheid." *Development and Change* 34, no. 2 (2003): 265-285.

Rostow, Walt W. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Sachs, Jeffrey. *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time.* New York: Penguin Books, 2005.

Sahlins, Marshall. "What is anthropological enlightenment? Some lessons of the twentieth century." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 28 (1999): i-xxiii .

Sardar, Ziauddin. "Development and the locations of eurocentrism". In *Critical development theory*, edited by Munck, Ronaldo, and Denis O'Hearn, 44-62. London: Zed Books, 1999.

Saugestad, Sidsel. *The inconvenient indigenous: Remote area development in Botswana, donor assistance and the first people of the Kalahari.* Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute, 2001.

Schaeffer, Timo. "Engaging Modernity : the political making of indigenous movements in Bolivia and Ecuador, 1900-2008". *Third World Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (2009): 397-413.

Schulte-Tenckhoff, Isabelle. *La question des peuples autochtones* [The Indigenous peoples issue], Paris : Bruyant-Bruxelles L.G.D.J., Collection Axes Savoir, 1997.

Seidman, Steven. "Deconstructing queer theory or the under-theorization of the social and the ethical". In *Social Postmodernism: beyond identity politics*, edited by Nicholson, Linda, and Steven Seidman, 116-141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1995.

Seth, Sanjay. "Modernity without Prometheus: on re-reading Mashall Berman's All that is Solid Melts into Air." *Third World Quarterly* 33, no. 7 (2012): 1377-1386.

Rajagopal, Balakrishnan. "The Violence of Development". *The Washington Post*. 9 August 2001.

Shiner, Larry E. "Tradition/Modernity: an ideal-type gone astray." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 17, no. 2 (1975): 245-252.

Speed, Shannon. "Global discourses on the local terrain: Human rights and indigenous identity in Chiapas", *Cultural Dynamics* 14, no. 2 (2002): 205-228.

Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People*. Commission on Human Rights. E/CN.4/2003/90. 21 April 2003.

Survival International. "Botswana president in racist outburst against Kalahari Bushmen", News. 10 December 2010. http://www.survivalinternational.org/news/6754 (accessed 6 November 2014).

Tauli-Corpuz, Victoria. "Our right to remain separate and distinct". In *Paradigm wars: indigenous peoples' resistance to globalization*, edited by Mander, Jerry, and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, 13-21. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2006a.

Tauli-Corpuz, Victoria. "World Bank and IMF impacts on indigenous economies". In *Paradigm wars: indigenous peoples' resistance to globalization*, edited by Mander, Jerry, and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, 49-58. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 2006b.

Teubner, Gunther. *Constitutional Fragments: Societal Constitutionalism and Globalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

The Hindu. 2013. "Bear mauls Chenchu tribal to death in Chinabodu". Correction section. 21 October 2013. http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/andhra-pradesh/bear-mauls-chenchu-tribal-to-death-in-chinabodu/article5257157.ece (accessed 6 November 2014).

The Times. 2013. "Real-Life Tribes who live like The Croods". 30 March 2013.

Truman, Harry S. "Inaugural Address". 20 January 1949. Washington D.C., 1949.

Tucker, Vincent. "The myth of development: a critique of a Eurocentric discourse". In *Critical development theory*, edited by Munck, Ronaldo, and Denis O'Hearn, 1-26. London: Zed Books, 1999.

United Nations. *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Division for Social Policy and Development. Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. ST/ESA/328, 2010.

Uquillas, Jorge E., and Martien Nieuwkoop (Van). "Social capital and indigenous peoples development programs in Ecuador". In *The search for empowerment: social capital as idea and practice at the World Bank*, edited by Bebbington Anthony J., Michael Woolcock, Scott Guggenheim, and Elizabeth A. Olson, 145-176. Bloomfield: Kumarian Press, 2006.

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Multidisciplinary CDA: a place for diversity". In *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, edited by Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer , 95-120. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2001.

Walmsley, Jan. "Normalisation, emancipatory research and inclusive research in learning disability." *Disability and Society* 16, no. 2 (2001): 187-205.

Walker, Robert S., and Kim R. Hill. "Protecting Isolated Tribes". *Science* 348, no. 6239 (2015)

World Bank. *Environmental and Social Framework*. First Draft for Consultation, 2014.

World Commission on Dams. *Dams and Development: A New Framework for Decision-Making*. London: Earthscan, 2000.

Yang, Mayfair Mei-Hui. "Putting global capitalism in its place: economic hybridity, Bataille and ritual expenditure." *Current Anthropology,* 41 (2000): 477-509.

Young, Elspeth. *Third World in the First: Development and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Young, Zoe. *A new green order: the World Bank and the politics of the Global Environment Facility*. London: Pluto Press, 2002.

Notes

[1] United Nations, *State of the World's Indigenous*, 1.
[2] More research is actually being conducted on Indigenous peoples living in cities. See for example Peters and Andersen (eds) (2013).
[3] See Saugestad, "The Inconvenient Indigenous", 43.
[4] Schulte-Tenkhoff, *The Indigenous Peoples Issue,*16.
[5] See Barnard, "Indigenous Peoples", 19; and Barnard, "Kalahari revisionism", 7-8.
[6] For further discussion on the concept, see Castree, "Differential geographies".
[7] Germond-Duret, "From Avatar to Reality".
[8] Mander, "Summary and Final Comments", 226.
[9] See for example Hopwood et al., "Sustainable Development: Different Approaches".
[10] Operational Manual Statement 2.34, replaced by the 1991 Operational Directive 4.20 on Indigenous Peoples, and then by the 2005 Operation Policy on Indigenous Peoples. The World Bank is currently reviewing its safeguard policies, including its policy on Indigenous peoples.
[11] Goodland, *Tribal Peoples, Economic Development,* 16.
[12] Ibid., 22.
[13] Ibid., 28.
[14] Bodley, "World Bank Tribal Policy", 408.
[15] Perrot, "Les Empêcheurs".
[16] Tauli-Corpuz, "World Bank Impacts", 51.
[17] Uquillas and Nieuwkoop, "Social capital", 147.
[18] Indigenous Peoples' Declaration on Extractive Industries, 15 April 2003, Oxford.
[19] Giddens and Pierson, *Conversations*, 94.
[20] Rostow, *Stages of Economic Growth*.
[21] Sachs, *The End of Poverty*.
[22] Teubner, *Constitutional Fragments*, 168.
[23] The Times, "Real-Life Tribes".
[24] Survival International, "Racist Outburst Against Bushmen".

[25] The Hindu, "Bear mauls Chenchu tribal".
[26] Delgado and Zwarteveen, "Modernity, Exclusion and Resistance", 119.
[27] Hakenholz, "Peuples Autochtones et Modernite".
[28] Havemann, "Denial, Modernity and Exclusion", 61.
[29] Tauli-Corpuz, "Right to Remain Separate", 14.
[30] Ibid, 20.
[31] Hopwood et al., "Sustainable Development: Different Approaches".
[32] Germond-Duret, *World Bank, Indigenous Peoples*.
[33] World Bank, *Environmental and Social Framework*.
[34] Jacobson, *Selected Writings*, 85.
[35] Derrida, *Positions*.
[36] Van Dijk, "Multidisciplinary CDA", 103.
[37] Doty, *Imperial Encounters,*10.
[38] Fitzsimons and Smith, "Indigenous Cultural Transformation", 32.
[39] Park, "Constructing Immigrants".
[40] Seidman, "Deconstructing Queer Theory".
[41] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality,* 83.
[42] Ibid, 78.
[43] Crowe, "Discourse Analysis", 57.
[44] Esteva, "Development", 7.
[45] Escobar, *Encountering Development,* 24.
[46] Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy*, 80
[47] Jackobson, *Selected Writings*.
[48] Lyon, *Semantics*.
[49] Kothari, "Tradition and Modernity Revisited".
[50] Shiner, "Tradition/Modernity".
[51] Omura, "Construction of Inuinnaqtun".
[52] Jorgensen, *Oil Age Eskimos*.
[53] Hirtz, "Modern Means to be Traditional", 889.
[54] Schaeffer, "Engaging Modernity", 398.
[55] Gusfield, "Tradition and Modernity", 351.
[56] Yang, "Economic Hybridity".
[57] Curry, "Moving Beyond Postdevelopment" 405.
[58] Ibid., 418.
[59] Bendix, "Tradition and Modernity reconsidered", 322.
[60] Robins, "NGOs, 'Bushmen', Double Vision".
[61] Sahlins, "What is anthropological enlightenment", ii.
[62] Bendix, "Tradition and Modernity reconsidered", 329.
[63] Lee, "Reinventing Modernity".
[64] Robins, "Whose Modernity?".
[65] Sahlins, "What is anthropological enlightenment".
[66] Agrawal, "Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge", 433.
[67] Robins, "NGOs, 'Bushmen' and Double Vision".
[68] Pallares, "Peasant Struggles and Indian Resistance".
[69] Speed, "Human rights and indigenous identity".
[70] Habermas, "Modernity versus Postmodernity", 3.
[71] Gould, "Modernity-Tradition Model".
[72] Seth, "Modernity without Prometheus".
[73] Escobar, *Encountering Development*.
[74] Tucker, "The Myth of Development", 1.
[75] Sardar, "Development and Eurocentrism", 44.
[76] Young, *Third World in the First*.
[77] Munnariz, "Development, Mining and Indigenous Peoples".
[78] World Commission on Dams, *Dams and Development*, 110.
[79] Rajagopal, "Violence of Development"
[80] Walker and Hill, "Protecting isolated tribes".
[81] dna India, "Development".
[82] Caufield, *Masters of Illusion*, 61.
[83] Ferguson, *The Anti-Politics Machine*.
[84] Young, *A New Green Order*, 12 ;203 ;182.
[85] Murphy, "Where oil flows".

[86] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 177ss;183;184.

[87] Ibid., 182.

[88] Ibid., 184.

[89] Amin, *Eurocentrism*, xii.

[90] Doty, *Imperial Encounters*, 10.

[91] Normalisation as employed here has a rather negative connotation, which is not the case in all contexts. For example, it is associated with positive change in some academic studies on disability, as it is about inclusion and giving people a voice. See Walmsley, "Normalisation, emancipatory research".

[92] Germond-Duret, "From Avatar to Reality".

[93] Jammulamadaka, "Smart Strategy".

[94] Fletcher, "Rethinking Resistance"

[95] Barras, "Life projects", 48.

[96] Habermas, "Modernity versus Postmodernity", 5.