SENGHOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT: CULTURE,
COSMOPOLITANISM AND EARTH WISDOM

by

Shanna Lee Mumm

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
August 2011

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

The undersigned hereby certify that they have read and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance a thesis entitled "SENGHOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT: CULTURE, COSMOPOLITANISM AND EARTH WISDOM" by Shanna Lee Mumm in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Dated: August 9, 2011

Supervisor: _____
Readers: _____
                   _____
                   _____

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

DATE: August 9, 2011

AUTHOR: Shanna Lee Mumm

TITLE: SENGHOR'S CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT: CULTURE,
COSMPOLITANISM AND EARTH WISDOM

DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL: Department of International Development Studies

DEGREE: MA   CONVOCATION: October   YEAR: 2011

Permission is herewith granted to Dalhousie University to circulate and to have copied for non-commercial purposes, at its discretion, the above title upon the request of individuals or institutions. I understand that my thesis will be electronically available to the public.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

The author attests that permission has been obtained for the use of any copyrighted material appearing in the thesis (other than the brief excerpts requiring only proper acknowledgement in scholarly writing), and that all such use is clearly acknowledged.

_____
Signature of Author

For Xavier, my son, who always brings light and love.
And for Meshon, whose generosity and support is immeasurable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This thesis is an exploration of how Senghorian thought can be useful for rethinking development. I argue that the criticisms provided by post-development are valid but that we need not reject development entirely. Rather than basing development in paternalism and charity, a foundation that will support and cultivate equality is necessary. I argue that Senghor's philosophy is particularly useful for rethinking development because it involves the deconstruction of colonial legacies, especially notions of inferiority and superiority. Furthermore, a Senghorian approach is useful because his cosmopolitan vision is based on ultimate equality that still recognizes and encourages cultural difference and finally, because his philosophy prescribes a way for humans to live in harmony with nature.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

MDGs–Millennium Development Goals

GDP–Gross Domestic Product

GNP–Gross National Product

SAPs–Structural Adjustment Programs

IMF–International Monetary Fund

C&D–Culture and Development

IDS-International Development Studies

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Chike Jeffers, for sharing with me his time and his knowledge. I have deep respect for Dr. Jeffers, as he has shown me what it means to be truly mindful. I am thankful that he pushed me to make carefully considered decisions about where I stand on important issues, a skill which I will continue to hone and which has improved because of his example and mentorship.

I would also like to thank the other two members of my committee, Dr. John Cameron and Dr. Jean-Christophe Kasende. Dr. Cameron's comments were invaluable as I made revisions and I am so grateful to both of them for agreeing to be on my committee, allowing for me to complete this task in a timely manner. I am humbled that they have gone out of their way to help me.

I would like to acknowledge the support of my family both near and far. Without their love and support I would not be where I am today. I am especially grateful to my partner, Meshon, for taking such good care of our son, Xavier. I thank Xavier, the person who has taught me more than I could have ever imagined, for showing me how to live in each moment and for the divine wisdom and joy he brings.

Finally, the Department of International Studies has been supportive and encouraging of my interdisciplinary thesis. The faculty have made this year enjoyable and rewarding; my classmates have made this year unforgettable and fun. I could not have survived the many hours spent in the Killam Library without the network of exceptionally wonderful friends I have made this past year.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preface

This thesis is about the contributions Léopold Sédar Senghor could bring to development studies. There is an element of serendipity in how I came to learn about Senghor. Even now, when I mention the poet, the philosopher, the politician, most people, especially English speaking people, have no idea who he is. Were I to mention the name, Léopold Sédar Senghor, in the small rural Saskatchewan town where I was born and raised, not only would literally nobody know anything about him, I imagine that ten people at most would know where Senegal is. I did not know where Senegal was until I planted trees with Birama, Alexandre and Ahmadou one summer during my undergraduate degree. They told me of their country, of the warmth and the hospitality of the people, of the sparkling blue ocean and the powerful presence and symbolism of the baobab tree. A seed was planted. Maybe I could travel to Senegal someday, but at this point I had one more year of university to complete.

During that final year of my undergraduate degree in political studies and English, I discovered a travel scholarship opportunity. Five thousand, five hundred dollars could be mine to put towards traveling anywhere in the world! All I would have to do is convince the committee that my travels would somehow inform and benefit my plans for the future. I already had the idea of traveling to Senegal but how would this journey specifically benefit the career I was thinking about? I had no plans for the future, no idea of a career at this point. I knew I was interested in literature and the interplay between literature and politics. I began my research and was thrilled to discover that the first president of independent Senegal (Senghor led the country from 1960-1980) was also a

poet and philosopher. It was almost too easy to spin my scholarship application and present Senegal as the perfect place for me to further my interest in politics and literature.

I travelled to Senegal and found much of the paradise my tree-planter friends had described. I found *teranga*[1], warmth, both of people and climate, family, community, joy and spirituality. Drumming *djembes* on the beach, artists creating goods and children singing and dancing. I also saw children with polio begging on street corners and I felt plastic bags wrap around my legs when I entered the crystal blue ocean waters. The plastic bags and the garbage strewn about are ubiquitous. But it isn't because there is more garbage or more waste, it's because there is no planning to take the garbage and hide it out of sight the way North American municipalities do. The mules, horses and donkeys that pull carts filled with goods sometimes have terrible lacerations on their legs; likely a result of sharing unlined, mostly unpaved roads with old cars that have been sent over from places like Japan, where people buy new cars every two years or so. I lived in Japan; the system is arranged so that it makes more sense to buy new cars than to insure old ones, as new cars come with insurance. In Japan, Christmas is promoted as a holiday for couples, where it is expected that expensive gifts are bought for your partner. It is a land of systematized consumerism.

Why did I include this personal discussion in the preface? I left Senegal feeling like I often do upon returning to my own society, to Canadian culture and society: we really are missing out on many wonderful and important aspects of life. We are often too busy to spend time with family and friends and we do not cherish our elders for the wisdom they have to offer. Most often, we live individualistic lives, separated from one

---

[1] *Teranga* is the Wolof word for hospitality. Senegal is often called "Le pays du *teranga*" or "The country of hospitality."

another by walls and fences and by our own societal beliefs about appropriateness and privacy. However, I cannot pretend that Senegal is truly a paradise. Is there a way to achieve balance between the high-consumerism and extremely busy and stressful pace of life in a country like Japan, or Canada for that matter, and the lack of basic healthcare (i.e. polio vaccines) in a country like Senegal? How could development be rethought so that the world could be more just and more equitable? And what does Senghor have to do with the answer to this question? My thesis will explain the specific contributions a Senghorian approach to development could bring.

Development needs to be rethought; in particular, the implied goal of making the entire world resemble the West is questionable. Pieterse (2010) notes that the "classic aim of development, modernization or catching up with advanced countries, is in question because modernization is no longer an obvious ambition" (p. 1). Many academics and scholars discuss the problems inherent to this linear model of "catching up" (Appadurai, 1997; W. Sachs, 1992, Rahnema, 1992; Escobar, 1995; Krishnaswamy, 2008; Bhabha, 1994) and note that the development project as a whole "did not work" (W. Sachs, 1992, p. 1). Nevertheless, linear models of modernization as Westernization continue to drive the development industry. Not only does Westernization as the development model lead to a global monoculture but it begs the question: can the world sustain upwards of six billion people living consumer lifestyles? Revathi Krishnaswamy (2008) feels that "thinking in terms of planetary sustainability, the prospect of billions more people chasing after the American dream is somewhat terrifying!" (p. 9). Big D development, as an intentional and concerted effort to bring social change, does not work; furthermore, it generally disrespects the environment and disregards cultural diversity. So the answer is

3

simple: no more big D development. Does this mean we should give up on any and all

attempts to help bring global social justice?

I argue throughout this thesis that big D development needs to end and that

development in general needs to be rethought but *not* that all efforts to make the world a

better place are to be discarded. A balanced form of development is worth seeking;

balanced development would mean economic de-growth for some and economic growth

for others. The end result would hopefully be global equity. Development that is based on

the intrinsic equality of all humans and that consists of giving and taking, of sharing and

learning will promote balance and equity. Policy efforts need to move away from a linear

big D development or development-as-growth model if global equity is to be the end

result; throughout this thesis I will assert that this can be done by working with culture,

by being open to so-called others so as to enjoy the benefits of mutually enhancing

contact and by relating to nature as though one is part of rather than separated from

nature.

My argument is that we should not simply reject development completely; rather,

we should rethink development so that it will promote equality, justice and a healthy

environment. This will require getting rid of the colonialist and paternalistic ideas that

drive big D development. I will look to Senghor for ideas that development could

incorporate in order to distinguish a new basis upon which to ground development theory.

I note that his work is lamentably essentialist but maintain that there is nevertheless much

wisdom to be gained. So what does this wisdom consist of? Ultimately, my question is:

What does development theory have to learn from Senghorian philosophy? I will argue

that his philosophy is particularly useful because it involves the deconstruction of

colonially created notions of inferiority and superiority, because his cosmopolitan vision

is based on ultimate equality that still recognizes and encourages cultural difference and

finally, because his philosophy prescribes a way for humans to live in harmony with

nature.

1.2   The Complex Whole

> "The networks of relationships linking the human race to itself and to the rest of the biosphere is so complex that all aspects affect all others to an extraordinary degree. Someone should be studying the whole system, however crudely that has to be done, because no gluing together of partial studies of a complex nonlinear system can give a good idea of the behaviour of the whole." (Murray Gell-man, 1994, p. 36)

I open with the quotation from Gell-Man for two reasons: first, International

Development Studies is an interdisciplinary field and I will draw on many disciplines

throughout this thesis. This has the advantage of giving me an opportunity to attempt to

bring together a holistic understanding; the disadvantage is that my work inevitably

displays that I am a "jack of all trades, master of none." Much of the research I have done

allows me to skim the surface of deeply researched areas in order to see what kinds of

theoretical combinations could emerge in order to give development a new and different

direction, with a different end goal. Second, and fortunately for me, Senghor was

extremely well-read in many disciplines and sought always to understand the complex

behaviour of the whole. His works and his knowledge, the theories and ideas he

developed throughout his lifetime, present a holistic vision that would be of benefit to

development studies.[2] Specifically, a Senghorian approach to development battles mental colonization, celebrates difference while encouraging cultural dialogue and includes a better way for humans to relate to the earth and to each other. However, as we shall see, this is not to say Senghor's works are unproblematic. Nevertheless, I take the following quotation to encompass what I consider the new goal for development should be: "the reuniting of Humankind to the World" (Senghor, 1964a, p. 38). In this thesis I will discuss Senghor's works in order to explore how his theories and ideas might prove useful in rethinking development.

1.3   Outline of the Following Chapters

Before moving into what Senghor has to offer, I will present a discussion of why development is in crisis and requires a serious rethinking. Thus, in the second chapter I discuss briefly the history and nature of big D development, explaining how colonial policies of domination have yet to be completely undone. I note that the failures of big D development lead many scholars to completely reject development, as in the post-development school. I conclude that though development has many problems, humans should not abandon the search for global equity and justice. Ultimately, I argue that cosmopolitanism can help provide a new basis upon which to rebuild and rethink development.

Chapter three introduces Senghor and his philosophy of Negritude more fully, noting the colonial situation under which Senghor lived. I explain that Negritude is born in part as a reaction to colonial injustice but that it is much more than an anti-colonial

---

[2]   In the introduction to *On African Socialism,* Mercer quotes Henri Fauconnier: "If this were not a topsy-turvy world, it would be governed by poets, for they are the most lucid of [people]. Beneath the appearances and conventions that blind us, they alone see reality in all its richness, its depth, its instability. Their glance is ever clear and ever new. They see and they foresee." (p. v)

stance, noting that the philosophy still has relevance today. In this discussion, I point out

the criticism that Negritude is essentialist, and it is, but it simultaneously deconstructs

hierarchies. I argue that this deconstruction is useful for development studies as a

deconstruction of hierarchies is a precursor to equality. I explain that this deconstruction

of hierarchies is contingent upon the notion that there is more than one type of reason;

intuition and rationality, both of which are aspects of human reason that have been

emphasized by different groups to varying degrees.[3] I note that intuition is generally

considered to be a weaker or softer way of knowing than rationality, especially since the

Enlightenment. The recognition of intuition as a version of reason that is equal to the

currently dominant Euro-American overtly rational kind of reason underpins Senghorian

thought; this recognition can encourage the centring and/or balancing of development as

it deconstructs hierarchies by establishing that the Euro-American way of understanding

is in no way superior and thus has much to learn from the majority world. Ultimately, I

conclude that readers must beware of dangerous generalizations within the racially

essentialist aspects of Senghor's philosophy but that we can read Senghor charitably,

seeking out the diamonds embedded in his sometimes rough oeuvre and taking the best of

what his philosophy can offer.

 The fourth chapter discusses one of the cornerstones of Senghorian thought: his

belief in the primacy of culture. Senghor asserts that unless change occurs at a deep

cultural level, it will only be superficial and will result in failed attempts at improvement.

I assert that development should work with cultural diversity rather than disregarding or

---

[3] I will use the term "rationality" to refer to technocratic, economic or "cold hard" rationality; the kind of understanding that comes from the mind. I will use "intuition" to denote a way of understanding that is based on feelings and emotions, the kind of knowing that comes from the centre of our being, from the heart.

obliterating diversity. I then note that in terms of having a vibrant culture, it is best to be both grounded in one's culture while being open to positive outside influence; however, I warn that the danger in being open to foreign influence is total assimilation to a more dominant culture, which makes it ever more pressing to be rid of inequalities. I argue that Senghorian cultural cosmopolitanism, as it deconstructs inequality and battles mental colonization by validating cultural identities, provides a version of cosmopolitanism that fends off Euro-American assimilation tendencies. This version of cosmopolitanism, as compared to other cosmopolitan thinkers, is more completely useful for development as Senghor works towards undoing the negative legacies of colonialism and ensures cultural diversity.

In chapter five I explain why it is necessary to ground development in the cosmopolitan ideal of the equality of all human beings. I begin by briefly discussing what cosmopolitanism is, noting briefly some of the trends and debates therein, before describing Senghor's cosmopolitan vision: the "Civilization of the Universal." I assert the pertinence of avoiding West/Eurocentric cosmopolitanism by describing the difference between Senghor's thinking and Appiah's. Then I explain that globalization is unavoidable and discuss ways to make globalization fruitful for all people. I argue that we should ground development not in paternalism or charity but in the idea that we are all connected *and* in the notion that we have obligations to seek global justice and equity. I conclude with a discussion on Dobson's ideas about thick and thin cosmopolitanism, arguing that both thick and thin appeals are worthwhile and that the "thin" idea of a common humanity and global unity could be thickened by considering this unity more

intuitively rather than rationally. The appeal to intuition serves again as warranting a Senghorian approach to development.

Chapter six takes the idea of cosmopolitanism beyond human interaction to a recognition of self not only in others but in nature as well. I argue that the recognition of oneness and the idea that all life contains vital force can be used to promote Senghorian thought as an environmentally sound philosophy. Rather than the idea that humans should manage the earth, as is usually proclaimed in development discourse, I propose that it would be more beneficial to recognize that humans are of and from the earth, are realized in and through nature. Thus, development should work towards understanding how to achieve sustainable development, while noting that big D development can never be sustainable. Development should be firmly grounded in the recognition that the flourishing of humankind is directly tied to the flourishing of the environment. Finally, I conclude this thesis by explaining how love can help guide humankind towards bowing respectfully to the sacred that is in each one of us and in all of nature so that we may learn to grow and flourish together.

CHAPTER 2: RETHINKING DEVELOPMENT

> "In fact, Enlightenment's declaration of itself as "the Age of Reason" is predicated precisely upon the assumption that reason could only come about as a result of the maturity in a white Europe: those geographically inhabiting the spaces outside Europe, or deemed to be of non-white racial origin, were considered rationally inferior or savage." (Eze, 2002: p. 283)

The field of International Development Studies is filled with paradox and complexity. Students in this field learn about the myriad ways in which big D development projects have failed and discuss better ways to do development while exploring whether or not development should be *done* at all. The paradox is that, though development scholars are aware of big D development problems, development practice continues to be, for the most part, about trying to "improve" those societies who constitute a country having a low Human development Index (HDI).[4] The assumption that one society knows how to improve another society is implicit in most policy implementation. The practice is based on charity and paternalism at best and outright exploitation at worst. There are many scholars (W. Sachs, 1992; Rahnema, 1992; Escobar, 1995; Pieterse, 2010; Lewis, 2005; Moyo, 2009) who argue that underdevelopment has been a continuous and concerted practice throughout history. There is also growing concern that attempts to raise people out of poverty will necessarily cause and continue environmental degradation, as the means to generating higher incomes in majority world countries generally involves increased infrastructure,

---

[4] "The Human development Index (HDI) is a comparative measure of life expectancy, literacy, education and standards of living for countries worldwide. It is a standard means of measuring well-being, especially child welfare. It is used to distinguish whether the country is a developed, a developing or an under-developed country." from Wikipedia http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_development_Index

especially in the mining and agricultural sector. These industries are notoriously bad for the environment. The recommendations of the critics of big D development vary from complete abandonment of any and all development practice to finding alternatives to development, from the implementation of better aid to handing complete control to market forces.

I will argue for a Senghorian approach to rethinking development; thus, it will be important to first discuss the meaning and evolution of development so as to effectively argue that development should be rethought. I will begin this chapter by looking at the term "development," in part to note that the term itself is relatively new–although the ideas on which it is based are not–and also to note that big D development signifies the intention of improving upon something, be it a person or a country. I then briefly describe the "age of development" which began after the Bretton Woods conference and the end of World War II. Following is a discussion of post-development's reaction to the "Westernization of the world."

The next section illustrates the similarities between big D development policies and colonialism, which both force a foreign ideal about what it means to be modern upon a group or country. The imposition of modernity upon a people requires that in the next section I consider what exactly modernity is. I explain modernity and its connection to the Enlightenment and the rise of instrumental and technical rationality, then I explain the problems inherent to this version of modernity before proposing that we think of modernity in more all-encompassing way, placing great emphasis on culture. I explain that development should be grounded in a recognition that all humans are equal but different and that we are all united by our shared planet, by our common destiny and by

our obligation to seek global justice. I then argue that big D development has failed to achieve global justice and equity because it has taken an overly rational approach as its basis for deciding how to implement change. I explain that this largely rational approach is evident in the overly technological and economic aims of development that disregard and sometimes sustain the inequality tied to colonial legacies. I conclude that Senghor's philosophy is particularly apt for rethinking development because it promotes a balance between intuition and rationality, which I explain begins to undo colonial legacies of inequality and other-ness.

2.1 The Meaning of "Development"

The term "development" is vague and unclear; it means many different things to many different people. If we consider the etymology of the actual term, "development," we find that the first recorded use is from 1756, where it signifies "an unfolding."[5] In its first usage, the term is used literally and there is no intrinsic assumption of improvement or of deliberate intent to improve; to develop is simply to peel away the enveloping layers in order to discover (indeed discover and develop would have been synonyms) what lies beneath. By 1836, the word "development" took on a linear meaning: "advancement through progressive stages." And by 1902, economics became embedded in the definition as "development" came to mean "state of economic advancement." The term "development," particularly after the end of World War II, was about attempting to place the entire world on the runway towards "high mass consumption." Rostow (1960), in his "stages of growth" model, asserts that all countries should be placed on the run-way to economic modernity in order to be able to "take-off" and continue progressing down the

---

[5]   Etymology found at www.etymonline.com.

12

linear path to economic, technological and political modernity. The ultimate goal is to reach the "age of high mass consumption." Because this kind of one-size-fits-all linear model of development-as-growth brought greater inequity while exhausting resources, destroying communities and degrading ecosystems, voices of development discontents began appearing throughout the past half-century. Even with all the failures of big D development in mind, Pieterse (2010) continues to invoke the *improvement* criterion of development, defining development as "the organized intervention in collective affairs according to a standard of improvement" noting, however, that "what constitutes improvement and what is an appropriate intervention obviously varies according to class, culture, historical context and relations of power" (p. 3-4).

The improvement criterion alone is problematic, for it reinforces hierarchy. There is a famous quotation attributed to an anonymous aborigine woman; she says: "If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time... But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together" (qtd. by Afshar, 2005, p. 545).[6] Working together would involve a mutual respect and regard for the cultural practices and ways of life; this mutual respect can only come about if the unequal power relations between the majority world and the minority world are made equal.[7] As I will explain further in chapter four, a change in power relations that will be lasting and meaningful must occur first at the level of culture. By recognizing what the majority world cultures have to offer the minority world cultures and by working towards

---

[6]   This quotation is often attributed to the Australian Aborigine elder and activist, Lilla Watson.
[7]   I will use the term majority world to refer to the "developing" world (a.k.a. the global South) and minority world to refer to the "developed" world (a.k.a. the global North), as these terms begin to dissolve the binary opposition while simultaneously acknowledging those sectors of "developing" world within the "developed" world and vice versa.

deconstructing unequal power balances, humanity can begin to work together meaningfully. Farokh Afshar argues that, "centring development not only helps us globally address mutual interdependencies but also, through mutual learning, helps us better help each other" (p. 530). For the most possible combinations of ways to help each other, there must be a recognition of the value of cultural diversity, which I will discuss further in chapter four. And with this diversity there must be an openness to dialogue with the "other," which I will explain further in chapter five. The value of cultural diversity along with a cosmopolitan openness to dialogue are cornerstones of Senghorian thought. The "age of development," however, paid little heed to cultural diversity and made little effort to understand or respect so-called others.

2.2   The "Age of Development"

The era commonly known as the "age of development" saw little attention paid to the cultural practices of the two-thirds of the global population supposedly in need of assistance. Cultural beliefs and practices were generally ignored; projects and policies that had worked in the reconstruction of Europe (via the Marshall Plan) were applied worldwide without any consideration for cultural, political or economic differences. Following the end of World War II, President Harry S. Truman gave an inaugural address that would, for many, solidify the meaning of development as it pertained to the "age of development." The measure of successful development since Truman's patronizing speech on January 20th, 1949 has generally been based on a nation-state's ability to modernize and to industrialize. As the language used in Truman's speech is crucial to understanding the continued patronization and assumption of Western superiority inherent to big D development, I shall quote at length:

More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching

misery. Their food is inadequate, they are victims of disease. Their economic life

is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them

and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history humanity possesses the

knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people...I believe that we

should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of

technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better

life...What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of

democratic fair dealing...Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace.

And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of

modern scientific and technical knowledge. (qtd. by Escobar, 1995, p. 3)

The words quoted above, though ethnocentric and arrogant, had a powerful influence in

creating the big D development agenda; that of pursuing material gain and economic

progress for upwards of two-thirds of the world's population (Escobar, 1995). Those in

control of implementing and designing big D development policies did so with the goal

of technical and scientific advancement; economic prosperity would naturally follow,

with the help of Western controlled institutions and bilateral foreign aid.

Such powerful development oriented institutions (what is now known as the

International Monetary Fund and the World Bank) came out of the Bretton Woods

conference in 1944. The goal was to have a multilateral, global system that would finance

and instigate big D development worldwide. These institutions gained momentum after

the end of the war, and with the Cold War blazing, those in charge clearly had the "catch-

up" model of development in mind. As Verhelst and Tyndale(2002) explain, since the

1950s, "development planning has been inspired by a vision of history as a linear evolution, and conceived of as a way of 'catching up' with 'modernity'" (p. 2). And so big D development has been a concerted effort by those in power; despite billions of dollars spent, global inequality is increasing.

2.3   The Rise of Post-development

As a result of 40 years of failed attempts at development the early 1990s saw the rise of the most vehement critics of development yet, the so called post-development school (Escobar, 1995; Esteva, 1992; W. Sachs, 1992). As scholars like Escobar considered the reality of the persistent and even increasing global inequality, a critique of development that was largely influenced by discourse analysis, by power relations à *la* Foucault and by postcolonial theory emerged. Escobar (1995) writes:

> Wherever one looked, one found the repetitive and omnipresent reality of development: governments designing and implementing ambitious development plans, institutions carrying out development programs in city and countryside alike, experts of all kinds studying underdevelopment and producing theories ad nauseum. The fact that most people's conditions not only did not improve but deteriorated with the passing of time did not seem to bother most experts. (p. 5)

However, the failure of development did increasingly bother experts, but not those experts in charge of World Bank and IMF policies, nor those experts advising the leaders of the most powerful countries about bilateral aid. Nevertheless, Wolfgang Sachs' (1992) *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power* was compiled and published. The introduction begins: "The last forty years can be called the age of development. This epoch is coming to an end. The time is ripe to write its obituary"

(Sachs, 2010, p. xv). This book contains the works of the most eminent critics of development. Post-development demands a new worldview, and is critical of "the economic mindset [that] implies a reductionist view of existence" (Pieterse, 2000, p. 175). Despite post-development criticisms, big D development practice today continues to emphasize infrastructure, technology and increasing levels of GDP. Pieterse (2000), who agrees with many of post-development's criticisms, argues that post-development's complete rejection of development is neither a fruitful nor a tenable position. I do not feel, however, that post-development scholars entirely reject development, for if the meaning of development became *the search for a balanced and holistic worldview*, then I think post-development scholars would jump on the development bandwagon, though they would likely demand a completely new term and concept.

Development as a practice has not yet become a search for holistic ways of achieving global balance. Latouche (1993) presents the definition of big D development that, in my opinion, is the kind of development that must die; his view on what exactly "development" means is this:

> The debate over the word 'development' is not merely a question of words. Whether one likes it or not, one can't make development different from what it has been. Development has been and still is the *Westernization of the world* (p. 160)

The Westernization of the world has been the goal of rich and powerful countries throughout much of history. The Westernization of the world represents the kind of big D development that needs to end. In many ways post-war big D development mirrors colonialism, which is why the post-development school views development as a colonial enterprise.

While the IMF and the World Bank became prominent after the second world war, the project of development began much before 60 years ago. Pieterse (2010) explains, "this is only one of the beginnings of the application of development to the South, which started with colonial economics" (p. 183). In the sense that, "[d]evelopment thinking is steeped in social engineering and the ambition to shape economies and societies, which makes it an interventionist and managerialist discipline," (p. 182) then colonialism is an example of an overtly exploitative form of development practice. In many ways, the rhetoric of development is dangerous in its euphemistic nature; Biccum (2002) explains, "the success of development as an idea over the 'civilizing mission' of the late colonial project could be due in part to a shift in rhetorical emphasis, because, while no-one wants to be colonised, everyone wants to 'develop'" (p. 41).

Aside from the connotations of the terms colonization and development, the goal of both is very similar: to bring civilization. One of the major problems with having a hierarchy of civilizations is that the civilization deemed superior falsely believes that it has the ability and knowledge to improve the lives of others. Leo Frobenius (qtd. in Senghor, 1970) writes:

> Each of the great nations that considers itself personally responsible for the "destiny of the world" believes it possesses the key to the understanding of the whole and the other nations. It is an attitude raised from the past. (p. 28)

This attitude is inherently paternalistic and creates a dichotomy of inferiority and superiority. The after-effects of colonization have yet to be resolved. Deconstructing this dichotomy, as I argue is necessary, does not lead to easy solutions. With regard to African development, Geschiere, Meyer and Pels (2008) explain that:

One cannot maintain, like many international donors do, that one simply hands

over the required technologies of growth and good governance to African

countries–a viewpoint that seems to enjoy an unexpected renaissance with the

current presentation of the Millennium Development Goals as a panacea for

Africa's crisis–because that would deny the centuries-old genealogy of inequality

between Africa and the West; nor can one simply say that Africa needs 'its own

development' for that, too, implies a denial of Africa's coevalness with the

developed part of the world. (p. 5)

This quotation denotes the complexity and multiplicity of factors involved in

development, and delineates the need for postcolonial theory to inform development

theory. Senghor's philosophy is useful for dealing with the "centuries-old genealogy of

inequality" as I will further explain in chapter three; for now, I will state that a rethinking

of development needs to take colonial legacies into account if equity is to be achieved.

Even the positive intentions behind colonial expansion and development practice

are very similar (not to mention the exploitation of the colonies' [read "developing"

countries] resources by the colonizer [read "developed" countries]). Indeed, by calling

colonization a "civilizing mission" as the French did, the effect was the creation of an end

people wanted to achieve; just as Biccum notes above, people *want* to be "developed," so

too did many want to be "civilized." Though the intention seemed to be one of assistance,

of helping, the problem is that the grounding for this intention is based on anything but

equality; rather the basis is that one superior society ought to help another inferior one.

Nothing good will ever come of such a mindset.

The similarities and differences between post-war development practice and colonization could be discussed at length; for the purpose of this thesis I want to focus on the reasons why postcolonial theory, and the postcolonial aspects of Senghorian thought in particular, should be incorporated into development theory. The residue of colonialism continues to matter globally, though the term postcolonial would lead us to think colonialism is a thing of the past. Sylvester (1999) points out that:

> most of today's development work either makes no mention of the colonial period or makes no apology for it [...] One gets the impression that the structural adjustment wing of mainstream development studies aims to finish once and for all the task of fitting the colonies to the still-modern models of Western political economy. (p. 717)

Perhaps by reconsidering the goals of development with the help of postcolonial theory as a guide, the Eurocentric or Western versions of modernity imposed throughout the ages will be presented under a different light, one that shows the flaws in the overtly economic and technical stories of modernization. But should we then decide to reject modernity all together?

2.4   Whither Modernity?

One can hardly discuss theory in any discipline without considering the idea of modernity. postcolonial theory overtly criticizes modernity, as does post-development, but what aspects of modernity are being criticized? Development practice and colonialism are connected by the common goal of modernization; however, what constitutes modernity? The question becomes, in terms of alternative or multiple modernities, modernization towards *which* modernity? Or as Homi Bhabha (1994) asks,

"What is the 'now' of modernity? Who defines this present from which we speak?" (p. 244).

The question of who determines what it is to be modern is evident in the linear notions of progress, whereby civilizations are considered to be along the same path to the same modernity but at different junctures; think of Rostow's stages of growth (1960) or more recently, Jeffrey Sachs' (2005) development ladder imagery. Jeffrey Sachs introduces *The End of Poverty* by presenting descriptions of his experience in four countries, all at different rungs on the ladder of development. Malawi is not yet on the bottom rung, Bangladesh has one foot on the ladder, India is "already several steps up the ladder" and China is deemed "the rise of affluence" (p. 15). Sachs goes on to note the number of people at each level on the ladder, all the way from the one billion who are "too ill, hungry, or destitute even to get a foot on the first rung of the development ladder" to the "one sixth of the world enjoying twenty-first-century affluence" (p. 18-19). The criteria for where populations stand on the ladder is based entirely on economics; the assumed goal is to climb up the development ladder and "enjoy twenty-first-century affluence" (p. 19). With reference to these linear assumptions, Biccum (2002) writes:

> The 'third' and 'first' worlds operate according to this transcendental sublation whereby the 'third world' is perceived to be located somewhere in the Western past, 'pre-capitalist', 'pre-industrial', in a liminal space. The dialectical maneuverings of modernity are meant to incorporate colonised space into history proper. The 'development' of the entire globe is prophesied to bring a 'more equitable universality'. In order that modernity fulfill its own prophecy, the 'third world' must be made to *resemble* the 'first' so that the colonising and

subordinating activities can be justified in the name of a greater good, that is

'global development'. (p. 42)

This version of modernity, this linear advancement towards a homogenous and unsustainable world is a version of modernity that I hope never fully comes to fruition. But there are some technological advances, such as the polio vaccines I mentioned in the preface, that are positive. Sachs' ladder imagery, if taken a step further, proves useful for my argument, for one might wonder: Where does one go after reaching the top of the ladder? If all countries of the globe are climbing up the same ladder, surely the ladder will topple once every nation reaches the top; the best thing would be to meet economically and technologically at the centre and to maintain cultural and environmental diversity. Can a balanced version of modernity be achieved? What aspects or what versions of modernity could be considered positive?

Taylor (1995), in his essay entitled, "Two theories of modernity," explains that modernity in its most well known form "conceives of modernity as the growth of reason, defined in various ways: as the growth of scientific consciousness, or the development of a secular outlook, or the rise of instrumental rationality" (p. 25). This version of modernity stems from the Enlightenment and the rise of rationality. Arjun Appadurai (1997) explains that "[w]hatever else the project of Enlightenment may have created, it aspired to create persons who would, after the fact, have wished to have become modern" (p. 1). Senghorian thought is especially useful for dealing with the negative effects of modernity in terms of the "rise in instrumental reason" as he explains that rationality and intuition are complementary and work best when in balance; one should not be emphasized over the other, both are needed to create flourishing civilizations. I will

explain this idea in more detail in the next chapter. For now, I will state that the Enlightenment changed the value placed on ways of knowing: rationality was promoted as being superior to intuition and all humans were considered equal based on their capability for reason.

That people would increasingly desire to become modern and advanced, is in part due to the rational kind of self-reflexivity Enlightenment thinking promotes. Giddens (1991) explains that the move from a traditional type of reflexivity to a modern reflexivity is problematic. He explains that the way humans make decisions about "how to go on" has changed; while it is true that all cultures take into account lived experience and society is thus shaped by ongoing discoveries, "only in the era of modernity is the revision of convention radicalised to apply (in principle) to all aspects of human life, including technological intervention into the material world" (p. 39). He goes on to discuss the problem of presuming one has "wholesale reflexivity–which of course includes reflection upon the nature of reflection itself" (p. 39). His argument, essentially, is that placing too much trust in the answers rational thought provides can be dangerous and can lead to imbalance, especially if self-reflexion leads to individualism, failing to recognize that we are all citizens of the world. It is rumoured that Einstein said, "[t]he intuitive mind is a sacred gift and the rational mind is a faithful servant. We have created a society that honours the servant and has forgotten the gift." Whether or not Einstein said this or not–and I can find no solid proof that he did– it is a quotation that, for me, gets to the very root of societal imbalance worldwide. What are the consequences of this imbalance? Giddens (1991) explains how reason has been subverted by this imbalance:

Probably we are only now, in the late twentieth century, beginning to realise in a full sense how deeply unsettling this outlook is. For when the claims of reason replaced those of tradition, they appeared to offer a sense of certitude greater than that provided by preexisting dogma. But this idea only appears pervasive so long as we do not see that the reflexivity of modernity actually subverts reason, at any rate where reason is understood as the gaining of certain knowledge. (p. 39)

In this light, the kind of reason that limits possible ways of understanding is unreasonable and ultimately reductive. There are a plethora of ways to understand and consider the world around us, it would be unreasonable to limit the possibilities.

In order to avoid reductionism, we must make room for multiple notions of what it means to be reasonable. And we must consider multiple modernities, for there are myriad ways to be modern. Modernization is a multifaceted process, including both changes from within and from without. Pieterse explains,

Modernization theory is usually referred to as a paradigm, but upon closer consideration turns out to host a wide variety of projects, some along the lines of *endogenous change,* viz. social differentiation, rationalization, the spread of universalism, achievement and specificity; and others involving projects of *exogenous change*: the spread of market relations or capitalism, technological diffusion and industrialization, westernization, nation-building... (p. 45)

Pieterse then discusses how the contradiction between internal and external influences in modernization theory is also a profound contradiction in development theory as well, as most critics of development reject the exogenous development practices. However, some

24

exogenous influence can be beneficial, just as certain aspects of Enlightenment are beneficial, are enlightening. Once again, the key is balance.

With the notion that the Enlightenment spread universal reason, ushered in modernity and perhaps inadvertently decreased the possible ways of understanding by devaluing intuition, we can be thankful that big D development's aim of achieving "high mass consumption" worldwide did not work as planned, for there are still ways to cultivate and encourage fruitful and beneficial versions of modernity, versions that will actually promote equity. As Wolfgang Sachs (2010) explains:

> If there is to be some kind of prosperity for all world citizens, the Euro-Atlantic model of production and consumption needs to be superseded, making room for modes of well-being that leave only a light footprint on the earth. Production and consumption patterns will not be fit for justice, unless they are resource-light and compatible with ecosystems. For that reason, there will be no equity without ecology in the twenty-first century. (p. xii)

Production and consumption patterns must also be compatible with communities and cultures if there is to be equity. Charles Taylor (1995) discusses the difference between cultural and acultural versions of modernity. He explains that, "a "cultural" theory of modernity is one that characterizes the transformations to have issued in the modern West mainly in terms of the rise of a new culture" whereas "an "acultural" theory is one that describes these transformations in terms of some culture-neutral operation" (p. 24). Taylor explains that the theory which "conceives of modernity as the growth of reason" is an example of an acultural type of theory (p. 24). He presents the argument that modernity does not have to imply a linear path towards Western industrialization and

capitalism. He explains, "[m]odernity is not that form of life toward which all cultures converge as they discard beliefs that held our forefathers back. Rather, it is a movement from one constellation of background understandings to another, which repositions the self in relation to others and the good" (p. 24).

The problem of big D development has been that, for the past two centuries, the dominant theories of modernity have been acultural, ignoring the differences within societies. Western rationality and the connected goals of economic, industrial and technological advancement have been privileged as the aims of advancement. Background understandings or epistemological differences have been assigned values (rationality trumps intuition and emotion, for example). If we explore the idea of modernity as being "movement from one constellation of background understandings to another," the question becomes that of ensuring the strength and validity of various background understandings, of diverse cultures, so they do not become subsumed by the still dominant acultural version of modernity. Verhelst and Tyndale (2002) explain why a cultural approach can serve to improve development outcomes:

> Many see our era as characterized by an undifferentiated obsession with technology, consumerism, the desire for quick profits (and quick solution), and a general lack of respect for those who are left out of the benefits of the growth of prosperity. The supremacy of science and technology, greater efficiency, and the reliance on heightened managerial skills to solve problems have all been unable to bring an end to hunger and malnutrition. Moreover, widening disparities between the rich and the poor, social injustices, environmental destruction, and a creeping depression and sense of meaninglessness are all products of our age. In this

context, a growing number of people are eager to see how differing cultural

approaches to development can enrich and enhance each other. (p. 6)

I argue that Senghorian thought can help solve the social injustice, environmental

destruction and the sense of meaninglessness mentioned above, precisely because he

considers culture to be of utmost importance. Thus, development should carefully

consider cultural practices and work towards balancing the emphasis placed on rationality

and on intuition when making development decisions; this balance of intuition and

rationality, which Senghor speaks to throughout his works, should be the foundation upon

which to rebuild development, as it moves away from the overly scientific, economic and

technological bases for development leaving room to bring culture, spirituality and the

environment into the equation.

It is imperative that alternate ways of knowing are considered valid, for there are

so many ways to view the world; no one way is the right way. As Taylor notes: "From

one point of view, humanity has shed a lot of false and harmful myths. From another, it

has lost touch with crucial spiritual realities" (p. 29). I argue that the very survival of the

human race is dependent on recognizing spirituality and intuition, especially because

many people intuitively understand the inherently interconnected nature of humankind's

relationship to the earth.[8] The Western scientific method, which is based on rationality,

---

[8]   Xavier Rudd song, "Sky to Ground":

"There's been changes in weather like never before
change in the winter and summer and spring and autumn
many many people still listening to the earth and her songs
so I sing it strong.
World peace all over and over again
sending this out to all my friends
this place my home from sky to ground
Seen *the universe connected* from the inside out."
(my emphasis)

necessarily separates the object from the subject, nature from humankind and in this way

limits the possibility of understanding; T. Gonzales and M. Gonzales (2010) explain:

> In this process, the scientist tends to delimit what their senses perceive, thereby
>
> apprehending what they want to know. The scientist does not deal with the whole,
>
> but with an abstraction of it...The modern scientific approach seeks to generate a
>
> universal knowledge in that truth is the inviolable and universal outcome.
>
> However, the sum of the fragments of reality often fails to make the whole. (p. 91)

In the same sense, the development practitioner, or any person for that matter, has a less

complete understanding if they focus solely on rationality rather than trying to understand

intuitively and rationally. In terms of the environment, it may make sense rationally and

economically to exploit the resources of the earth but intuitively it is obvious that the

exploitation of the earth is not only wrong but will ultimately result in humankind's self-

destruction.We need a more complete kind of reason, a balance of intuition and

rationality, that we may explore the complexity of nature while being in awe at the

wonder and beauty of it; this balance will allow us to live in harmony with the earth. By

reinstating intuition and spirituality as valid and valuable means to understanding and

knowing, as is asserted throughout Senghorian philosophy, then people will begin to

understand how unreasonable it is to destroy the earth that supports all life upon it.

Thus, one of the most pressing reasons, in my mind, to explore alternative

modernities and multiple kinds of reason is environmental for the earth cannot sustain the

move towards the usual acultural version of modernity much longer. Taylor summarizes

as follows:

In short, exclusive reliance on an acultural theory unfits us for what is perhaps the most important task of social sciences in our day: understanding the full gamut of alternative modernities in the making in different parts of the world. It locks us into an ethnocentric prison, condemned to project our own forms onto everyone else and blissfully unaware of what we are doing. (p. 32)

Postcolonial theory alone is not enough, nor is post-development. Though I agree with many of the post-development criticisms, I feel that exploring Senghorian thought can provide insight into a worthwhile and beneficial form of development. Thus, complete rejection of development is not necessary, nor is a complete rejection of modernity, for some aspects of the Enlightenment, like justice and equality, are worth seeking.

The criticisms provided by postcolonial theory are very useful, though at times the positive aspects of Enlightenment reason are overlooked. Eagleton (1994) reviews Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* and, despite many praises, writes:

One can say goodbye, it would seem, to old-fashioned Enlightenment concepts like justice or freedom, or emancipation, which postmodernism finds embarrassingly naive...his [Bhabha's] work seems not in the least enthused by the idea of political liberation–a boundary which even this most brilliant of postcolonial theorists has yet to cross. (1994, February 8ᵗʰ, *The Guardian*)

The answer lies not in discrediting Enlightenment ideals completely, for Enlightenment principles are grounded in equality and freedom; rather a search for balance is necessary. On the one hand, the Enlightenment ideal of universality does seek the transcendence of difference, which is reductive in that it leads to fewer ways of knowing and being. But Enlightenment thinking also seeks to "secure universality and guarantee continuous

historical progress in the form of individual autonomy, material well-being, and social

peace and stability" (Outlaw, 1996, p. 151). Outlaw asks if it might be better to go

slightly against the grain of modernity without eliminating it completely, as the promises

of social peace and stability have not yet come to pass (p. 151). Perhaps the aim should

not be to transcend difference but to transcend inequality. Thus, Outlaw explains:

> I think we would be wise to take up once again the quest for modernity and carry
>
> it through, but this time conserving raciality and ethnicity in reconceptualizing the
>
> ordering of social life as a means to providing understandings more appropriate
>
> for ordering social formations with a diversity of racial/ethnic cultural groups. (p.
>
> 151)

Senghor's works discuss ways to reconceptualize the ordering of society as we search for

more appropriate understandings. Indeed, this reconceptualization relies on validating

more than one form of reason, on bringing intuition back to its rightful place as equal and

complementary to rationality. I have incorporated Outlaw's work to show that it is

possible to maintain Enlightenment ideals of universality, as in the search for social

justice and for "political liberation," as Eagleton noted above, without discounting the

plurality of voices and forms of reason presented by diverse racial and ethnic groups. The

means to achieving political liberation, as I will further discuss in chapter four, are

through culture; Senghor writes, "there can be no political liberation without cultural

liberation" (*Prose and Poetry,* p. 71). A Senghorian approach to development encourages

cultural difference while demanding equality.

I do not claim to have the map to global justice, peace and stability. However, the

levels of global inequality present in our world today and the degree of environmental

degradation make this search imperative, for despite technological and economic progress worldwide, inequality is increasing steadily. It is shameful that one seventieth (1/70) of the money spent on consumption by high-income countries would provide $300 billion to put towards poverty alleviation (Pogge, 2008, p. 3). How long will it take for people to begin acting as though we are interconnected, as "citizens of the world?" If development is grounded on the notion that all humans are equal but different and that we are obliged by this recognition to seek justice, then there might still be hope for a future on this planet. Senghor's works describe such a cosmopolitan vision.

2.5   Cosmopolitanism

I have explained that, though I agree with the criticisms of development put forth by post-development scholars, development should not be rejected entirely; rather, it needs to be rethought and based in something other than paternalism and charity. Development policy has not been purposefully detrimental with the ultimate goal of economic gain for the elite in all cases. In a less cynical tone, development continues to thrive because of the language of universal human rights and the search for global equity. While there is much deconstruction to be done, deconstructing the search for global justice will not prove beneficial. We must recognize that we are all united in a common global destiny and that we, as citizens of the world, have an obligation to seek justice and equity. The recognition of a common global destiny is a cosmopolitan ideal. This ideal, though it may seem unattainable, need not be. Appiah (2006) explains, "cosmopolitanism shouldn't be seen as some exalted attainment: it begins with the simple idea that in the human community, as in national communities, we need to develop habits of coexistence: conversation in its older meaning, of living together, association" (p. xix). Furthermore,

the search for global equality and justice is simultaneously about self-preservation. Damisio (2003) explains how Spinoza presents the reciprocal nature of not doing harm to others in order to not do harm to oneself, stating that "[t]he endeavour to live in a shared, peaceful agreement with others is an extension of the endeavour to preserve oneself" (p. 171).

The recognition of a common humanity is the usual basis for cosmopolitan thought;[9] however, the various strands of cosmopolitanism and the debates therein make it difficult to decide upon what this commonality entails. Vertovec and Cohen (2002) note the variety of angles from which to view cosmopolitanism:

> In most cases the re-emergence of cosmopolitanism arises by way of a proposed new politics on the left, embodying middle-path alternatives between ethnocentric nationalism and particularist multiculturalism. For some...cosmopolitanism refers to a vision of global democracy and world citizenship; for others it points to the possibilities for shaping new transnational frameworks for making links between social movements. Yet others invoke cosmopolitanism to advocate a non-communitarian, post-identity politics of overlapping interests and heterogenous or hybrid in order to challenge conventional notions of belonging, identity and citizenship. (p. 1)

Senghor's cosmopolitanism certainly advocates for a middle path and includes a vision of world citizenship, though he does not invoke a non-communitarian, post-identity politics. Senghor argues that being firmly rooted in one's culture is the precursor to successful

---

[9]   I will discuss an article by Andrew Dobson called, "Thick Cosmopolitanism" at the end of chapter five. For now, let it be known that he feels that the recognition of a common humanity is a thin motivation for cosmopolitanism. He argues that illustrating material causal relationships will better obligate people to bring about global justice.

cosmopolitan dialogue; culture is so important to Senghor's cosmopolitan vision that I have, in this thesis, placed the chapter pertaining to culture before the one pertaining to cosmopolitanism. This is to show that a Senghorian approach to development would be based, first and foremost, in working to ensure and cultivate cultural integrity and rootedness. His cosmopolitan vision wards off West/Eurocentrism and clearly states that a dialogue of cultures without equality will not be fruitful and will not lead to flourishing. It might be possible to look to various theories–perhaps a combination of cultural cosmopolitanism, postcolonial theory and deep ecology–and still come up with some of the same ideas about rethinking development as I will present as a Senghorian approach. But I argue that a specifically Senghorian approach is the superior path particularly because he was able, beginning many years ago and pondering over a lifetime, to create a philosophy that could lead to the "Civilization of the Universal," a utopian dialogue of giving and taking. The "Civilization of the Universal" will be "a symbiosis of the most fecundating elements of all civilizations" (Senghor, 1964b, p. 83). I argue that development should be grounded in cosmopolitan ideals and Senghor's cosmopolitan ideals in particular because his philosophy deconstructs negative colonial notions of inferiority and superiority, is based on cultural primacy and the equal dialogue of cultures and his philosophy involves a better way for humans to relate to nature. Senghor's vision is more than cosmopolitanism, it is postcolonial cultural cosmopolitanism plus earth wisdom. Senghor's holistic vision provides ways to deal with the very roots of why development has failed thus far: it has failed to take culture and spirituality seriously, it is not based on equality and thus does not allow for respectful dialogue and it is destructive of the earth. Development is a product of an overly rational way of understanding the

world and because Senghor calls for the balance between intuition and rationality, his philosophy can help solve the root cause of why big D development has helped bring humanity to the brink of self-destruction.

When Amartya Sen explains in D*evelopment as Freedom* (1999) that people should have the freedom to lead the kind of life that they value, it is the emphasis on values and the recognition that freedom will mean different things to different people that is ultimately useful. If development had less to do with growth and raising levels of GNP and more to do with "enhancing the lives we lead and the freedoms we enjoy," (Sen, 1999, p. 14) then I say, let us develop the earth! Abandoning development means abandoning the search for justice. I agree that we need to abandon big D development, the kind that is paternalistic and inherently inequitable. However, the health and well being of everyone and everything on the planet is worth seeking, for we are invariably interconnected. Senghor (1980) asserts the common destiny of humanity in the following quotation:

> My message, since you ask me to deliver one, is that we are all – continents, races,
> nations and civilizations – embarked upon the same destiny. It is an
> understatement to say that, in this grand adventure, it is necessarily the case that
> we need to be in solidarity: we need to do more than this, by cultivating our
> differences in order to reciprocally enrich each other. It is only in this way that we
> will be able to save ourselves, rather than perish together. (p. 360)

Let us delve into the works of Léopold Sédar Senghor to illustrate why have called his philosophy "postcolonial cultural cosmopolitanism plus earth wisdom." I will explain

throughout what his holistic philosophy can bring forth in terms of alternative ways forward, in terms of balancing and centring development.

CHAPTER 3: MORE THAN JUST A REACTION TO "LA MISSION CIVILISATRICE:" SENGHOR AND THE BIRTH OF NEGRITUDE

Léopold Sédar Senghor's works have been criticized by many and dismissed as passé. Even prominent Senghor scholars feel that Senghor's works have been adequately discussed already; Ekpo (2010) explains that, "Irele [an expert in African literature] frankly confessed that there was nothing new to say or do about or beyond Negritude or Senghor, everything having already been oversaid and overdone" (p. 177). However, development theory still has much to gain by incorporating Senghorian thought. I begin this chapter by giving a biographical account of Senghor's early years, incorporating the reforms and changes in educational policy in French West Africa at the time, as these changes delineate the changes in colonial policy that affected Senghor's life. I explain that the equality and universality promised by Enlightenment philosophy faltered as colonialism was increasingly racist; black Africans were first promised French language and culture and were later deemed incapable of fully achieving French civilization. Next, I describe how Senghor was personally shaped first by believing he could master French language and culture and be accepted as equal and then realizing that this promise would ultimately be broken. I argue that Senghor comes to terms with this injustice through the development of Negritude, which allows for difference but not inequality. Senghor's philosophy is particularly useful for rethinking development, as development should be based on equality and should recognize diverse ways of being. I then discuss how Senghor adopted French culture and wanted to take from it what he considered useful but that he came to realize the value of African culture as well; spirituality is hugely important to Senghor and development needs to consider the importance of spirituality,

for it is extremely important to understanding how many majority world people make decisions about their lives. Also, the minority world could benefit by entertaining the benefits of spiritual practices. Development is beginning to recognize that reciprocal enrichment is fruitful, though I argue that it is yet to based in equality and that much more giving *and* taking needs to occur in order to truly centre development.

The following section is more about Senghor's philosophy and less about his life. It focuses on Senghor's Negritude as a tool for battling mental colonization and I argue that decolonization of the mind is a battle that has not yet been won. As I describe Negritude more fully, explaining how it is not simply anti-colonial, I note the ways in which Senghor's philosophy can be useful for development today. Specifically, I argue that battling cultural imperialism is necessary if there is to be equality. A Senghorian approach to development would be based on a world that is free from notions of superiority and inferiority.

Finally, I consider whether or not the essentialism found in Senghor's works is so problematic that his works should be discarded entirely. I argue that while essentialism is present in his writing, he also does much to deconstruct essentialism as he ultimately seeks the mutual benefits of hybridity: of heart and mind, of more than one kind of reason. I further argue that this call for hybridity is useful for development studies, explaining that being open to other ways of knowing and being gives a greater understanding of possible ways to rethink development. His philosophy is sometimes essentialist but he is not racist, as he believes that all races are equal and complementary; there is no inferiority or superiority in his vision. Furthermore, his work is less essentialist than it seems at first glance. I propose to elucidate in this chapter that

Senghor's philosophy is ultimately worth considering. Let us begin by getting to know Senghor.

3.1   Senghor of Senegal, Born Under French Rule

Léopold Sédar Senghor's philosophy was shaped by having been born in West Africa, under French colonial rule. Senghor was born on October 6th, 1906 (Vaillant, 1990, p. 5). His early life, up to age seven, was spent in his mother's village: Djilor. There, Senghor's life was largely outside of French influence, and he was "free to wander the countryside, to dream, to learn, to ask questions of a wise elder" (Vaillant, 1990, p. 19). The wise elder was Senghor's beloved Uncle Toko Waly, and Senghor spent much of his young life learning from his animist shepherd uncle. In fact, he spent too much time with Uncle Waly and the rivalry between the maternal uncle and the father, Diogoye, caused the young Senghor to be sent to Ngazobil, six kilometres from Joal, to attend a missionary school run by the Fathers of the Holy Spirit (p. 19-20). There, for the first time, Senghor began to learn the French language (not to mention Wolof, the language of the majority of Senegalese). The instruction at Ngazobil was very basic and the missionaries used both Serer, Senghor's mother tongue, and Wolof in their teaching (p. 21).

The educational policies of the French towards the colonies were undergoing some debate at the time Senghor was born. These debates demonstrate trends in racial thinking during the beginning of the twentieth century. As Vaillant explains, "most educators assumed that the native could not fully assimilate the French language or give up his former modes of thought" (p. 22). However, the French civilizing mission had already been implemented in full force; the initial belief was that, if West Africans were

to learn French they would develop strong cultural ties to France. Vaillant notes that a French colonial educator by the name of Georges Hardy worried about the effects of teaching French to African children, for they may begin to exist "in two separate worlds: the real world from which he has come and to which he is passionately attached by the language of the country; and an artificial world–a temporary existence where he for the time being comes into contact with the French language" (qtd. on p. 22). In many ways, and especially in Senghor's case, the policy of the French was a success as many West Africans came to love French language and culture; however, "they also suffered from living in...two separate worlds" (p. 22).

The suffering, it would seem, comes not from living in two separate worlds as much as it comes from being promised by Enlightenment ideals that all people are equal and then discovering that those who supposedly live by those ideals do not adhere to them. The suffering is caused by having partial access to two separate worlds but becoming somewhat alienated by both of them. Perhaps Enlightenment notions of individual equality based on the universality of reason were born of truth. However, colonial realities made actual equality an impossible option, for how can equals purposefully and knowingly exploit and disadvantage each other? Paul Taylor (2004) explains how anti-black racism increased because of late nineteenth-century economic downturns which prompted "reinvigorated imperial zeal" (p. 45). He summarizes the way in which racist reasoning was necessary for and cultivated by imperial expansion:

> Colonial powers went overseas in search of markets, resources, and places to send their ne'er-do-wells, and this led to a feedback loop of racist reasoning. States won support for colonial adventures by emphasizing the need to civilize the backward

races or to cultivate lands–under the doctrine of *terra nullius,* or empty land–that the natives had allowed to lie fallow. Meanwhile, the colonial administrators and functionaries, trained above all to keep the inferior natives in check, brought invidious "knowledge" about their "savage" charges back to the European homelands. (p. 45)

The presentation of indigenous peoples as being inferior races by colonial administrators may have been used to create a shiny veneer for the supposed civilizing mission that was, in reality, blatant exploitation.

For Senghor, the idea that Africans had no civilization prior to colonialism is absurd and Negritude was, in part, an assertion of the long-standing complexity and diversity of black African civilization. In "Problématique de la Négritude," Senghor (1971b) states that the French "denied, on the one hand, that we had a *civilization* (a civilization at least equal, even though different); they denied us, on the other hand, the right to recognize this *difference*, to cultivate it and reclaim, for it, an equality that is not identical but complementary"[10] (p. 4). Here Senghor is writing about colonial administrators' denial that Africans already had a civilization; the following quotation explains that the mindset of development agents is often similar to that of colonial administrators: "The current process is that researchers and development agents claim to be representatives of the people, on the arrogant assumption that their particular techniques are the exclusive domain of trained academics and elites" (Anacleti, 2002, p. 173). The denial that local people know what it is they need and require sustains the

---

[10] « ...niait, d'une part, que nous eussions une *civilisation* – du moins une civilisation égale encore que différente – , on nous déniait, d'autre part, le droit de reconnaître cette *différence*, de la cultiver et de réclamer, pour elle, une égalité, non pas identique, mais complémentaire. »

notion of inferiority and superiority. Senghor's works are useful for breaking this false

dichotomy down, as he asserts throughout his philosophy that people should have the

right to choose their own way forward. In *On African Socialism* (1964b) he states, "the

evil of colonization is less these ruptures [slavery, feudalism, capitalism and colonialism]

than that we were deprived of the freedom to choose those European contributions most

appropriate to our spirit" (p. 82). This right to choose appropriate contributions will only

be truly free once it is recognized that all cultures and all "[r]aces are not equal but

complementary, which is a superior form of equality" (1937, p. 13).

If development, both in terms of theory and practice, were to recognize this

complementarity, this equality, then there would be more instances of centring

development. However, as Afshar (2005) explains:

> in a South-focused ID field (especially in the North), for every person who so
>
> reflects there are many more who remain fixated on how the South must change
>
> and how we in the North must "help" them change, blind to the development
>
> issues within our North that need change. (p. 531)

I do not wish to proclaim exactly what the minority world can or should learn from the

majority world; however, I do assert that an open dialogue free from assumptions of

inferiority and superiority would be of great benefit to development.

Senghor knew, in his heart and in his mind, that he was not inferior. He came up

with an explanation that allowed him to be equal but still different, which is why his

philosophy is so useful for deconstructing inequality. However, during Senghor's life,

there was a general assertion by many colonial administrators that "only certain aspects

of French culture can be mastered by an African" (Vaillant, 1990, p. 55). Vaillant quotes

Georges Hardy to illustrate the blatant assumptions of superiority held by at least some of

the colonial administrators:

> We have put much water in the wine of African programs...for the time being let
>
> [Africans]...remain in the cave of which Plato speaks so beautifully, and...look at
>
> the overly bright sun [of French civilization] only through its reflection in the
>
> muddy waters of African streams. (qtd. on p. 58)

In many ways, Senghor's desire to prove his ability to see *clearly* the brightness of the

sun leads to the birth of Negritude, for despite his extreme mastery of French language

and culture, despite his proving himself time and again, he finds that upon his arrival in

Paris, that he is not accepted by the French as an equal. Indeed, his mastery of French is

how he managed to travel to Paris at all, for, in 1928, he was the first black African to be

awarded a half scholarship of 250 francs to study literature in Paris (p. 62). However,

once he has spent some time in Paris he himself decides that he *is* different; "Senghor

acknowledged that he had been profoundly drawn to the French and their culture, and not

until he was a student in Paris had he recognized how different his intuitive reactions

were from theirs" (p. 97).

His realization that French civilization could not offer him all that he may have

initially hoped leads him to emphasize and recollect that which is good and positive about

his homeland, including spirituality. In his poem, "Femme Noire," or "Black Woman," he

personifies Africa as a woman:

> Naked woman, black woman
> Clothed with your colour which is life, with your form which is beauty!
> In your shadow I have grown up; the gentleness of your hands was laid over
>   my eyes

And now, high up on the sun-baked pass, at the heart of summer, at the heart
    of noon, I come upon you, my Promised Land,
And your beauty strikes me to the heart like the flash of an eagle.

Naked woman, dark woman
Firm-fleshed ripe fruit, sombre raptures of black wine, mouth making lyrical
    my mouth
Savannah stretching to clear horizons, savannah shuddering beneath the East
    Wind's eager caresses
Carved tom-tom, taut tom-tom, muttering under the Conqueror's fingers
Your solemn contralto voice is the spiritual song of the Beloved...

Naked woman, black woman,
I sing your beauty that passes, the form that I fix in the Eternal,
Before jealous Fate turn you to ashes to feed the roots of life. *(Prose and
Poetry,* 1976, p. 106)

Senghor experienced many difficult situations while living abroad in Paris and the

memories of his childhood, of the spirituality and beauty he lived, led him to note that

French civilization has much to offer, but that it is nevertheless lacking in some ways.

One important aspect of life that is lacking is spirituality. With regard to the preeminence

of spiritual fulfillment for all people, he prophecies in "Vues sur l'Afrique noire," after

stating how the colonizers take primary resources from the colonies, "but tomorrow, for

her [France's] reconstruction, she won't simply need primary resources, she will also need

spirituality"[11] (1945, p. 68). According to deep ecologist Chellis Glendinning (1995), this

prophecy proves true for all of Western society: "In Western culture, we live with chronic

anxiety, anger, and a sense that something essential is missing from our lives, that we

exist without a soul" (p. 37). I do not wish to assert that spirituality is the one thing the

majority world can offer; however, I do wish to assert that development should

---

[11] « Mais, demain, pour sa reconstruction, elle n'aura pas seulement besoin de matières premières, elle
aura encore besoin de forces spirituelles. »

incorporate spirituality into its agenda. As Ver Beek (2002) explains, the removal of spirituality from the development dialogue means that,

> academics and practitioners can precipitate changes in people's spirituality and subsequently in their whole way of life without the participants' awareness or consent...It is only through dialogue that people can come to a better understanding of how spirituality shapes their lives and decisions, how it can affect and be affected by different development paths, and how they can make informed decisions about which path will best serve them. (p. 73)

Spirituality needs to enter into development theory more completely; a Senghorian approach to development would require that spirituality be a topic of great importance, as he believed that the goal of each person should be to work towards spiritual fulfillment (1945, p. 60).

Part of the reason development planning should deeply consider and discuss spirituality is because spirituality is extremely important to many people in the majority world; to discount it is disrespectful and it increases inequality, for "there is a certain degree of condescension implicit in withholding what one believes to be a superior understanding of reality so as not to offend or impose" along with the "silent conviction that science and development ultimately will allow people to leave behind their spiritual and 'unscientific' beliefs (Ver Beek, 2002, p. 72). The condescension in promising Enlightenment ideals of equality, only to ultimately assert that Africans are not *really* capable of achieving French civilization, similarly places the colonizer in the position of superiority. This unfulfilled promise is essentially what led Senghor to develop Negritude, which asserts the intrinsic value and worth of black culture. Senghor never

believed that he or his culture was inferior, though he did come to the conclusion that he was different; his desire to prove himself as equal to the best of the Europeans led him to Paris, where he fleshed out, with Aimé Césaire and others, the philosophy of Negritude.

3.2   Negritude as Anti-Colonialism?

> "The colonial problem is nothing other, at its core, than a provincial problem, a human problem."[12] (Senghor, "Vues sur l'Afrique noire," 1945, p. 40)

I have highlighted the colonial situation under which Senghor was raised to show that his formative years were influential to the birth of Negritude. But Negritude is a philosophy that is applicable to more than the colonial situation; it is universal and demands attention even today, perhaps especially today. Diagne (2004) notes that,

> there is an urgent need for new or modified paradigms of development...For the African philosopher the task with regard to development lies not with the atavistic work of a Mbiti[13] but with assiduous conversation with the *futurist ideas* of Fanon, N'Krumah, Senghor, Diop, Hountondji, Amin, and others. (p. 66-my emphasis)

Were Negritude specific to colonialism, it would not be considered *futurist* nor would Diagne state that Senghor's works had anything to offer development today. Moreover, even if Negritude were simply an anti-colonial movement, which I do not think it is, it would still be applicable as the legacies of colonialism are far from past.

The connection to colonialism is intrinsic to Senghor's philosophy, just as recognizing the legacies of colonialism is crucial to rethinking development today. While

---

[12]   « Le problème colonial n'est rien d'autre, au fond, qu'un problème provincial, un problème humain. »
[13]   John S. Mbiti's 1990 book entitled, *African Religions and Philosophy* is widely read but it has been criticized for being overly generalizing as it seeks to find the commonalities underlying religion and spirituality for all of Africa. Diagne is noting that Mbiti's work is more descriptive whereas the works of the other Africans mentioned are more prescriptive.

many consider Negritude to be an anti-colonial philosophy, it is certainly not merely so. Senghor was a realist about colonization and he chose to find, amidst the injustice, the racism and the exploitation, those aspects of colonialism that could be beneficial to West Africans. Thus, in "Vues sur l'Afrique noire," (1945) he explains that he doesn't want to "repeat the problem of colonization but to rethink it"[14] (p. 39). For Senghor, rethinking means admitting that colonialism has had an impact, certainly, and that though much harm was done, the best practice for West Africa at this time would be to incorporate the beneficial aspects colonialism has put forth (p. 39-40).

At the time, Senghor is asking France to do what is right for her colonies and to allow Senegal the freedom to forge her own future. "Freedom" is what nobel laureate, Amartya Sen (1999), argues development should bring; however, the freedom for nations, groups, cultures to choose their own development path has yet to come. People in the majority world must still be wary of being assimilated to a version of Western modernity. Thus the subtitle of Senghor's paper, "assimilate, not be assimilated," is applicable for rethinking development today, as the goal of development is often to bring civilization to the supposedly less civilized.[15]

Senghor uses the example of a French friend of his who said to him, "Admit, finally, that we have brought you Civilization." To which Senghor replied, "Not exactly. You have brought us *your* civilization. Allow us to take what is best, most fruitful, and suffer that we will leave you the rest"[16] (p. 40). Rather than taking an overtly anti-colonial

---

[14] « je ne dis pas à reposer le problème de la colonisation, mais à le repenser. »
[15] The full title of this paper is, "Vues sur l'Afrique noire ou assimiler, non être assimilés. »
[16] « Avouez, enfin, que nous vous avez apporté la Civilisation." Et Senghor: "Pas précisément. Vous nous avez apporté *votre* civilisation. Laissez-nous y prendre ce qu'il y a de meilleure, de fécondant, et souffrez que nous vous rendions le reste. »

stance and rejecting outside influence completely, Senghor is reacting to what he calls the

"colonial *fact*"[17] (p. 40); what has been done cannot be undone, decisions for the future

are what matter. Thus, rather than rejecting the potential benefits France had introduced,

Senghor decides to choose a more positive angle with which to approach the colonial

problem: "Contact *of two civilizations,* this seems to me the best possible definition of the

problem"[18] (p. 40). Senghor's willingness to take that which is useful from France should

be mirrored by France; France should take that which is useful from Senegal. On a global

scale, all cultural groups should be open to taking that which is beneficial from each other

as rethinking development should entail centring and balancing.

The idea of contact and cultural sharing as positive opportunities is a theme that

runs throughout Negritude and through Senghor's philosophy, the culmination of which is

the "Civilization of the Universal," which I will discuss in chapter five. For now, it is

important to understand that the philosophy of Negritude is still relevant today. In the

sense that "Negritude is a Humanism" and in the sense that the colonial problem is a

human problem (as in the introductory quotation), one which continues to impact the

world today, then reducing Senghor's works to nothing more than a reaction to

colonialism, and thus dismissing them as passé, would be an unfruitful act. As I do not

wish to be wasteful, let me now describe Negritude in greater detail.

Senghor's (1969) two-part definition of Negritude, found in "De la Négritude,"

explains how the philosophy functions in two ways: objectively and subjectively. In the

following quotation he offers a simple and clear definition:

---

[17] *« fait* colonial »
[18] « Contact *de deux civilisations,* cela me semble être la définition la meilleure du problème. »

47

Negritude could be defined under a double-aspect: objective and

subjective...Objectively, Negritude is a certain vision of the world and a certain

concrete way of living this world. It is, like the Germans say, a *Weltanschauung,* a

Da-sein, more precisely, a *Neger-sein,* that is to say a "Negro way of being/being

Negro."[19] (p.17)

The type of Negritude that is objective constitutes nothing less than a worldview and

should not be confined to colonialism. Senghor notes that the second or other Negritude

is that which was born during the years from 1931-1935 (p. 17): "This one is a project of

action. It is a project in the sense that we wanted to ourselves found upon traditional

Negritude in order to bring our contribution to the Civilization of the Universal"[20] (p. 17).

This project of action was especially necessary during decolonization, but Negritude is

not to be discarded because colonialism is over. The outright assertion of Negritude, the

subjective aspect, the "project of action" became necessary during the years leading up to

decolonization because a counter to cultural imperialism was needed so that black

African civilization could retain a cultural rootedness that would keep strong the valuable

gifts to be offered at the "rendez-vous." These gifts will consist of and stem from the

fundamental values of Negritude, which are:

A rare capacity for emotion, an existential and unitary ontology, achieved, by a

mystic surrealism, to an engaged and functional artistry, both collective and

actual, where the style is characterized by the analogous image and the

---

[19] « La Négritude peur être définie sous un double aspect: objectif et subjectif...Donc, objectivement, la Négritude, c'est une certaine vision du monde et une certaine manière concrète de vivre ce monde. C'est, comme disent les Allemands, une *Weltanschauung,* un *Da-sein,* très précisément, un *Neger-sein,* c'est-à-dire un « être nègre » »

[20] « Celle-ci est projet et action. Elle est projet dans la mesure où nous voulons nous fonder sur la Négritude traditionnelle pour apporter notre contribution à la Civilisation de l'Universel. »

asymmetric parallelism. This is what we will bring to the "Rendez-vous of give

and take" in this, the century of the *Civilization of the Universal.*[21] (Senghor,

1969, p. 23)

These gifts are valuable as is Senghor's vision of the Civilization of the Universal.

Development should take note of the valuable offerings *all* cultures can bring rather than

assuming that the minority world already knows all it needs to know.

Colonialism tried to assimilate cultures, tried to civilize the supposedly savage

colonies and in many ways, big D development has continued in the same way. Negritude

is informed by the colonial situation, Senghor notes as much, and the colonial situation

has left legacies of inferiority and superiority. Development should work towards

dismantling inferiority and superiority to ensure a multitude of voices as we work

together to solve the crises we face on this earth. The end goal of the "Civilization of the

Universal" requires that each civilization maintain and cultivate the gifts they have

developed over time and development should not work against this goal.

The only way to keep strong the positive attributes of each culture is to avoid

assimilation by foreign domination. From some of Senghor's earliest works, right up until

his last published work, *Ce que je crois*, he spoke of the need to battle cultural

domination. Even the choice of suffix for the word "Negritude" is an affront to cultural

imperialism. In *Ce que je crois*, Senghor (1988) writes,

It's that the suffix *-itude* has a more concrete significance, or is less abstract, than

the suffix *-ité*...It was not a value judgement but one of identity. Because we were

---

[21] « Un rare don d'émotion, une ontologie existentielle et unitaire, aboutissant, par un surréalisme
     mystique, à un art engagé et fonctionnel, et le parallélisme asymétrique. Voilà ce que nous apportons au
     « Rendez-vous du donner et du recevoir », en ce siècle de la *Civilisation de l'Universel.* »

colonized, we fought against political domination but, moreover, against cultural

colonization"[22] (p. 137).

The assertion that cultural imperialism is most pernicious is evident in earlier works as

well. It is cultural imperialism, rather than the exploitation of resources, that Senghor

finds most threatening. He states in "Élements constitutif" (1959), "*cultural imperialism,*

we too often forget, is the most dangerous form of colonialism: it casts a shadow over the

conscience"[23] (p. 282). Thus, Negritude was, in part, born of the colonial situation in

which Senghor existed but it is also relevant today, in part because cultural imperialism

continues today, sometimes under the guise of development.

Looking back on the motives and aspirations of both Césaire and Senghor as they

formed and presented Negritude, we see the commonality of an attempt to undo the

damage done by the racist colonial discourse of superior and inferior races. Vaillant

explains that "he [Senghor] felt he had a calling to speak for his people, and for all

colonised people seeking to throw off the weight of colonial attitudes" (p. 3). In 1976,

showing the intention behind and development of Negritude, Césaire had this to say in a

welcome speech while Senghor was visiting Fort-de-France:

> We were torn by the same anguish and, above all, were weighed down by the
>
> same problems...our youth was not banal...It was marked by the tormenting
>
> question, who am I? For us, it was not a question of metaphysics, but of a life to

---

[22] « C'est que le suffixe en -*itude* a une signification plus concrète, ou moins abstraite, que le suffixe en
    -*ité*...Ce n'était pas un jugement de valeur, mais d'identité. Parce que colonisés, nous luttions contre la
    domination politique mais, d'abord, contre la colonisation culturelle. »

[23] « *L'impérialisme culturel*, nous l'oublions trop souvent, *est la forme la plus dangereuse du
    Colonialisme:* il obscurcit la conscience. »

live, an ethic to create, and communities to save. We tried to answer that question.

In the end, our answer was Negritude. (qtd. in Vaillant, 1990, p. 90)

In this passage, one can see that, though Negritude is often criticized, for Senghor it stems from a philosophical attempt to determine how to live the best possible life and also from a desire to save communities and eventually, the entire world. Senghor's philosophy should not be limited in space and time;[24] rather we can gain insight from his philosophy as we work towards achieving a dialogue of cultures that is based in equality. This dialogue requires cultural diversity but it also requires contact and being open to choosing to incorporate outside influence, which goes beyond the particularism of postcolonial theory. This combination is part of the recipe for global peace and stability. However, despite Senghor's good intentions, the old adage that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions" rings true for many critics of Negritude.

3.3   Is Negritude Worthlessly Essentialist?

When reading Senghor's works on Negritude, many critics get to the place in "Ce que l'homme noir apporte," (1939) where Senghor, rather blithely, states: "Emotion is Negro, as reason is Hellenic"[25] (p. 24). This quotation and the essentialism it evokes, does, in many ways, reinforce the dangerous kind of hierarchization of races the world needs to be rid of. Paul Taylor (2004) explains that, "When nineteenth-century US slaveholders linked blackness to irrationality, emotionality, and incapacity for self-government, they were interpreting race to mean that blackness signified, to sum it all up, inferiority" (p. 25). Slavery, the holocaust and residential schools are some of the most

---

[24]   Cheikh Ahmadou Bamba Thiam's dissertation entitled, "A Philosophy at the Crossroads: The Shifting Concept of Negritude in Leopold Sedar Senghor's Oeuvre," discusses why it is inadvisable to fasten Negritude into a temporal space.

[25]   « L'émotion est nègre, comme la raison hellène. »

horrific proofs that essentialist discourse is dangerous. Since the Enlightenment, emotion

and irrationality have traditionally been associated with weakness and are characteristics

attributed to women and supposedly uncivilized groups. Jeffers (2009) notes that,

> Senghor's belief in the uniqueness of black people poses problems for the critical
>
> reader, now more than ever. Senghor's *Négritude* is the epitome of racial
>
> essentialism, and this puts his work sharply at odds with what seems to be a
>
> contemporary consensus on the bankruptcy of racial essentialism. (p. 60)

While I do admit that Senghor uses essentialist language, and note that his works

have been overlooked and discarded because of this racialist discourse, I assert that he

does not reinforce race hierarchy. Senghor furthers his early statement of, "emotion is

Negro as reason is Hellenic" by differentiating between two kinds of reason. Senghor

(1964b) often repeats the idea that "European reasoning is analytical, discursive by

utilization; Negro-African reasoning is intuitive by participation" (p. 74). It is in his

elaborations of this difference that we can see how and why the type of intuitive reason

said to be used more prominently by black people is a superior form of reason. In the

following elaborate discussion of the different types of reason the claim of a superior way

of knowing is made:

> Thus the Negro African *sympathizes,*[26] abandons his personality to become
>
> identified with the Other, dies to be reborn in the Other. He does not assimilate;
>
> he is assimilated. He lives a common life with the Other; he lives in a
>
> symbiosis...Subject and object are dialectically face to face in the very act of
>
> knowledge. It is a long caress in the night, an embrace of joined bodies, the act of

---

[26]   In the French text, *sym-pathise*, literally, "feels with."

love. "I want you to feel me," says a voter who wants you to know him well. "I think, therefore I am," Descartes writes. The observation has already been made that one always thinks something, and the logician's conjunction "therefore" is unnecessary. The Negro African could say, "I feel, I dance the Other; I am." To dance is to discover and to re-create, especially when it is a dance of love. In any event it is *the best way to know*. Just as knowledge is at once discovery and creation–I mean re-creation and recreation, after the model of God. (p. 73-my emphasis)

It is interesting that Senghor's discussions of different types of reason have caused critics to say both that he is essentialist in such a way as to maintain the inferiority brought about by colonial relations while others say he presents an anti-racist racism. The discourse is essentialist, I admit, but Senghor does not believe in racial purity: "race is a reality, but I do not say racial purity. There is difference, this is not to say inferiority or antagonism"[27] (1937, p. 13). Thus Senghor encourages difference as he argues that difference does not imply inferiority; in this way his works dismantle race hierarchies while maintaining the benefits of diversity.

Furthermore, Senghor does believe black people are more apt in the ways of intuition but he does not think black people are incapable of rationality or reason, nor is he suggesting the compete abandonment of analytic or discursive reason; rather, he points out, again, the need for balance. He asks:

Does this mean, as certain young people would like to interpret my remarks, that the Negro African lacks discursive reason, that he has never used any? I have

---

[27] « La race est une réalité, je ne dis pas la pureté raciale. Il y a différence, qui n'est pas infériorité ni antagonisme. »

never said so...No civilization can be built without using discursive reason and without techniques. Negro-African civilization is no exception to this rule. (1964b, p. 75)

In this quotation he counters those who take him to mean that black Africans lack discursive reason. Senghor fully believes that an emotional or intuitive way of considering the world is equal to understanding life via rationality. He even goes so far as to find support from Europeans, like Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and from "new science" for the raising of intuition to a level on par with rationality (Senghor, 1964b, p. 70-73).[28]

Senghor believes that the complementarity of races is beneficial and that all races will have something to offer at the "rendez-vous de donner et de recevoir," of give and take. Not only is Senghor's essentialism grounded in equality, when reading Senghor very closely one recognizes that his work is not as essentialist as it might sometimes seem. The following passage from "L'esthétique négro-Africaine" displays profound wisdom:

People will say that the spirit of the Civilization and the laws of Negro African Culture, as I have exposed them, belong not only to the Negro African, but are held in common with other peoples as well. I do not deny it. Every people unites on its face the various features of the human condition. I claim, however, that nowhere else do we find these features united in this equilibrium and under this light: nowhere else has rhythm reigned so despotically. Nature did well, desiring that each people, each race, each continent would cultivate, with a particular

---

[28]   Some readers of Senghor (Hountondji and Soyinka) criticize him for being Eurocentric because he looks to European scholars for support.

dilection, certain virtues of Man; in this cultivation resides their originality.[29]

(Senghor, 1956, p. 216).

In this passage Senghor states that the "spirit" of what it means to be African is common

to all people but that it has been cultivated to varying degrees. When he states that

"[e]very people unites on its face the various features of the human condition," he makes

a statement that is not racially essentialist as he is noting the intrinsic commonality of all

humans. Jeffers (2010) explains that, in this sense, "black people, who have cultivated

intuitive reason (and, as indicated in the passage, a rhythmic attitude) do not therefore

lack rationality – they have merely placed less emphasis upon its use" (p. 227). On the

other end of the spectrum of types of reason, white people have generally placed a greater

emphasis on rationality but do not necessarily lack an ability for intuition. These two

ends of the spectrum–along with anywhere in between–are available to all humans. Thus,

"Senghor seems to be committed more strongly to a *human essence* than to racial

essences" (Jeffers, 2010, p. 228).

Nevertheless, Senghor's philosophy does contain elements of essentialism.

However, Souleymane Bachir Diagne (2010) explains the way in which his essentialism

also deconstructs essentialism:

The language of essentialism is certainly present in Senghor's texts, probably

more than in Césaire's. But the deconstruction of essentialism is also at work in

them...Negritude is not the ideology of separated identities that, despite his

protestations, many critics of Senghor have taken it to be. Hybridity is always at

work deconstructing his essentialist assertions and the Senghorian obsession with

---

[29]   Translation by Chike Jeffers (2010, p. 227).

mixture is a Penelope ceaselessly making sure to undo fixed differences: 'the

humanism of hybridity' could very well have been one of the poet's slogans. (p.

247)

Whether or not one decides to attribute the variance in types of reason to racial

differences, it is the hybridization of types of reasons, the balance of the heart and the

mind, that Senghor sees as the goal for all of humankind. In a discussion of radial energy

and of the increasing levels of consciousness as one moves from plants on up to humans,

Senghor (1969) describes, in "De la Négritude," the goal of *being,* which he calls *extra-

being* (p. 25). He explains that understanding radial energy and how it interacts with the

chain of being "has the vocation of being realized in the freedom of a person, this is to

say in the spiritual extra-being, by the harmonious development of the two

complementary aspects of the soul: the heart and the head, intuitive reason and discursive

reason"[30] (p. 25). I propose that we should incorporate Senghor's philosophy into

development by extracting from the essentialism the wise notion that *all* people should

work towards harmoniously balancing those two aspects of the soul.

Letting go of the seeming certitude of rationality will lead to an openness; from a

place of being open we are better able to learn from each other. We should all try to

"become identified with the Other," as Senghor claims black Africans do (1964b, p. 73).

In development, this would give all actors involved a chance to recognize their own

limitations and to recognize also the enriching possibilities of contact. As Verhelst and

Tyndale (2002) explain:

---

[30]   « a vocation de se réaliser en personne dans la liberté, c'est-à-dire dans le plus-être spirituel, par le
       développement harmonieux des deux éléments complémentaires de l'âme: le cœur et la tête, la raison
       intuitive et la raison discursive. »

Indeed, different cultures very often open the eyes, minds, and hearts of the

outsiders who enter into the process of recognising them. However, this requires

an opening up of one's deeper self to what seems alien in the other. To go through

such an experience with a grassroots community, one has to abandon some of

one's most cherished intellectual convictions and to 'relativise' one's all-

encompassing reason. (p. 16)

Senghor notes that being open to what "others" have to offer can be mutually beneficial,

as in centring development. He also encourages relativizing reason or, more aptly put,

embracing a more complete reason, one that is comprised of intuition and rationality.

I have tried to introduce Negritude while touching on the ways it can be useful for

centring and rethinking development. I have stated that it would be a waste to discard

Senghor's works entirely. I have discussed how Negritude is an anti-colonial philosophy

but that it is also an assertion of a collection of cultural values; these values are useful for

rethinking development. I have also stated that colonialism and its legacies are not over,

development should be careful not to reinforce colonial hierarchies. With regard to the

essentialism found in Senghor, I admit that it is problematic. However, I ask that we see

beyond his somewhat blithe over-generalizations for there is much wisdom in his works.

Ekpo (2010) explains how a fellow scholar convinced him to look with fresh eyes upon

Senghor's oeuvre, stating that "there were sociopolitical gems in Senghor...that deserve to

be extracted and brought to the attention and benefit of our time" (p. 177). I have briefly

noted that spirituality is an important aspect of development, as Senghor asserted, and

should be acknowledged as such. I have also noted that a Senghorian approach to

development does much to deconstruct the hierarchy or ways of knowing and brings us

closer to centring development. The next three chapters will dive deeper in to his works as I ponder: what can these "sociopolitical gems" specifically bring to the world of development theory? I will discuss the need for development to carefully consider culture, to embrace a Senghorian version of cosmopolitanism and to incorporate the kind of deep environmentalism inherent to Negritude.

CHAPTER 4: DEVELOPMENT IGNORES CULTURE AT ITS PERIL

I have briefly noted that Senghor's belief in the primacy of culture is an aspect of Senghorian thought that development should adopt. In this chapter I argue that development needs to work with culture and spirituality rather than against them because strong cultures are integral to global equality and because attempts at development that do not consider culture are less successful than those that take it into account. For Senghor, culture is that upon which all else is based; it is the precursor to all aspects of life. As he explains the task of building a new state in "The African road to socialism," he writes:

> Our task is clear, with regard to the present and to the past–colonization and traditional civilization, the history that we have lived. We must emerge from our alienation to build a new state. Political, economic, and social disalienation, once again, are all prerequisites of cultural disalienation. Contrary to the notion of numerous African politicians, culture is not an appendage that can be lopped off without damage. It is not even a simple political means. Culture is the precondition and the goal of any policy worthy of the name. (1964b, p. 79)

Development should incorporate the primacy of culture noted in the above quotation, as the economic, political and social approaches to development have not thus far brought equality and justice. Anacleti (2002) candidly explains the reason why culture must be incorporated into development practice:

> People participate in what they know best. At present, and for the foreseeable future, at least 70 per cent of Africans will continue to be rural and semi-literate. Their knowledge will continue to be parochial, but specific to the realities of their

daily lives. Most of this knowledge will continue to be guided mainly by cultural

principles and values. Hence the need to study local culture as the starting point

for dialogue about people's development and their participation in bringing it

about. (p. 169)

Culture is that which gives people the means for understanding the world around them.

To disregard or even to fail to carefully consider culture in development will lead to

policies that simply do not make sense; if they do not make sense, they will fail to bring

positive change.

I begin this chapter by showing that Senghor believed culture to be of utmost

importance. Then I present a discussion of how Senghor defined culture. Next, I note

that, in terms of development, having strong cultural roots is desirable because of the

benefits of diversity; also, working outside of culture, as development tends to do, often

leads to failure whereas working with culture can lead to success, as in the example of

Amina Az-Zubair and Nigeria. I then discuss an article by Tim Kelsall to illustrate that

incorporating culture into development practice is advisable but difficult in practice.

However, I maintain that a cultural approach to development is necessary. Next, I explain

how culture could be incorporated more effectively into development theory by asserting

the equality of all cultural groups.

The following section regards how postcolonial theory can help deconstruct

hierarchies, but I note that postcolonial theory alone does not give us answers about how

to encourage dialogue and foster the unity of humankind. Thus, I explain how the

postcolonial cultural aspects of Senghor's works are especially useful for rethinking

development because he combines a foundation of cultural rootedness with an openness

to that which is beneficial from other cultural groups. I aim to establish the importance of

culture to development in this chapter, noting that development studies needs to

recognize the primacy of culture for optimal results.

4.1   Senghor's Emphasis on Culture

Senghor's major speeches and essays are collected in five volumes called "*Les*

Libertés." Of the five volumes, three of them–*Liberté 1*, *3* and *5*–focus on culture. For

Senghor, culture is paramount and is the precursor to politics and to all aspects of life.

Thus, we find in his works such notable quotations as: "independence of spirit, *cultural*

independence, is the necessary precondition of all other forms of independence...political,

economic and social."[31] (1964b, p. 285). For Senghor, culture was the basis for

understanding and hence changing any other aspect of life. Understanding and cultivating

should be the goal of any policy or project, which is not to say that understanding culture

is simple. In "Le problème de la culture," he explains that "Culture, definitively, seems to

us an unceasingly renewed effort, which tends towards an always evasive balance, one

that is broken as soon as it has been reached. It is here, in this Sisyphean effort, that

resides the greatness of Man"[32] (1950b, p. 97). Understanding and discovering culture

may often seem to be a Sisyphean effort, but development needs to rise to the task rather

than failing to understand the importance of culture.[33] But as culture is difficult to define,

let me explain how Senghor thought of culture.

---

[31]   « l'indépendance spirituel, *l'indépendance culturelle*, est le préalable nécessaire aux autres
indépendances...politique, économique et sociale. »

[32]   « La Culture, en définitive, nous apparaît comme un effort sans cesse renouvelé, qui tend vers un
équilibre toujours fuyant, aussitôt rompu qu'atteint. C'est là, dans cet effort de Sisyphe, que réside la
grandeur de l'Homme. »

[33]   Sisyphus is from Greek mythology. He is punished by being forced to roll a boulder up a hill only to
watch it roll back down and then repeat the task again and again for all of eternity.

As there are myriad ways to define culture, for the time being, let me note that culture comprises, according to Senghor, an element of spirituality. In "Le problème culturel en A.O.F.," he notes that, rather than the systems and structures of a society that comprise civilization, culture is made up of "imagination, active spirit, for there is the idea of a creative dynamism in the word"[34] (1937, p.11-12). The connection between spirituality and culture is inseparable and neither should be left out of developmental practice. Verhelst and Tyndale (2002) explain:

> What matters in a culture is its capacity to generate self-respect, the ability to resist exploitation and domination, and the ability to offer meaning to what people produce and consume, to land, liberty, life and death, pain and joy. Culture is, in the final analysis, about meaning: that is why it is so closely related to spirituality (p. 13).

Senghor's many discussions surrounding culture leave the reader with an abstract concept; however, the idea that culture is extremely important is always present. Senghor does define culture in "Le problème culturel en A.O.F." (1937) as: *a racial reaction by Man to his environment that tends toward an intellectual and moral equilibrium between Man and this environment*[35] (p. 12). He then explains that "[b]ecause the environment is never immutable, and neither is race, culture becomes a perpetual effort towards a perfect equilibrium, a divine equilibrium"[36] (p. 12). This definition of culture is useful but he does not explain how or why the tendency is towards equilibrium. The current state of the

---

[34] « …imagination, esprit actif, car il y a, dans le mot, l'idée d'un dynamisme créateur. »
[35] *« une réaction raciale de l'Homme sur son milieu tendant à une équilibre intellectuel et moral entre l'Homme et ce milieu. »*
[36] « Comme le milieu n'est jamais immuable, non plus que la race, la culture devient un effort perpétuel vers un équilibre parfait, un équilibre divin. »

globe– with climate change, environmental degradation, the depletion and pollution of our oceans, ethnic violence, increasing disparity between rich and poor– might lead one to the conclusion that the trend is towards destruction rather than equilibrium. Although, the increasing disequilibrium might be because culture and spirituality have been nearly consumed by science and technology.

The definition of culture as a "reaction" is useful because it shows how, for Senghor, culture is never static, it evolves over time; the greatest danger would be for a society to evolve in such a way that meant being completely assimilated to another culture with no trace remaining of the original culture.

4.2   Battling Cultural Imperialism

Senghor emphasizes the need to be rooted in one's culture to avoid being assimilated completely to foreign domination as the evolution towards a much hoped for equilibrium ebbs onwards. He quotes Claude MacKay's *Banjo* in the conclusion to "Le problème culturel en A.O.F.,": "Plunging down to the roots of our race and constructing upon our deep foundation, this is not returning to a savage state: it is culture itself"[37] (1937, p. 21). Having strong cultural roots is necessary for battling the mental colonization brought about by centuries of imperialism. Ishemo (2002) argues that:

> The origins of Africa's problems lie in the specificity of capitalist development and its long-term effects on African societies. It is fair to say that the European model was forced down their throats. African people had no say in this, because that was the nature of the Eurocentric project. It precluded all positive knowledge that African societies had generated. (p. 29)

---

[37]   « Plonger jusqu'aux racines de notre race et bâtir sur notre profond fond, ce n'est pas retourner à l'état sauvage: c'est la culture même. »

By assuming European models were superior and thus crushing African ways of thinking, being and doing, imperialism and colonialism cemented the belief that European ways are superior to African ways; this cultural imperialism needs to be undone and Senghor helps fight this battle.

Furthermore, being grounded in a foreign culture is unfruitful in that it reduces diversity. Senghor warns in "Vues sur l'Afrique noire," (1945) that "They [the French] risk doing nothing but making us into pale French copies – consumers but not producers of culture"[38] (p. 43). In short, the more people become mere consumers of cultures rather than producers of it, the less cultural difference worldwide; with a decrease in cultural diversity we have a decrease in ways of knowing and of understanding the world. Senghor explains that "the ideal civilization would be like these quasi divine bodies, emerged from the hand and from the spirit of a grand sculptor, who will join together all the reconciled beauties of the races"[39] (1950b, p. 96). In this vision, a plethora of beauty to choose from would be optimal.

Furthermore, attempts to impose foreign systems, structures and ways of being on people in a foreign land will ultimately fail. Big D development, the kind that attempts to "civilize" the entire world by trying to make countries into replicas of the West, has, to my knowledge, failed in every instance. Verhelst and Tyndale (2002) state: "any development process must be embedded in local culture, or development simply will not take place" (p. 11). When participatory or bottom-up grassroots development occurs,

---

[38] « On risque seulement de faire, de nous, de pâles copies françaises, des consommateurs, non des producteurs de culture. »

[39] « La civilisation idéale serait comme ces corps quasi divins, surgis de la main et de l'esprit d'un grand sculpteur, qui réunissent les beautés réconciliées de toutes les races. »

there is often some measure of success. Sometimes a combination of foreign investment and local knowledge can also bring success.

An example of development made successful by considering culture is the way in which Amina Az-Zubair has effectively battled corruption in Nigeria. She is the special advisor to the president on the Millennium Development Goals and has the incredible task of working to ensure that Nigeria reach the MDGs (a task that the majority of African nations will fail to accomplish). *Huffington Post* contributors and cofounders of Save the Children, Craig and Marc Kielburger, explain that, "Az-Zubair estimated for every $10 in aid allocated to state governors for distribution, only $2 reached people in need. Local officials pocketed the cash and corrupt contractors accepted money for work they didn't perform" (March 19th, 2011). Az-Zubair understood that Nigerians perform tasks well if total responsibility is given to them and if they are held accountable for the outcomes. Thus she instituted a conditional grants scheme where first the state and then local governments play a role in project implementation. In an interview, Az-Zubair explains:

> Because, we have given responsibility, we have held them accountable; we have a very good monitoring and evaluation mechanism. And essentially, we are partnering, it is not one over the other, and we see that their success is ours, if they fail, we fail, it is very clear. (Economic Confidential, January, 2010)

Because Az-Zubair has effectively battled corruption by considering Nigerian cultural norms, Nigeria is one of the few countries in Africa that has shown considerable improvement in terms of reaching the MDG targets.[40]

---

[40] Nigeria has steadily been improving in terms of all but one of the MDGs, that of environmental sustainability. For a complete progress report see: http://www.ng.undp.org/mdgsngprogress.shtml

The MDGs represent a conundrum of development, for while they illustrate a search for global justice and equality, they are not culturally specific. However, Amina Az-Zubair has managed to work with Nigerian culture in order to help bring greater equity for her people. The MDGs alone do not take culture into account, certainly, but Az-Zubair is figuring out how to help bring health, education and greater equality in a way that is suited to Nigeria.

Senghor uses the metaphor of a grapevine to illustrate the failure of trying to introduce policies, programs or projects that are unsuitable: "And the grapevine, it's one example in a thousand, cannot acclimatize to Black Africa; she grows, but the grapes never reach maturity. It's that the soil is other, and other the climate"[41] (p. 43). Development practice, for many years, tried to propagate grapevines in soils that would not produce grapes. During the early years of the "age of development," Senghor (1959) presented a report to the Constitutive Congress of the Party of African Federation (PFA). Within this report is the following passage:

> True independence is that of spirit. A people is not really independent when, after its accession to nominal independence, its leaders import, without modification, institutions–political, economic, social, or cultural–that are the natural fruits of the geography and history of another race. (p. 8)

At the time he wrote this report, the big D development industry was pushing technological, political and structural changes on the so-called developing world without paying any attention whatsoever to cultural differences. Even the oft-cited supposedly successful development of the Asian Tigers occurred because "they selected certain

---

[41]   « Car la vigne, c'est un exemple entre mille, ne peut s'acclimater en Afrique noire; elle y pousse, mais les raisins n'arrivent pas à maturité. C'est que le sol est autre, et autre le climat. »

elements of the Western experience which they combined with indigenous strengths, creating distinctive new models of development" (Kelsall, 2008, p. 628). In Africa today, with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, we see a continuation of imposing norms and practices from the outside with little consideration of cultural norms and practices.[42]

Tim Kelsall's article, "Going with the grain in African development?" (2008) ponders what would happen if development considered cultural difference and tried to work with differences rather than trying to impose foreign structures and systems, much like Senghor recommended in his 1959 report. As Kelsall explains, "the point is to introduce a system that makes sense to local people" (p. 642). He considers whether the extended family or the community should form the basis for development in Africa. Using anecdotal evidence, it seems that in many cases the acceptance of the extended family as a basis for governance in Africa is superior to imposing Western style options. But not in every case. A blend might be a viable option, for many Africans have long ago begun to embrace notions of individualism (just as Western people also desire stronger communities). Obviously these generalizations, of the West being individualistic and Africa being communitarian, do not apply across the board; such is the danger with searching for commonality. The complex reality is that every instance, every situation will require careful consideration as one cannot assume, for example, that a policy of governance that has been successful in Senegal will necessarily be successful in Ghana. In terms of the intersection of the minority and majority worlds and all the dichotomous

---

[42] Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers replaced Structural Adjustment Programs in 1999. Rather than imposing adjustments from the outside, majority world governments draw up their own development plans; however, the International Financial Institutions still decide whether or not to provide aid money. For a thorough discussion of to what degree anything has changed from the time of SAPs, see: Fraser, A. (2005). Poverty reduction strategy papers: Now who calls the shots? *Review of African Political Economy,* 104(5), 317-340.

ideas these two worlds bring forth (modernity/tradition, affluence/poverty, individualism/community, science/spirituality, rationality/intuition), a blend, a balance of these imaginary worlds is what we need to seek.

I feel that there are many situations which could be ameliorated by the blending of more than one way of thinking and the sharing should go both ways; the minority world needs to realize that much can be learned from the majority world, rather than assuming the patronizing role of the all-knowing enforcer of development. Ver Beek (2002), in discussing research that has shown that prayers contribute to healing and recovery, even when the people being prayed for are unaware that they are being prayed for, notes that "this research calls into question the Western materialistic and scientific perspective on health and strongly suggests that not only should traditional spiritual health practices be respected, but that they may have much to teach 'modern' medicine as well" (p. 66). If development theory were to consider and adopt Senghor's ideas surrounding the primacy of culture, noting especially that all cultures have something to offer–such as the aforementioned beneficial spiritual health practices inherent to many majority world peoples–I dare say the state of the world as a whole might improve.

4.3   Culture and Development in Practice

However, the blanket statement that development should take culture into account is hardly meaningful in practice. Perhaps this is precisely *because* culture is an inherently important part of human life and one cannot operate outside of culture. Some might argue that it is the most important part of life as it "permeates all aspects of life" (Verhelst with Tyndale, 2002, p. 10). The cultural turn in critical theory, though it has influenced development theory somewhat, did not lead to embracing or even acknowledging cultural

difference in development practice and it certainly paid little heed to spirituality.[43] As Ver

Beek (2002) notes,

> For most people of the 'South,' spirituality is integral to their understanding of the
>
> world and their place in it, and so is central to the decisions that they make about
>
> their own and their communities' development. Their spirituality affects decisions
>
> about who should treat their sick children, when and how they will plant their
>
> fields, and whether or not to participate in risky but potentially beneficial social
>
> action. Despite the evident centrality of spirituality to such decisions, the subject
>
> is conspicuously under-represented in the development discourse. (p. 60)

The failure to recognize the importance of culture and spirituality ultimately reduces the

effectiveness of development, both in terms of practice and research.

Even the president of the World Bank, James D. Wolfensohn, notes the

importance of culture in development, stating that "however you define culture, it is

increasingly clear that those of us working in the field of sustainable development ignore

it at our peril" (qtd. In Verhelst with Tyndale, p. 4). Acknowledging the importance of

culture is quite simple and I think many scholars would agree with Verhelst's statement:

"Integrating the cultural dimension into development can lead to the adoption of a less

reductive and more all-embracing approach" (p. 9) However, what is more complicated is

determining how this recognition of culture should be incorporated into the development

project; indeed, those whose aim is maintaining diversity might reject development

altogether.

---

[43]   The cultural turn came about in the early 1970s as more emphasis began to be placed on *meaning* and a
      move away from the positivist methods became more popular. The movement was influenced largely by
      Foucault and Geertz as post-structuralism entered the realm of social sciences.
      http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cultural_turn

Ultimately, many proponents of cultural diversity advocate for the right to choose the aspects of culture one deems fitting; what is not acknowledged in this ideal is the reality that colonial legacies of mental colonization impede decision making for choice is never truly free if power balances skew, inform and denote available options. Pieterse notes that "dominant discourses and structures of power often reinforce and perpetuate particular identities" (p. 78). Vincent Tucker (1999) has proposed that the failures of dependency theory are due to the focus on economic and political control and on exploitation to the detriment of consideration for "the cultural dimension of domination" (p. 12). According to Tucker, "cultural analysis is central to any understanding of power and to any strategy of resistance or dependency reversal" (p. 12). Thus, his suggestion is that social sciences and development studies in particular, should incorporate the critical and culturalist positions of postcolonial thought. This line of thinking is similar to Senghor's ideas about the primacy of culture, for he states that "there can be no political liberation without cultural liberation" (*Prose and Poetry,* p. 71). However, some development theorists and practitioners see cultural difference as an obstacle to global equality and justice; promoting cultural difference is considered to be a rejection of modernity and progress.

4.4   Simultaneously Rooted and Unrooted

Senghor is certainly not advocating for post-development or an outright rejection of modernity in his works, though the same awareness of these dominant and exploitative discourses and structures of power that lead post-development scholars to reject development outright, lead Senghor to feel the need for black Africans to embrace and rejuvenate black culture, which seems like a rejection of modernization. However,

because Senghor also advocates for taking what is useful from other cultures, such as

technological innovation, he encourages advancement, so long as the aspects of foreign

cultures that are deemed useful are shaped to suit black African reality. Furthermore, as

Senghor embraces universality, he is unlike postcolonial thinkers; however, he does not

embrace the universality of each individual but of all individuals: "French universalism

speaks of Man, not of men"[44] (1945, p. 41). This is a subtle but important difference as it

explains how seeking global justice and equality should be done by placing an emphasis

on communities, civilizations and the cultivation of vibrant cultures for the benefit of all

those who make up the group. But Senghor feels it would be wasteful to reject the outside

world. In some ways his philosophy seems to contradict itself as it represents both

cultural nationalism and an openness to outside influence. This seeming paradox is

shown clearly in the following quotation:

> True culture is being rooted and being unrooted (*enracinement et déracinement*).
>
> It is being rooted as deeply as possible in native soil: in one's spiritual heritage.
>
> But it is being unrooted: open to rain and sun, to the fertile contributions of
>
> foreign civilizations. In the difficult construction of Africa in the twentieth
>
> century, we need the best of *francité*. As I like to say, it is time for us to return to
>
> Descartes: to the spirit of method and organization. But it is no less necessary that
>
> we remain rooted in our soil. Cartesian clarity must shed light, but essentially
>
> upon our riches.[45] (Senghor, 1969, p. 25-26)

[44] « L'universalisme français parle de l'Homme, non des hommes »

[45] « La véritable culture est enracinement et déracinement. Enracinement au plus profond de la terre natale: dans son héritage spiritual. Mais déracinement: ouverture à la pluie et au soleil, aux apports fécondants des civilisations étrangères. Dans la difficile construction de l'Afrique du XXe siècle, nous avons besoin du meilleur de la *francité*. Comme j'aime à le dire, il est temps que nous retournions à Descartes: à l'esprit de méthode et d'organisation. Mais il n'est pas moins nécessaire que nous restions enracinés dans notre sol. La clarté cartésienne doit éclairer, mais essentiellement nos richesses. »

As Jeffers (2009) ponders this passage, he asks, "here more than anywhere else Senghor exposes the strangeness of the combination – how can that which is unrooted still be rooted?" (p. 60). Development needs to work towards this paradoxical combination which embraces cultural diversity and combines the deconstruction of hierarchies with the reality that we are all global citizens, and increasingly so. Senghor would argue that the deconstruction of hierarchies and being rooted in one's culture is a precursor to ideal cosmopolitanism, which consists of dialogue between equal cultures. We must recall that the battle for cultural liberation, for freedom from cultural imperialism has not yet been won. Radhakrishnan (2001) points out the uneven playing field upon which an openness to outside influence is currently played:

> ...in a world structured hierarchically between East and West, developing and developed nations, is the longing of the West for completion from the East somehow considered not as drastic as the longing of the East for completion by the West? Let us say, [to use] fairly stereotypical characterizations just to make a point, the West is looking to the East for spiritual enhancement and enrichment and the East is looking to the West for technological advancement. Which of these two needs for completion would be considered more dire? In a world-historical situation where materialism and technology are valorized more than spirituality and matters "interior," it is inevitable that oriental dependency would position itself in a weaker position within the global structure. (p. 329)

Translated by Chike Jeffers, who notes: "*déraciner* would normally be translated "to uproot," but since that which has been uprooted cannot possibly be thought of as rooted in any way, I have used the vaguer term "unroot."" (2009, p. 60)

The need to elevate the value of spirituality and "matters "interior"" is another aspect of why Senghor's philosophy is so worthwhile; he battles the very idea that rationality is superior to intuition as I discussed in chapter three. In his deconstruction of the hierarchy of ways of knowing, Senghor is in the postcolonial school.

Senghor is sometimes lumped together with postcolonial scholars, as his essay, "Negritude: a Humanism of the Twentieth Century" is included in the collection *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader,* alongside the works of Fanon, Spivak, Said and Bhabha. I have already stated that Senghor's work is, in many ways, a version of anti-colonial resistance (though I believe it is more than that). However, the introduction to the collection explains that Senghor's 1966 speech is representative of "a highly influential example of black essentialist or nativist theory" (p. 24). As postcolonialism rejects essentialism outright, it may be difficult to claim that Senghor could fit into the realm of postcolonial theory. However, as I explained in the previous chapter, with the help of Diagne, Negritude does deconstruct the idea that the West is superior, and is in this sense postcolonial. And it does, in many ways, ascribe to the protection of cultural diversity encouraged by postcolonial theory.

Senghor is not asking for a return to a pre-modern world, but for the recognition of difference and for the strengthening of cultural identities and practices in order to avoid being assimilated. For him, the leader of Senegal post-independence, and a champion of pan-African unity, the black African need especially be wary and fend off the assimilating tendencies of France. The goal of avoiding assimilation is not simply an affront to the modernization project, it is more importantly about battling mental colonization, about asserting the worth and equality of black values; thus the definition of

Negritude as: "first of all, being rooted in the virtues of black peoples, developing and blossoming before being open to the fertilizing pollen of other peoples and civilizations" because "to be able to *become* by being enriched by the riches of Others, we must previously be ourselves, and strongly so"[46] (Senghor, 1973, p. 469-70). This quotation shows how Senghor's cultural nationalism does not demand a rejection of the outside world. Rather, if one has their roots firmly grounded and fertilized in the soil of one's own culture, the reach of one's branches will be ever greater, ever more able to spread across vast distances, open to that which is most fruitful.[47] Thus we begin to understand how Senghor's philosophy works towards reconciling the paradox within the integration of postcolonialism to development studies—how his philosophy provides a critique of modernization and homogenization but still prescribes a way for the diverse cultures that make up humanity to flourish together. As Kebede (2004) explains, "the priority of mental liberation establishes the primacy of deconstruction: when Western concepts are deconstructed, the affirmation of difference without hierarchy or opposition becomes possible" (p. 124).

The reason we need Senghor's ideas about culture, and not just a postcolonial approach to development, is because Senghor gives us a way to move towards a dialogue of cultures and to flourishing. By bringing postcolonial theory to development studies, the difficulty of reconciling the desire to maintain difference while simultaneously

---

[46] « …c'est, d'abord, enracinement dans les vertus des peuples noirs, croissance et floraison, avant d'être ouverture aux pollens fécondants des autres peuples et civilisations. Pour pouvoir *devenir* en s'enrichissant aux richesses des Autres, il nous faut auparavant être nous-mêmes, et fortement." Senghor, "Encore de la Négritude, ou Négritude, Nègrerie et Nigritie » (1973) in *Liberté 3.*

[47] When I was traveling in Senegal, my friend, Ousmane Sy, explained to me the significance of the Baobab tree to Africans (he used the word Africans, it is his generalization I am repeating, not my own). Ousmane explained that the Baobab is representative of Africans because of its strong roots firmly grounded in African culture but with its branches spread wide, open to the outside world.

seeking global equity comes forth. How can we consider cultural diversity to be of utmost importance while simultaneously seeking global equality and justice? The world needs to believe, as Senghor did, that "races are not equal but complementary, which is a superior form of equality" (Senghor, 1964b, 13). And all actions and all practices, including development policies, need be grounded in the recognition of this superior form of equality. However, Appiah (2006) notes that "there will be times when these two ideals–universal concern and respect for legitimate difference–clash. There's a sense in which cosmopolitanism is the name not of the solution but of the challenge" (p. xv). The next chapter explains more completely how Senghor's cosmopolitan philosophy can minimize the clash between these two ideals.

CHAPTER 5: COSMOPOLITANISM AND THE "CIVILIZATION OF THE UNIVERSAL"

> "When we discover that there are several cultures instead of just one and consequently at the time when we acknowledge the end of a sort of cultural monopoly, be it illusory or real, we are threatened with the destruction of our own discovery. Suddenly it becomes possible that there are just *others*, that we ourselves are an 'other' among others." Paul Ricoeur, "Civilisations and National Cultures," in his *History and Truth*
>
> "It is time to conclude my *Ce que je crois.* I will do it by reaffirming my faith in the *Civilization of the Universal,* to which I dedicate the few remaining years of my life."[48] (Senghor, 1988, p. 231)

Senghor's philosophy consists of a combination of cultural diversity and cosmopolitanism, or rather a vision of cosmopolitanism founded upon cultural integrity. I discussed the primacy of culture before cosmopolitanism because Senghor's vision of cosmopolitanism is based in a world where culture is of utmost importance, as it is the basis for economic, political and social reality. I argue that Senghor's cosmopolitan vision is particularly useful for rethinking development because of his emphasis on culture, equality and openness. The term cosmopolitanism is becoming increasingly popular and increasingly complex; I will begin by presenting a brief discussion of what cosmopolitanism is and the various trends in cosmopolitan thought. Then I move to a description of Senghor's cosmopolitan vision, contrasting it briefly with Appiah's, explaining why Senghor's is most useful for development. Next I explain why a belief in the intrinsic equality of all humans is needed along with the casting off of unwarranted

---

[48] « Il est temps de conclure mon *Ce que je crois.* Je le ferai d'un mot, en réaffirmant ma foi dans la *Civilisation de l'Universel,* à laquelle je consacre le peu d'années qui me restent à vivre. »

fears of "others" so that cultural sharing can occur. Following is a discussion on the inevitability of globalization, noting the need to work towards a version of cosmopolitanism that is not West/Eurocentric and that will benefit humanity and the planet rather than being reductive, oppressive and environmentally damaging. I explain that this will require an acceptance of diverse values along with an openness to learning and sharing, all of which are founded upon the appeal to a common humanity. As Andrew Dobson questions the strength of the appeal to a common humanity, I explain how Senghor's vision can "thicken" what Dobson considers to be "thin" cosmopolitanism. In order to even begin the discussion about why we need cosmopolitanism and what this cosmopolitanism should consist of, I begin by considering what it means.

5.1   Cosmopolitanism in Brief

What does cosmopolitanism mean? The term is quite abstract and, for some, brings to mind a kind of alcoholic beverage. Though there is currently a renewed interest in this philosophy, it has a long history. Cosmopolitan scholars most often trace the origin of cosmopolitan thought back to Diogenes the Cynic (born circa 404 BCE), who claimed that he was a "citizen of the world" (Brown and Held, 2010, p. 4). Brown and Held explain what this assertion of global citizenship meant to Diogenes: "Diogenes held that all human beings are owed certain positive duties of hospitality and brotherly love, *as if they were* common citizens" (p. 4). Since the time of the Cynics, cosmopolitanism has been at large through the ages. The Enlightenment and Immanuel Kant's political philosophy are generally considered the birthplace of contemporary cosmopolitan thought because, though Kant focused on outlining a vision of cosmopolitan law, "his

interests covered the entire range of cosmopolitan thought...Kant's cosmopolitanism can be seen to incorporate aspects of cultural, political and civil cosmopolitanism" (p. 9).

It is cultural cosmopolitanism that I mainly focus on throughout this chapter, because Senghor placed such an emphasis on culture and because any lasting change will require a cultural shift, as I discussed in the previous chapter. There are myriad versions of cosmopolitanism combinations; Vertovec and Cohen (2002) argue that cosmopolitanism can be viewed as:

> (a) a socio-cultural condition; (b) a kind of philosophy or world-view; (c) a political project towards building transnational institutions; (d) a political project for recognizing multiple identities; (e) an attitudinal or dispositional orientation; and/or (f) a mode of practice or competence. (p. 9)

Other than the first political project, I would argue that all these views are based on culture; even the "political project towards building transnational institutions" requires cultural consideration to be successful. I look to Appiah's, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers,* for an understanding of cultural cosmopolitanism because, by focusing on culture, he begins to challenge the sometimes West/Eurocentric nature of cosmopolitanism.

Appiah's version of cosmopolitanism mirrors Senghor's vision in many ways, as Senghor was a cosmopolitan with a universal vision who emphasized local culture. The reconciliation and combination of universalism and pluralism in cosmopolitan thought has been called "New Cosmopolitanism" by Hollinger (2002). Both Senghor and Appiah have elements of this combination in their cosmopolitanisms. Appiah (2006) notes the need to balance the local and the global in the following passage:

I want to hold on to at least one important aspect of the objectivity of values: that there are some values that are, and should be, universal, just as there are lots of values that are, and must be, local. We can't hope to reach a final consensus on how to rank and order such values. That's why the model I'll be returning to is that of conversation–and, in particular, conversation between people from different ways of life. (p. xxi)

But there is considerable difference, for Appiah denies the need or desire to purposefully rejuvenate or protect culture and would see attempts to ward of West/Eurocentrism as unnecessary. Chapter seven of his book, entitled "Cosmopolitan Contamination," expresses the argument that it is undesirable to purposefully and forcefully protect diversity, for Appiah explains, "cosmopolitans think human variety matters because people are entitled to the options they need to shape their lives in partnerships with others" (p. 104). While this statement is nearly unproblematic, it does assume that the options are being considered on an equal setting, which is not the case in reality. Thus, the section entitled: "The trouble with "cultural imperialism"" contrasts significantly with Senghor's philosophy, as Senghor believed cultural imperialism was the most pernicious of all threats. For Senghor, the threat was not as superficial as considering which movies were available to watch; rather, his difficult task was trying to undo the inferiority and superiority surrounding the way people understand the world around them (i.e. intuition and rationality). This inequality stems from Enlightenment theory and is firmly instated by colonialism. Development should be based on a non-West/Eurocentric version of cosmopolitanism that specifically battles cultural imperialism, rather than discounts its significance as Appiah does. Jeffers (2010) explains that "what leads Appiah to this

problematic position, of course, is his unwillingness to take seriously the background condition of colonialism when thinking about what it means to be a cosmopolitan – or, more precisely, the cultural situation resulting from that background" (p. 410). Senghor certainly takes the cultural situation resulting from colonialism seriously and presents a vision of cosmopolitanism that is dependent on successfully battling cultural imperialism so that all cultures will have an equal voice in the dialogue.

This dialogue, this conversation between people from different ways of life is what Senghor envisions to be the ultimate goal of humankind: the "Civilization of the Universal." He sums up the reality of this contact in "Le dialogue des cultures:"

> It's a fact, a global fact, that all the cultures of all the continents, races and nations are, today, symbiotic cultures, where the four fundamental factors of sensitivity and willpower, intuition and deduction play an increasingly equal role. In this vast dialogue that makes up the ladder of the Universal, all of the continents have contributed, from oldest Africa to youngest America.[49] (1983b, p. 210)

Senghor emphasizes throughout his works his belief that the dialogue of civilizations will occur and that all groups will have something to offer at the rendez-vous. His assertion in "Ce que l'homme noir apporte," that, "black people will not come empty-handed to the political and social rendez-vous,"[50] (p. 33) does much to deconstruct racial hierarchy imposed throughout history. All groups will have something to offer.

---

[49]   « C'est un fait, et mondial, toutes les cultures de tous les continents, races et nations sont, aujourd'hui, des cultures de symbiose, où les quatre facteurs fondamentaux que sont la sensibilité et la volonté, l'intuition et la discursion jouent, de plus en plus, des rôles équilibrés. A ce vaste dialogue qui se fait à l'échelle de l'Universel, tous les continents ont contribué, le plus vieux, l'Afrique, comme le plus jeune, l'Amérique. »

[50]   « les peuples noirs ne viendront pas les mains vides au rendez-vous du politique et du social. »

This belief reinforces the equality within difference theme upon which Negritude is based.

However, the world has not reached a state of global equality. Far from it. Globalization does not listen to every individual, to every cultural voice; we still see instances of voices being forcefully stifled and crushed. Senghor (1983b) notes this problem and hopes humanity can move past inequality:

> The major problem today, for humanity, is that each continent, race or nation, each man or woman becomes, ultimately, conscious of this cultural Revolution, that above all, by burying this cultural disdain, one will bring his or her active contribution.[51] (p. 210)

The cultural Revolution consists of recognizing that various forms of reason are equal and complementary; intuition and rationality work best in tandem. The cultural mistake was overemphasizing rationality, creating an imbalance, to the detriment of the earth and all the people on it. By burying this mistake, the hierarchy of civilizations will no longer exist for the highly rational and hence technologically, economically and perhaps politically advanced civilizations will no longer be considered superior to the more spiritual and intuitive civilizations. Of course there is much complexity within civilizations but even so, the balance between rationality and intuition brings a greater degree of global equality because this equilibrium demands that all people entertain the idea that they both have something to teach and something to learn.

---

[51] « Le problème majeur, aujourd'hui, pour l'humanité, c'est que chaque continent, race ou nation, chaque homme ou femme prenne, enfin, conscience de cette Révolution culturelle, que surtout, enterrant le mépris culturel, il y apporte son active contribution. »

Why is grounding development in equality and difference, in recognizing alternative ways of understanding the world, so important in the face of globalization? In our increasingly interconnected world, Senghor's idea that all cultures will participate in the dialogue is nearly inevitable; the challenge will be to create a dialogue of equally represented and respected voices, a dialogue of giving *and* taking rather than one based of force and coercion.

5.2   Increasingly Global, No Matter How

The increasingly connected nature of our world augments the need to firmly establish that all humans are equal; cosmopolitanism is based on the ideal of human equality. Parekh (2003) notes as much in "Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship," where he states, "it is both right and prudent to insist not only on the intrinsic but equal worth of all human beings" (p. 5). Globalization is increasing and humankind ought to be wary of how this process might play out. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to adequately discuss all the debates and scholarship surrounding globalization; what is important to note is that globalization entails an increase in contact between civilizations, which Senghor has noted can be positive (1945, p. 40).

Sen (2002) explores the little acknowledged fact that "there were many global developments in which the West was not even involved" (p. A2) and he goes on to discuss the printing of the first book, which was printed in China but was a Sanskrit text translated by a Turkish scholar! Sen's arguments about the value of globalism are eloquent, and he is particularly concerned with the ability of globalization to bring the poor "what they need." (p. A2) Rather than focusing on the highly unlikely possibility

that globalization, if left unchecked, benefits all, Sen states: "Globalization deserves a reasoned defense, but it also needs reform" (p. A2).

Arguably, one of the reasons globalization needs reform is because globalization often functions as a form of Western imperialism; rather than globalization the term Westernization is invoked. The fear that cosmopolitanism is simply Westernization in disguise is a valid concern and one that I have already noted as I compared Appiah's and Senghor's cosmopolitanisms. One of the problems with Westernization is that it creates a monoculture and thus threatens human survival; Prentki (2005) explains that "[t]he capacity of communities to maintain a dynamic cultural life in a constant state of dialogue or hybrid negotiation between inside and outside elements will be critical to the survival of the inhabitants of the globe" (p. 164). I agree that dynamic culture is necessary for the survival of the planet and each culture needs to be recognized as having something worth offering *and* each culture, especially the West, must recognize that they have something to learn.

This give and take constitutes a fine balance and without a cultural shift and the systematic reforms that would ensue because of it, there is little hope for the world's poor. Prentki explains that "the paradox at the heart of cultural identity is if it lays itself entirely open to the socio-economic forces of the dominant model of globalisation, it will be destroyed; but if it attempts to cut itself off from outside influences, it will atrophy into slow death by heritage" (p. 164). This kind of "damned if you do, damned if you don't" situation exists because of the extremely unequal global power balances. The balance of power will only change if there is a complete paradigm shift, which I argue is necessary if we are to continue down the path towards global justice and equality. The current

disequilibrium must come to an end: "The continuing imposition of this global order, essentially unmodified, constitutes a massive violation of the human right to basic necessities–a violation for which the governments and electorates of the more powerful countries bear primary responsibility" (Pogge, 2007, p. 53). I agree that the global order must change, but if the change is to be lasting it must begin as a cultural change, a change in values. Those who have the largest capability to make changes are obviously those who have the most power.

5.3   Responsibility, Obligation and Forgiveness

However, the language of paternalistic responsibility reinforces hierarchies; rather, change would be made more beneficial and durable by grounding the global order in the basic cosmopolitan premise that all humans are equal and then making decisions accordingly. We must recognize that most people would never knowingly harm their loved ones and then expand "loved ones" to include all of humanity. In this way, globalization can be fruitful and bring global equity. Rather than believing that the acceptance of difference will lead to a 'clash of civilizations' à la Huntington, we need to focus on ways to make globalization a positive phenomenon.

The values of cultural sharing and interrelationship are based in cosmopolitan ideology and I maintain that the real equality of cultures will only come about by undoing the idea of "other" by being open to learning and understanding alternative ways of being and of thinking. Herein lies the true "responsibility" of the powerful countries. Parekh (2003) discusses the need to be rid of the notion of "other" and to recognize our common humanity:

As the world becomes interdependent, we constantly encounter unexpected forms of otherness, unfamiliar ways of life, apparently strange bodies of beliefs and practices. This frightens us, deprives us of our bearings, and generates a moral and cultural panic. We suppress the diversity and tensions in our own and other ways of life, homogenise their identities, and turn them into sharply different, mutually exclusive and even antagonistic entities. We then respond to this false and mutually reinforcing disjunction by either seeking to shape others in our own image or embracing a shallow relativism that rules out all meaningful contacts with them. There is nothing to be said for either response. One is arrogant and expansionist, the other insular and cowardly. Both alike are sustained by the fear of the other, and ill-equipped to sustain the spirit of globally oriented citizenship in a multicultural world. What we need instead is openness to the other, an appreciation of the immense range and variety of human existence, an imaginative grasp of what both distinguishes and unites human beings, and the willingness to enter into a non-hegemonic dialogue. (p. 16)

Cosmopolitanism must work towards this goal of entering not just a dialogue, but a "non-hegemonic dialogue" to avoid becoming West/Eurocentric and/or homogenizing. As Senghor noted in "Vues sur l'Afrique noire," contact between two civilizations can be of great benefit, but only if the contact is between equals will it be fruitful. In "La voie Africaine du socialisme: nouvel essai de definition," Senghor (1960) shows that he knew of this necessity, which is why he proclaims that the complementarity of cultures must be recognized by deconstructing assumptions of European superiority:

Europeans have given off the pretension of having been the only ones to think

civilization at the level and in the dimension of the universal. From there to

maintaining that European civilization is identical to *the civilization of the*

universal and that as such, it must be adopted as *universal civilization*, there is but

a step, which has already been taken… We did not have much trouble

demonstrating that each "exotic civilization" had also thought along universal

lines; that the only merit of Europe on this point was to have, thanks to its

conquests and its technology, to spread *its* civilization around the world.[52] (1960,

p. 284)

Part of the problem with envisioning a dialogue of equal cultures is that the spread of

technology and imperial conquests have created a global order where blatant inequality

seems near impossible to dismantle. Parekh (2003) summarizes the reasons why,

including the forceful "spreading of *its* civilization," Western powers have an additional

responsibility to help foster well-being for the world's poor:

Thanks to colonialism, many Western states are partly responsible for the

conditions of life in other parts of the world. They designed and ran their economy

to suit their interests...Although colonial rule is now over and cannot be held

responsible for all current ills, it ended in many cases barely three decades ago, a

very short time in the history of nations. Even after it ended, the economic and

political lives of ex-colonies continued to be dominated by Western

---

[52] « Les Européens ont émis la pretension d'avoir, les seuls, pensé la civilisation européenne au niveau et à la dimension de l'universel. De là à soutenir que la civilisation européenne s'identifiait à la *civilisation de l'universel*, et qu'à ce titre elle devait être adoptée comme *civilisation universelle*, il n'y avait qu'un pas, qui avait déjà été franchi… Nous n'eûmes pas beaucoup de peine à démontrer que chaque <<civilisation exotique>> avait, elle aussi, pensé à la mesure de l'universel, que le seul mérite de l'Europe, sur ce point, avait été, grâce à ses conquêtes et à ses techniques, de diffuser *sa* civilisation par le monde. » (Translated by Chike Jeffers)

powers...Since at least some of the problems of the developing countries are

caused by Western powers, the latter have an additional historically derived

obligation to help these countries enjoy stable and decent lives. (p.10)

Though I agree with Parekh, I am generally concerned about the paternalism invoked by

the notion of obligation. There is a fine line upon which to balance when walking along

the path of obligation; certainly, recognition of past injustices and subsequent policies

that attempt to undo historic wrongs would be worthwhile, so long as the intention is one

of seeking global justice. The obligation to live as though the well-being of each

individual, whether across the globe or sitting at your table, is tied up in one's own well-

being is also worth fulfilling. An obligation to deconstruct racial, class and gender

hierarchies is something every person on this globe should work to achieve. I am wary of

the kind of twisted paternalistic "civilizing mission" type of obligation that has, for the

most part, driven development so far. Andrew Dobson presents a useful kind of

obligation to seek global justice that is based on material realities.

Dobson (2006) begins his article by asking "whether it is something about the

principles of cosmopolitanism as they are usually expressed that fails to turn an

intellectual commitment to them into a determination to act on them" (p. 165). I agree

that turning commitment into action is a worthwhile endeavour and welcome any ideas

about how this might be done. The premise of Dobson's argument is that central to most

versions of cosmopolitanism is the appeal to beneficence, an appeal that claims "we

should act...because we are all members of a common humanity" (p. 168). Dobson feels

that this is a "thin" basis for cosmopolitanism. He argues that in order to make

cosmopolitanism "thicker" there needs to be a real sense of "nearness to vulnerable,

suffering, disadvantaged others" noting that "the recognition that we are all members of a common humanity seems not to bring such others near enough" (p. 171). The way to bring about this "nearness" is to show causal responsibility, because "causal responsibility produces a thicker connection between people than appeals to membership of common humanity, and it also takes us more obviously out of the territory of beneficence and into the realm of justice" (p. 172). He discusses climate change as an example of how we can empirically determine that our actions truly have an impact on others (p. 173-4).

Dobson's logical approach to expanding and strengthening the sphere of cosmopolitan obligation is useful; Senghor can also serve to thicken cosmopolitan obligation. I do not *feel* that the appeal to common humanity is weak–though I might *think* it is. Senghor too would feel that seeking global justice because we are all connected is a firm reason for this goal. However, the notion of interconnectedness is better felt than thought, better intuited than rationalized. Thus, when Dobson claims that "becoming a cosmopolitan is fundamentally an intellectual affair" I would argue that more people could have access to being "thicker" cosmopolitans if becoming a cosmopolitan was also deemed an emotional affair. Dobson claims that, "at the level of motivation, the answer [of a common humanity] runs out of steam: the cerebral recognition that we are all members of a common humanity seems not to be enough to get us to 'do' cosmopolitanism" (p. 182). I do not refute this. Senghor, and I, might simply ask if a "cardial recognition," such that would come about if a greater emphasis were placed on emotional and intuitive understandings, might get more people to "do" cosmopolitanism. Ultimately, Dobson's ideas about "thick" cosmopolitanism are useful

but I think a Senghorian approach could also make cosmopolitan "thick" by promoting an emotional recognition of common humanity.

Senghor's idea of a common humanity is very forgiving to the imperial powers and would not ask for any special obligations to be filled; he might simply ask that Western cultures come to the rendez-vous with a spirit of openness and with the intention of global peace. The following discussion is based on his poem, "Prayer for peace," from *Hosties Noires* (1945), which begins by offering the "Lord God" a prayer of peace and pardon. The prayer is written in the voice of Senghor's "Africa crucified for four hundred years yet breathing still" (p. 134). The prayer itself begins by asking, "Lord God, forgive white Europe. It is true Lord, that for four enlightened centuries, she has scattered the baying and slaver of her mastiffs over my lands" (p. 134). Senghor then poetically describes all the evil and sin white Europe has caused over time. This recollection begins to bring anger, and he writes: "the serpent of hatred raises its head in my heart, that serpent that I believed was dead" (p. 135). He asks that the Lord kill this hatred as he prays especially for France: "Yes Lord, forgive France that shows the right way, and goes by devious paths. Who invites me to her table and bids me bring my own bread, who gives with the right hand and takes away half with the left" (p. 136). He then notes that he has "a great weakness for France" and asks: "Bless this people who were tied and twice able to free their hands and proclaim the coming of the poor into the kingdom. Who turned the slaves of the day into men free equal fraternal" (p. 136). He then asks that the people of France be blessed,

And with them all the peoples of Europe, all the peoples of Asia, and all the

peoples of Africa, all the peoples of America.

Who sweat blood and sufferings. And see, in the midst of these millions of

waves, the sea-swell of the heads of my people.

And grant to their warm hands that they may clasp the earth in a girdle of

brotherly hands

BENEATH THE RAINBOW OF THY PEACE. (*Prose and Poetry,* p. 137-8)

This poem, though I did not quote it in full, shows that Senghor is totally aware of all the

colonial injustice that has occurred and is still occurring. He knows that "white Europe"

committed wrongs that devastated societies, yet he is willing to forgive.

While some criticize him for his willingness to forgive, and his "weakness for

France" (i.e. Eurocentrism), I believe that his forgiveness shows strength along with a

desire to make the best of a harsh reality. Derrida (2003) explains that "forgiveness is not,

it *should not be,* normal, normative, normalising. It *should* remain exceptional and

extraordinary, in the face of the impossible: as if it interrupted the ordinary course of

historical temporality" (p. 32). I do believe that Senghor sincerely forgives the

unforgivable for he knows that nothing fruitful will come from hatred and anger;

however, I do not think he chooses to forget the wrongs. This is why it is "the heads of

[Senghor's] people," and not the heads of "white Europe," that will rise and unite the

world in love's embrace.

5.4   Forgotten But Not Gone

However, because Senghor understands the power of forgiveness and that it can

be the only way to achieve true equality and peace, I must urge that forgiveness is

admirable but forgetting would be foolish. The injustices of the past should be

acknowledged and reparations should be made. The historical wrongs were committed

because power relations were extremely out of balance; universal equality was non-existent. The language of universal human rights has brought us closer to equality but we still have far to go. As I argue that development should be grounded in cosmopolitan ideals, I must assert that the version of cosmopolitanism must not be West/Eurocentric. We must rid the world of any remnants of the impetus for a "civilizing mission." "Colonial cosmopolitanism" is an article by Peter van Der Veer (2002) which discusses the ways in which cosmopolitanism can function as colonialism. The problem lies in the difference between the ideal of respecting difference and the actual practice of believing one holds the key to understanding the 'right' way to live:

> Colonizing modernity disclaims its roots in a European past and claims a cosmopolitan openness to other civilizations. However, this is an openness to understanding with a desire to bring progress and improvement, a cosmopolitanism with a moral mission. (p. 167)

This West/Eurocentrism that might come about because of a "moral mission" is not desirable, for it is inegalitarian and reductive. Jeffers (2010) explains in the sixth chapter of his dissertation that:

> The antidote to Eurocentrism in cosmopolitanism...is twofold. First, cosmopolitans must combat the problem of forgetting by cultivating an *anti-colonial memory*, interpreting the meaning and history of globalization in a way that unequivocally condemns oppression and seeks unification only for the purpose of the flourishing of all humanity. Second, the goal of cosmopolitanism should be a *polycentric world*, as against the established tendency toward a

Eurocentric world and against the idea of an *acentric world*, which has facilitated

Eurocentrism. (p. 376-377)

If development theory were to seriously incorporate Senghorian thought then the goal of

development could be based upon a cosmopolitanism that is not West/Eurocentric and

that maintains diversity of culture while seeking universal flourishing.

It is the imperative to avoid West/Eurocentric or colonial cosmopolitanism that

necessitates a strong culture as the precursor to cosmopolitanism; being deeply rooted

and unrooted at the same time. The deeply ingrained idea that Western models of

modernization represent the best way forward is challenged by Senghor's philosophy as

he believes in various forms of reason and of a balance between intuition and rationality.

Moreover, he believes that combinations of firmly rooted cultures can bring about the

best civilization possible. In a 1956 debate he explains,[53]

I think all the great civilizations were civilizations that resulted from an

interbreeding, objectively speaking...Indian civilization, Greek civilization,

French civilization, etc., etc. In my opinion, and objectively, this interbreeding is

necessary. It is a result of the contact between civilizations. Indeed, either the

external situation has changed and cultural borrowing enables us to adapt

ourselves to the new situation, or the external situation has not changed, and

cultural borrowing enables us to make a better adaptation to the situation. (*Prose*

and Poetry, p. 75)

The important word in this passage is "borrowing" for the act of borrowing implies

choice; one does not borrow something unless one wants to. It must be remembered that,

---

[53] The debate was part of: *Le Premier Congrès International des Écrivains et Artistes Noirs.*

as Amartya Sen (1999) believes, all people should have the right to lead the kind of life they value. This will inevitably allow for diversity, as there are a myriad of values in this world.

Cosmopolitanism allows for a multiplicity of values but also believes in universal truth. There are certain morals that are, or should be, universal; however, as Appiah explains, "we cosmopolitans believe in universal truth...though we are less certain that we have it already" (p. 144). The goal, I would argue, is to continue searching for universal truths, keeping in mind that "cosmopolitans think that there are many values worth living by and that you cannot live by all of them" (Appiah, p. 144). The challenge will be for the minority world elites to accept that their culture is not superior and to change their actions of exploitation and domination because of a firm belief in the equality of all human beings and because of the causal relationships that Dobson (2006) explains. Respect for diversity with an openness to learning and sharing that is grounded in ultimate equality is the kind of cosmopolitan vision Senghor puts forth. This may be an idealistic vision but it is one worth pursuing, if we are going to survive on this planet together. As Senghor says in "La culture face à la crise," (1983a) "So it can only be the nations, having reconciled with one and other, and moreover with themselves, that can, thanks to culture, definitively vanquish the cyclic crises that ravage our planet Earth"[54] (p. 198). Arguably, the extent to which climate change, global warming, resource depletion, pollution of the oceans and fresh water and environmental degradation of all kinds is impacting humanity, I cannot urge strongly enough that development needs to uphold and

---

[54] « C'est alors seulement que les nations, réconciliés les unes avec les autres, mais d'abords avec elles-mêmes, pourront, grâce à la culture, vaincre, et définitivement, les crises cycliques qui ravagent notre planète Terre. »

promote a new way of relating to the earth which will require nothing less than a cultural

shift, whereby the paradigm becomes one that is respectful and nurturing rather than

exploitative and dominating.

CHAPTER 6: SENGHOR'S EARTH WISDOM

> "We do not understand ourselves yet and descend farther from heaven's air if we forget how much the natural world means to us. *Signals abound that the loss of life's diversity endangers not just the body but the spirit.* If that much is true, the changes occurring now will visit harm on all generations to come...An enduring environmental ethic will aim to preserve not only the health and freedom of our species, but access to the world in which the human spirit was born." (Wilson, *The Diversity of Life,* p. 351–my emphasis)

In my discussions of Senghor's cosmopolitan vision, I have yet to mention that the term, "Civilization of the Universal," was first used by Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a French Jesuit priest and paleontologist; while I know of no scholars who have yet to connect Senghor with environmentalism, many have linked environmental theory with Teilhard's works (Skehan, 2006; U. King, 2006; T. King, 2006). Senghor (1963) explains in an homage to Teilhard just how important Teilhard was to him: "It is a matter of stating how a man, a Negro-African intellectual, was, in his search for Truth, aided, saved by Teilhard de Chardin"[55] (p. 9). I argue that Senghor's philosophy contains valuable "earth wisdom" that would be of great benefit if incorporated into current trends in environmental development discourse.

My argument in this chapter is that development theory needs to rethink the assertion that humans should manage nature, that development can be sustainable; rather, development needs to be based in an entirely different worldview, one that consists of a

---

[55] « Il s'agit de dire comment un homme, un intellectuel négro-africain, a été, dans sa recherche de la Vérité, aidé, sauvé par Teilhard de Chardin. »

better and different way of relating to the earth. Senghor's philosophy is inherently earth friendly as he sees all aspects of nature as being interconnected; the idea of interconnectedness is useful for rethinking the goals and policies of development as they have a huge impact on nature and the environment. Senghor is largely influenced by Teilhard and because scholars have made the connection between Teilhard and environmentalism, I begin this chapter by discussing Teilhard's influence on Senghor, noting that neither Senghor nor Teilhard were explicitly concerned with environmental degradation, perhaps because the concerns were not yet so obviously severe in either of their lifetimes. Next, I argue that Senghor's vision of global and cosmic unity is made possible by incorporating a spiritual dimension into the way humans relate to nature. Following is a discussion of Senghor's ideas surrounding the difference in the ways black Africans understand the world as compared to Europeans. I argue that Senghor's description of the way black people relate to the world is the way that all people should relate to the world. I state that Senghorian thought can be viewed as an ecological philosophy that can be the basis for rethinking development's ideas about the environment.

The next part of this chapter deals with two problems present when looking to Senghor for environmentalist theories, the problems being essentialism and anthropocentrism. Ultimately I argue that we should take Senghor's description of how black Africans relate to objects and to others as a beneficial way for all people to relate to the world around them. As for the anthropocentrism, I argue that the notion of vital force creates a kind of stewardship of the earth that is not based on separation from nature or on controlling nature and is thus a positive way to see humans as having the

responsibility to encourage and ensure the vitality and flourishing of the earth, of which humankind is a part. Finally, I explain how Senghor's proclamations about the need to balance intuition and rationality mirror arguments made by deep ecologists. Thus, while no one–that I know of–has yet read Senghor for his environmentalist contributions, I feel he has much to add to the mélange as we rethink development in order to ensure the "reuniting of Humankind to the World" (Senghor, 1964a, p. 38). Ultimately, I state that development needs to move away from the discourse of managing nature towards recognizing that humans are *part* of nature. Biro (2011) notes that the "need to change dramatically how we relate to the non-human world has perhaps never been more urgent; yet the political will to make such changes–and especially collective changes–is clearly almost absent" (p. 6). As I argue that we need to rethink the assertion that humans can *manage* nature, the question becomes: what alternative can Senghor offer in terms of how we *should* relate to the non-human world, to nature?

6.1   Big D Development is Not Sustainable

> In Bruntland, ecology is merely a search for managerial efficiency. As a theory of both culture and nature, such an "ecology" is a misnomer. First, it never acknowledges nature for itself. Nature is never seen as a dwelling. It is only a resource, or a toolshed. It is not *oikos*, a word that denotes prudence or care, the world of the housewife or tribe. Its jargon stems from the accountant's office, where a being *is* only if it is monetized. The world of nature is reduced to the world of commodities. (Visvanathan, 1991, p. 381)

Development's approach for dealing with environmental degradation has been, since the Bruntland Report at least, to develop sustainably.[56] It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss all of the debates surrounding sustainable development; what I want to make clear is that sustainable development is dependent upon the ability of human rationality and science to "manage" nature. The opening lines of the document, entitled *Our Common Future,* are as follows:

> In the middle of the 20th century, we saw our planet from space for the first time. Historians may eventually find that this vision had a greater impact on thought than did the Copernican revolution of the 16th century, which upset the human self-image by revealing that the earth is not the center of the universe. From space, we saw a small and fragile ball dominated not by human activity and edifice, but by a pattern of clouds, oceans, greenery, and soils. Humanity's inability to fit its doings into that pattern is changing planetary systems, fundamentally. Many such changes are accompanied by life-threatening hazards. This new reality, from which there is no escape, must be recognized-and managed.'(1987, p. 1)

I agree with the language of urgency, certainly. The earth and all that it sustains is in danger. What I disagree with is that humans are capable of "managing" the environmental crisis while simultaneously maintaining the idea of growth and big D development. David Ehrenfield (2005) explains:

---

[56] The Bruntland Report was published in 1987 and is a product of the World Commission on Environment and Development, convened by the United Nations and chaired by Gro Harlem Bruntland, Norway's former Prime Minister. (Escobar, 1996, p. 327)

Our ability to manage global systems, which depends on our being able to predict

the results of the things we do, or even understand the systems we have created,

has been greatly exaggerated. Much of our alleged control is science fiction. (p.

223)

It is dangerously hubristic to assume that humans can effectively manage the earth,

especially if we are unwilling to change the way we think about and relate to nature. As

Escobar (1996) notes, the idea that "nature and the earth can be 'managed' is a

historically novel assertion. Like the earlier scientific management of labour, the

management of nature entails its capitalization, its treatment as commodity" (p. 328).

Treating nature as a commodity will necessarily increase the separation of humanity from

nature; this separation is at the heart of the environmental crisis.

The dominant Euro-American worldview considers humans to be separated from

nature. Gonzales and Gonzales (2010) explain that the mechanistic worldview, which

"has made central the dichotomy and premises of the subject-object relationship [and]

views nature as inert" is "the blueprint that Westernized societies have used to build their

scientific institutions and to construct capitalist development" (p. 87). They note that this

worldview sees all aspects of nature, whether animate or inanimate, as resources and

commodities and "relies heavily on reductionist science by detaching the material world

from the non-material world" (p. 87). They further explain that this dominant worldview,

upon which big D development is based, is incapable of being sustainable, as the

relationship between culture and nature is broken and "has become toxic and violently

dominant and destructive of global ecological systems previously sustained by the rule of

equilibrium and harmony, a rule outside of human dominion" (p. 87). In terms of this

dominant worldview, Gonzales and Gonzales argue that "the environmental crisis we currently face suggests that the past and current Euro-American worldview, and way of being, urgently needs to be revisited" (p. 87). They look to the "Andean cosmovision of ever" for rethinking the dominant and environmentally destructive worldview; I will turn to the visionaries who dreamed up the "Civilization of the Universal" to bring forth a more earth friendly worldview–in the end, we come up with the same basic premise: "humans are not outside or above nature" (p. 92).

6.2   The Influence of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin

> The phrase "Sense of the Earth" should be understood to mean the passionate concern for our common destiny which draws the thinking part of life ever further onward. In principle there is no feeling which has a firmer foundation in nature, or greater power. But in fact there is also no feeling which awakens so belatedly, since it can become explicit only when our consciousness has expanded beyond the broadening, but still far too restricted, circles of family, country and race, and has finally discovered that *the only truly natural and real human Unity* is the Spirit of the Earth. (Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Building the Earth,* p. 37)

I noted in the introduction to this chapter that Senghor explained how he was helped, saved even, by Teilhard; the reason, in this instance, that Senghor needed to be saved is because, though he was heavily influenced by marxist theory, he disagreed with certain aspects of it, and found himself, for a time, figuratively lost. He searched for a philosophy that solidified his deepest intuitions about the meaning and purpose of life and marxism did not do this for him. He chose to take Marx as a starting point for his

version of African socialism but wanted to push marxism further (1963, p. 9). Senghor

agreed with the basic ideas of alienation from nature and of class struggle. However,

Senghor (1964b) does not agree that, as Marx claims, "the most complete alienation of

man stems from religion, because religion separates man from nature, from society, and

from himself" (p. 38). Senghor explains throughout his works that African ontology and

religion seeks synthesis between man and nature. Furthermore, he explains that "man is

at the outset a natural being. He is a product of nature, but an incomplete one, realized

only *in* and *through* nature" (p. 115). This language contrasts with sustainable

development's notion that humans can "manage" nature. As Teilhard unites matter and

spirit, he validates Senghor's decision to "maintain the Negro-African method of

knowledge" (p. 75). Thus Senghor asks,

> Let us merely be careful not to be led astray by the narrow determinism of
>
> Marxism, by abstraction. Let us hold firmly to the *concrete,* and we shall find,
>
> underlying the *concrete,* beyond the *discontinuous* and the *undetermined,* the
>
> liberty that legitimates not only our faith but the *African Road to Socialism.* (p.
>
> 75)

Another aspect of how Teilhard legitimized Senghor's philosophy stems from the

fact that Senghor saw class struggle not as simply within nations, not between the

bourgeoisie and the proletariat but between coloured people and white Europeans (1963,

p. 10). Senghor returned to the foundation of his being, to Negritude, in order to push

marxism to its limits (p. 11). Teilhard works, in Senghor's words, "opened up my

obstructions to the light of liberation"[57] (p. 10).

---

[57] « débouchait mes impasses sur le soleil de la libération. »

6.3   The Inseparability of Matter and Spirit

Senghor (1963) explains that first and foremost, Teilhard's works reveal the false opposition of spirit and matter revealing a "unique reality" where there exists "a spirit-matter" that is not separate (p. 11). The recognition of this unity is necessary for the personal well-being and even spiritual liberation of humankind: "beyond the material well-being, the spiritual "more-being," the blossoming of intelligence and of the heart, is confirmed as the ultimate goal...of Man" (p. 11).

Basing the attainment of human liberty in matters spiritual necessitates a nurturing and loving relationship to nature, as does the belief that all matter is imbued with spirit. However, the kind of spirituality humans–and developers–ought to embrace at this time is one that promotes harmony and helps save the earth. Ursula King (2006) explains that:

> There is a great burgeoning interest in spirituality, although much of this is rather
> unwholesome and not at all connected with ideas about the *world as a whole.*
> Much spirituality is too past-oriented and far too individualistic by being primarily
> focused on a person's inwardness. This goes together with the modern emphasis
> on individual self-development and personal fulfillment...But this is not
> understanding spirituality *ecologically,* as a dynamic process and vivifying energy
> connected with *all of life.* (p. 79)

The spirituality Senghor values and promotes in his holistic vision is an ecologically nurturing spirituality. In *On African Socialism,* he notes that "spiritual products represent man's legitimate effort toward...the unity and reconciliation of man with nature" (p. 118). Senghor also understands the failure of overt individualism noted

by King in the quotation above. In "Ce que l'homme noir apporte," he expresses: "What the modern world has forgotten, and what is one of the true crises of civilization, is that human flourishing demands an extra-individualistic aim"[58] (p. 32). Senghor's view that spiritual work involves the "reconciliation of man with nature," along with his demand for going beyond individualism, displays how his commitment to a vision of unity is necessarily ecologically sound. I feel that Senghor, were he alive today, would agree with Küng and Kuschel's (1993) statement:

> We are *all intertwined together* in this cosmos and we are all dependent on each other. Each one of us depends on the welfare of all. Therefore the dominance of humanity over nature and the cosmos must not be encouraged. Instead we must cultivate living in harmony with nature and the cosmos. (qtd. by U. King, 2006, p. 89).

Indeed, his definition of Negritude as "the communal warmth, the image-symbol and the cosmic rhythm which instead of dividing and sterilizing, unified and made fertile" (*Prose and Poetry,* p. 99), implies that a fundamental aspect of Negritude involves "living in harmony with nature and the cosmos." The reason for living in harmony is a recognition of unity, of oneness. Teilhard (1966) describes the value of increasing the recognition of unity on earth:

> The great educational value of geology consists in the fact that by disclosing to us an earth, which is truly *one,* an earth, which is in fact, but a single body since it has a face, it recalls to us the possibilities of establishing higher and higher degrees of organic unity...to see people drawn closer and closer together by an

---

[58] « Ce que le monde moderne a oublié, qui est une des causes de la crise actuelle de civilisation, est que l'épanouissement de la personne exige une direction extra-individualiste. »

ever-increasing knowledge and sympathy until finally, in obedience to some

divine attraction, there remains but one heart and one soul on the face of the earth.

(qtd. by U King, 2006, p. 82)

6.4   Cosmic Unity in African Ontology

While Senghor honours Teilhard as the man who provided him with liberation, he

also cites Teilhard as one of the intellectuals who, along with Bergson, Rimbaud, and

more, provided European validation for the philosophy of Negritude. Senghor (1963)

notes in his homage to Teilhard that the revelation concerning the inseparability of spirit

from matter "does not contradict African ontology"[59] (p. 11). Because of this validation,

he exclaims, "Dear Teilhard, who always caused me to return to my sources by

legitimizing my Negritude!"[60] (p. 12). Much of what Senghor presents as African

ontology in his descriptions of Negritude parallel ecological notions of

interconnectedness, particularly with regard to the way Black Africans relate to objects

and to "others."

The idea that all life energy is interconnected is an inherently ecological idea.

Naess (2008) explains that, "[e]ssential to ecological thinking, and to thinking in quantum

physics, is the insistence that things cannot be separated from what surrounds them" (p.

72). Senghor explains that the black African is ultimately aware of this interconnection

and actively becomes that which he or she is relating to. On an energetic and spiritual

level,

---

[59]   « ne pas contredire l'ontologie Africaine. »
[60]   « Cher Teilhard, qui a toujours m'a fait revenir à mes sources par légitimer mon négritude! »

the Negro African *sympathizes,*[61] abandons his personality to become identified with the Other, dies to be reborn in the Other. He does not assimilate; he is assimilated...[i]t is a long caress in the night, an embrace of joined bodies, the act of love. (Senghor, 1964b, p. 72-73)

This sympathetic joining ensures oneness, creating an understanding of togetherness rather than a notion of otherness.

This kind of understanding expresses a relationship to an "other," be it person or object, that is inherently equal and loving, for the act of relating entails becoming or at the very least, of sharing being. As Senghor states, "he [the Negro African] lives a symbiosis" (p. 73). Imagine the positive ramifications of embracing a way of knowing that consisted of people figuratively and energetically becoming that which they are trying to understand, trying to consider; would humans still knowingly exploit and destroy the earth and nature? True empathy would not breed such destruction, nor would it allow for racism and hatred. Human instigated environmental degradation and ethnic violence would become impossible, for it would mean knowingly harming oneself and the people one loves.

The basis for Senghor's description of how black Africans relate to "others" stems from African ontology. In "Ce que l'homme noir apporte," Senghor reminds the reader "that the Negro cannot imagine the object as separate from himself in his essence"[62] (p. 24). Part of the basis for this claim comes from African philosophy and religion whereby

---

[61]   The translator, M. Cook, explains that in the French it is « *sym-pathise,* » literally implying, "feels with."

[62]   « que le Nègre ne peut imaginer l'objet différent de lui dans son essence. »

all matter is infused with Spirit, and Spirit is God (Mbiti, 1990, p. 33). Mbiti explains that:

> African peoples place God in the transcendental plane, making it seem as if He is remote from their daily affairs. But they know that he is immanent, being manifested in natural objects and phenomena, and they can turn to Him in acts of worship, at any place and at any time. (p. 33)

For Senghor, not only is God present in natural objects but so too is part of the human spirit, which is an extension of God in Man. Senghor (1939) notes that, "[a]ll of Nature is animated by a human presence...Not only animals and natural phenomena–rain, wind, thunder, mountain, river–, but also the tree and the pebble make up human beings"[63] (p. 25). The belief in the sharing of essential qualities leads Senghor (1969) in "De la Négritude," to claim that "Black African ontology is not only unified; it is existential"[64] (p. 19). The essential qualities that animate all of existence consist of vital force (p. 19). This vital force "pre-exists being, created being"[65] (p. 19). He then explains that "God gave vital force not only to people, but also to animals, to vegetables, down to minerals"[66] (p. 19). The recognition that all matter is imbued with vital force, with Spirit and that nature is thus necessary for spiritual well-being posits African ontology as an earth friendly philosophy. Because nature is animated by the same vital force present in humans, a divine presence, and because all of nature makes up human beings, we can conclude that nature must flourish in order for humans to flourish and vice versa.

---

[63] « toute la Nature est animée d'une présence humaine...Non seulement les animaux et les phénomènes de la nature–pluie, vent, tonnerre, montagne, fleuve–, mais encore l'arbre et le caillou se font hommes. »

[64] « L'ontologie négro-africaine n'est pas seulement unitaire; elle est existentielle. »

[65] « pré-existe à l'être, fait l'être. »

[66] « Dieu a donné la force vitale non seulement aux hommes, mais encore aux animaux, aux végétaux, jusqu'aux minéraux. »

Recognizing or even *trying* to understand this connection would be a step in the right direction for development.

According to Senghor, the knowledge of the interrelation between humans and nature is part of black African ontology and is evident in the different way in which Europeans and black Africans interact with the world. The following quotation explains Senghor's (1964b) ideas on this matter:

> Let us now consider the Negro-African as he faces the object to be known, as he faces the Other: God, man, animal, tree or pebble, natural or social phenomenon. In contrast to the classic European, the Negro-African does not draw a line between himself and the object; he does not hold it at a distance, nor does he merely look at it and analyze it. After holding it at a distance, after scanning it without analyzing it, he takes it vibrant in his hands, careful not to kill or fix it. (p. 72)

The recognition of unity makes the idea of non-harming obvious; the black African would be cautious not to harm an "other" because of a deep understanding and recognition of the interconnected nature of all living things. The European does not understand or recognize this deep reality. In the words of Frederick Ochieng'-Odhiambo (2009) on this concept, "[t]he black man approaches each object gently, anxious and cautious not to harm it, eager to comprehend it holistically for he assumes that he shares with it and all else in the world certain essential qualities" (p. 69).

In a further discussion surrounding the underlying epistemological differences between European and African modes of thought, Senghor (1970) explains that the European conception is:

static, objective and *dichotomic.* It is dualistic in that it makes an absolute

distinction between body and soul, matter and spirit. It is founded on separation

and opposition: on analysis and conflict. The African, on the other hand,

conceives the world, beyond the diversity of its forms, as a fundamentally mobile,

yet unique, reality that seeks synthesis. (p. 30)

In this passage we see the value of the black African mode of thought as it forever seeks

synthesis, harmony and unity rather than dualistic and dichotomous separation. In terms

of what this means regarding humankind's relationship to nature, Ochieng'-Odhiambo

writes: "Reason, unlike emotion, has no sympathy. The consequence of such an approach

to cognition is that it isolates the European from nature, and it leads him to see nature as

alien. It is something to be possessed or domesticated, and utilized" (p. 71). Indeed, as I

have noted already, development, even the supposedly environmentally sound sustainable

development, tends to consider the environment as something that needs to be

"managed."

The earth would benefit if all people developed a deep connection to nature and

thus halted the subjugation and control of nature. However, I must note that it is

increasingly evident in the discussions of how different races relate to objects and to the

world that the aspects of Senghorian thought that are most fruitful for environmental

theory are also essentialist. Furthermore, Senghor was a humanist and his vision was

anthropocentric, which is something many environmentalists would disagree with.

6.5   Essentialism and Anthropocentrism

I have already noted that Senghor's discourse is, at times, essentialist yet have

asked that we look beyond his essentialism to see what is of value in his works. My

argument that all people should adopt and learn the black African way of relating to the world assumes that there really is a black African way. The arguments that black Africans are more in tune with nature mirror those that claim women and/or indigenous groups as being more in tune with nature. I recognize the danger in such generalizations and over-simplifications. We must be wary of promoting a philosophy that reinforces the myth of the noble savage, especially when reinforcing that myth foments and/or bolsters hierarchical divisions like those of race and gender. But I have already stated that, though Senghor is essentialist, there is nevertheless much wisdom to be gained by reading his works. I propose that we consider Senghor's assertions surrounding the way black Africans relate to objects and to "others" as the prescription for a better way for *all* humans to relate to the earth and to each other.

Furthermore, if there are people in this world who relate to objects and "others" sympathetically and with love as the basis for their understanding and actions then perhaps we should consider melding this more earth-friendly way of being with the current trend of subduing and controlling nature, for "at the same time as we have tremendously increased our power over nature, we have been subjecting ourselves more and more to the negative repercussions that arise from our exercise of that power" (Biro, 2011, p. 5). The negative repercussions are accumulating. We must forget for a moment about laying claims to who fits into which groups; I do not wish to assert a way of being upon any person who would choose to reject this way of being, but I am a woman and I am happy to be considered apt in the ways of loving nature. Yet I know that there are women in this world who claim no affinity for nature whatsoever. And of course there are

men who love and nurture nature as well. The goal in this time of environmental crisis should be to reunite *all* of humankind with the earth.[67]

Senghor's vision seeks balance. What he is imagining is a balancing of the modes of thought, of rationality and intuition. In a sense, what he is calling for is a "Celebration of the Heart and Mind," which is the title of a work by Galleano (1991). In this work Galleano illustrates the wisdom of Colombian fishermen, of whom he says, "[they] must be learned doctors of ethics and morality, for they invented the word *sentipensante,* feeling-thinking, to define language that speaks the truth" (p. 121). The Colombian fishermen already understand the balance we should all be seeking, that of *feeling-thinking*. Senghor (1950a) expresses the two ends of the environmental spectrum when he writes, "if Europe excelled in the integration of the physical environment to Man, the work of conscious will, black Africa taught us the opposite gesture: the amourous giving into nature"[68] (p. 102). Everyone should give amorously into nature. I hope that everyone, regardless of race or gender, would adopt a balanced, whole, and "truthful" way of knowing.

But this balancing of thought, which comprises nothing less than a complete cultural shift, though it would arguably fundamentally change the world, is human-centred, as is Senghor's philosophy. The anthropocentrism is evident in the following quotation:

Here we must notice the privileged position at the centre of the system occupied

by Man, as a person, a living being able to increase his being. For the universe is

---

[67] I have already used this quotation to state what I believe the goal of development should be: "the reuniting of of Humankind to the World" (Senghor, 1964a, p. 38)

[68] « si l'Europe excellait dans l'intégration du milieu physique à l'Homme, œuvre de la volonté consciente, l'Afrique noire nous enseignait la geste contraire, l'amoureux abandon à la nature. »

a closed system of forces, individual and distinct, it is true, yet also

interdependent. All creation is centred on Man. Insofar as being is life-force, the

ancestors, if they do not wish to be *in-existent* or to use the Bantu expression,

'completely dead' must devote themselves to strengthening the life of those who

are living, and by doing this they are enabled to share in it. The lower

beings...animals, vegetables and minerals...have no other purpose in God's plan

than to support the action of the dead. They are instruments, not ends in

themselves. (*Prose and Poetry,* p. 37)

Ecologists and environmentalists are generally critical of anthropocentrism and I can

imagine most environmental scholars would cringe at the statement that all "lower

beings...are instruments." Admittedly, the idea causes me some concern.

Anthropocentrism is often cited as the main cause for environmental degradation

because it allows humans to disregard and disrespect the well-being of other species, of

plants and animals. One of the most controversial recent development projects has been

the Three Gorges Dam project in the Republic of China. Dam-building represents a

concrete example of humankind's efforts to dominate and control nature, to the detriment

of ecosystems and to those who have to be relocated. In the case of the Three Gorges,

"when the water rose to its final height of 175m in October of 2009, 1.35 million

residents, 17,200ha of land, and 1,500 enterprises had been displaced or inundated"

(Wilmsen, Webber & Yuefang, 2011, p. 22). Despite any positive outcomes associated

with the building of this dam, I assert that the decision to go ahead and build it did not

take into account the ecosystems, the habitat and the cultural and spiritual importance of

the area that is now completely flooded. Human technological and economic

advancement was the aim of the project, but not for those who were forcefully relocated. Nature and culture were ultimately deemed less important than the economy. This is the kind of anthropocentrism that is worrisome.

But Senghor's anthropocentrism would not lead to the building of such an environmentally and culturally destructive dam. His philosophy does not disrespect the "lower beings;" on the contrary, his philosophy notes the necessity of all life, that is composed of essential spirit-matter, to be loved and revered in order to have spiritual well-being. In *Ce que je crois* he explains,

> It is man who is the active centre of the cosmos. Man's essential and, in a word, human function, is to collect all the scattered forces which underlie matter. More exactly, all aspects, forms and colors, smells and movements, sounds, noises, quiverings, and silences of the universe. It is up to him to reinforce their life by reinforcing their force.[69](p. 113)

Humans have the capability to reinforce and protect all forms of life on this earth, but we will have to change the way we think, live and act if we are to do this. Human actions have caused the current environmental crisis but I also believe that humans are the only form of life on earth capable of righting what has gone wrong. The righting of wrong will not come because of attempts to control, dominate or even manage; it will come from a deep recognition of unity. Perhaps anthropocentrism that is based in cosmic unity and a more intuitive understanding of nature could help save the earth. T. King (2006) notes that Teilhard would also be criticized by environmentalists for giving too

---

[69] « A l'homme, centre actif du cosmos. Sa fonction essentielle et, pour tout dire, humaine, est de capter toutes les forces éparses qui sous-tendent la matière. Plus exactement, tous les aspects, les formes et les couleurs, odeurs et mouvements, sons, bruits, frémissements, et silences de l'univers. Il lui appartient de renforcer leur vie en renforçant leur force. »

dominant a role to humans. However, he explains that "Teilhard would see us of the earth to such an extent it would be the earth managing the earth; but the earth centered around the human" (p. 187). If all humans learn to become more intuitive and learn the art of *sentipensante,* then the idea of stewardship can be ultimately positive. In terms of development, this would mean recognizing that stewardship or even sustainability is not about management; rather it is about mutual reinforcement, as Senghor notes throughout his philosophy. Mathews (1998) supports the Senghorian idea of mutually beneficial interactions and she explains that,

> selves, being self-realizing systems, maintain themselves through continuous exchange with things external to them. They are thus essentially relational entities: their ongoing identity and integrity are functions of incessant give and take with elements of their environment. (p. 68)

At all levels, be it groups, individuals, plants, objects, the goal should be that of balance, of giving and taking. One of the most important insights that Negritude can offer in terms of the environment is the assertion of emotion and intuition as valuable ways of knowing.

6.6   Deep Ecology and Bringing Back Intuition

The literature surrounding deep ecology is reflective of Senghorian thought because it values intuition as a means to understand nature. The intuitive "Earth wisdom" Senghor attributes to the black African is just the kind of wisdom deep ecology champions. Much like Negritude focuses on the emphasis of versions of reason as comprising a balanced worldview, so too does deep ecology demand a shift in values; the following passage, written by Fritjof Capra (1995 ed.), echoes the philosophy and aim of Negritude. She writes:

The shift to a new worldview and a new mode of thinking goes hand in hand with

a profound change in values. What is so fascinating about these changes, to me, is

a striking connection between the change of thinking and the change of values.

Both can be seen as a shift from self-assertion to integration. As far as thinking is

concerned, we can observe a shift from the rational to the intuitive, from analysis

to synthesis, from reductionism to holism, from linear to nonlinear thinking. I

want to emphasize that the aim is not to replace one mode by the other, but rather

to shift from the overemphasis of one mode to a greater balance between the two.

(p. 24)

A greater balance between rationality and intuition should be the goal for all humans

everywhere. Senghor (1988) explains that, since 1889, a Cultural Revolution has been in

the works whereby intuition is becoming increasingly validated. It began with Henri

Bergson's first published work, l'*Essai sur les Données immédiates de la Conscience*

along with Paul Claudel's first theatrical piece, *Tête d'Or* (p. 210). Senghor explains that

"Bergson...gave intuitive reason back its place"[70] (p. 210). If humans are awakening to a

finer balance between rationality and intuition, to a more reasonable and holistic way of

thinking, this shift in values will mean a different and more ecologically sound way of

interacting with and relating to the earth.

This long-term change in the manner of relating to the earth is what deep

ecologists call for, and it is almost identical to the way in which Senghor claims black

Africans relate to the earth. Arne Naess (2008), the founder of deep ecology, without

---

[70] « Bergson...a redonner sa place à la raison intuitive. »

giving credit to Senghor or to traditional African philosophy or to anything other than his own deep intuitive thoughts, writes:

> Because of an inescapable process of identification with others, with increasing maturity, the self is widened and deepened. We "see ourselves in others." Our self-realization is hindered if the self-realization of others, with whom we identify, is hindered. Our self-love will fight this hindrance by assisting in the self-realization of others according to the formula "Live and let live!" (p. 82)

Senghor would, I hope and imagine, be happy to endorse the way in which I have strategically used Negritude as part of the way to help resolve the current environmental crisis. Development should let go of the vain assumption that humans know how to manage and control nature and move towards basing change on the recognition that we are all part of nature and that nature makes up the whole and complex entity known as the Earth; humans must become reunited with the Earth, for the sake of the future of all life on this planet. Indeed, at a time when an over-emphasis on rationality seems to take us ever further down the progressive path to the destruction of the earth, we need, more than ever, "a double movement that is both centripetal and centrifugal: that of reason *and* of heart, that of science *and* of myth"[71] (Senghor, 1950, p. 102-my emphasis).

---

[71] « un double mouvement centripète et centrifuge: celui de la raison et du cœur, de la science et du mythe. »

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION: THE POWER OF LOVE

> "When the power of love overcomes
> the love of power, the world will
> know peace." Jimi Hendrix

Throughout this thesis I have been explored ways and ideas that might bring

positive change to development, thereby helping to create a shift in ways of thinking that

might ultimately save the world. We are at a time in history where our knowledge is more

vast than ever before yet efforts towards lasting peace and environmental well-being

remain distant and seemingly unattainable. Indeed, the basis of my argument is that we

need knowledge, yes, but we need also to consider that there are various forms of

knowledge and that there are diverse ways to understand the earth and humankind. I

believe that if humans worked towards balancing our minds so that we valued equally the

rational and the intuitive, and then based decisions on the carefully balanced

considerations provided by these two ways of knowing, of understanding, then a

profound shift would occur that might lead to equality and to the flourishing of the entire

earth.

I began this thesis with a chapter that describes the evolving state of development

theory and practice. Development has mostly been based on an overtly rational and

homogenizing ideal, where it was often assumed that all nations should and could be

made into a version of Western modernity. Furthermore, big D development has mostly

been paternalistic and based on the assumption that the developed nations are more

advanced and thus more civilized; the developed nations felt that they had an obligation

to bring the developing world up out of the darkness of their own savagery, and they

needed resources to stay on top. These problems all led to post-development and I agree

with the criticisms that post-development brings forth. However, I do not believe a complete rejection of development is the most fruitful option; rather, development should be rethought by incorporating Senghor's "postcolonial cultural cosmopolitan plus earth wisdom" philosophy.

The second chapter considers the historical period that shaped Senghor's philosophy of Negritude, though I assert that Negritude is not merely anti-colonial. After introducing Senghor's philosophy and noting the problems of essentialism within, I propose that Senghor has many "socio-political gems" to offer development theory. The foundation of what Senghor offers involves the deconstruction of hierarchies made available by the recognition of more than one type of reason. The three more specific aspects of Senghor's vision that I presented as most useful for development theory are his emphasis on culture, his cosmopolitan vision and the earth friendliness inherent to his philosophy.

I presented these three aspects in three separate chapters though my discussions portrayed the necessary interconnection of culture, cosmopolitanism and the environment. Verhelst and Tyndale (2002) note the interrelation by using the analogy of a forest; they eloquently state: "Just as forests are sustainable thanks to biodiversity, so humankind needs cultural diversity for its survival...[n]either cultural apartheid based upon indifference or enmity, nor total merger into a universal monoculture, is a sustainable proposition" (p. 22). I have used Senghor's works to argue that rooted cultural diversity is the precursor to a form of cosmopolitanism that is based on the equality of all humans; humans should have the right to lead the kind of life they value; a value-filled life includes and demands a healthy environment. Notably, discussing culture is a

complex task, especially in a world of increasing globalization, which provides greater means to understand, experience or simply notice the existence of other cultural practices and ways of living. A respect for diverse ways of living is crucial and is tied to universal equality. This diversity of voices represented at the "rendez-vous" will provide the greatest number of possible combinations for solutions to the crises of our world. I assert that development theory would benefit by taking Senghor's works into consideration and implementing cultural primacy in combination with cosmopolitanism into policy decisions.

The value of the non-human world must also be of primary importance to development, for humans are dependent upon the earth for survival. As Vandana Shiva (1988) explains, "[w]ith the destruction of forests, water and land, we are losing our life-support systems. This destruction is taking place in the name of 'development' and progress, but there must be something seriously wrong with a concept of progress that threatens survival itself" (p. xv.). There must be a paradigm shift that undoes the dominant idea that humans can manage nature and the environment; rather, humankind would benefit by the recognition that we are an intrinsic part of nature. I explain how Negritude presents black Africans, along with other groups, as being able to reunite humankind to the world, to the earth. I note the essentialism present in this proclamation and I hope that all people work towards reuniting humankind to the earth, regardless of race or gender. The deep recognition of the unity of all life and the recognition of the vital force that animates everything is available to all people and this recognition will promote and foster a deep respect for the earth. Human flourishing is dependent on nature and we should do all we can to exist in harmony as part of our natural world.

I do not wish to label any race or gender as being "emotional" but I do hope we can recognize the value of emotion and of intuition and banish the idea that these ways of knowing are soft and inferior to rationality. The emotion that promotes an earth friendly cosmopolitan vision founded upon cultural diversity is love. Love of nature, love of humankind, love of life. Love is the answer because it is the force that gives meaning to existence. Senghor (1962), in the culmination of a discussion surrounding the way to ultimate self-realization and spiritual freedom, which consists of "Reflexion, Co-reflexion and Ultra-reflexion" (p. 43-56), describes the final step of pan-human convergence. Emphasizing the essentiality of love, he writes, "Union via Love, *Love-Union,* this is what, definitively, gives flavour to life and to existence" (p. 56). I believe that the "Civilization of the Universal" is dependent on love because I see no other way to move beyond opposition and fear towards unity and harmony as Teilhard and Senghor envision. Teilhard too, is convinced of the power of love.[72] In *Building the Earth,* he states,

> in spite of all the apparent improbabilities, we are inevitably approaching a new
> age in which the World will cast off its chains, to give itself up at last to the power
> of its internal affinities. We must believe without reservation in the possibility and
> the necessary consequences of universal Love. (p. 61)

Universal Love. I assert that the "Civilization of the Universal" will, if it comes to be, be based in equality and be born from a feeling of love. In his collection, *Élégies majeures,* Senghor (1979) poetically expresses this belief in universal equality and love:

---

[72] So much so, in fact, that there is included at the end of the first essay in *Building the Earth,* a note which reads: "Father Teilhard de Chardin did not exclude from Christianity any one who expressly or implicitly believes in *Love.*" (p. 34)

"to those who would love their lands: their people

And all the people, all the lands of the earth

in a universal love."[73] (p. 57)

In the opening to "Ce que l'homme noir apporte," Senghor quotes André Gide: "Wisdom

is not found in reason, but in love"[74] (p. 22). I believe that the kind of wisdom that is

based on love could save the earth along with us humans currently inhabiting the earth.

Many people will snicker at this idealism; however, I believe that it is worth defending,

because the alternative, it seems, is somehow less true. Teilhard provides me with

validation for my idealism, much like he provided for Senghor's spirituality. He writes:

"It is finally the Utopians, not the "realists," who make scientific sense. They at least,

though their flights of fancy may cause us to smile, have a feeling for the true dimensions

of the phenomenon of [Humankind]" (1965, p. 67).

Though I am an idealist, I do believe that there are simple and practical ways that

could help promote the coming of the Civilization of the Universal. For one, international

conferences like the World Social Forum should be continuously attempted until truly

international, multi-class and multi-racial dialogue occurs.[75] This dialogue must be based

in equality. I have experience with yoga and because it teaches that all humans are

fundamentally equal, I suggest that yoga be incorporated into education worldwide. Yoga

---

[73] « à ceux qui aimèrent leurs terre: leur peuple
Et tous les peuples, toutes les terres de la terre
dans un amour œcuménique. » found in « Élégies pour Georges Pompidou »

[74] « La sagesse n'est pas dans la raison, mais dans l'amour. »

[75] The World Social Forum was first held in Brazil in 2001. It is an international meeting that is meant to be representative of a global civil society. The discussions are generally about finding alternatives to neoliberal globalization. It is held annually at the same time as its capitalist rival, the World Economic Forum. The World Social Forum is a step towards a kind of "rendez-vous of give and take" but it has been criticized for mainly featuring European and Brazilian intellectuals. For a book length discussion, see: Santos, BS. (2006). *The rise of the global left: The world social forum and beyond.* London: Zed Books.

in schools has already begun and I can personally testify for the success of teaching yoga to inner city youth in Saskatoon.[76] As language is intrinsic to cultural primacy, I believe measures should be taken to protect languages and I believe that the learning of more than one language should be encouraged for all people. If nothing else, learning another language gives insight into alternative ways of understanding the world; the more insight we gain, the more likely it will be that we can come up with solutions to problems like the current environmental crisis. Senghor (1945) explains that, "learning languages is an instrument to discovering human truths" (p. 67). Discovering human truths is a worthwhile goal. Culture must be explored and carefully considered as it should be the basis for all development, education, political and social decisions. Contact between diverse groups should be encouraged. We should try to see ourselves in "others" until we realize that we are all "others" at which point the very notion of "other" and the inequality that comes with it will disappear. Development practitioners and policy makers should be trained in becoming open to new and different ways of being and understanding, so as to shed harmful notions of superiority and inferiority. Also, I recommend that people spend as much time amidst the beauty and wonder of nature as possible in order to reconnect with the Earth Mother, who sustains all life.

I recommend that further research be done in order to find ways to practically implement these recommendations globally. I believe that such changes would bring about the shift from an over-emphasis on rationality to the balance between rationality and intuition that could change society for the better. Let us work towards remembering

---

[76] For more information about the organization, Vinyasa Yoga For Youth, founded by my *guru* (yoga teacher, literally *remover of darkness*) see this website: http://vinyasayogaforyouth.com/

the sacred gift of intuition by being open and by embracing other ways of knowing so that the the global society can achieve balance. Senghor writes in "De la Négritude:"

> In fact, the cultural awakening of the world will be found in the balance between these two modes of knowing, both equally necessary, because, as intuition discovers and synthesizes, discursive intelligence [rationality] analyzes in light of practical use and discovery.[77] (1969, p. 25)

As development scholars and theorists have the task of determining the direction development should take, I would simply ask that a balanced understanding be sought, one that honours cultural diversity, is grounded in equality and seeks harmony with the earth. Verhelst and Tyndale (2002) state: "Each culture, each civilisation is called upon to relate to others in a spirit of joyful interest and compassionate love" (p. 22).

Most religions–and certainly Senghor's description of African ontology–expresses the idea that there is an element of sacred in every person, and even in all of reality (Verhelst & Tyndale, 2002, p. 8). I sense that this recognition of spirit, of light, of vital force or energy as being part of all existence, is a spiritual truth common to all people who intuitively embrace spirituality, which is why the following quotations, though collected from diverse sources, all mean the same thing: *namaste*.[78] Chief Crazy Horse of the Oglala Sioux said to Sitting Bull, four days before he was assassinated: "I salute the light within your eyes where the whole universe dwells. For when you are at that centre

---

[77] « En fait, l'avenir culturel du monde se trouve dans un équilibre entre ces deux modes de connaissances, tous également nécessaires, car, si l'intuition découvre et synthétise, l'intelligence discursive analyse en vue de l'utilisation pratique de la découverte. »

[78] "The gesture Namaste represents the belief that there is a Divine spark within each of us that is located in the heart chakra. The gesture is an acknowledgment of the soul in one by the soul in another. "Nama" means bow, "as" means I, and "te" means you. Therefore, Namaste literally means "bow me you" or "I bow to you."" Aadil Palkhivala from: http://www.yogajournal.com/basics/822

within you and I am at that place within me, we shall be one."[79] More than one hundred

years later, Marianne Williamson (1994) writes: "We are all meant to shine, as children

do. We were born to make manifest the glory of God that is within us. It's not just in

some of us; it's in everyone"(p. 190-91). And Senghor (1956) furthers the recognition of

the light within all "others" by explaining, in "L'Esthétique négro-Africaine," that the

divine spark that is in all of life is mutually reinforced by interaction:

> The Other–be they adult, ancestor, spirit or God–, far from being an obstacle, is
>
> support for, source of vital force. Far from their being *conflict* in this
>
> confrontation between *You* and *me,* there is conciliatory accord, not derealisation,
>
> but a realisation that is bigger than the individual essence.[80] (p. 206)

By saluting that which is divine in all of humankind, by bowing to and being open to the

"other" while employing wisdom based on love, an "active wisdom," we can achieve the

"Civilization of the Universal" and hopefully save the environment. It is "active wisdom"

that development must incorporate, which according to Senghor (1959) entails,

"recognizing the unity of the world and working toward its ordination"[81] (p. 277).

Development should be grounded in theory that recognizes "the unity of the world" and

policies should "work towards its ordination."

---

[79] The website explains that, "This was passed on by Chief Joe Chasing Horse, a relative of Crazy Horse. He translated it from the words of a grandmother who was present when the words were spoken. This is a statement of Crazy Horse as he sat smoking the sacred pipe at Paha Sapa with Sitting Bull for the last time, four days before he was assassinated. Many of these words are often repeated." http://www.buffalomessengers.org/prophecies.html

[80] « L'Autre–adulte, Ancêtre, génie ou Dieu–, loin d'être obstacle, est support, source de force vitale. Loin qu'il y ait *conflit*, dans cette confrontation de *moi* et *Toi*, il y a accord concilient, no déréalisation, mais réalisation plus grande de l'essence individuelle. »

[81] « reconnaître l'unité du monde et à travailler pour son ordination. »

References

Afshar, F. (2005). Exploring the frontiers of international development: countries of the North, well-being, spirituality, and contemplation. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies,* 26(3), 527-546).

Anacleti, O. (2002). Research into local culture: implications for participatory development. In D. Eade (Ed.), *Development and culture: selected essays from development in practice* (pp. 168-174). Oxford: Oxfam GB in association with World Faiths Development Dialogue.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large:cultural dimensions of globalization.* Minneapolis, Minn.:University of Minnesota Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism:ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co..

Bamba Thiam, C. A. (2007). A philosophy at the crossroads: The shifting concept of Negritude in Leopold Sedar Senghor's oeuvre. (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Information and Learning Company. UMI Microform 3285808.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Biccum, A. R. (2002). Interrupting the discourse of development: on a collision course with postcolonial theory. *Culture, Theory & Critique,* 43(1), 33-50.

Biro, A. (2011). Introduction: the paradoxes of contemporary environmental crises and the redemption of the hopes of the past. In A. Biro (Ed.), *Critical ecologies: The Frankfurt school and contemporary environmental crises* (pp. 3-23). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Brown, G. W., & Held, D. (2010). *Cosmopolitan reader.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Capra, F. (1995). Deep ecology: a new paradigm. In G. Sessions, (Ed.), *Deep ecology for the 21st century* (pp. 19-26). Boston and London: Shambhala.

Chatervedi, R., Singleton, B. & Howe Kritzer, A. (2005). *Ethnicity and identity:Global performance.* Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Daleaux, A. (2006). La liberté selon Teilhard et la science. In Deane-Drummond, C. (Ed.), *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on people and planet* (pp. 37-55). London: Equinox.

Damisio, A. R. (2003). *Looking for Spinoza: Joy, sorrow, and the feeling brain.* Orlando: Harcourt.

Deane-Drummond, C. (2006). *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on people and planet.* London: Equinox.

Derrida, J. (2003). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness.* New York: Routledge.

Devall, B., & Sessions, G. (1985). *Deep ecology: Living as if nature mattered.* Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith Books.

Diagne, S. B. (2004). On prospective: development and a political culture of time. *Africa Development,* 29(1), 55-69.

Diagne, S. B. (2010). In praise of the post-racial: Negritude beyond negritude. *Third Text,* 24(2), 241-248.

Dobson, A. (2006). Thick cosmopolitanism. *Political Studies,* 54, 165-184.

Eade, D., Verhelst, T. G., & Tyndale, W. (2002). *Development and culture: Selected essays from development in Practice.* Oxford: Oxfam GB in association with World Faiths development Dialogue.

Eagleton, T. (1994). Goodbye to Enlightenment. *The Guardian,* 5 May.

Economic Confidential (interviewer unknown) & Amina Az-Zubair (interviewee). (2010, January). How we channel billions of naira on 8 goals. Retrieved from: http://economicconfidential.net/new/interviews/115-nigeria-mdgs-how-we-channel-billions-of-naira-on-8-goals-amina-az-zubair-

Ekpo, D. (2010). From Negritude to post Africanism. *Third Text,* 24(2), 177-187.

Ehrenfield, D. (2005). The environmental limits to globalization. *Conservation Biology,* 19(2), 318-326.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (1996). Construction nature: Elements for a post-structuralist political ecology. *Futures,* 28(4), 325-343.

Esteva, G. (1992). Development. In Sachs, W. (Ed.), *The development dictionary: a guide to knowledge as power* (pp. 6-26). London: Zed Books.

Eze, E. C. (2001). *Achieving our humanity: The idea of a postracial future.* London: Routledge.

Eze, E. C. (2002). Answering the question, "what remains of Enlightenment"? *Human Studies,* 25(3), 281-288.

Fraser, A. (2005). Poverty reduction strategy papers: Now who calls the shots? *Review of African Political Economy,* 104(5), 317-340.

Galeano, E. H. (1991). *The book of embraces*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Gell-Mann, M. (1994). *The quark and the jaguar: Adventures in the simple and the complex*. New York: Owl Books.

Geschiere, P., Meyer, B., & Pels, P. (2008). *Readings in modernity in Africa.* Oxford: James Currey.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (2001). *The global third way debate*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Glendinning, C. (1995). Recovery from western civilization. In G. Sessions (Ed.), *Deep ecology for the 21ˢᵗ century* (pp. 37-46). Boston and London: Shambhala.

Gonzales, M. & Gonzales, T. (2010). From colonial encounters to decolonizing encounters. Culture and nature seen from the Andean cosmovision of ever: The nurturance of life as whole. In S. Pilgrim & J. Pretty (Eds.), *Nature and culture: Rebuilding lost connections* (pp. 83-103). London: Earthscan.

Hollinger, D. (2002). Not universalists, not pluralists: The new cosmopolitans find their own way. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice* (pp. 227-239). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hountondji, P. J. (2002). *The struggle for meaning: Reflections on philosophy, culture and democracy in Africa.* Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.

Jeffers, C. (2009). Black civilization and the dialogue of cultures: Senghor's combination of cultural nationalism and cosmopolitanism. In Constant, I. & Mabana, K.C. (Eds.), *Negritude* (pp. 54-65). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Jeffers, C. (2010). The Black gift: Cultural nationalism and cosmopolitanism in Africana philosophy. (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Information and Learning Company. UMI Microform 3433587.

Kebede, M. (2004). African development and the primacy of mental decolonization. *Africa Development,* 29(1), 107-129.

Kelsall, T. (2008). Going with the grain in African development? *Development Policy Review,* 26(6), 627-655.

Kielburger, C. & M. (2011, March 19ᵗʰ). At TED Talks, Bill Gates Highlights Amina Az-Zubair, Nigerian Working To End Poverty. *HuffPost Impact.* Retrieved from:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/craig-and-marc-kielburger/ted-bill-gates-az-zubair_b_836672.html

King, T. (2006). Teilhard and the environment. In Deane-Drummond, C. (Ed.), *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on people and planet* (pp. 179-193). London: Equinox.

King, U. (2006). One planet, one spirit : Searching for an ecologically balanced spirituality. In Deane-Drummond, C. (Ed.), *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on people and planet* (pp. 74-96). London: Equinox.

Krishnaswamy, R. (2002). The criticism of culture and the culture of criticism: At the intersection of postcolonial and globalization theory. *Diacritics,* 32(2), 106-126.

Krishnaswamy, R., & Hawley, J. C. (2008). *The postcolonial and the global*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Latouche, S. (1993). *In the wake of the affluent society: An exploration of post-development.* London: Zed.

Lewis, S. R. (2006). *Race against time: Searching for hope in AIDS-ravaged Africa* (2nd ed.). Toronto: House of Anansi Press Inc..

Mathews, F. (1998). The real, the one, and the many in ecological thought. In D. Cooper & J. Palmer (Eds.), *Spirit of the environment: Religion, value and environmental concern* (pp. 57-73). London: Routledge.

Mbiti, J. S. (1990). *African religions and philosophy* (2nd Ed.). London: Heinemann.

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

Naess, A. (1973). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary. *Inquiry,* 16, 95-99.

Naess, A. (2008). *The ecology of wisdom: Writings by Arne Naess.* Drengson, A. & Devall, B. Eds. Berkeley: Counterpoint.

Ochieng'-Odhiambo, F. (2009) Negritude: the basic principles and appraisal. In Constant, I. & Mabana, K.C. (Eds.), *Negritude* (pp. 66-82). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Parekh, B. (2003). Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. *Review of International Studies*, 29, 3-17.

Pieterse, J. N. (2000). After post-development. *Third World Quarterly,* 21(2), 175-191. *Review of International Studies,* 29, 3-17.

Pieterse, J. N. (2010). *Development theory: Deconstructions/reconstructions* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Pogge, T. W. (2002). *World poverty and human rights: Cosmopolitan responsibilities and reforms*. Cambridge: Polity.

Prentki, T. (2005). Surviving the monoculture: Land, language, identity corpses, zombies or life after McDonald's. In R. Chatervedi, B. Singleton & A. Howe Kritzer (Eds.), *Ethnicity and identity:global performance* (pp. 163-183). Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Radhakrishnan, R. (2001). Globalization, desire, and the politics of representation. *Comparative Literature,* 53(4), 315-332.

Rahnema, M. (1992) Poverty. In W. Sachs, (Ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power* (pp. 158-177). London: Zed Books.

Ricœur, P. (1965). *History and truth; essays*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Rodney, W. w/Babu, A.M. & Harding, V. (1981). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa.* (Rev. ed.). Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture.* London: Sage.

Rostow, W. W. (1960). *The stages of economic growth, a non-Communist manifesto*. Cambridge, U.K.: University Press.

Rudd, X. (2009). Sky to ground. On *Koonyum Sun* (with Izintaba) (CD). Byron Bay, Australia: Salt-X Records.

Sachs, J. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. New York: Penguin Press.

Sachs, W. (1992). *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power.* London: Zed Books.

Sachs, W. (1992). Environment. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power* (pp. 26-37). London: Zed Books.

Sachs, W. (2010). Preface to the new edition. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power, second edition* (pp. vi-xv). London: Zed Books.

Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

Santos, BS. (2006). *The rise of the global left: The world social forum and beyond.* London: Zed Books.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Knopf.

Sen, A. (2002). How to judge globalism. *The American Prospect,* 13(1), 1-14.

Senghor, L.S. (1937). Le problème culturel en A.O.F. In *Liberté I: Négritude et humanisme* (pp. 11-22). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1939). Ce que l'homme noir apporte. In *Liberté I: Négritude et humanisme* (pp. 22-38). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1945). Vues sur l'Afrique noire ou assimiler, non être assimilés. In *Liberté I: Négritude et humanisme* (pp. 39-69). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1950a). De la liberté de l'âme ou éloge du métissage. In *Liberté I:Négritude et humanisme* (pp. 98-103). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1950b). Le problème de la culture. In *Liberté I: Négritude et humanisme* (pp. 93-97). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1956). L'Esthétique Négro-Africaine. In *Liberté I: Négritude et humanisme* (pp. 202-217). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1962). *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin et la politique Africaine*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1963). Hommage à Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. In *Liberté 5: Le dialogue des cultures* (pp. 9-13). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1964a). *Liberté I: Négritude et humanisme*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1964b). *On African socialism*. New York: Praeger.

Senghor, L. S. (1969). De la Négritude. In *Liberté 5: Le dialogue des cultures* (pp. 14-26). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1970). Negritude: A humanism of the twentieth century. In R. J. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), (1994). *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory* (pp. 27-35). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Senghor, L.S. (1971). *Liberté II: Nation et voie africaine du socialisme*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1971b). Problématique de la Négritude. *Présence Africaine,* 78, 3-36.

Senghor, L. S., Reed, J. O., & Wake, C. (1976). *Prose and poetry.* London: Heinemann Educational.

Senghor, L.S. (1977). *Liberté 3: Négritude et civilisation de l'universel.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1979). *Élégies majeures.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L.S. (1980). *La poésie de l'action: Conversations avec Mohamed Aziza.* Paris: Éditions Stock.

Senghor, L. S. (1983a). La culture face à la crise. In *Liberté 5: Le dialogue des cultures* (pp. 192-198). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1983b). Le dialogue des cultures. In *Liberté 5: Le dialogue des cultures* (pp. 199-210). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Senghor, L. S. (1988). *Ce que je crois: Négritude, francité et civilisation de l'universel.* Paris: B. Grasset.

Senghor, L.S. (1993). *Liberté 5: Le dialogue des cultures.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Shiva, V. (1988). *Staying alive: Women, ecology and survival in India.* India: Kali for women.

Skehan, J.W. (2006). Exploring Teilhard's 'new mysticism': 'Building the cosmos.' In C. Deane-Drummond (Ed.), *Pierre Teilhard de Chardin on people and planet* (pp. 13-37). London: Equinox.

Steger, R. & Roy, R. K. (2010). *Neoliberalism: A very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sylvester, C. (1999). Development studies and postcolonial studies: Disparate tales of the "Third World." *Third World Quarterly, 20*(4), 703-721.

Taylor, C. (2001). Two theories of modernity. In D. Parameshwar Gaonkar (Ed.) *Alternative modernities* (pp. 172-196). Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Taylor, P. C. (2004). *Race: A philosophical introduction.* Oxford: Polity.

Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1965). *Building the earth.* London: Dimension Books.

Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and culture.* Oxford: Polity.

Towa, M. (1971). *Léopold Sédar Senghor, négritude ou servitude?* Yaounde: Editions CLE.

Tucker. V. (1999). The myth of development: A critique of eurocentric discourse. In R. Munek and D. O'Hearn (Eds.), *Critical development theory: Contributions to a new paradigm* (pp. 1-26). London: Zed.

Vaillant, J. G. (1990). *Black, French, and African: A life of Léopold Sédar Senghor.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Van der Veer, P. (2002). Colonial cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and practice* (pp. 165-180). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ver Beek, K.A. (2002). Spirituality: A development taboo. In D. Eade (Ed.), *Development and culture: selected essays from development in practice* (pp. 60-77). Oxford: Oxfam GB in association with World Faiths Development Dialogue.

Vertovec, S. & Cohen, R. (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Visvanathan, S. (1991), Mrs. Bruntland's disenchanted cosmos. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 16(3), 377-384.

Williams, R. J. & Chrisman, L. (1994). *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Williamson, Marianne. (1994). *A Return to love: Reflections on a course in miracles.* New York: HarperPaperbacks.

Wilmsen, B., Webber, M. & Yuefang, D. (2011). Development for whom? Rural to urban resettlement at the Three Gorges Dam, China. *Asian Studies Review,* 35, 21-42.

Wilson, E. O. (1992). *The diversity of life*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.