

presents emerging issues and ideas that call for action or rethinking by managers, administrators, and policy makers in organizations

Poverty Alleviation at an International Development Organization: Resurrecting the Human Being as Subject

Sangeeta Parameshwar, Param Srikantia and
Jessica Heineman-Pieper

Executive Summary

This paper examines the field experiences of one of the authors in designing workshops for Finance Ministers of several countries at a leading international development organization. The power of a single book to cause a paradigm change is brought out as the authors sense-make the field experience in the light of their reading of *The Development Dictionary*, edited by Wolfgang Sachs, which debunks the myth of a "First World" and a "Third World" based on the socially constructed binary paradigm of "development" and "underdevelopment." While claiming to do the opposite, professionals in the field of "international development" have often been impoverishing global communities through Western economic and technological interventions, enabled by the "aid" provided by interested global financial institutions on usurious, harmful, and coercive terms. It is ironic that the West, with all its economic crashes, corporate scandals, addictive consumerism, runaway militarism, and unsustainable life styles, considers itself competent to "develop" the other three-fourths of the world's population.

A crucial shortcoming of disciplines like Western management, business administration, public policy, and development economics is that their conceptual frameworks and the ensuing strategies ignore the inner, subjective landscape of human beings that can be a source of creative transcendence from the standpoint of human flourishing. As a basis for an enlightened consciousness in global social change work, the paper recommends an alternative conceptual framework defined by the four coordinates of man-as-subject with a focus on the person (as opposed to man-as-object with a focus on aggregates), an abundance-based appreciative valuing (as opposed to a scarcity-based problem solving), organic, indigenous approaches that are grassroots-based (versus expert-driven prescriptions grafted from a foreign source) and an orientation toward Being (rather than a focus on "doing" that results in the mechanistic implementation of programmatic routines). The paper seeks to highlight the importance of resurrecting human subjectivity as a fundamental regenerative force underlying empowerment and poverty alleviation. The answer to the world's problems may be 'counter-development,' by which the 'rich' 'developed' countries "develop" themselves in their spiritual consciousness, thereby reducing the systemic risk of their unsustainable, wasteful ways on the rest of the world they seek to 'develop.' If we think of the world as a global learning community, a repository of different ways of living and being that are non-comparable, we may have to remake these contemporary development institutions more in the image of a 'global parliament of cultures' in which different cultures, from a stance of equality, share life furthering practices with one another and seek to understand what gives vitality to all of them.

As experiences of urban poor groups illustrate, the poor have demonstrated extraordinary creativity and ingenuity in designing innovative solutions to their own problems, and they appear more competent at poverty reduction than local or national governments and international agencies (Appadurai, 2001). Poverty alleviation led by the poor themselves may be a viable alternative to poverty alleviation led by the rich. International development agencies from wealthy countries that claim to be focused on "poverty alleviation" should perhaps reframe their mission to "greed alleviation" in their own countries.

KEY WORDS

Poverty Alleviation

International Development

Appreciative Inquiry

Expert-driven Approaches

Capacity-building

Western World-view

One of the foremost international development organizations announced a programme that granted debt relief to indebted countries if they were able to present a poverty reduction plan that reflected a systematic approach to poverty reduction. The organization required the respective governments of the countries to formulate the plan through a consultative process that maximized civic engagement in the development of the poverty reduction plan. The governments were required to solicit input and participation from a variety of business, government, and civil society actors, including NGO leaders, parliamentarians, and other voices 'representing' the poor in their respective countries (interestingly, the international organization required the voices of representatives but not of poor people themselves). The organization brought in consultants to help develop these workshops. Broadly stated, the purpose of the workshops was to model a consultative and participatory process for maximizing civic engagement in the formulation of poverty reduction strategies, although, ultimately, the responsibility for the formulation of the strategy and its implementation would lie with the government. One of the authors to this paper was a consultant brought in to help conceptualize the design and process steps for the workshops and to develop the training material and programme content. This paper is a result of the retrospective, sense-making of the three authors as they discussed and debriefed the field experiences of the author who was directly engaged in the consulting project.

A FUNDAMENTAL CONTRADICTION

Immediately prior to the field experience of one of the authors, *The Development Dictionary*, edited by Wolfgang Sachs, had awakened him into recognizing palpable ideological tensions in how the whole idea of 'development' has come to be framed and enacted in the global context. Although a number of powerful international financial institutions and Western governments have been promoting the hegemonic conception of international development based on the morally simplistic self-characterization of Western societies as being "more developed" and the rest of the world as "developing," an increasing handful of scholars and practitioners have recognized that, while this framing often goes unquestioned in development circles, it is in fact an imperialist, socially constructed fallacy. Appreciative, participatory, or reflexive approaches attempt to attenuate the blatant

and coercive imposition of Western world-views by following a non-positivist, phenomenological perspective that calls attention to the voices of the victims of these zealous 'development' initiatives, highlighting their right to articulate a vision of their own future. In a subsequent section, we flesh out explicitly the tension between the positivist approach to development in which problems and solutions are "objectively" construed and sourced from a narrow body of mostly Western 'experts,' versus a variety of post-positivist and de-colonizing perspectives that recognize a more complex picture, including the hidden agendas of international institutions, the power imbalances that determine what aspects of a reality come to be framed as the "problem" and the "solution," and that argue for the importance of invoking egalitarian solutions that incorporate the grassroots wisdom of world cultures.

By calling itself "international development," the field is irremediably trapped in a fundamental contradiction of its own making: When the objective of the profession is unashamedly to "develop" others, the goal is a one-way transfer of culture and the strategies are concomitantly unilateral and 'expert'-driven. Although non-traditional scholars recognize the problems engendered by expert-driven approaches, which deny the dignity and autonomy of local communities, international development practice often deploys an army of mostly Western 'capacity building experts' in non-Western societies to 'develop' their standard of living (Rahnema, 1992), while ignoring the naturally sustainable ecologies of material self-sufficiency inherent in these non-industrial life styles. Even though the field of international development may, in theory, recognize the value of involving communities in active, self-directed processes of inquiry, in reality, the field's professionals, under the guise of development, have often been impoverishing communities through Western economic and technological interventions. These interventions simultaneously upset the ecological balance and erode the self-esteem and capacity of entire communities to generate organically grown solutions internally consistent with their culturally embedded paradigm (Shiva, 2002; Srikantia and Fry, 2000; Sachs, 1992). The assumed superiority of the expert on "capacity-building" has been called into question very effectively in the 1995 *Annual Report of the South Africa's Community Development Resource Association (CDRA)*:

"We all know the classic development *cliche*...give a man a fish, feed him for a day; teach him how to fish, feed him for a lifetime. This is a laudable sentiment but it becomes more complex on two counts. The first we have known for some time—it does not help to teach people to fish when they are denied equal access to the resource base....But the second complexity is more intractable. What if those of us who claim to do the teaching do not know how to fish? What if we have never really fished in our lives?" (excerpted from "Capacity Building Myth or Reality", from the CDRA Annual Report).

The emergence of post-positivist perspectives that challenge the process of policy analysis as value-neutral "pure science" also helped pave the way for an interpretive, dialogical conception of policy. In this vein, Hajer (1993) refers to discourse coalitions as "a group of actors who basically share a social construct" (p.45). These constructs (for example, "international development") help in politically framing phenomena and giving them meaning. Sometimes the shared consensus achieved by a technocratic elite can be so entrenched as to form an effective barrier to more egalitarian, inclusive representations. The construct, "international development," automatically privileges one group of actors who consider themselves "developed" to act upon and transform the realities of another group that the technocratic elite views as "less developed," In elucidating the politics of societal transformation, Hajer (1993) demonstrates how, although the ideas of the ecological modernization coalition triumphed over the technocratic coalition, it failed to transform the institutional practices that continue to be driven by the technocratic coalition. There is a compelling parallel in the context of international development in that though the purely technocratic discourse has been challenged through various critiques of development practices (Sachs, 1992), it continues to exercise influence through the bureaucratic institutionalized systems and processes of such powerful actors as the World Bank, the IMF, USAID, DFID, etc.

In his field experiences, the author was committed to going beyond the customary assumption that the so-called developing world must learn from the so-called developed world in a one way flow of learning and ex-

perience. He was interested in exploring what new possibilities are ignited when participants share diverse life-furthering practices from their own contexts without being steamrolled by the usual hierarchical devaluing established by the Western 'expert' paradigm of "international development." The resulting design therefore used appreciative inquiry to encourage participants to share inspiring moments from their own countries and cultures as a basis for a process of worldwide learning.

THE MYTH OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The organization that contracted the services of the author was primarily one of the largest and most powerful international development organizations in the world. To the authors, the notion of international development itself embeds and perpetuates corrosive stereotypes about non-Western cultures and ways of being. Exposed as they have been to critical theory perspectives that apply Foucauldian concepts to deconstruct the binary paradigm of development and underdevelopment (Sachs, 1992), the authors view the enterprise of international development as a destructive enactment of a devaluing and patronizing gaze by Western cultures toward the rest of the world. The development paradigm reduces the myriad forms of value and abundance in the world to one based on a relentless materialism – and then places the countries and people of the world along a linear scale in which (not surprisingly) the West emerges at the forefront. In this paradigm, the West looks down on the ways of life of the remaining two-thirds of the world's population and seeks to 'develop' them to be more like the West (Escobar, 1995). Others point out that even in the West this ideology has produced thoroughly unsustainable societies (Sachs, 1992) that simultaneously teach people to become dependent upon external 'resources' and to become numb to their inner being, while creating the greatest wealth disparities in the world, thereby resulting in widespread misery (Shiva, 1992; Shiva, 2005; Rowbotham, 2007). Many critics of development ask why the rest of the world would want to take this route. And yet, the ideology has been a powerful one, and many societies have made the Faustian bargain in pursuit of the false promise of 'development,' often nudged along the way by coercive powers such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, multinational corporations, and the Central Intelligence Agency (Perkins, 2004).

Critical theorists have shown how the idea of development is an extension of the Eurocentric imperialist project to reshape the world in the image of Europe and North America based on a vestigial colonial gaze (Estava, 1998). Whereas in the natural world, we accept the differences in ecology as representing a manifestation of the boundless diversity of nature, in what has been the Western enterprise of international development, there is an attempt to rob the world of its cultural and economic diversity and to create a homogenous world predicated on the Western world-view. Such hubris appears to derive from an assumption that three-fourths of the world's population is in a lamentable, primitive condition from which they need to be rescued, a view rooted in a social construction of reality defined by the values and assumptions of the West (Sachs, 1992). The economic systems and countries that continue to be contemptuously referred to as "developing" constitute non-comparable forms of living and look similar only through the homogenizing gaze of a Western observer. Cultures such as *Rajasthanis*, Iroquois, Americans, Maori people, and Bushmen, are non-comparable, and it is distorting and destructive to create socially constructed dimensions based on exclusively Western mindsets and agendas, and then to pretend these cultures exist on a value-neutral continuum (Sachs, 1992). The comparison is not 'objective' – each way of categorizing distorts the things categorized in different and systematic ways, and these ways are not neutral but relate to the purposes in categorizing (Wimsatt, 2007). Such dimensions are inextricable from the (Western) values, assumptions, and purposes that underlie the choice and definition of the comparative dimension. Imposing such a culturally alien and one-sided 'metric' creates a powerful and devaluing gaze that impacts how people see themselves. For example, writers such as Helena Norberg-Hodge recount how the people of Ladakh, when asked "where are the poor people in your society?" did not see themselves as poverty-ridden (Norberg-Hodge, 1992). Years later, after they were exposed to the socially constructed notion of development and underdevelopment, they began to see themselves through the gaze of Western civilization and began to think of themselves, for the first time, as underdeveloped, poor, and in need of 'help.'

While critical theorists recognize and expose how the 'international development' discourse mechanically reproduces mindsets and realities that fuel the egos and

the interests of those in power while effacing the perspectives of communities experiencing the destructive effects of 'development,' the development agenda proceeds unperturbed due to the vastly disproportionate power exercised by these international institutions. Stiglitz (2003) presents several examples of situations that illustrate how these institutions have been dominated by Western economists engaged in the mechanical reproduction of their theoretical frameworks; they apply their standard models and force other countries to fit into the Procrustean bed of their own thinking while ignoring the indigenously developed wisdom. As Stiglitz (2003) has shown, even when 'debtor' countries enact healthy economic policies that are good for them, (for example, Ethiopia's progress under Meles Zenawi's leadership when the IMF became perhaps unhappy that Ethiopia was paying back its loan faster than expected), interested international institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO browbeat them into passive conformity to Western economic dogma that hurts their economy and society.

Although the countries in question have paid back the principal amount of their loans many times over, their image as "debtor" countries is fixed because of the usurious interest component. Indeed, the whole 'aid' construct and practice is a ruse for first transferring the initial loan principal to US construction companies and contractors (to build dams and other projects that disrupt local ecologies: Farmer, 2004; Perkins, 2004); for ensuring a steady stream of interest income for the 'giving' countries (Danaher, 1994; George, 1997), resulting in political, economic, and social disempowerment in the 'aided' countries, and for allowing the 'developed' countries to dictate policies to secure unrestricted access to the resources (human, natural) and populations (seen as a growing 'market' for consumer goods) in the 'aided' countries (Perkins, 2004). Even the so-called 'debt-relief' comes at a dire cost to 'indebted' nations and at a huge profit for Western multinationals: Conditions on loan 'forgiveness' routinely require that the country hand over ("privatize") vital resources (including water, oil, land and so on) to Western multinationals, whose exploitation and appropriation of those resources harms local communities and has led to great human suffering and even several effective revolts (Perkins, 2004; Shiva, 2002).

THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL DIMENSION: POST-POSITIVIST TRIBUTARIES IN POLICY ANALYSIS

The debate between positivist and post-positivist approaches within public policy have powerful ramifications for the methodologies employed in the practice of development work. The same tensions between such rival intellectual camps as the phenomenologists and behaviourists and objectivists and relativists known to public policy scholars have played themselves out in a variety of other applied disciplines as well, including international development. There is growing recognition that the ways in which policy analysts and planners frame issues are based upon representations not of an “objective” reality but of a reality that comes to be constructed through the interplay of power relations, the agendas and interests of multiple actors, causality and responsibility, and authority and legitimacy (Fischer and Forrester, 1993). Problems are not “objective” features of the world; rather, policy planners and analysts actively engage in constructing the “issues” that we pay attention to (Fischer and Forrester, 1993).

Positivism, as Hajer and Waagenaar (2003) point out, is not restricted to the conduct of the social sciences but involves implications for governance and policy making. Post-positivist approaches, with their grounding in philosophy of science, are particularly relevant to the practice of public policy, international development and social work. For example, international development practitioners are embedded in dynamic scenarios in which agendas, political power, and diverse world-views interact in complex ways that go beyond the official, “objective” language of science. The post-positivistic approaches recognize that ontology (presuppositions about reality) and epistemology (presuppositions about the determination of that reality) are interpretive acts. The Western observer starts from conviction in the superiority of his own culture, defines a set of dimensions for categorizing cultures derived from his culture and then uses these dimensions as a yard-stick for reflecting back the same cultural hierarchies that he started the exercise with. Positivism, in contrast, holds that reality (ontology) is unitary and is unaffected by our method of knowing, while at the same time, it defines reality as that which can be known through particular (atomistic, reductive) forms of experience (Bhaskar, 1979) and thus it presumes to legislate the legitimacy or illegitimacy of various approaches to knowledge. The positivist fram-

ing in fields like international development can have extremely damaging consequences, for example, by delegitimizing traditional knowledge and systematically excluding vital non-monetary costs, cultural consequences, and values relevant to human flourishing as outside the domain of scientific assessment, while focusing only on outcomes that further the hegemonic economic interests of the so-called developed nations.

In echoing the concerns articulated above, Dryzek (1993) explores the epistemological foundations of positivism and critical rationalism, and argues that the exclusive dependence on the positivistic approach in the policy disciplines has led to a serious oversimplification of complicated realities. Embracing alternative epistemological frames beyond positivism would, in Dryzek’s view, help legitimize multiple voices and result in approaches to policy that are more inclusive of the perspectives of different actors. Under conditions of such open mindedness, post-positivistic approaches based on a participatory epistemology would revitalize the policy sciences, introducing argumentation that would help expose the ills that bedevil policy analysis such as “manipulation of agendas, illegitimate exercises of power, skewed distribution of information and attempts to distribute attention” (Dryzek, 1993, p13). Reflecting a similar orientation, Healey (1993) also echoes the post-modernist disenchantment with the seemingly rational, positivist approaches and argues for more communicative approaches in which debate, engagement, and participation are central. This shift to a more egalitarian and inclusive approach is also supported by Dunn (1993) who highlights the tensions between scientific language and ordinary language and advocates moving policy planning from the esoteric domain of the scientists and having it emerge naturally from day-to-day exchanges between policy makers, scientists, and citizens.

Yanow (2003) argues that truly understanding issues in public policy requires deep local knowledge, which is dependent upon lived experience in local conditions. Gasper (2004) too articulates a vision for science that goes beyond its exclusivity and embraces a “complex intellectual ecosystem” characterized by a dynamic interplay of multiple ideas, inquirers, users, and life forms all enjoying legitimacy. Giri (2004) reviews several developments (the decomposition of the image of the civilized man, the emergence of new identities, the proliferation

of a variety of social movements, an explosion in pluralism and heterogeneity of styles of life, to name a few) that highlight new possibilities for a radical transformation of contemporary research methods. By bringing “ontological cultivation” back to social research, Giri’s (2004) vision of creative social research presents powerful possibilities that go beyond the usual slogan mongering of ‘social research with participation’.

THE APPROACH OF THE WORKSHOPS

In developing the course material for the workshops that the Finance Ministers of the ‘indebted’ countries and their respective civil society conglomerations would attend, it became clear that in economics and development theory, these countries were viewed as the “problem” – as failing, dependent, and needing to be ‘pulled up’ by the self-styled, falsely compassionate hand of the West. Given the pervasive usurping of discursive space exercised by the Western development organizations, the author was committed to searching for a viable programme template that would not perpetuate the observed asymmetry of power. Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider, 1999), a structured organizational development process, that focuses on the positive, “life-giving” forces in a system, if engaged in a genuine spirit of equality and emancipatory co-creation, could contribute towards correcting this imbalance by drawing attention to the sources of abundance, rather than the sources of scarcity, in the so-called Third World.

Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider, 1999), is a method that seeks to identify what gives life and vitality to a system by asking its members to tell stories of peak moments when that community or organization was at its very best. By having people share memorable moments when they experienced a high level of commitment, passion, productivity, and vitality, Appreciative Inquiry attempts to connect people with the peak moments in their own history. These stories of peak moments become the basis for identifying the deeper capacities and the life-giving forces of the organization or community. The entire process of Appreciative Inquiry unfolds in four stages (commonly referred to by Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987) as “the 4D Cycle.” In the first stage, called “Discovery,” the peak moments in the community’s history are identified through storytelling. In the second stage called “Dreaming,” the members of the community are encouraged to articulate

images of a positively valued future. In the third stage, “Design,” people are encouraged to stand in the positive energy unleashed by examining the best moments of the past and their positive images of the future and to identify creative ways in which the gap between current reality and the ideal image of the future can be narrowed by effective collective action. The final phase, “Destiny,” is more about sustaining and preserving the positive energy for collective transformation unleashed in the preceding three stages.

Methodologies

A variety of methods were combined in the delivery of the workshop within an Appreciative Inquiry frame. The incorporation of diverse techniques also helped ensure that the workshop was able to meet the learning styles of participants (Osland and Kolb, 2006), honouring concrete experiences (learning from experiences) reflective observation (learning by observing), abstract conceptualization (learning by thinking), and active experimentation (learning by doing). The methodologies that were used included: Lectures, exposure to best practices, visioning exercises, inter-group reflection and dialogue, cross-country dialogue and deliberations, design of action components, critical incident technique, case studies, role playing skits and creative presentations, video clips, and force-field analysis.

We now examine the process steps and objectives of the workshops in the light of four coordinates defined by (i) man-as-a-subject with a focus on the person (as opposed to man-as-an-object with a focus on aggregates), (ii) an abundance-based appreciative valuing (as opposed to a scarcity-based problem solving), (iii) organic, indigenous approaches that are grassroots-based (versus expert-driven prescriptions grafted from a foreign source) and (iv) an orientation toward Being (rather than a focus on “doing” and the mechanistic implementation of programmatic routines).

Man-as-a-subject with a Focus on the Person

Man-as-a-subject with a focus on the person may be distinguished from man-as-an-object with a focus on aggregates. Western social sciences and their applications face a fundamental unresolved dilemma, namely, the tension Hegel (1901) identified between man-as-a-subject (as a creative subject seeking to be and to realize his deepest potential through his subjectivity) and man-as-

an-object (influenced and manipulated by others in the pursuit of their vested interests). This parallels the duality that Gordon Allport (1937) incorporated into psychology, after reading the German philosopher, Wilhelm Windelband, between idiographic approaches (that celebrate human subjectivity through a phenomenological exploration of consciousness) and nomothetic approaches (that seek to articulate general principles based on large aggregations).

Unlike spirituality, philosophy, poetry, fiction, and a number of other disciplines, the applied social sciences that inform the paradigm of policy makers eclipse the subjectivity of human beings by homogenizing and reducing them into a nomothetic, dehumanized, aggregate level representation (as in the socially constructed categories of “underdeveloped” or “developing” nations). The French philosopher, Michel Foucault (1980), described the creation of “docile bodies”; we believe that the applied behavioural sciences have systematically promulgated conceptual routines that create “docile minds,” that position people as “objects” (versus agents), within a false gaze of superiority derived from “expert power.” The application of Appreciative Inquiry helped attenuate the man-as-a-subject and man-as-an-object dilemma in the workshop process.

The author attempted to design a programme that would celebrate the subjectivity of human beings and allow them to share their inner landscapes, so to speak. Participants were encouraged to project their subjectivity through the story-telling of peak moments, of coming alive as individuals and communities with rich experiences and histories that others could learn from. For example, the vast majority of the sessions were oriented around inviting participants to share memorable experiences and stories around civic engagement and poverty reduction. The very first session provided an opportunity for country teams to share memories of significant events that shaped participation and civic engagement in their societies. In doing so, people were encouraged to connect with their own histories and to name at least one event that was personally significant, leading everybody on the team to participate.

Throughout the design, in a sustained manner, participants were asked a variety of questions that helped generate the substantive content for the workshop through a participatory process. They were asked to respond to

such questions as, “What do you most value about the work that you do in terms of its impact on civic engagement in poverty reduction?” The author was striving to create a celebration of the subjectivity of the person and a representation of their inner worlds including an acknowledgement of their agency as people who have had rich life experiences. On hindsight, he realized that even this seemingly “appreciative” question as framed is value-laden and implicitly blames the victim, as if they alone were the cause of their poverty.

Abundance-based Appreciative Valuing

Abundance-based appreciative valuing may be contrasted with scarcity-based problem solving. Rather than perpetuate the notion of indebted countries as the “problem,” the programme materials were designed to provide an opportunity for the Finance Ministers of the various countries to highlight examples of successful economic reconstruction and resilience in their countries. The international development organization’s intranet contained case studies that had already been compiled of best practices from the so-called Third World. By incorporating these as case studies into the training material, the workshops provided an opportunity for the participants of the ‘indebted’ countries to engage in cross-border learning from settings that were similar to their own. The Bangalore Report Card Case Study (Public Affairs Centre Website) is an example of how a city in India, under the leadership of a former management professor, had set up citizen surveys in which people evaluated the quality of various civic services like telephones, electricity, and water. The data were then tabulated to yield “report cards” that were then ceremoniously presented to politicians and bureaucrats at a public event, as a means of exerting pressure on these individuals to respond to public dissatisfaction and introduce corrective action. From Brazil, the Puerto Alegre Case Study (Cabannes, 2004) captures the resourcefulness and innovativeness of a community usually dismissed as a “poor slum.” They organized themselves effectively to demand a greater say in and allocation of the city’s budget for the rehabilitation of the poorer versus the more prosperous areas of the city. The pioneering work by Narayan (2005) explores poverty not merely in its financial dimensions but as a fundamental assault on human dignity. This approach has helped expose the limitations of the economist’s poverty diagnostics that are restricted to the tangible, mate-

rial dimensions of poverty. Newer methods of understanding poverty, based on the need for direct participation of the poor and the inclusion of their voices, have resulted from Narayan's work, marking a welcome departure from the customary mostly Western expert-driven approach to poverty measurement through the application of standard economic criteria. This initiative showcased the ingenuity, the humanity, and resourcefulness of people who lead incredibly rich lives and yet are discounted by the Western economist as "Third World."

In fostering an appreciative valuing of their experience (in contrast to the denigration of their experience by the "First World" economist who sees them as "Third World" and having to be rescued from their pathetic plight), participants were asked to identify and share memorable experiences from their home country contexts in which they saw a community being actively engaged in poverty reduction efforts characterized by an egalitarian, participatory sharing of control over key decisions and resources. The stories were followed by the Appreciative Inquiry-based reflection on "What do you think was the most important factor that made such a positive example possible?" Similarly, in formulating a portrait of a desirable future, a feeling of abundance was fostered and reinforced (as opposed to an experience of scarcity) by inviting participants to envision a reality that they would most feel moved to work toward. Because the participants were often in key decision roles in their governments, they were invited to collectively visualize the type of civic engagement and participation that would be best suited to their country context in the poverty reduction process. In constructing their image of the future, participants were called upon to visualize new and better systems, social relationships, governance structures, strategies, and improved morale. There was room for creativity and the design allowed a variety of presentation processes including conceptualizing and presenting their insights in the form of a lecture, a brief skit, a television show, a newspaper headline story, poetry, art, community-based rituals, or a group meeting. The intention was to create a context in which participants could rise above the negative energy of battling economic underdevelopment and instead tap into the positive forces for economic reconstruction.

Organic Approaches that are Indigenously Sourced

In the context of global social change, organic approaches that are indigenously sourced generate very different consequences from expert-based solutions grafted from a foreign source. In the context of the workshop, participants were encouraged to deepen their understanding of their local realities by mapping out the historical concatenation of circumstances that produced the current realities. The intent of the author in proposing this was two-fold. Firstly, the purpose was to awaken participants to their "developing," "Third World" status as being the legacy of the "developed," "First World's" colonial plundering and theft and in a twist of moral irony, left the economically disenfranchised countries framed as "the problem." Secondly, the purpose was to deepen the participants' understanding of the local conditions and inspire them to formulate indigenous solutions rather than import "context-free" economists' solutions purporting to represent universal laws. In the international development literature, the plundering under colonialism is rarely discussed as one of the major causes of "underdevelopment" and the plunderers now emerge in their new roles, clad in expensive suites and wielding Samsonite briefcases and Gucci bags as benevolent "developers" of those they have disenfranchised.

The design also provided for country teams to develop their own mini case studies highlighting positive examples of poverty reduction initiatives and of civic engagement. These short case studies of civic engagement in poverty reduction drawn from real world contexts were then used to stimulate further reflection and inquiry around the applicability of these "best practices" to various country contexts. Expert-driven strategies offered from the pulpit of the "First World" which perpetuate false hierarchies of expertise in the workshop were minimized by this design because virtually all the content was generated by participants in conversation with other participants, sharing stories, peak moments, and interesting local scenarios. The design also incorporated a plenary presentation in which participants were exposed to a variety of best practices from similar country contexts and asked to explore how these lessons could be applied to their own country situation. For example, participants were asked how the ideas on civic engagement presented here fit with their situation. What pos-

sibilities can we see in our situation beyond what is presented here? What are the particular challenges that we see in exploring some of the options being considered? What recommendations do we have for surmounting some of these challenges?" The examples used in the programme were therefore sourced from regionally contiguous or socio-economically similar contexts, thereby enhancing the relevance of the curriculum.

Reorienting toward Being

In the field of economics, Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum have introduced a new ethic that redefines development by going beyond the standard economists' conception, in embracing the capabilities of people to *be* and to *do* (Nussbaum and Sen, 1993). To Dreze and Sen (1989), the goal of development should be "the enhancement of the capability of people to undertake valuable and valued 'doings and beings'" (p.12). The challenge, however, is that in the hands of international development institutions, programmes of capacity building often result in a narrow focus only on the more tangible dimensions of what people can *do* (consistent with the Western bias toward action) while missing the wisdom of Nussbaum and Sen (1993) whose focus includes who people can *be*, through an expansion in their capabilities.

The authors' voyage through the Eastern traditions of Zen Buddhism, Sufism, Hinduism, and Taoism (Osho, 1996; 2004) awakened them to a deeper understanding of the mindset of the ideological and institutional apparatus of international development organizations. It became increasingly clear that the practice of international development is based on reshaping the world in the image of the West (Escobar, 1995). Based on a value orientation that evaluates the worthiness of life's pursuits largely in terms of material outcomes, life in most Western countries is predicated on a paradigm that asserts that you need to *have* (money and resources), so that you are able to *do* what you may most want to do (e.g., vacation at exotic resorts) in order to *be* (happy). This framework makes *being happy* dependent upon *doing* and *having* and overlooks the fact that the domain of *being* is an inner reality not determined by the external circumstances. For example, you can *be happy* doing the dishes in your kitchen and you can *be* utterly miserable at an exotic resort. One of the greatest treasures of the so-called "Third World" has been this liberation of the inner be-

ing from its dependence on external possessions. For example, the familiar sight of street children everywhere in the world, joyously playing by a garbage heap with a discarded milk carton tied to a string should remind us all that the stream of human joy and vitality does not flow according to the Western paradigm of you need to *have* in order to *do* in order to *be*, but rather in the reverse direction – that you can begin by accessing the state of *being* happy, and then what you *do* and what you *have* will be permeated by happiness. These children know that they can *be* happy quite independent of what they *have* or don't have, unlike their counterparts in most materially abundant societies who live in psychic discontent though surrounded by material abundance. This primacy of *being* over *having* and *doing* is a great source of inner strength in the so-called "Third World" while disciplines like economics and international development have missed the point that raising the standard of *having* has not turned the trick of *being* even for the "First World."

It is ironic that the Western hemisphere, with all its economic crashes, corporate scandals, addictive consumerism, extreme militarism, and unsustainable life styles continues to believe that it is in a position to "develop" the other three-fourth's of the world's population. Most of these other cultures have long traditions of recognizing and cultivating "being" as the source of human possibility (Osho, 1996).

We would like to acknowledge that there are deep currents in Western spirituality and in psychology that do resonate with the Eastern framing of the domain of "being" but these voices of maturity rarely reach the shores of Western economics and "development." For example, in groundbreaking work in psychology and philosophy called intrapsychic humanism (Pieper and Pieper, 1990; 2003), there is recognition of the farther reaches of human nature, encompassing a realm of operative ideals which affect how we experience each other and ourselves at a deeper level than the lower level specifics of observable behaviour ("*doing*") or ingrained personality traits, knowledge, and intellect ("*having*").

In the field of management and organizational behaviour, Goss, Pascale and Athos (1993) compare Western and Japanese organizations in their approach to improving quality. While in the Western organizations, the emphasis of senior management is on "what are you

doing in the area of total quality management?" in the Japanese organizations, the interest is in "who are you being with regard to quality?" This is not just a difference of semantics. For example, in the American automobile industry, factory managers could implement a multiplicity of practices ("*doing*") while in the Japanese plants, deep personal commitment to quality ("*being*") helps achieve a quality-oriented culture that goes beyond implementing techniques, fads, and fashions ("*doing*").

Most training and development activity in international organizations has been shaped by Western behavioural sciences with a concomitant focus on skills, competencies, and observable behaviours. These techniques are grafted globally with little recognition of the fact that to many cultures, Western approaches to training and change management appear sophomoric; these cultures are often attuned to a being-oriented epistemology and ontology that goes beyond surface-level behaviour. Because these interventions are backed by administrative coercion, workshop participants in many countries are being held captive in workshops that are alien to the very core of their being. The authors have personally experienced this disconnect not merely in the workshop materials of this organization but in dozens of global NGOs and corporations.

There is much that Westerners could imbibe from other cultures if they were willing to engage the domain of *being*, a layer of deeper reality that Western behavioural science does not recognize. Unfortunately, the levers of Western international development practice are largely in the hands of social scientists whose academic training and education is steeped in logical positivist notions of an objective reality that is presumed to be independent of (but in fact is largely determined by) the researchers or interventionists themselves. Their research, and the prescriptions that follow, far from being value-neutral, try to impose the structures of the Western status quo (including the negative gaze of 'underdevelopment') upon other cultures. For social scientists who have been socialized in their disciplinary paradigms of "*doing*" and "*having*," the mystery of *Being* as celebrated in a variety of human pursuits like literature, poetry, music, and philosophy, is just more evidence of the archaic space of the 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' mindset that needs to be 'disciplined' in Foucauldian terms to conform to the Western social science dogma.

CONCLUSION

The world, as it is today, is a socially constructed reality over-determined by the economist's lens. Critics of this global order such as Rowbotham (2007) argue that economists have created a world in which we have to deal with the contradiction that not only is every country in debt, but also that the United States, supposedly the world's richest country, has the largest debt in the world which runs into several trillion dollars. We might wonder why the "First World" is exhorting the so-called "Third World" to follow its lead (Rowbotham, 2007). The recent financial collapse demonstrated the inherent instability of the Western economic 'free trade' system; countries were better-off to the extent they preserved local autonomy and sustainability, not a fragile global interdependence. Responding to the American-made financial crisis, Taleb (2009) writes: "Nothing should ever become too big to fail." The free-market vision for the world is exactly an economy too big to fail but too fragile to endure. Development does not even work within the 'First World': Failed economic institutions, housing collapse, widening economic inequalities, an unjust health care system, student loans that cripple graduates, government bailouts of private banks with tax payer money, alongside unjust wars to keep the military-industrial complex spinning. Indeed, more and more voices are now pointing out that even within the US, giant corporations have more power than the democratic voice of the people (Johnson, 2009; Kivel, 2006; Perkins, 2004).

In recent years, there has been a growing chorus of critical voices questioning the very conceptual foundations of international economic development. The critiques of the Western conception of economic development, in particular, have emanated from a number of paradigmatic positions, including (but not limited to) post-positivist approaches (Fischer and Forrester, 1993; Hajar and Waagenaar, 2003), radical structuralism and radical humanism (Burrell and Morgan, 1979), monetary theory (Rowbotham, 2007), Eastern and Western spirituality (Srikantia, 2008), spirituality and philosophy (Srikantia and Parameshwar, 2008), Foucauldian deconstruction (Sachs, 1992; Escobar 1995), post-development theory (Nandy, 1992; Rahnema and Bawtree, 1997), alternative economics (Schumacher, 1973), and interestingly, from some Nobel Prize winning economists themselves, including Sen (2000) and Stiglitz (2003). More radical,

experiential testimony about the corruption inherent in the global economic enterprise has been provided by John Perkins (2004) in his *Confessions of an Economic Hitman*, in Naomi Klein's (2007) *Shock Doctrine*, and in numerous publications by The Apex Press (see <http://cipa-apex.org/books/poclad/>).

The Indian mystic, Osho (2004), once mused whether the problem facing humanity is poverty or greed. In suggesting that human propensities toward hoarding based on greed was the real source of global hunger, Osho went on to inquire: 'Have you ever seen a bird that is poor?' It appears as if the global 'poverty problem' is predicated on the prerogative of the rich to define what the problem is. Perhaps if the poor and marginalized had the prerogative of defining what the problem is, following Osho, they may have decided that concentration of wealth based on the rich man's greed is the problem. Shiva (2005) shows how poverty is not an original condition but a consequence of appropriation and violation. As Sachs (1992) suggests, whereas to the international development elite, more 'development' is the answer to global poverty, the answer to the 'poverty problem' may be 'counter-development,' by which the rich "develop" themselves in their spiritual consciousness so that they might see the futility of continuing on the path of their unsustainable and wasteful 'doing' and 'having.' International development and much of the mainstream globalization literature has missed the point that raising the standard of *having* is not the answer to the human dilemma of *being*. As Srikantia (2008) points out:

"Like ancient eastern religions, the theology of modern economics also has embedded within it a *karmic cycle* of disenfranchisement of spirit. Firstly, the economic paradigm creates an escalating spiral of dependence on external material conditions as the path to human joy and well being. By igniting an insatiable thirst for material externals, it creates a condition of inner scarcity and negates the potential for joyous living. It then systematically materially disenfranchises large segments of the population, effectively robbing them of both inner abundance and outer abundance." (p. 21)

The disingenuous contradictions of international development work can be experienced just by entering the luxurious atrium of one of the most prominent international development institutions, whose glittering walls are inscribed with sanctimonious proclamations about alleviating poverty. A five-star hotel style lobby, decorative fountains, and a basement studded with dozens of restaurants serving cuisine from all over the world is suggestive of an addiction to opulence even while foreign governments are told to practice 'austerity' through structural adjustment programmes that impoverish their people (Danaher, 1994). The global institutional architecture that has been designed ostensibly to combat global poverty has created a wealthy "poverty reduction industry" with its own lifestyle, ideology, personnel, and methodologies.

The systematic neglect of the richness of the 'non-Western other' is sustained by a schema of apperception that depicts three-fourths of the world as the locus of scarcity and enables the "experts" on their global missions to ignore the indigenous wealth, inherent resilience, and spiritual richness of non-Western and traditional ways of living. The authors recommend an alternative conceptual framework defined by the four coordinates of man-as-a-subject with a focus on the person (as opposed to man-as-an-object with a focus on aggregates), an abundance-based appreciative valuing (as opposed to a scarcity-based problem solving), organic, indigenous approaches that are grassroots-based (versus expert-driven prescriptions grafted from a foreign source) and an orientation toward Being (rather than a focus on "doing" and the mechanistic implementation of programmed routines). Development work currently embodies a denigration of reality of 'the non-Western other' in terms of each of these coordinates.

Although the authors present their alternative conceptual framework defined by the four coordinates, they are acutely aware of the multiplicity of ways in which emancipatory possibilities and the associated language are often co-opted by the Western development apparatus in the service of its own agendas. As the contributors to *The Development Dictionary* make clear (Sachs, 1992), the history of development is riddled with concepts like empowerment, needs, one world, participation, to name only a few, that, on the surface, sound helpful but that at a deeper level undermine constructive indigenous alternatives to the Western development

agenda. As George (1997) points out, despite the noble stated objective of eliminating poverty, development work has actually resulted in systematic wealth transfer from the poor to the rich countries.

In view of the foregoing analysis, in the eyes of the authors, there is really no place in the global ecosystem for institutions that promote "development." If we think of the world as a global learning community, a repository of different ways of living and being that are non-comparable, we may have to remake these contemporary development institutions more in the image of a 'global parliament of cultures' in which different cultures, from a stance of equality, share life furthering practices with one another and seek to understand what gives vitality to all of them. On the other hand, true de-colonization (Nandy, 1997) may involve dismantling such global institutions entirely, especially given their pernicious tendency to seek ever expanding power and ever constricting centralized authority.

Shiva (2002; 2005) demonstrates that the poor are poor not because they are incompetent but because in multifarious ways they have been robbed. Indeed, the poor have demonstrated extraordinary creativity and ingenuity in designing innovative solutions to their own problems, and they appear more competent at poverty

reduction than local or national governments and international agencies (Appadurai, 2001).

Poverty alleviation led by the poor themselves may be a viable, even preferable, alternative to poverty alleviation led by the rich. International development agencies from wealthy countries that claim to be focused on "poverty alleviation" should perhaps reframe their mission to "greed alleviation" in their own countries.

In conclusion, an ideal global learning community is one in which societies find respectful ways of understanding what gives life and vitality to one another without the morally absurd, hierarchical labeling of some countries as "developed" and other countries as "developing." The need to honour the cultural diversity of the world and to assess the "contemporary manifestations" of racism and discrimination becomes especially significant in the context of the recent United Nations World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance held in Geneva in April 2009. We may need to use a bit of "structural adjustment" on the global financial institutions as part of dismantling their racist 'development' paradigm and enlighten their elite workforce in ways that would make them relevant from the standpoint of human flourishing in an interdependent world. ✓

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon (1937). "The Functional Autonomy of Motives," *American Journal of Psychology*, 50 (1/4), 141-156.
- Appadurai, Arjun (2001). "Deep Democracy: Urban Governmentality and the Horizon of Politics," *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(2), 23-44.
- Bhaskar, R (1979). *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences*, Sussex, England: Harvester Press.
- Cabannes, Y (2004). "Participatory Budgeting: A Significant Contribution to Participatory Democracy," *Environment and Urbanization*, 16(1), 27-46.
- CDRA (1995). "Capacity Building: Myth or Reality?" *Community Development Resource Association Annual Report 1994-1995*, South Africa: Woodstock.
- Cooperrider, D (1999). "Positive Image, Positive Action: The Affirmative Basis of Organizing," in Srivastva, S and Cooperrider, D (Eds.), *Appreciative Management and Leadership: The Power of Positive Thought and Action in Organizations*, Euclid, Ohio: Williams Customs Publishing, 91-126.
- Cooperrider, D and Srivastava, S (1987). "Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational Life," In Woodman R W and Pasmore W A (Series Eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Volume 1, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 129-169.
- Danaher, K (1994). *50 Years Is Enough: The Case of the World Bank and the IMF*, Boston: South End Press.
- Dreze, J and Sen, A (1989). *Hunger and Public Action*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dryzek, J S (1993). "Policy Analysis and Planning; From Science to Argument," In Fischer, R and Forester, J (Eds), *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, Durham: Duke University Press, 213-233.
- Dunn, W (1993). "Policy Reforms as Arguments," In Fischer R and Forester J (Eds.), *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, Durham: Duke University Press, 254-290.
- Escobar, A (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Estava, Gustavo (1998). "Regenerating People's Space," *Alternatives*, 13(1), 271-298.

- Farmer, P (2004). *Pathologies of Power*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fischer, R and Forrester, J (Eds) (1993). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Foucault, M (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, Gordon, C (Ed. and Trans.), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gasper, D (2004). "Interdisciplinarity: Building Bridges and Nurturing a Complex Ecology of Ideas," In Giri, A K, *Creative Social Research: Rethinking Theories and Methods*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 308-344.
- George, S (1997). "How the Poor Develop the Rich," In Rahnama, M and Bawtree, V (Eds.), *The Post Development Reader*, London: Zed Books, 207-213.
- Giri, A K (2004). *Creative Social Research: Rethinking Theories and Methods*, Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Goss, T; Pascale, R and Athos, A (1993). "The Reinvention Roller Coaster: Risking the Present for a Powerful Future," *Harvard Business Review*, 71(6), 97-108.
- Hajer, M A (1993). "Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Great Britain," In Fischer R and Forester J (Eds), *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, Durham: Duke University Press, 43-76.
- Hajer, M A and Wagenaar, H (Eds.) (2003). *Deliberative Policy Analysis; Understanding Governance in the Networked Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Healey, P (1993). "Planning through Debate; The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory," Fischer R and Forester J (Eds), *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, Durham: Duke University Press, 233-253.
- Hegel, G W F (1901). *The Philosophy of History*, Sibree, J (Trans), New York: PF Collier.
- Johnson, S (2009). "The Quiet Coup," *The Atlantic*, May, Accessed online at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200905/imf-advice>
- Kivel, P (2006). *You Call This a Democracy?: Who Benefits, Who Pays, and Who Really Decides*, New York: The Apex Press.
- Klein, N (2007). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Nandy, A (1992). "State," In Sachs, W (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary*, London: Zed Books, 264-274.
- Nandy, A (1997). "The Colonization of the Mind," In Rahnama, M and Bawtree, V (Eds.), *The Post-Development Reader*, London: Zed Books, 168-177.
- Narayan, D (2005). *Measuring Empowerment: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives*, New York: World Bank.
- Norberg-Hodge, H (1992). *Ancient Futures: Learning from Ladakh*, San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Nussbaum, M C and Sen, A (Eds.) (1993). *The Quality of Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Osho (1996). *And the Flowers Showered: Discourses on Zen*, Edited by Ma Ananda Nirgun, New Delhi: Diamond Pocket Books (P) Ltd.
- Osho (2004) *Joy: The Happiness that Comes from Within*: New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Osland, Joyce S; Kolb, David A; Rubin, Inwin M and Turner, Marlene E (2006). *Organizational Behaviour: An Experiential Approach*, 8th Edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ Pearson/Prentice Hall 2006.
- Perkins, J (2004). *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Pieper, M H and Pieper, W J (1990). *Intrapsychic Humanism*, Chicago: Falcon II Press.
- Pieper, M H and Pieper, W J (2003). *Addicted to Unhappiness: Free Yourself from Moods and Behaviors that Undermine Relationships, Work and the Life You Want*, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Public Affairs Center Website: <http://www.pacindia.org/rsrc/03Report%20Cards>
- Rahnama, M (1992). "Poverty," In Sachs, W (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, London: Zed Books, 158-176.
- Rahnama, M and Bawtree, V (1997), *The Post Development Reader*, London: Zed Books.
- Rowbotham, M (2007). *The Grip of Death: A Study of Modern Money, Debt Slavery and Destructive Economics*, Trowbridge, UK: The Cromwell Press.
- Sachs, W (Ed.) (1992). *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, London: Zed Books.
- Sen, A (2000). *Development as Freedom*, New York: First Anchor Books.
- Schumacher, E F (1973). *Small Is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered*, New York: Harper.
- Shiva, V (1992). "Resources," In Sachs, W (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*, London: Zed Books, 206-218.
- Shiva, V (2002). *Water Wars*, New Delhi: India Research Press.
- Shiva, V (2005). "Two Myths that Keep the World Poor," *Ode Magazine*, November, Accessed Online at: http://www.odemagazine.com/doc/28/two_myths_that_keep_the_world_poor/
- Srikantia, P (2008). "The Loss of 'Being' in the Pursuit of Global Economic Gain," Paper presented in the symposium on *Transforming Questions: Game Changing Opportunities for Developing Nations*, at the Annual Academy of Management Meeting, Anaheim, California.
- Srikantia, P and Fry, R (2000). "Appreciative Capacity Building; A Self Referential Technology of Organizational and Community Transformation," *Global Social Innovations*, 1(3), 38-48.
- Srikantia, P and Parameshwar, S (2008). "Spiritual Anchors in the Troubled Waters of Globalization: A Philosophical

Framework for Global Organizing," *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 2(6), 223-234.

Stiglitz, J (2003). *Globalization and Its Discontents*, New York: W W Norton & Co.

Taleb, N N (2009). "Ten Principles for a Black Swan-proof World," *Financial Times*, April 27. Accessed at: <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/5d5aa24e-23a4-11de-996a->

Wimsatt, W C (2007). *Re-engineering Philosophy for Limited Beings: Piecewise Approximations to Reality*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yanow, D (2003). "Accessible Local Knowledge." In Hajer, M A and Waagenaar, H (Eds.), *Deliberative Policy Analysis; Understanding Governance in the Networked Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 228-246. ✓

Sangeeta Parameshwar is an Associate Professor at the Department of Management, University of Illinois at Springfield. She received a Ph.D. in Organizational Behaviour from Case Western Reserve University, a B.A. from the University of Iowa, and a B.A. from St. Xavier's College, Mumbai. She has published or presented research papers on transformational leadership, spiritual leadership, and transcendental organizing. A regular presenter at the Academy of Management meetings, she has also addressed leaders of global non-governmental organizations.

e-mail: parameshwar.sangeeta@uis.edu

Param Srikantia is a Professor of Business Administration at Baldwin Wallace College. He received a Ph.D. in Organizational Behaviour from Case Western Reserve University, an M.A. in Business Administration from the University of Iowa, an M.A. in Personnel Management from Tata Institute of Social Sciences, an M.A. in Psychology from the University of Bombay, and a B.A. in Psychology from St. Xavier's College,

Mumbai. He has taught at Case Western Reserve University, George Mason University, the University of Iowa and Jammalal Bajaj Institute. His scholarly work focuses on globalization and eastern spirituality. His professional experiences include working for USAID, the World Bank, Arthur Andersen, the Unilever Group, the Tata Group of Companies and other organizations.

e-mail: PSrikant@bw.edu

Jessica Heineman-Pieper is an Assistant Professor of Public Policy at George Mason University. She has a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, a B.A. from Harvard University, and a second B.A. from Oxford University (as a Rhodes Scholar). She has consulted to the National Institute of Mental Health (USA) on science policy and has worked as a management consultant with Booz Allen Hamilton. Her scholarly work focuses on embedded values and assumptions in organizations and systems, as well as opportunities for transformation.

e-mail: jhpieper@gmail.com

Terrible inequalities continue to scar our world. Too many people continue to suffer and die from poverty, conflict and disaster - despite all the means at our disposal to create and share wealth, protect people from the violence of man or nature, and deepen respect for the dignity of every human being

— Kofi Annan