

## CONTENTS

January - March 1988

Vol. XXI, no. 1, Issue 98, English Edition

Dominique Temple on  
ECONOMICIDE

VACHON, R.	Introduction: Dominique Temple's Thought	2
TEMPLE, D.	A Letter to the Kanak: the Policy of the "Severed Flower"	10
TEMPLE, D.	The N.G.O.s' Role in Economicide	36

The next issue (no. 99) will be  
on "Culture and the State in  
India".

Published in *INTERCULTURE*, French Edition (ISSN 1712-1571)

Cahier 97 (Automne 87)	« La transformation de la mission chrétienne en dialogue », presenting in French the same texts as in No. 97: "Transforming Christian Mission into Dialogue".
Cahier 98 (Hiver 88)	« Dominique Temple sur l'économicide », presenting in French the same texts as in the present issue, No. 98, English Edition.

published by the monchanin cross-cultural center

# INTER culture



exploring the frontiers of cross-cultural understanding

\* \* \* 25th anniversary of Monchanin Cross-Cultural Center (1963 - 1988) \* \* \* \*

*Dominique Temple on*

*Economicide*

WINTER/JANUARY 1988

98

english edition

an International Research, Information and Exchange Journal

*INTERCULTURE* is a quarterly founded in Montreal in 1968 by Monchanin Cross-Cultural Center. It has a threefold objective:

- . to inform on contemporary cultures as living realities;
- . to promote research and encounter in full intercultural reciprocity;
- . to explore and raise intercultural questions and issues.

*INTERCULTURE* reaches anglophone and francophone communities in various parts of the world. It is published in twin editions, one in English, the other in French.

Since it was established, the Monchanin Cross-Cultural Center's journal has passed through three phases:

From Issue no. 1 (January 1968) to Issue no. 71 (April 1981), it bore the title *REVUE MONCHANIN JOURNAL* and contained both English and French texts. With Issue no. 72 (July 1981), it adopted the name of *INTERCULTURE*, but was still bilingual (with occasional issues appearing in separate English and French editions).

Since Issue no. 85 (Winter 1985), *INTERCULTURE* is published in two separate editions, one French (ISSN 0172-1571), the other English (ISSN 0828-797X), both under the same sequence number.

---

*No culture, tradition or community, no matter how evolved, traditional or intercultural it may claim to be, can, by itself, establish the nature of criteria of human growth for the whole of mankind.*

---

*INTERCULTURE*/English Edition (ISSN 0828-797X). Postage paid Montreal. Second class mail. Registration number 6725. Return postage guaranteed.

Volumes 1-16 (1968-83) available on 35 mm microfilm. Orders to be directed to World Microfilms Publications, 62 Queen's Grove, London NW8 6ER, England.

Indexed with abstracts in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*, American Theological Library Association, 5600 South Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60637.

Published by Monchanin Cross-Cultural Center, 4917 St. Urbain St., Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2T 2W1 (514) 288-7229

## PRESENTATION

THIS ISSUE PRESENTS THE EMERGING AND YET LITTLE KNOWN ORIGINAL WORK OF AN ECONOMIST NAMED DOMINIQUE TEMPLE. WE THINK THAT IT CAN SPARK AN IMPORTANT AND FRUITFUL DELATE.

THE INTRODUCTION PRESENTS, ON THE BASIS OF EXCERPTS FROM HIS WRITINGS, THE MAIN LINES OF HIS THOUGHT, OF WHICH:

- 1) THE RADICAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE WESTERN ECONOMIC CULTURE OF EXCHANGE AND THE ECONOMIC CULTURE OF COMMUNITARIAN RECIPROCITY FOUND IN MOST ECONOMIC CULTURES OF THE "THIRD WORLD".
- 2) HOW THE NGOS ARE IN THE PROCESS OF KILLING THE ECONOMIC CULTURES OF THE "THIRD WORLD" (ECONOMICIDE).

ALL THAT IS ILLUSTRATED BY EXAMPLES TAKEN FROM NATIVES AMERICANS AND FROM THE BALANTE PEOPLE OF BLACK AFRICA.

THE FOLLOWING TWO ARTICLES COMPRISE A CONCRETE APPLICATION OF HIS THEORY TO THE CONTEMPORARY SITUATION OF THE KANAK IN NEW CALEDONIA, AND AN ANALYSIS OF THE WAY IN WHICH THE FRONT-LINE NGOS ARE DESTROYING THE TRADITIONAL THIRD-WORLD ECONOMIES IN THE NAME OF DEVELOPMENT.

## INTRODUCTION

# Dominique Temple's Thought

by ROBERT VACHON

### THE WESTERN PROJECTION

Upon discovering the new world (ed. note: of America, of Asia, of Africa and of the Pacific), the Westerners projected upon the various indigenous economics, the fundamental principle of their own economics, namely exchange... They thought that they could treat them as if they were archaic exchange-economies, each one adapted differently to particular environments, but the idea that all economics are universally based on exchange was not questioned. However, such an assumption can no longer be held.

The Third World economies, of course, are familiar with exchange and sometimes even make use of it, but nevertheless just about all of them, as value systems, are organized on reciprocity and not on exchange. One should no longer confuse reciprocity and exchange, because reciprocity is the reproduction of the gift, its generalization. And the gift can no longer be considered as a primitive form of exchange, but its very opposite (1). The author even speaks of the antagonistic nature of the two

This introduction is made up of excerpts from D. Temple's following publications: *La dialectique du don: essai sur l'économie des communautés indigènes*, Paris 1983, Diffusion INTI, 49 p.; *Echange et réciprocité, intervention au symposium d'Alicante*, 1985, (unpublished); *Lettre aux Kanak*, 1986, 30 p.; *Qu'est-ce que l'économicide*, IFDA Dossier, 1987, 14 p.; *Les économies africaines sont-elles des économies d'échange ou de réciprocité?*, 1987, (unpublished), 22 p.; *Hommage à Cabral*, 1987, (unpublished), 32 p.; *Analyse des thèses présentées au 14e congrès du P.A.I.G.C. (Parti africain pour l'indépendance de la Guinée et des Iles du Cap Vert)*, 1987 (unpublished), 27 p.

economies.

### THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE ECONOMICS OF EXCHANGE AND THE ECONOMICS OR RECIPROCITY

Let us try to summarize the author's views on this topic:

#### a) Motivation

Exchange, of which barter is the primitive form (2), is motivated by the desire of each one of the partners to satisfy his desires. He seeks his self-interest. It implies ownership i.e. privatization, private or collective (3), which in turn, brings about competition, accumulation, expropriation of the means of production by the privileged ones, and finally class struggle. It is determined by each one seeking his own well-being, and, if necessary, at the expense of other individuals' well-being or of the common good. One's identity postulates others' differences as being in rivalry.

The economy of reciprocity, however, is motivated by the other's need, by the common good, understood not as the sum of individual goods (the collectivity) but as communitarian being, that indivisible third which is not reducible to the sum of the parts and which cannot be the property of any one. There, an individual cannot be more important than another. One's identity includes the other's difference. It means the wholistic self. It is founded on an invisible and irreducible kinship which unites us in and because of our differences. It is a structure of reciprocity which forbids all privatization, prevents competition, accumulation, exploitation and the birth of class.

#### b) The notion of value

In exchange, the notion of value is strictly material. One's desire is reduced to what a relationship to reified things can mediate. The substratum of exchange is a relationship to objects, to consumer products. Being is reduced to essential biological needs. The notion of work is reduced to a biological work force and the exchange value to the salary or to the price of this work force. In exchange, each partner replaces the object that he gives by the object that he acquires. The emphasis is on the thing given, on having. Value here depends on one's subjective will.

In reciprocity economics, when something is given, it is not replaced. Otherwise it would not be a gift. This void is compensated, not by something material, but by the acquisition of a prestige, of a spiritual and sacred value which consists in the fact of having participated in the genesis and elaboration of social and community being. The more one gives, the more one is, the more one is interrelationship. To accumulate and to receive is to lower oneself. It is in giving that one finds dignity. Power and riches do not consist in accumulating but in distributing and spending. The emphasis is on community relationship and being. The objects are symbols pregnant with being. They stop being objects. Their stuff is being. Value here does not depend on one's subjective will but on harmonizing to being.

#### c) Beware of the words reciprocity and gift!

The author warns us against the general use that is made of the word reciprocity as an equivalent of

exchange. The reciprocity he speaks of is not reciprocity as a face-to-face exchange relationship where one is obliged to make restitution, where equality is the rule, where it is competition which determines the exchange. Reciprocity or gift is not a surplus translated into redistribution, but a gratuitous gift which obliges the other to reproduce the gratuitous gift. The rule here is inequality. It is redistribution here which organizes the productive reciprocity and which is the measuring rod of power, of prestige. Hence, not other to other reciprocity but communitarian or relational reciprocity. Hence, this notion of gift should not be confused with what is called gift in the West and which is, in fact, a loan or the reimbursement of a loan.

#### d) Productivity

It isn't true that the economic system of relational reciprocity is an anti-production system. On the contrary, it is as productive if not more sometimes than the exchange system. But while the exchange system produces goods to satisfy one's desires, the reciprocity system produces only that surplus which is justified by the fiesta. And it is the manifestations of prestige (coming from the gratuitous gift) which are the basis and last reason of redistribution, of gift, of production and of the investment required for this redistribution.

#### THE EXAMPLE OF AFRICAN ECONOMIES

They are not pre-capitalistic or archaic exchange economies, but gift and communitarian reciprocity economies. The author gives the example of the Balante community (in Guinée-Bissau).

In the Balante system, the origin of the community is the man who has opened a field. Around him, his sons constitute a complex of communities (foyers), called "*Kpan*". If one of these experiences difficulties or some form of necessity, all the other communities immediately could come to its rescue; the totally disinterested gift is imperative towards the one in need.

This is an obvious elementary structure of reciprocity. This structure is centralised around the Father who distributes the lands, manages the community livestock, says what needs to be cultivated, decides on the fiestas and invitations to other families and sees to the collective offerings required to determine the community's identity. The sacrifice consists in a gift which summarizes the sum total of gifts from each community. The result: a feeling of belonging to an indivisible Third, expression of the being and identity of the community which is the depositary of the law and tradition: the *Fram*. The Father is its duty-called servant, witness, oracle. The *Fram* is two things: first the spirit, the being of the community created by reciprocity, but this being is hypostasized, represented in a separate spirit which is then fetichized in a material reality.

Thus, it is the gift which is considered as the basis of the society. A man who succeeds in his work is appreciated because he is capable of giving. He is respected in proportion to his capacity of distributing, helping others and offering many fiestas.

The greater family, sometimes made up of very many communities linked in solidarity, constitutes a unit which,

in turn, reproduces the principle of reciprocity towards other families. Thus, when a foreign family asks to open up new land and to establish themselves, it is the family that has founded the village, which, with the approval of others, gives it the right to enter, gives it new land, in the same way as the Father distributes the fields to his sons. The founder of the first family naturally becomes the land chief.

Each extended family, the *Kpan*, also practises giving under the form of invitations and fiestas. When a *Kpan* has accumulated enough rice etc, it invites other *Kpan* to a feast, the *Kussundé*. This feast is a great source of prestige for the family that invites. Hence it becomes the reason for high productivity.

Some feasts are obligatory. They measure the power and rank of the givers, institutionalize the hierarchy: such is the case with funerals. The family head must give a supreme feast which will give him the highest reputation and perpetuate his prestige as exemplary. He thus prepares what will be his posthumous feast by accumulating as much livestock as possible. If, at the father's death, the conditions are not favorable, his mourning will be celebrated by a temporary feast. The family will sometimes wait, even many years if need be, to honour his name by a worthy feast. The redistribution will then be maximal; the totality of the livestock will be sacrificed and his prestige will be definitively sealed in people's memories.

Through these celebrations, the principal events of life (birth, marriage, initiation, death, passage from one age group to another) are given a

social dimension i.e. their meaning. It is the gift which allows to give each one of these events their social impact by translating them in terms of prestige and glory.

These events, quantified in terms of social prestige, also allow to regulate the access of all to the means of production and the equality of all in the prestige competition, because they are statistically distributed in uniform fashion in time and space.

Reciprocity can take other forms, specially productive ones. The women of a *Kpan* for example work together the land of each community. If one community enjoys an extra work force, and another one lacks it, this form of reciprocity will allow each to enjoy an average force.

There are also age groups among the Balante which allows one to differentiate between the various statuses of production. This allows to overcome the rivalries which competition for prestige could bring about. It substitutes to prestige obtained through the sole redistribution of riches, that of a social ethic, prerogative of the initiated ones, obtained after having gone through all of the social statuses.

The reasons for production and over production in Balante society can only be understood on the basis of the obligation of redistribution and reciprocity which establish prestige. The latter is the social reason for overproduction. That is why to orient production on the basis of exchange in lieu and place of reciprocity, is to bring about the destruction of the African economy and the disappearance of African culture.

*THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN  
THE TWO ECONOMIES:  
THE HISTORICAL MISUNDERSTANDING*

The relationship, presently, is one of enfeoffment of the reciprocity economy to the exchange economy. It is based on ignorance, feigned or not, of the contradiction between the two economies.

At the beginning of contact between European civilization and Third World civilization, from the XVth to the XIXth c., this confusion was undoubtedly unintentional. The indigenous peoples of these newly discovered worlds thought they were dealing with strangers who held the same system of reciprocity and who followed the principle that prestige is proportionate to the gift. They therefore reacted according to their law of hospitality by giving a great deal with the idea of enfeoffing the newly arrived to their authority or, by enfeoffing themselves to the former in order to benefit from the redistribution of the newly arrived, when the latter seemed to enjoy values of prestige that were superior to their own.

But the Whites were seeking to accumulate as much as possible at the lowest price, according to the law of exchange and to the profit economy. Both societies misunderstood the nature of each other's economic system. Thus their respective effort and practise added up so that all the material riches of one world were transferred in a single thrust, to the other world. This is what he calls the historical misunderstanding. It is the latter which explains much of the under-development which the theory of unequal exchange does not. And this continues up to this day.

There are many different forms of this misunderstanding. The author describes one that he calls "paradoxical", "practised by the colonists and especially the missionaries, which is reproduced today by many NGO's. It is the reason behind the severe defeat of Indianness and Africanness, and it is known under the name of religious pacification." He calls it "the masqued misunderstanding."

Having become aware that in indigenous economies, power came with giving, some Westerners consciously "gave" in order to be acknowledged as an "authority" by these communities. It is this weapon of the gift, that religious missions but also colonial administrations used, in order to win the allegiance of the traditional authorities. Today, cooperation and the would-be help to the Third-World by NGO's is that very same weapon.

The acquired authority serves, either to substitute the indian and african value system with western religious values (such is the case with missions), or to order the enfeoffed communities to change their infrastructure i.e. to substitute their reciprocity infrastructure with an infrastructure of exchange. Such is the approach, even in projects whose objective is one of food consumption. Hence ethnocide and economicide. These ethnocidal and economicidal principles are the basis of the systematic destruction of the original economies and cultures of the Third-World, and the major reason for the dehumanization that is propagated by the western capitalistic system. And it would be risky to believe that it will renounce conquering and subjecting the world to its own alienation. The author therefore sees the organization for development and international cooperation as the "economicide inter-

national", the no I enemy of Third World liberation.

The author distinguished three types of NGO's.

1) The Colonialistic NGO's: those organizations whose business it is to exploit the Third World and to live off international aid.

2) The Ethnocidal NGO's: those who directly try to introduce systems of production and exchange in those societies by deliberately ignoring that developing an exchange economy is antagonistic to an economy of reciprocity and to the values attached to it.

3) The Economicidal NGO's: those NGO's which practise volunteer work and charity, or, in some way, the gift. But the moment that they acquire the title of donor or redistributor of aid to the Third World, they take over the title from the legitimate leaders of the people and replace them. This political decapitation and usurpation of power, which has been characteristic of missions, should be given a name which specifies that the western aggression hits the indigenous communities at the very heart of their economies. Hence I think that it should be given the exclusive name of economicide.

This is not to say that the Third World communities have no right to the world redistribution that is called help to the Third World, but on the contrary, that they have a "right" to it, or again that this redistribution is due to them. It is only under that condition that the indigenous communities will be able to utilize it, without themselves being in a state of obligation towards the outside world and thus lose face within their own communities.

That is he thinks that we should look at Third World aid as an "indemnity", a kind of compensation towards the victims of genocide, of ethnocide and of economicide. Somewhat like the help given to Israel by Germany is considered as a reparation for Nazi crimes.

*WHAT TO DO? ECONOMIC DECOLONIZATION AND  
SOLIDARITY WITH THIRD WORLD CULTURES*

Assuming the antagonistic nature between the economy of exchange and the economy of reciprocity - the former being ethnocidal and economicidal towards the latter -, it is clear that the answer to the impoverishment of the indigenous peoples and to their liberation does not lie in integrating them to the exchange system and to the dynamics of class struggle, nor in development i.e. in the transfer of economic infrastructures of exchange. Since the problem is not that of unequal exchange, the solution does not lie in the struggle for equal exchange. To suppress the alienation of unequal exchange and of exploitation is not to suppress the alienation of exchange itself. On the contrary, it generalizes it.

The solution? Deepen, promote and privilege the economy of reciprocity and its own economic infrastructure, as having a right not only to exist, but to priority. All the more so, since, for these peoples, the exchange economy is dishonourable and degrading. It is appropriate to pariahs, to strangers, to slaves. Hence, liquidate all obstacles to the existence and enhancement of their structures and of their communitarian being. This is what the author calls economic decolonisation: liberate the economy of reciprocity from its enfeoffment to the economy of exchange. (He notes:

"we can understand therefore why westerners are so interested in recognizing - in intercivilizational dialogue - only one economy, their own, and in declaring it universal... For the day when the world would recognize an economy of reciprocity and base its international relations on it, it will enter a post-capitalistic era where power will no longer be measured by accumulation and by the power of guns".)

The author goes further: build the State on the principle of reciprocity and on the latter's communitarian structures. The reconquering of political and military borders allows or should allow the Third World States to protect their historical bases and their fundamental structures, the structures of reciprocity. The struggle for liberation therefore implies that the Native Indian communities, for example, should claim economic territories protected by legal boundaries. The alliance with marxist guerillas, if they are not preceded by a treaty in due form, which stipulates that indigenous autonomy and territoriality will be immediately recognized, is political suicide. Since Native peoples essentially live from the land, the principle that these communities must have recognized is that land is inalienable. Work can be privatized. Land, not.

But since the exchange economy is the only way to have access to certain goods (of usage) of the West, the author recognizes that indigenous economies are obliged to have recourse to it and to barter, but that this is a temporary concession that must be marginalized as much as possible and even be encouraged to eventually disappear, because it is a barbarian economy, not only incompatible with their own but destructive of it. In the meantime, he speaks of enfeoffing the exchange

economy to the economy of reciprocity.

Moreover, he believes that the West itself needs this other development or alternative which is the economy of reciprocity. The Third World countries hold therefore the key to history. It is time to reconsider the idea that African communities are lagging behind and to consider them henceforward as being ahead.

When Westerners speak of another development, he says, they undoubtedly refer to the Third World, maybe because they sense in some way that it is there that it is really possible, but, he adds, it is also a search which interests our own Western existence. Maybe we are in greater need of help from Native peoples and other Third World peoples and civilizations where the principle of reciprocity is still alive - than they are in need of ours.

We therefore need to be in solidarity with the cultures of the Third World. We must consider the Third World as the spearhead of liberation struggles. The author, finally, opposes Western civilization (decivilization) to a world civilization based on structures of communitarian reciprocity. And it is the Third World, he says, which is its herald.

#### Notes and references

- (1) The author is partly critical of the economic anthropology of Mauss (on the gift), of Clastres and Sahlins and also of Polanyi and Levi-Strauss, (on production). This critical analysis can be found in *La dialectique du don, Essai sur l'économie des communautés indigènes*, Paris, Diffusion INTI, 1983, pp 5-49 and also in his talk at the Alicante Convention, 1985.
- (2) "Barter is different from exchange, but it makes possible the development of exchange. It is different, because its purpose is the satisfaction of the individual needs of each partner, while exchange seeks accumulation, profit. They therefore have a different finality: barter seeks to satisfy needs, while exchange seeks to conquer power."
- (3) Collective property does not question the principle of property. It is nothing but a generalization of private property, its socialization. It is a vulgar communism.

\*

# The Policy of the 'Severed Flower'

by DOMINIQUE TEMPLE

December 22-24, 1984. The Kanak people convene and create the Kanak and Socialist National Liberation Front. They prudently write out a transitional document - the Charter of the Kanak People - as a preparation for Independence. This chapter is presented in France by the FLNKS-France in the text "Kanak libre" (1), along with other articles.

What we propose here is a criticism of the article entitled "The Kanak Culture". First, because it reveals enough of Kanak thinking to start a

debate on the difference between Kanak economics and Western political economics. Second, because it also makes use of Western concepts that can create a certain ambiguity.

## I. THE POLICY OF THE "SEVERED FLOWER"

The author of "The Kanak Culture" proposes that the Kanak culture should be considered as the basis of Kanak society identity: "the collective memory of the Kanak people, which is so alive today, is found in their culture. The latter is the basis of the

The people of New Caledonia, known as the KANAK people, are Melanesians, related to the other peoples of the South Pacific and to the New Guinea Papouans. After 130 years of French colonial government, they are now restricted to only 1/5 of their land. Since 1960, the French Government has encouraged such massive immigration that the Kanak now constitute only 43% of the population. The Kanak independence movement reached a high point in 1984 with the Kanak People's Charter which is commented upon here.

Kanak people's history. It is not written down, but the stories, myths, and legends are being transmitted orally from generation to generation. Kanak identity finds its source in Kanak culture". p. 23.

As a homage to Kanak culture, such a statement is beyond reproach. But what does draw one's attention is that the author considers culture as the "only" source of the Kanak identity.

Now, one can also consider, with Marx for example, or with Levi-Strauss, that culture derives from an underlying, unconscious structure, which is as important as culture itself. Thus, from that viewpoint, one will have to admit that there is something else, besides manifest culture, which is the foundation of Kanak identity and history.

It is very ambiguous to dissociate culture from its unconscious foundations and to ignore the latter. We are not in any way attempting here to condemn anyone, but such a statement does authorize a policy, which has been systematically programmed by Westerners, when faced with Third World resistance to colonization pure and simple, a policy which could be called that of the "severed flower". Just as one cuts a flower, admires it and even protects it, so one carefully severs an indigenous culture from the structures that gave birth to it, one protects it and even praises it, but henceforth one is sure that it will quietly die its own death, because it can no longer be nourished and regenerated by its roots.

We cannot bypass the unconscious principles that underlie one's manifest culture. To ignore them authorizes one to substitute other principles,

and in this case of Kanak society, to substitute Western political economics for the structures of reciprocity which underlie Kanak economics, as the text further attests: "Culture encompasses all of Kanak reality, their vision of the world and of life, their social organization, their political system, their systems of production and exchange, their relationship with the land and their cultural manifestations. It synthesizes all of this in the Kanak people's awareness". p. 23.

Thus, the author here introduces "production and exchange relationships" i.e. nothing less than the principles of the Western mode of production.

And, this time, ignoring what Marx would call the "real" and Levi Strauss the "unconscious" structures, he projects those that are acknowledged by Westerners as the basis of their own system: "production and exchange relationships".

Now the underlying relationships behind Kanak concepts are not those of production and exchange but of redistribution and reciprocity.

Thus Kanak culture has been severed from its source, namely the structures of reciprocity, and the latter have been replaced by those of Western culture itself. The roots of the Kanak roses are replaced by the roots of white briars. This severed flower policy goes on by substituting one set of roots for another.

Some descriptions of Kanak reality eloquently and strongly show how the deep roots of this people draw upon a source that is very different from that underlying the Western world. We also find in the text a description of power and leadership which speaks for

itself: "There is a kind of specialization which distributes to clans and families certain 'prerogatives' which thus form a functional and balanced political whole. The ordering point of the system is symbolized by the one who is placed above the others to represent them all but not command them. He is the one whom Europeans call the chief". p. 24.

A "functional and balanced whole" is thus represented by "the one who is placed above the others". There is thus a structured whole underlying the concept, embodied in a person depository of the tradition.

This person who is placed above the others - and Leenhardt has remarkably insisted on this - is the one who is the seat of eloquence, of knowledge, the one who, ever since his early childhood, received the "baskets of words". He sets all Kanak relationships; he is the depository of law. But in what seems to be characteristic of the Kanak, he does not command: "It is the Europeans, says the author, who call him chief". In other words, the law emerges, is symbolized, respected, kept, taught, but is not imposed through coercion.

This may be the reason why the Kanak do not call this person of responsibility a chief, do not call him Father, but rather Son. He is called the Great Son, because he embodies the name of the clan, because he is the clan's offspring.

Law is here close to freedom. The unconscious surfaces through the conscious in a constant revelation of truth, thus making it useless to convert it into an obligation. We are thus very far from the colonial order, from the armies of the military and of the police and, all the more so, from

the colonizers. That is the kind of respect which is the basis of social being, as indicated in the following description of the distribution of authority.

"Power is equitably distributed between the leader, the land chief, the clan of fishermen, the clan of farmers and all the other clans. There is a type of hierarchy which is rather a mutual dependency established between groups which exercise certain complementary prerogatives over each other". p. 24.

There is therefore, among the Kanak, a lively engendering of law. Of course, law is spoken by the one who has received the mandate to express it. Law is the guardian of institutions, but it also refers to those "prerogatives" which find their reference point, their center of balance and their just middle ground, in the Great Son. These are the relationships which are the equivalent of Western capitalistic and socialistic "production and exchange relationships", but which are opposite to the latter.

That is why there is between the two systems, ever since the origin of their encounter, an antinomy, which can only be solved through Kanak independence.

The fact that this tradition is rich with acquired knowledge, with living experience, that it is a repertoire of so many kinds of expressions in various conditions of reciprocity, does not stop it from nourishing itself constantly from its own source, namely the immanent relationships of reciprocity in Kanak society. We should therefore try to discover its specific laws, beyond its illustrations, under the guise of legends,

customs, myths, songs, rituals, and cultural representations.

The author pursues his description in the paragraph entitled "The Political System".

"In Kanak societies, the political element is dominant. Every time one speaks, one is moved by a preoccupation to establish relationships that, at least momentarily, foster the emergence of viable political configurations. Thus the myths are simultaneously theories and political strategies: they base themselves on principles and rules (right of original occupancy, sharing of functions, hospitality to strangers, reference to original space, etc.), all the while contributing through all kinds of strategies (change of identity, hierarchical inversions, converting strangers who are allies into natives and relatives, eventual recourse to bluffing) to set the basis of a social edifice which takes into consideration both the circumstances and the ambitions of each one. These constructions whose geometry is variable are simultaneously mobile and inventive". p. 26.

All the strategies in this text rest on principles and rules whose meanings we must now describe in a more precise manner. We must now define what we mean by reciprocity, describe what are the general principles behind the rules of hospitality, of land distribution, of alliances, of the strategies that animate the Kanak political life.

The author facilitates this task for us because he shows clearly: "In the political game, the strategies utilized to enjoy high rank and political power all have to do with the circulation of goods and not with

their accumulation or that of land. To have much prestige, one must give much, distribute many gifts, and thus foster one's network of alliances."

We are here face to face with the very foundations of the political economy of societies of reciprocity.

What is proposed to us here is *the principle according to which power is in proportion to giving, which is the inverse of Western society's principle, wherein power is in proportion to accumulation.*

The text brings to light the proportional relationship between "prestige" and "giving": "To have much prestige, one must give much", and also between "prestige" and "rank", i.e. "power": "To enjoy high rank and a certain political power". What the author indicates here is the principle behind the rules of the game in Kanak politics.

Finally, this political authority is brought into relationship with its economic source: "In the political game, the strategies all have to do with the circulation of goods". An important perspective is opened up, i.e. that of the radical contradiction between Kanak and Western political economics, more generally between reciprocity systems and exchange systems, when the text indicates, in passing, an opposition between "the circulation of goods and... their accumulation". Hence "circulation of goods" must be understood as redistribution for, obviously, it is the gift and the reproducing of the gift which is in opposition to accumulation, and the generalization of giving, called reciprocity, which makes goods circulate, whether this reciprocity be individual or centralized by the community leader (the Great Son).

These observations must now be looked into if we are to develop a Kanak economic theory which will have nothing to do with Western society's "production and exchange relationships", and which we shall find akin to the economy of reciprocity in other Third World communities. The author leads us naturally into it, because the paragraph of his article is entitled: "The Economic System".

## II. THE ANTAGONISM BETWEEN THE EXCHANGE ECONOMY AND THE ECONOMY OF RECIPROCITY

A natural question, which we have previously indicated, is: can the economy of reciprocity be reduced to an exchange economy?

That is obviously what Westerners try to do, for if the categories of the economy of reciprocity can be interpreted as categories of the exchange economy, then one system is reducible to the other and one can integrate the Kanak system into the economic system that Western society is trying to impose on the whole world.

This problem is not limited to the Kanak. It applies to all ethnic communities throughout the world. But, as is affirmed in very clear terms in the case of the Kanak.

For if one could, in some way or other, interpret the principles of the Kanak economy (as one generally does) without fundamentally changing their nature, in terms of an archaic or primitive exchange, the Kanak would have no choice but to adapt to the Western world and be integrated into its exchange system, hoping that this integration be worked out in such a way as to protect their well understood interests. For, since the Kanak

no longer enjoy the natural advantages that would allow them to present themselves in the international market in a position of strength like the Arab emirates or others, it would be in their interest to choose some type of socialistic mode of integration.

But if the answer to this question is in the negative, then there is another possible economic development to which the structural foundations of their society predispose them. From that perspective, all integration to a Western political economy, even of the French socialistic type, can be seen as suicide or treason, unless it is willed by the Kanak people themselves as a "revolution" whose purpose would be to abolish an order which would suddenly appear to them to be an alienation from the Western ideal. But what the Kanak are saying is not leading in that direction.

With regard to economics, the article under analysis says: "The life of the Kanak flows rhythmically according to social manifestations during which products are exchanged: it is the system of gifts and counter-gifts, of barter. The products from fishing, brought in by the fisherman's clan, will be exchanged against yams from the farmer's clan, etc." p. 26.

We are here face to face with a very great ingenuousness or with an enterprise of mystification wrought upon the categories of Kanak political economy, whereby Westerners try to enfeeble Third World economics to their own.

This mystification consists in reducing the relations of reciprocity in a given community to exchange relationships.

In this case, this reduction is effected through the use of two intermediary terms, namely, complementary reciprocity which is not named as such but rather described, between the clan of fishermen and the clan of farmers, and barter, which is named as such.

It may be that the Kanak have not uncovered this mystification, for when they hear the Westerner speak of exchange, they naturally understand gift and reproduction of the gift. Isn't that what the author means when he adds, after the expression "exchange of products": "it is the system of gifts and counter-gifts", only to immediately add, in an opposing sense: "barter"... In short, the confusion of categories lets each one read whatever he cares to read into the text.

Let us note, first, that the author defines reciprocity as a game of gifts and counter-gifts. Of course, anthropology gives a broad meaning to counter-gift, but here, counter-gifts suggest that they come to compensate for the first gifts and that they are their equivalent, although complementary - apparently, then, an exchange.

Let us eliminate a source of confusion: the counter-gift of course exists as an equivalent of another gift in societies of reciprocity, although, under that angle, it is not always admitted as such. The counter-gift, whose meaning is to be the equivalent of another gift, whose purpose is to compensate for, to annul the other's gift, is seen as an anti-gift and not as another gift. It then becomes a disavowal of the prestige to which the first donor pretends. Such a counter-gift can be justified when its author wants to relativize an excessive or unduly ostentatious gift

whose purpose is to establish an exaggerated authority of the donor over the donee. In that case, the counter-gift's purpose is to lessen the pretentiousness of the former. The counter-gift can even mean a refusal of the gift, or can be equivalent, in certain cases, to a declaration of hostility.

But if we speak of another gift (not of a "counter-gift") i.e. of the reproduction of the gift, when the respective situations of the partners are reversed, this other gift is no longer counter. It is the partners who find themselves in reversed conditions: the donor in need and the donee enjoying an excess of goods. There is however a case where the donors are in a position to give to each other simultaneously and in mutual fashion, without having to wait for the conditions that justify the gift to be reproduced inversely, so that the two gifts, simultaneous and inversed, seem this time to be an exchange. This is the case when each one has something that the other does not have: we then have the opportunity of two complementary gifts. But this unnamed and only described (in this text) category between fishermen and farmers - hence complementary reciprocity - is here reduced to "barter", and, through the latter, to exchange, because barter is legitimately defined as primitive exchange, as an immediate exchange of different products based on each partner's necessity. Barter is an exchange under the grip of necessity.

What distinguishes it from reciprocity is that it comes from one's own "self's" necessity and not from the "other's" necessity, while what determines the gift and reciprocity is the other's necessity, not one's own.

In barter, one "takes" from the other what one needs and tries to part with as little as possible, but to "take" is not to "give"! It is therefore a misinterpretation to identify "complementary reciprocity" which is a "double gift" with "barter".

Confusing reciprocity with exchange by assimilating the counter-gift with complementary reciprocity is to allow one to reduce the gift (which is a gift of a material product without a material counterpart but which is symbolized by the acquisition of an equivalent of prestige) to an exchange in which the material portion that is given is compensated for by another material portion, so that there remains no material void, no place, no gift finally, which could be symbolized by a virtual equivalence, a value in the form of prestige. In other words, to assimilate reciprocity to exchange is to eliminate the notion of prestige which is fundamentally the symbol of the gift, a prestige which defines political rank and power.

From then on, the very notion of value in the system of reciprocity is disqualified. In one stroke, the value system of prestige, engendered by the gift and reciprocity, is dismissed and substituted for the value system of exchange.

By replacing the gift and reciprocity with barter, one signals the rapid establishment of economic exchange, since barter can be considered as the forerunner of exchange. The roots of Kanak values are replaced with those of Western values.

It then becomes possible for Westerners to proclaim their respect for Kanak values. And it is all the more easy to do so, since they have the assurance that the whole Kanak

value system is henceforth good for the Museum of Man.

Such a confusion, which seems to express the West's ideological violence rather than scientific objectivity, allows one to say: "Fishing products brought in by the fishermen's clan will be exchanged against yams from the farmers' clan", instead of: "Fishing products brought in by the fishermen's clan will be redistributed to the farmers and the latter's yams will be redistributed to the fishermen".

In fact, it is the word "clan" which alone allows one to unveil the reality, because not everyone can be a fisherman. If anyone could be a fisherman or a farmer, then, maybe, we could believe that there is an open competition and that each can exchange his products. But no. The word clan means a status for fisherman or farmers. Competition here is impossible, unimaginable, but the fishermen's clan is naturally obliged to redistribute the fruit of its catch to the community. It is the same with the farmers.

So the differentiation in status is a communitarian one which constrains each producer to insure not only his own subsistence, but also that of the others. One's status allows the obligation of giving to be expressed in a diversified and complex structure.

The intersecting of so many redistributions could give the illusion of being an exchange, and the equivalence of redistributed products could create the illusion of an exchange value (an illusion which Westerners will hold on to because it allows them to better integrate the economy of reciprocity into their own), but in no way can reciprocity be

reduced to exchange, if examined closely.

Surely, we are dealing here, in all cases, with political economics, with circulation of goods, with their allocation, production and consumption, and, therefore, appearances may be the same. But the systems themselves are not the same. They are in fact antagonistic and do not even beget the same concepts, the same ideologies, the same notion of value.

The laws of "development" are not the same as those in the other case, as it has been claimed. One is not the primitive form of the other, as has been affirmed in order to submerge their antinomy in a nebulous archaism, lost in the mists of time, in order to subordinate and enfeeble the more "primitive" system of reciprocity to the system of exchange.

It is a case of two different and even antagonistic systems. Hence in Kanak land, the colonial system and the Kanak system confront each other as two different systems of civilization.

### III. VALUE IN THE KANAK ECONOMIC SYSTEM OF RECIPROCITY

#### A. The Value of Prestige

Our text continues: "Parallel to the exchange of products, there is the exchange of prestige goods which Europeans call Kanak money. (They)... confer a certain prestige to the one who enjoys these." p. 26.

These lines can serve as an introduction to the Kanak notion of value.

We have emphasized that the gift whose generalization seems to be the very foundation of the Kanak economy, is the opposite of exchange. In other words, in the gift and in reciprocity, the product that is given is not compensated for by another product, but it leaves an imprint, a material void which is symbolized by a fulness of prestige. The gift molds, so to speak, an awareness of prestige.

To give is to acquire a name. Hence, the prestige value is strictly proportional to the gift. It is the opposite of the exchange value, which represents what one has accumulated, not what one has given.

In France, if one owns 10 gold ingots, one enjoys the riches of these 10 units and the wealth is represented by a notion which is their value. With the Kanak, it is just the opposite: if I give 10 gold ingots, it is then that they acquire value. The value is not what is acquired, what is accumulated, but what is given, what is redistributed. The two notions are rigorously antagonistic.

Kanak value, hence a prestige value (2) can also be represented and embodied in particular objects that popular common sense has called "Kanak money".

It is not a money in terms of its exchange value, since it is not a material equivalent, i.e. an accumulated use-value which could be the equivalent of another use-value. It cannot be used to buy nor to serve as an exchange money, but it is verily a money in that it crystallizes, as Marx would say, a prestige value which corresponds to a certain quantity of material goods that are "given" instead of being "accumulated".

One could say that it is a kind of empty exchange money, or the inverse of exchange money.

Unconsciously, the White Man has perceived that it is real money and that it is irreducible to his own. That is why he gave it the only name he could find in the absence of a theory regarding it, namely "Kanak money".

The aim of the Western theoreticians will nevertheless be to reduce this money to being a "primitive" exchange money. For example, they will try to find transactions that have degenerated, induced by the colonists, from which they may infer that Kanak money does or can serve to buy something as merchandise or as a material equivalent. But this kind of extrapolation leads nowhere.

The reduction of Kanak money to an exchange money is an intellectual operation practised only by theoreticians, either to dismiss the Kanak value system, or because, like Mauss, they have no other concepts with which they can compare it except those of Western political economy.

The author of our text spares us the criticism of such a reductive position. He acknowledges that Kanak money, hence the circulation of prestige money or of the money of being (for prestige and being seem to be very close notions in the Kanak mind) is parallel, he says, to the circulation of use-value. He thus confirms that prestige money is not a material equivalent of merchandise which could act as a substitute, like gold for wood.

### B. *The Value of Being*

In the case of Kanak reciprocity, it would seem that the gift is not only an occasion to acquire prestige, but it fits into a structure that we shall call the alliance, where it becomes an occasion to participate in the social being, in the communitarian being begotten by this form of reciprocity.

Prestige is the name of being itself, engraved as title of glory; it is the glory of the clan or of Man which crystallizes into a chain of shells... The latter are crystallized being.

Because these crystallizations of prestige are "being", "self", they are theoretically unalienable. They cannot be exchanged. However, they can be transmitted, given and redistributed. Let us explain...

The goods of prestige can be transmitted like titles of nobility or a royal crown, but cannot be sold nor bought. The author emphasizes that these are transmitted in the course of matrimonial relations, births or mournings: "the volume of exchange is particularly significant, he says, at the birth of a child, at a wedding or at death". He is speaking here of the transmission of the name or of being, of life established by alliances and reproduced by the generations.

Money here is a symbol of an alliance, of a union of reciprocity. This derives from the conditions that surround its use. Customary marriages, says Leenhardt, are marriages between cross cousins "set by the parents during the early childhood of their child's life. This oath between members of two clans is marked by an exchange of two moneys of unequal

length". Money here represents being and alliance. If the oath is broken, it is not enough for the defaulting party to return the money: the break is completed only when the injured party agrees to return the accepted money. "The two moneys", Leenhardt concludes, "being the two parts of the same bond, must each be exchanged anew and in a common agreement, so that the gesture of unbinding may be accomplished. It is an unloosing of the bond and not a payment that the plaintiff demands". This confirms that money here represents the very being created by the alliance.

One could say that money is each one's part in the elaboration of a new being, but whose value comes only from that being in a sort of recurring fashion. Money is simultaneously being and name.

This equivalence between name-being and money shows up in many other rituals: the rituals of peace, of war, of oaths...

Leenhardt thinks that sometimes money is given in exchange for something - he then assimilates it to exchange money - but he specifies that this something can only be another's silence, a magical virtue, or tools, all of which are considered by the Kanak to enjoy magical power. As for all other goods, he says, one does not have recourse to money but to barter.

One must note that the magical power of things among the Kanak is the power of the word that inhabits them, the power of the name to which they are consecrated. The magical references of those goods that can be translated by prestige money, have to do with prestige, so that Leenhardt thereby confirms that these transactions are not exchanges but reciproci-

ty, and more precisely alliance relationships between names, in order to create a superior being. Since the value of this alliance is symbolized in money and since money "fetichizes" it, like gold "fetichizes" exchange value, one will be able to substitute a missing portion of being within a reciprocity relationship, by money. Thus it is that after wars, the social equilibrium is reestablished by symbolizing the departed through lengths of money. Since money is the materialization of the value created by the exchange relationship, one can consider Kanak money as the materialization of the value begotten by the gift and by reciprocity.

### C. *The Gift of Prestige Money*

But there can also be, it seems, another type of money circulation. Prestige value might not be accounted for in terms of money, if it did not enjoy a role in the circulation of economic goods. By receiving Kanak money, one is honoured, but one is thereby obliged to keep one's rank. Kanak money is a title which certainly obliges one to give, to redistribute. In that sense, it can circulate merchandise in a gift system, like exchange money in an exchange system. This shows how the reciprocity economy is not an archaic economy, but how it can be as sophisticated as the Western political economy.

One could ask here: why is prestige money given? Is it not to force redistribution and thus benefit from the latter? In a word, could it not be reduced to being a buying power and thus an exchange money?

It may be necessary to specify here that when a donor agrees to give prestige money, it is in view of at-

taining a gift of superior value, a gift of the second degree which will give him greater prestige. What allows him to confer prestige value is the fact that the latter can be crystallized in money. This money is something material and figurative, which can therefore enter into the cycle of gift and reciprocity. The money already has a certain amount of value: by conferring this value, the donor gains an equivalent in prestige in that he doubles it, and this authorizes him to enjoy a power which is twice as great. (3)

Thus the cycle of prestige and of redistribution can reproduce itself, bringing about a greater production of riches, or the growth of a society of abundance. This second cycle of the gift is comparable to the cycle of money in the Western system, when money is loaned and brings interest instead of being directly invested. Here, the interest (100% interest!), instead of being material, is the interest of prestige.

It is important to reiterate that the gift of prestige-money cannot be interpreted as a purchase.

#### D. *Symmetrical Reciprocity*

In a society where power depends on the rigorous equivalence between gift and prestige, one can, at any time, measure value in material terms. Where the competition between donors to acquire maximum prestige is limitless, we have a rather materialistic approach to prestige, which can be measured in a rather striking way.

The gift is then reduced to the image one can project of the distributed use-value. The very name of the donor can reflect the gold or cop-

per that has been distributed. Thus, in the potlatch, the prestige-value is modeled on the material image of what has been ostentatiously given or burned.

But it does not seem to be so, at all, with the Kanak. Reciprocity cannot be reduced to being a competition in giving or to a struggle for prestige. The matter is more complex.

It would seem that Kanak reciprocity is familiar with what we would call gift alienation (i.e. over-consumption, ostentatious destruction of riches in order to affirm one's superiority, or again, in another form of alienation, namely the power which takes the form of tax enfeoffment and which can lead to slavery).

The criterion for measuring gift alienation consists in relativizing the gift on the basis of someone else's need.

One can then speak of *symmetrical reciprocity*. Symmetrical in the sense that it is possible to give only if the other accepts to receive on the basis of his own necessity and not because he feels obliged by the gift. Symmetrical in virtue of the equilibrium between the giving of the one and the need of the other.

As a society becomes more complex - with division of labour and complementary status - this principle establishes the "just measure" in the redistribution of goods, in complementary reciprocity relationships, and it allows one to define reciprocity equivalences on the basis of consumption by each and all.

The difference with exchange is that here it is the common good and not private interest which is the

mainspring of economic progress.

"Positive" reciprocity is the gift and the reproduction of the gift, which creates competition for the power of prestige. Symmetrical reciprocity is the relativizing of the gift through another's need; hence the relativizing of power since it is no longer possible to exploit the differences in redistribution potential, in terms of power or prestige-power.

Symmetrical reciprocity is to positive reciprocity what equal exchange is to unequal exchange. Competition for power, in both symmetrical reciprocity and equal exchange, is neutralized.

But the similarity stops here. Furthermore, symmetrical reciprocity is antithetical to exchange. As we have specified, exchange is motivated by private interest. In the exchange economy, the other is recognized as other only in a minimal fashion, just enough to obtain from him what one desires, and that cannot be obtained in any other way.

Symmetrical reciprocity means recognizing the other, since the gift consists in satisfying the other's desire, thus considering him as part of Man.

But symmetrical reciprocity also takes into account the other in his dignity, i.e. recognizes that he has the right to give, the right to prestige and hence to power, since it does not allow anyone to justify a position of dominance on the basis of inequality of gifts.

Let us be clear: it is not the one who receives the gift who has here the means to impose, through a counter gift, a limit to another's preten-

sions. But it is the donor himself who refuses to crush the other by a gift and gives only in the measure in which the other accepts to receive; or again, only in the measure in which the other's gift, whatever it may be, is seen as equal to his own, as in the example of those two Greek soldiers who, meeting on a battlefield, recognize each other as old allies and offer each other their armour: one is made of bronze, the other of gold, but symmetrical reciprocity here establishes the equality between gold and bronze... (4)

However, exchange is also a form of relativizing: it is relativizing the "taking", through the capacity of the other to relinquish. It therefore tends towards an equilibrium of interests, but it is not possible to say that giving and receiving, on the one hand, is equivalent to taking and relinquishing, on the other.

What does this opposition consist of? It is that, in the framework of exchange, it is private interest which prevails and motivates the partners' transaction; it is self-interest which is increased, the equilibrium is one of opposite forces. Of course, exchange does allow one to put a stop to theft and crime, but the essential preoccupation is to protect oneself from this. That is why exchange is always accompanied by competition, and the other remains fundamentally a rival.

#### IV. ETHICS OR RACISM?

We shall now further clarify the difference between positive and symmetrical reciprocity as we have just defined them. We shall thereby bring out a second dimension of the contradiction between exchange and reciprocity - one which is even more fundamental and important than that already discussed up to this point.

In the case of exchange, the human ideal is the individual. The principle is the individual, even if it is collectivized in structures of generalized exchange. Of course, it is the wealth of the other that is coveted, but it is accumulated and sought in order to satisfy what is needed for the coherence of the individual. Westerners are not at all interested in Kanak or Arab wealth and values, but in what, on those Kanak, Arab or African territories, is necessary to their own economy: nickel, petroleum, gold.

Hence, in the exchange economy, each partner seeks his own coherence, and the definition of the self is reduced to one's own body. The individualism of exchange does not allow one to substantially modify one's definition of Man, the one that is used as reference point. The each one for himself of free exchange leads to the idealization of the self. When this idealization is pushed further, it evolves into a narcissistic cult of the self, which, when unquestioned and unenriched by the other's differences, leads to withdrawal within one's own shell, to nationalism. It degenerates into a conception of Man increasingly reduced to what is innate, to natural, biological differences. Finally, it leads to the monstrous human cancer of racism, which itself sometimes degenerates into national-socialism and

other types of fascism. Elsewhere, it might be apartheid, U.S. policy towards Blacks, that of Latin-American towards Native Indians, or that of the French towards the Kanak, etc.

Genocide, colonialism, and apartheid are the tumours bred by racism. But racism is the logical consequence of the exchange economy.

The Kanak already have a colonial experience of all that. Let us now look at what happens in symmetrical reciprocity.

Here, on the contrary, the notion of Man is enriched by taking into account the other's need. The human ideal is irreducible to individual identity, to a biologically enclosed self. It is differentiated and enriched by the other's reality, in such a way as to be always more than the notion of the individual, without being reducible to the other's differences. It is the very being that emerges from the interaction and relationship between both.

Symmetrical reciprocity therefore gives rise to a "Third" who is always beyond the identity of each partner.

This "Third" is a "greater being", who moves, draws upon, or grounds the desire of both. Since this being is irreducible to either partner's imagined self, it is an essentially communitarian one. It is mankind's common being, the social being. This "Third" is clearly revealed as an absolute which seems beyond the self, belonging to no one, but which in reality is created by the reciprocity structure, which serves as its foundation.

This "Third" is therefore alive as long as it is not "fetishized" in some imaginary representation which replaces it, and as long as the structures of reciprocity are in operation. It then remains impersonal and its only name is that of the human being. That is why all societies of reciprocity call themselves "Man", like the Kanak, for example, whose name means human. But it can also fetishize itself in an absolute and take the name: God.

If man's structure is defined by and reduced to his biological nature, to that of a work force like that of an ox or else to a mechanical force, what is called work is reduced to activating a certain quantity of biological energy. Some economists have not hesitated to measure exchange value in terms of heat, heat being the simplest form of energy. The notion of value can thus eventually be reduced to that of the most primitive energy conceivable.

This is not so with symmetrical reciprocity which sets the nature of work in another dimension because the definition of man cannot be reduced to the biological. This dimension is that of the total man, including what is specific to him, i.e. his spiritual nature.

It is the structure of symmetrical reciprocity which gives to work and its conditions a different nature from that of biological or mechanical labour. From his window, the artist has to see the gulls over the ocean, if he is to work.

Work which is art is irreducible to a quantity of physical or vital energy. Being irreducible to the biological individual. This aesthetic dimension is constitutive, from

the start, of the very essence of human work as it is related to the other and hence as "social" work. In societies of symmetrical reciprocity, work is therefore art.

From that, one can understand that the notion of value does not consist of those various categories proposed by Westerners in order to choose one of them as definitional of economic value, thus rejecting all others as stemming from various irrational metaphysical postulates. Value does result from human work, but we should mean by human work more than the effect of a waterfall or working the soil. Of course, human work can be reduced to that of the ox or the waterfall, but it is the structure of exchange which brings that about, and which leads to the various types of alienation we are all familiar with.

Symmetrical reciprocity, on the contrary, produces work conditions that are fully human, i.e. work that is specifically human and social, where the being of man is created; work that is art, art of living, aesthetics of being, hence work that is ethical. The being of Man is not the fruit of hazard, something irrational and absurd. It requires specific structures, so that Man can be responsible for them.

Thus value represents a spiritual and even an affective energy. What the Greeks called "*philia*" and the Kanak "*ka*". It is therefore the ethical dimension which constitutes the highest value. This is obviously something other than the materialistic value ideology of the West.

One can also say that through reciprocity, the other becomes the representative or the image of the common "Third" and is thus irreducible

to a biological quantity. He is a spiritual necessity. The very meaning of symmetrical reciprocity consists in taking this necessity into account. Each one is therefore a thirst for Humanity, a thirst for Justice. That, more than material needs, is the driving force behind the revolutionary struggle of Third World peoples.

There is therefore a dialectic between being and work, which makes the notion of work itself conform to the exigencies of being and which transforms it into spiritual work. The value of symmetrical reciprocity symbolizes the being produced by work, its essence and even affectivity. That may be why it seems that among the Kanak, work becomes an offering and the other can be respected as God.

There is, however, a whole intermediary range between an ideal symmetrical reciprocity on the one hand, and a mere positive, more materialistic type of symmetrical reciprocity, on the other hand.

But it is in symmetrical reciprocity that value finds its highest ethical dimension, where one borders on pure affectivity and on the notion of something sacred.

#### V. THE "SACRED" AND "ECONOMICS"

Reciprocity therefore engenders a "Third" which, as an absolute, can be given an impersonal name, v.g. the "ka" of the Kanak. This name is sacred. The sacred is the nature of value in symmetrical reciprocity. For the sacred is that which more expressly appertains to the common "Third", to what is rigorously and specifically human: the spiritual energy itself translated by the word "Man", or here, by "Kanak".

But one must note that if *Ka* is petrified in its transcendence, *Ka* becomes God. This petrification is what religious missions do, in a very typical manner, in order to bind Kanak life in allegiance to their Churches.

The Kanak *ka*, however, is the word, says Leenhardt, and rightly so, it seems: it is being in its "manifestation", but without having to become fossilized in symbols or rituals, for it has not forgotten the structure which allows it to be, the communion from which it emerges, that of Kanak reciprocity: the offering of food, hospitality, marriage alliance, and, we could, say, equality, but it is more exactly parity in a reciprocity relationship. That is the structure which insures and creates those conditions that allow the common being to exist, the Kanak being, hence a sort of "inclusive Third" which defies the foundations of the Western logical mind: the principle of the "exclusive Third", which, more precisely, is the logical principle of exchange.

As to that "inclusive Third", that being which is in-between all, one participates in it, engenders it by giving. Hence one receives it to the extent of one's participation in an offering and sharing relationship.

The more one gives, the more one is.

The result is that through the image of the gift transformed into prestige and the glory of being, the growth of being itself is assured. That is why economic value, and Kanak money itself is sacred.

"Each grouping of families owns, in a 'sacred basket', a certain amount of this money which constitutes its patrimony", says Leenhardt. (5)

This is one's named being and "it is always connected to a 'head'", i.e. an art object, some very refined weave with mother-of-pearl pendants, some sculpture... For this "head" represents the ancestor, that is, the name of being. Money, art, the sacred, name and being. Everything is marvelously linked in that quote from Leenhardt. From art as a condition of work, one arrives at money as an expression of value, as a representative of Man's being - sacred and named, like the Kanak being.

The foundation of it all, one must add, is the real structure which makes it coherent and able to exist, namely symmetrical reciprocity.

The author of the text under analysis did not bypass this sacred nature of value in the Kanak economy. We can be grateful that he affirmed it clearly in the face of purely materialistic Western conceptions of value.

"The cultural manifestations which Westerners consider to be Kanak folklore are a sacred activity." p. 27

Thus, sacred, among the Kanak, is the immediate translation of a real structural fact, of a live, concrete structure. But just as the Western economist fetishizes the exchange value into gold, one can fetishize the being-value into a being-money, Kanak money. That allows missionaries to denounce the Kanak sense of the sacred as fetishist and to try to replace it with their own. In fact, it seems that among the Kanak, the sacred is an immanent living being, so much so that the Kanak give the name of the money "Adi" or "Mi" to young girls. Is this done so that the money will confer its value to the young girl or is it because the young girl is here considered as a sacred being?

Do the missionaries today acknowledge that Kanak sense of the sacred? Or are they still alienating it within their own religious categories? In any case, they do claim, because it springs from its source, that it is primitive ("seeds of the word" they say). We might have them note that the sacred is true only at its spring and that the notion that they wish to substitute for it is so petrified after centuries of alienation that it is hardly recognizable.

However, if the Kanak oppose their culture in its sacred nature to that of the Westerners, they do so because of the latter's materialistic ideology. Now, since the latter have preserved an area where they compensate for what they have lost in their daily lives as exchange producers and consumers, through religious ceremonies and the realm of Churches, the Kanak can recognize, there, some spokesmen who may cultivate the sense of the sacred like a flower in a greenhouse, but who still thus retain that sense.

The place of dialogue seems to be in the protestant Churches because they are the ones who have the greatest respect for the autonomy and the mystical freedom of others.

Finally, when the Kanak must refer to economic categories in Western terms, they opt for socialism, considered however as a vehicle for dreams, a utopia, a desire for what has been lost in Western capitalistic society, and not the reality of the Soviet Union.

The civilizational frontlines in which the Kanak participate, are therefore an anti-materialistic front, if one terms the ideology born of the exchange system as materialistic. It

is a front which calls for a relationship of respect, not of competition. The Kanak border is that of respect. When respect is not respected, the border becomes rejection.

The Kanak border is that civilizational border from which many exclude themselves, namely, all those who ignore courtesy, those who cannot or will not participate in ethics, justice and equity, those who cannot or will not enter into a relationship of friendship...

But the border seen in reverse by the colonists is a border of free exchange, of competition, of materialism and racism, a colonial border of so-called Western and Christian values, a border of contempt.

What does Kanak independence then mean?

Liberation... but it can also be understood as being the affirmation of an economic system based on reciprocity, not on exchange, of a value system based on ethics and not on a materialistic ideology, in a word, of a system which is irreducible to the Western system.

It also means undoubtedly that the Kanak system of reciprocity gives birth to a people whose border is not primarily geographical (geography serving here only to delimit the material conditions that allow the system of reciprocity to exist), but rather a "social structure" border. Anyone, it seems, is Kanak, or man, in Kanak terms, whether he be White or Black, who respects the principles of symmetrical reciprocity, in the Kanak language, wherever possible.

This system proclaims a law which is opposed to the materialistic

and religious alienation of the West. A law which is opposed to that dichotomy which ploughs the furrow of "White Peace", to use Jaulin's expression, a living law, or rather a *praxis*, the *praxis* of reciprocity which is common to almost all Third World societies. The return to Kanaky is the liberation movement of the Kanak people, but it is also the life of the Third World, hence the youth of the world, the starting point of today's and tomorrow's humanities, away from the carcasses of military paraphernalia, aircraft carriers and nuclear tests.

This is Man, naked perhaps, but in his true form. It is Man who has taken stock of all the suffering, genocide, racism, ethnocide, economicide, slavery, servitude, and proletarianization, and who transcends the fetishism of his own concepts and imagination in order to reach the symbolic, the universal. Kanaky is the herald of a post-capitalistic society: it can exist.

One should be grateful to the Kanak for coming to Larzac to meet the most despised peasants of France, those shepherds who have defied the military power of the Western world. The Kanak border, it is clear, extends to that golden and deserted "Landes", right into enemy country, to walk again along paths of alliance, to revive the tradition of sharing resources.

That kind of solidarity is reciprocity. That is what creates a human frontier with what is not. It weaves an alliance of indigenous soils, from the French cause to the Kanak stone, from the internal colony to the external colony.

Here, the problem of borders is immediately solved. Because each

one wishes the other to be different in order to establish a relationship of reciprocity. Each one must be able to produce in order to give. In between the borders, the dynamics of reciprocity create a "greater being", the alliance being. One will have to choose between war and alliance. We may have to choose war to liberate Kanaky from the racism and colonialism of free exchange, from capitalistic exploitation or from collectivism.

## VI. THREE OBSERVATIONS

Before looking into the question of the strategy to be undertaken in the liberation struggle, let me clear up three things.

A. *Why is it that the Kanak economy, and, in a more general way, the economy of reciprocity throughout the world, has been disorganized by the exchange economy?*

The reason seems to be the following. If one puts together a system of reciprocity and an exchange system where both know no other law but their own, so that the exchangers think they are dealing with other exchangers, and donors dealing with other donors, an accretion takes place between the two systems, but they accrete in favour of the exchange system and its triumph.

The Kanak, for example, will offer hospitality to the French colonist, with a generosity that is all the greater since he wishes to increase his prestige, establish his authority, subject the stranger to his law, or else forge a common being in a framework of symmetrical reciprocity. But the colonist will congratulate himself for having obtained so many

riches without having had to pay anything. He will have noticed that when he addresses himself to great leaders, they even refuse all compensation. Recently, we heard a French university scholar say, in a meeting of the "Kanak People's Support Committee", how the French administration had succeeded in acquiring vast agricultural areas of Kanaky, peacefully and for a song, because the Kanak chiefs had shown satisfaction with signs of precedence and deference bestowed upon them on that occasion. The university scholar's conclusion was that these chiefs were therefore venal - easily bought off - and had thus, through their treason, assured the success of colonization... Obviously, the Kanak had not elected venal persons as chiefs but, on the contrary, the best among their own people precisely because they were great donors.

Had the administrators understood the Kanak political economy, they should then have given the Kanak even more riches than the latter had, for example more French lands, at least to establish their authority. Otherwise, the appropriate thing to have done would have been to return to the Kanak the products obtained from the bestowed land, at least as homage or as a tribute... But the administration settled for privatization and for driving out the Kanak from the bestowed areas.

The contradiction of the two systems is an inevitable consequence of historical conditions or of the fact that each society did not understand the other's laws. That is what I have called the historical misunderstanding.

But time is a great teacher. We have gone through only half of this period, namely that portion of mutual

ignorance which conditions such a transfer of wealth from the one to the other. In that sense, the triumph of free exchange is due to circumstance: the defeat of Kanak reciprocity, like that of the Mexicans, the Peruvians and all societies based on a system of reciprocity - India or China - is of a logical order, but this logical relationship is itself possible only within certain precise historical conditions and a precise time frame, wherein each other's values are misinterpreted. When this misunderstanding has disappeared and when we acknowledge the nature of the interface between the two systems, we shall certainly see the end of the Kanak failure and maybe the decline of colonialism.

#### B. *Class struggle and civilizational front*

From the very moment that exchange leads to capitalistic alienation and the exploitation of people's work, it seems quite legitimate for those victims, including the victims of colonial exploitations v.g. in the nickel mines of New Caledonia, in the gold mines of South Africa, to struggle in order to reestablish either a better sharing of the goods produced, or conditions for an equal exchange through socialization of the means of production. But, in both cases, we are not moving out of exchange, out of a system in which merchandise is a material thing destined to satisfy elementary needs or instincts. One has not departed from the materialism that comes from relationships of production and exchange, nor from private or collective individualism.

Of course, there is in the system of reciprocity a certain individualism, but the latter should not be confused with the individualism that

comes from exchange. The individualism of reciprocity is a personal responsibility towards the common good, towards the social being. This means that if an individual no longer has the freedom to redistribute the fruit of his work, if he can no longer give, if, therefore, he can no longer acquire fame or establish his prestige, his only motivation to produce will be that of seeing exclusively to his own subsistence. That is why all collectivization which makes redistribution anonymous suppresses what constitutes the main motivation of production in reciprocity economies, and reduces these economies to subsistence economies. What is missing is the ethical spring, the symbol of prestige.

By suppressing individual responsibility, collectivization "decapitates" the reciprocity system in its dynamics of growth. It provokes under-production, under-development. That very same collectivization which, in the class struggle, is seen as an efficient way to neutralize the privatization of the means of production is seen as inappropriate in a system of reciprocity.

If privatization is a mistake, since the accumulation that it guarantees is, in the Kanak system, "economic death", so collectivization is also a mistake, since prestige is necessary as the motive behind production.

In short, it is not by having recourse to a cooperative system that the Kanak communities can insure their future. That system has in any case failed among peasants of all the socialist countries of the world, beginning with the Soviet Union. The reason behind this is not that the peasants there are less revolutionary than elsewhere, but because they were organized in agricultural communes, in

systems of reciprocity, and that by the establishment of collective farms these structures were suppressed. From that viewpoint, the Russian revolution has yet to take place.

#### C. *The control of exchange at the service of reciprocity*

Is it possible for a system of reciprocity to achieve modernity directly, to benefit from contemporary technology including that which has been elaborated on the basis of colonial exploitation and pillaging?

It would seem that any system of reciprocity can practise exchange at its borders, and acquire modern technology from the outside world. In fact, all human societies founded on reciprocity know about barter and exchange and have practised it at their borders and for their benefit. The problem is to reverse the enfeoffment. Instead of reciprocity being enfeoffed to exchange, it should be the other way around.

The ancient Greeks, for example, whose whole economic system was based on reciprocity, did nevertheless use exchange economics at their borders, whether that of *oikos*, the elementary community, or that of the city or the empire. In order not to bring dishonour upon themselves through a practise which they considered shameful because of its unethical and non-human character, they would make it the responsibility of their slaves. In Athens, the practise of exchange by the slaves was tolerated for the benefit of the citizens. It was practised with resident foreigners or with stateless tradesmen, profiteers, to the extent to which it supplied the home with needed products. In Sparta, however, this was not tolerated; the

slaves could use the exchange economy only among themselves and for themselves. The very title of Greek citizen was reserved only for those who practised reciprocity relationships with each other, thus for those who owned the land, just as in Kanak country it seems. Another requirement, in order to ensure that there was enough giving capacity, was that they had to be at least able of feeding one man who did not own land, i.e. someone else.

Exchange was not, therefore, unknown in such places, but since it creates only an elementary value or rather a purely materialistic dimension of value, it was reserved for non-citizens, i.e. for those who did not engender the specific values of the city (today it would have been reserved for the colonists). But Greece is an antiquated reference: one could very well illustrate with more modern examples taken from the Chinese, the Indians...

In any case, one cannot resign oneself to seeing all of mankind become alienated by the capitalistic system. It is impossible to accept that our world is condemned to war. All that is alive must seek some way out of the cul-de-sac which is giving rise to death camps, famine, the most scandalous form of underdevelopment in the history of mankind, and to what reduces rich societies to a pitiful and miserable lack of soul and feeling.

Kanaky seems ready to participate, along with the Third World, in a political economy based on reciprocity. What is certain is that the Kanak are predisposed to such an ultramodern, post-capitalistic perspective, and that they are way ahead because they already possess active principles

of reciprocity.

There is only one preliminary condition to this fabulous adventure. And that is independence.

For the time being, the French are excluded from participating in this revolution. They are dependent on an exchange economy, and as such, they are all colonists. It is hence against them that Kanak independence can and must take place. It is against the West as a whole that the South Africans must conceive their liberation.

The preliminary requirement for a revolution of reciprocity is a border of rejection regarding free exchange, colonialism and racism. We thus come to a question of strategy: how does one achieve independence in the face of an adversary who is very well armed and determined?

The French arguments against independence are summarized by J. Doumenge in *Encyclopedia Universalis*:

"For France, the brutal questioning of its sovereignty is not, there again, without danger. It isn't so much the loss of control of a strategic material, nickel, as the questioning of its foreign policy and the propagation of its culture. The atomic test sites of Eastern Polynesia necessitate a certain surveillance: the absence of a base in New Caledonia would make it more vulnerable. Furthermore, how can one develop a universal, hence trans-ethnic francophone culture, if one allows, at the same time, an ethnic group in a given territory to monopolize political expression in the midst of a multiracial population?" (*Universalis*, 1985, p. 92)

Hence, three arguments: the military protection of France's nuclear armour, nickel, and the propagation of the French language.

The French responded to the third argument when Algeria became independent. The spreading of their culture occurs through decolonization, the reparation of wrongs and the recognition that peoples have a right to self-determination. As for the preoccupation to preserve a trans-ethnic culture, it seems legitimate, but this culture is assured in the very definition of Kanak society whose laws are laws of reciprocity, hospitality and respect - something that the French have already enjoyed - while this openness is impossible if the territory is occupied by a capitalistic, colonialistic and racist French social class.

The nuclear test site of Mururoa has never as yet been able to be protected or defended from New Caledonia soil, and Kanak independence does not threaten Mururoa. Moreover, the nuclear tests are being protested both by peoples of the Pacific and by French society.

Finally, the nickel belongs to the Kanak. Anyway, it no longer constitutes, in any way, a strategic material or a basis for a portion of the French economy. What was exploitable with enormous profit has already been exploited.

In fact, there is only one important reason that remains to justify the colonial presence: the colonists are there to become rich. The day this major reason disappears, they will go and colonize elsewhere. The Algerian colonists left for that reason, like those of Rhodesia or Vietnam.

The national liberation strategy is therefore theoretically quite simple: it consists in suppressing the colonist's economic reason for being there.

We could question here the perspective of a liberation struggle centered on the theory of unequal exchange alone.

The confrontation between the colonists and the Kanak, between the Third World and the Western World, is not limited to unequal exchange. The theory of unequal exchange is deliberately set within the Western economic field, that of exchange. So what else can derive from it except a certain restructuring of the Western system? One can even pay homage to such unequal exchange theories for arresting Third World revolt and channelling it into the evolution of Western civilization.

Now, the real issue consists precisely in finding a way of moving away from that evolution. Furthermore, we have already entered, perhaps unconsciously, an era where the refusal of alienation occurs more by rejecting it than by protesting it, in order to go on directly to something else.

To put it differently, it is the colonists who colonize and decolonize, because they are the result of a structure: they follow the gold. And since the Kanak have no reason to become colonists themselves or to replace them, they must be able to practise a faultless economic boycott, Gandhian style.

That strategy has, in any event, proven fruitful. *Le Monde* of 12/2/85 writes to this effect that:

"The economic situation (the Western, not the Kanak one, obviously) is getting worse every day. People are worried. They buy less, they no longer invest, they even think of leaving... Tourism, previously highly promoted, has now become practically nil. The forest industry is completely paralyzed under the pressure of events in the bush. A good number of breeders are starting to sell off part of their livestock at a low price."

The departure of the colonists is here clearly linked to the keypoint of their economy. The essential question for the colonists is to know whether it is possible or not to make money without having to work (or almost). It is in the face of that reality that the French government has proposed an economic integration which would induce the Kanak to share the benefits. The Pisani Fabius plan is clear: no to the Kanak economic alternative: autonomy, even independence, will be granted, on the condition that the Kanak give up their reciprocity structures and adopt exchange structures. What the socialist government therefore guarantees is that this changeover will take place under terms favorable to the Kanak: in a word, self-colonization.

Edgard Pisani explains in *Le Monde* of March 25th, 1985: "A productive Kanak agriculture must be created. This does not require that the bush economy disappear. Quite the contrary. We need a new thrust, and it doesn't require that the farmers leave the country. Your own traditions, your customary and land laws are a greater obstacle to agricultural development than the presence of non-Kanak farmers and breeders".

To say that Kanak law is an obstacle to agricultural development

is begging the question against the obvious. Gift and reciprocity societies are, by definition, societies of consumption and of abundance. Everyone knows it: in such societies, power is judged according to one's power of redistribution, so that invitations and feasts are the very mechanisms of the economy. But, as we have said, when the indigenous economy is uprooted by colonialism, these mechanisms are annihilated and the effect is to reduce production to mere subsistence motives. It is false to affirm that customary law is an obstacle to agricultural development. It is precisely the privatization of land, introduced by the colonists, which has reduced the Kanak economy to a self-subsistence level.

What Pisani really means is that the Kanak land and reciprocity legal system is an obstacle to the exchange economy of the colonial farmers. The reverse is true. The fact is that the Kanak are in their original homeland and have been dispossessed of their lands through abuse, ignorance and violence.

Edgar Pisani pursues: "Customary and written law are in contradiction. What we should be talking about is the interface between custom and the exchange economy into which this territory must enter" (*Le Monde*, March 25, 1985), i.e. between value systems - the Kanak and the colonial one.

These quotations are a reminder of the socialist thesis regarding the Third World: self-colonization.

Since the Kanak have refused the collectivization of State socialism that is found in communist countries, one can wonder why they have chosen the term socialist: their revo-

lution could have asserted itself as the first to refer to reciprocity principles in the face of Western structures. In any event, Pisani's solution would result in a Western type economic development that the "socialistic" Kanak are expected to set up.

But such a policy can be applied neither by the Kanak directly, nor by the colonial administration. One must have recourse to the specialized technicians, the specialists of economicide, the "Trojan horse" mercenaries of colonization: the NGO's (non-government organizations).

I shall now briefly recall what this fearsome weapon of Western colonization is all about: its detailed analysis can be found in the next article.

The operation consists in donning the mantle of one category from the reciprocity economy, and the main one at that, namely: the gift. The NGO is always a donor and a volunteer. Thus, without difficulty, it wins the indigenous peoples' trust, i.e. it can use the authority that the Natives legitimately accord to the donor. That allows it a substitution of power.

A political authority is granted. But this is done in a way which is detrimental to the legitimate authority of those who look after the indigenous economy. The NGO does have a constraint, namely, to adapt to the dimensions of the spheres of indigenous reciprocity - the village, for example. Whence the theory of micro-projects. This means only to adapt to the form of indigenous power. The NGO can then act as counsel or even direct economic development projects, on the basis of new structures, namely those of production in view of exchange.

This is not so much an "exterior" exchange which would leave the reciprocity structures of the community itself intact at certain levels, but is for the purpose of an "interior" exchange, precisely in order to replace the fundamental structures of reciprocity of the community itself by exchange structures. The NGO's objective is to substitute reciprocity structures with exchange structures.

When colonization fails, as is the case with Kanaky, and when the border between the Third World and the Western world becomes sharper, then some paratroopers of the Western economy, disguised as natives, are sent across the front line. In a word, under the guise of a gift, the international NGOs destroy the interior borders of human communities. The gift becomes the Trojan horse through which Westerners expect to definitively break the Third World's defenses, to secretly open from within the reciprocity economy's doors to free exchange and thus dash any hope of another development.

The debate is clear: one cannot blame Pisani-Fabius for not bringing their game out in the open. The objective is that the Kanak adopt an exchange economy in lieu of a reciprocity one. Socialistic decolonization consists in self-colonization. And one has recourse to international aid in order to make up for what the colonists lack, they who are decidedly in need of war.

France's strategy in this story is also very clear: those who submit to this proposed yoke will be considered as valid spokesmen; the others are too dangerous to be acknowledged as such, hence their summary execution.

The execution of Eloi Machoro is exemplary. We all remember how the French media reported it according to very detailed and well-prepared information. Here is how *Le Monde* gives the official version of the assassination of April 12th, 1985:

"The police, at first, discreetly encircled the premises... Then supplementary mobile forces, assisted by three reconnaissance armoured vehicles, an ELI detachment (a light element of intervention) and especially elements of the GIGN (Groupe d'Intervention de la Gendarmerie Nationale)... At 5:30 the loudspeakers let out the first warning. According to the police, gunfire came from the house, reaching the armoured vehicles. The police retaliated. At 6:12, another series of the usual warnings. This time the "indépendantistes" fired in the direction of the police, not harming any of them. At that moment, the sharpshooters of the GIGN retaliated by observing orders not to inflict any deadly wounds, if possible, on the encircled Melanesians."

"It seems that it was Marcel Nonaro, Eloi Machoro's faithful lieutenant, who was first hit in the left shoulder. He died almost immediately. Almost simultaneously, Eloi Machoro, who was out in the open - perhaps he was trying to escape - and close to Marcel Nonaro, made a sudden move to the side and it is at that moment that he was shot - seemingly by a member of the GIGN - right in the chest."

This version reveals a scenario. Everyone knows today that it is a fake one. I shall not remind the Kanak who attended that summary execution of their leader what the conditions were that surrounded the political assassination of a prisoner, which was coldly ordered by French authori-

ties, in contempt of all human rights.

The FLNKS and the Kanak people's support group had every good and convincing reason to denounce the French government. They did not do so. This raises a fundamental question. If the political assassination of the Kanak resistance leadership who are opposed to a socialistic colonization does not lead to a power struggle with the assassins, then the French strategy is certainly sure of winning the battle.

The yoke of self-colonization on one side, and political assassination on the other. There is no reason for such an alternative not to reproduce itself systematically, especially with rightist and extreme right-wing governments.

Undoubtedly, the Kanak, like all the other Third World peoples, have to look upon their liberation as a long-term struggle. The rights of Man and the rights of peoples to self-

determination, along with the principle of historical reparation, are a preliminary condition which should be a priori of all negotiations, and governments that do not respect the United Nations Charter should be disqualified. It is idealistic to build the future on diplomatic hopes. Independence cannot be bought. It must be conquered because colonists will only submit to a greater force. Alone, the Kanak can hardly deal with repression within a French framework. Hence the debate must be internationalized. The Kanak claim must join the claims of South African Blacks, of Afghans, of Erythreans, of Sarahouis, and therefore foster a solidarity between all the contemporary struggles for the emancipation of the Third World from all Western tutelage. But one must also elaborate one's own doctrine, and if possible, in one's own language, in order to achieve the unity of the Kanak people in terms of a community development project which is their own and which clearly defines the border which separates them from the enemy.

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES

- 1) Kanaky Libre, Comité FLNKS, France.
  - 2) The term "prestige" is found in Mauss who himself quotes a German author, but Mauss has unfortunately tried to prove that this value was one of primitive exchange.
  - 3) There is also the gift of the material which serves in establishing prestige value. This material is to be considered as use value, which can be distributed, hence also to acquire a certain prestige. In order to become prestige value, it has to be personalized as a seal by the donor. It has to become a name that is sanctified by the very being of the donor, because it is carried by him in his "sacred basket".
  - 4) Homer, *Iliad*, song 6.
  - 5) Leenhardt, M., *Notes ethnologiques néocalédoniennes*, Institut d'Ethnologie, Musée de l'Homme, Paris.
- 34 Vol. 21, no 1, Issue 98

#### OTHER WRITINGS BY DOMINIQUE TEMPLE

- "Thèmes de réflexion du Groupe de Lima", *CADAL*, Tlaloc no. 40, Mexico D.F. 1976, 4 pp.
- "Quel développement" 1979, (non-published), 4 pp.
- "Frente de classes y frente de civilizaciones", *CISA*, 1980, 4 pp.
- "Le contrat à deux prix des céramiques Shipido", *Nouvelles de l'Ecodéveloppement*, no. 17, Paris, 1981, 10 pp.
- "Echange inégal ou ethno-développement, le cas des indiens Shipido", in *Pluriel*, no. 29, 1982, 12 pp.
- Contribuciones al etnodesarrollo*, 1983, 88 p., (private publication).
- "Ethno développement des Mapuche du Chili, *Diffusion INTI*, Paris, 1984, 30 pp.
- "Contribuciones al proyecto de ley fundamental agraria de Bolivia", 1985, 13 pp., (non-published).
- "El aymara y la logica del tercer incluido", *Suplemento Jayma*, no. 7, La Paz, 1986, 5 pp.
- "Agropoder y Economia comunitaria, *Chitakolla* no 28, 1986, 2 pp.
- "Los limites del intercambio desigual ante el frente de civilizaciones, *Suplemento Jayma*, no. 8, 1986, 5 pp.
- "Crisis entre los Mapuche", *America India* no. 2, 1986, 3 pp.
- "Sugerencias de investigaciones para el desarrollo comunitario", 1986, 10 pp., (non-published).
- "Relatividad del triunfo del intercambio", 1986, 3 pp., (non-published).
- "Comunidad y desarrollo en el altiplano andino", 1986, 28 pp., (non-published).
- "Apuntes filosoficos sobre el fundamento de la reciprocidad", 1986, 10 pp., (non-published).
- "La condicion previa", 1986, 8 pp., (non-published).
- "Apuntes para una teoria del etnodesarrollo", 1986, 14 pp., (non-published).
- "Economia y comunidad", 1986, 7 pp., (non-published).
- "Estructura comunitaria y reciprocidad", *Huerrquen Admapu*, Mayo 86 et Diciembre 86: Admapu casilla 1676 Temuco Chili, 1986, 30 pp.
- "Contribucao a compreensao do sistema de producao Balanta", Republica de Guinee Bissao. Ministerio de desenvolvimento rural e pesca. Depatamento de pesquisa agricola. Estacao de caboxanque, 1987, 8 pp.
- "Contribucion a la economia mapuche", 1987, 22 p. (non-published).
- "La condicion previa del desarrollo de las comunidades indias", 1987, 7 pp., (non-published).

# The N.G.O.s' Role in Economicide

by DOMINIQUE TEMPLE

## I. THE TROJAN HORSE

The prestige values of a system of reciprocity are a natural expression of the donor's power and enhance what characterizes him, but they simultaneously claim to give testimony to the social being in which each being participates. This social being cannot be reduced to a particular expression because in reciprocity, it is born out of a relation to the other. In other words, the awareness is foremost a communitarian one. It does not refer to the identity either of the one or of the other, but to a common third. The other person's prestige is therefore as important as one's own. That is one of the reasons behind the Third World's so-called "mimicry" of the West. However this longing for other people's

prestige values is not the only explanation as to why the Third World adopts the symbols of Western prestige.

The capitalistic system is interested in substituting merchandise for Native prestige values. It tries to force the Native system to produce export goods so that it may have the currency required in order to buy prestige values that are proposed in lieu of its own values. The way to impose this production is credit. From the Native viewpoint, credit translates into an immediate distribution of prestige merchandise which can be interpreted, according to its categories, as a redistribution which

justifies reciprocity, in this case productive and enfeoffed reciprocity: the latter is converted into the production of export goods which can in turn be converted into exchange money.

Credit, or rather, the debt, creates a kind of tax, a production tax for exchange. That explains how monetaristic theories have succeeded in imposing themselves in the Third World. Let us recall that these theories claim that the development of Third World countries requires that they transform themselves into producers of those goods that are most profitable on the exchange market, in order to have access to money which will then allow them to buy what they need from low-cost producers.

However, if the independence of Third World states allows a reorganization of sectors of the subsistence economy within a framework of reciprocity favorable to traditional values, the axis "Western production of prestige goods - Native production of exchange values for export" is in opposition to the axis "Native production of consumer values - regeneration of Native prestige values".

Consequently, it becomes imperative for the free exchange advocates to destroy traditional systems of reciprocity, today as yesterday, wherever these systems subsist or manifest themselves anew.

Certainly, the weapon of food is very efficient in ruining the self-subsistence of Third World communities, but it doesn't offer any definitive solution. The Westerner deems it necessary to permanently prevent the reconstitution of systems of communitarian reciprocity. These societies

must also be integrated into the Western capitalistic economy in order to avoid their being exploited by communist movements: Native reciprocity-type production must be replaced by production aimed at exchange. International programs of technical, financial assistance, or of economic and scientific cooperation (green revolution, technological transfers, etc.) have multiplied, thus contributing to the destructuring or dependence of regional and national economies, but without succeeding in reaching in any definitive way the most isolated rural communities of the Native peoples that offer the most resistance to integration.

This is where the advocates of free exchange and of monetaristic theories call on Non-Government Organizations (N.G.O.s). For the latter use capital which does not require immediate profit and which avoids the constraints of capitalistic production. They can, therefore, be partly, at least, assimilated, certainly in a better way than credit, to gift annuities ("investissements à fonds perdus"), i.e. to the gift. All N.G.O.s can claim to be donors or protectors. It is this title, which, more than economic efficiency, explains their credibility and success in the area of Western assistance and cooperation. The recognition of prestige which is necessarily linked to the gift in the mind of the Indigenous communities, establishes the former as political authorities.

One can distinguish between the donor-type N.G.O.s and the technical assistance-type N.G.O.s, who do not directly have funds and economic power. The donor N.G.O.s can have their own technicians as is the case with some of the national organizations of

bilateral cooperation, or they can use the technical assistance-type N.G.O.s as intermediaries, to manage, control or redistribute the funds from assistance programs.

Indigenous and peasant organization contest such tutelage. After having fought for direct contact with the financing N.G.O.s and for the control of the technical N.G.O.s, they today seek direct contracts or reciprocity with "professionals" or else with reciprocity-type partners. In other words, they want to determine the orientation and definition of development programs, and replace the Western technicians with their own. Obviously, no financial or technical N.G.O. accepts this kind of control or contract. In the face of these claims on the part of Native organizations and peasants, they prefer, in situations that have become difficult, to call upon national partners, those "relayers" who propose themselves as the new intermediaries and who base their legitimacy in the name of national independence.

However, in order to be efficient, the N.G.O.s have then to adapt to the Indigenous structures of reciprocity, which justifies a strategy of intervention at the micro-economic level, because the Native structures or reciprocity have been broken up and atomized by colonialism and exist in a dispersed state. In other words, the strategy consists in adapting the development projects to the village community enterprise i.e. at the level of the principal unit of reciprocity.

This adaptation allows it to perform a substitution of power at the ethnic or family level, whatever the case may be, and thanks to that substitution of authority, the technician

or the financing agency can decide in lieu of the village authority, or of the ethnic or family authority, what investment projects should be undertaken. Since it expresses its authority according to the terms of its competency, it induces, willy-nilly, a Western-type development. That is what leads to what we have called technicism.

Let us illustrate that economicidal behaviour by taking a North-American example from Bolivia.

One knows that in reciprocity communities, in the ritual ceremonies which make it possible for someone to reach a higher rank, an authorized person is chosen to express tradition or to bespeak community law. For example, during a wedding, the person chosen to be the spokesman for community and tradition must be an example of what fosters value in the community: the gift. If one is chosen to bless the wedding, to be the godfather, one is obliged first to give, to unite, through words, the two parties who wish to establish a relationship of matrimonial reciprocity. To give is here the act which establishes the godfather in his role of ethical reference. In other circumstances, he does not himself give, but insures the redistribution of each one's offerings as a collective center of the relations of symmetrical reciprocity, so that all may be expressed as a common feeling, law and unique word. He redistributes the gifts he has received and that redistribution confers upon him the authority which embodies ethnic identity.

One of the most important North-American N.G.O.s of Bolivia has named itself "Plan para el Padrino" (Plan for the godfather). It claims to

establish relationships similar to those of kinship between indigenous and North-American families. The latter remain anonymous but give money. The sponsorship is insured by the N.G.O. who redistributes the funds. Through these gifts, it enjoys indigenous authority, but it proclaims North-American religious values and not the ethical values of the Aymaras or Quechuas.

The substitution of power is obvious. So is that of references, both at the economic level where money replaces the indigenous redistribution values (coca leaves for example), and at the level of cultural symbolism where religious ideas or beliefs replace traditional values. The anonymity of North-American families gives the agency the freedom to manage the funds according to a strategy which never allows the Aymara or Quechua to escape the new law i.e. the moral enfeoffment sought by the N.G.O. in order to replace the Aymara prestige with prestige defined in Western terms, and the Native "padrino" with a North-American god.

Or course, not all N.G.O.s declare their intentions so openly. But all derive their authority from giving. Some N.G.O.s claim that they are defending Native cultures and use anthropological guarantees, but it is easy to note that under the guise of respect for the indigenous culture, they seek in reality, to wrench it away from the economy of reciprocity.

In order to effect this separation, they define political economy according to Western terms (the production of exchange values). Since there is generally no such economy in the Indigenous world, they have recourse

to the anthropological thesis according to which the exchange economy would be hidden, masked or integrated (1); this thesis therefore authorizes Western technicians to discover it, to unmask it or rather to invent it by reinterpreting their intervention. The cultural anthropologist himself benefits, since he acquires an authority over the indigenous culture itself.

Both share roles: the one claims to be the cultural specialist, the other the economic specialist. They share the community or ethnic group: one takes the body, the other the soul, each according to his competence. But such a separation between indigenous culture and the economics that sustain it, by refusing to admit that there are other economic systems besides exchange economics, allows Westerners to develop production in view of exchange under the guise of respect for the indigenous culture. This is what we can call the policy of the "severed flower".

At the root level of economics, the work of the Western technician consists in replacing the indigenous process of reciprocity with a "profitable" production process (profitable, or course, in his terms of exchange value). The result of this policy is to develop, in territories abandoned by colonial or capitalistic enterprise (or by international bilateral, technical cooperation), privatized or collectivized forms of production which shift indigenous production in the direction of exchange and towards the creation of an exchange currency.

It is however very difficult to denounce these N.G.O.s as being economicidal. They will defend themselves against that accusation with great conviction, having immediate recourse

to anthropological justification. Furthermore, they exploit the confidence that indigenous peoples have in them. Sometimes they even go so far as to present themselves behind indigenous leaders. In short, they present themselves as the Greeks in the Trojan horse presented themselves to the Trojans. The Trojan horse here is the Gift, i.e. Third World assistance itself. (2)

One must acknowledge that their ethnocidal activity is merely indirect. It is effected through the introduction of economic infrastructures. For these will engender their own notions which will start to compete with the traditional ones. The substitution of cultural references will take place by means of solving a generational conflict, but it is the Native peoples themselves who will insure this transformation. Here the ethnocide is particularly well masked.

But the N.G.O.'s action at the economic level, is no less direct: it consists in replacing the infrastructure of reciprocity with an infrastructure of exchange. That is what we here propose to call: economicide. That is the essential and systematic function of the Western N.G.O.s.

Of course the N.G.O.s are not the only culprits. Economicide is also characteristic of international technical cooperation and assistance. But the N.G.O.s are in practise the only Western forces which can intervene within the indigenous communities. They are the front-line pioneers of production development for the purpose of exchange, but remain "masked", because these charitable, religious, humanitarian agencies present themselves as an alternative to government

and intergovernmental institutions. They serve to channel the disinterested aid coming from Western individuals and private associations in the name of solidarity, struggle for social justice, the rights of Man and of Peoples. While official cooperation generally ignores the Native peasant communities and no longer deceives anyone, the N.G.O.s on the other hand deceive themselves first, but also deceive others twice, both the Western donors and the indigenous communities.

The results of their intervention have now become so obvious that they are today more and more contested by indigenous communities and organizations, when the latter have the right to speak and have access to the media.

One must add that our critique has nothing to do with the exploitation of the failures of the N.G.O.s by neo-liberal critics whose motivations are quite questionable. The latter form of critique results in authorizing greater Third World intervention. Of course, it can easily overcome the demagogic arguments that oppose it, but it unfortunately also uses such an occasion to snuff out the indigenous communities' own critique.

This is not to say that Third World peoples have no knowledge and experience of exchange. On the contrary, one can say that all communities have always known exchange and practised it, but they do so only at their borders or for servile activities, not to produce value. To engender value, they have recourse to reciprocity, so that exchange is hardly or never used in indigenous communities. Today, however, economic liberalism claims that it is exchange which must direct the economics of those communities

and engender the reference value!

One cannot claim either that these communities do not themselves wish to practise exchange with Westerners, since it is the only way to trade with them, at least when it is to their advantage to do so. And they do develop certain production structures aimed at exchange. This explains some of the alliances between indigenous communities and Western enterprises, but, in this case, it must be emphasized that such activities are oriented towards the exchange market outside the communities and not within their communitarian borders. Such initiatives remain subordinated to an indigenous authority which is exclusively determined by the laws of intra-community reciprocity. In this case, it is reciprocity which enfeoffs exchange, and not the opposite. There is therefore an indigenous alternative to the development promoted by Westerners. That is why the authorities who run the indigenous economic process must confront the foreign tutelage of the N.G.O.s.

Such indigenous authority is that of the legitimate leaders of community development or of ethnodevelopment. There is therefore a demarcation line between community leaders and the Westerners economists or ethnologists on the question of the notion of development and the control of its means.

This line situates the outposts in the following manner. On the one hand, there is the society of "unidimensional Man" or of "Homo aequalis" with his ideological materialism, his exchange and competition economics, his idealistic and religious alienations, and on the other hand, the Third World societies founded on reciprocity, on ethical values and on a praxis where daily life and spiritu-

al life are not alienated from each other.

However, it is tragic that the latter's laws and systems are not recognized and that each side remains a prisoner of its own world, when an acknowledgment of the theoretical logic of both could allow mutual understanding, and could allow one to institutionalize, across borders, relationships of mutual respect and of solidarity, maybe at a universal level.

## II. THE CONFUSION BETWEEN CHARITY AND GIFT

It is customary to say that the N.G.O.s and the Churches supporting them, are acting in good faith and that their intervention in the Third World is not part of a concerted plan of ethnocide. But how is one to explain the facts: are they to be considered as the realization of their fundamental principles? An explanation might be the confusion between charity and gift.

It is symptomatic that the Catholic Church, for example, tries to silence liberation theology, as it has done recently in the ban on the theologian L. Boff, under the pretext that expressing faith in a Marxist praxis alongside struggling peasants constitutes a compromise with the world, a political compromise, while missionary work based on the practice of materially disinterested giving would be spiritual and legitimate, because apolitical.

Giving does not represent for the religious an act of political economy but, on the contrary, an anti-economic act, because their reference points are the definitions of the Western political economy. (Of course it is anti-economic

in an exchange economy). But such a definition of economics is characteristic of an exacerbated Western ethnocentrism akin to racism: it is the political economy of exchange which is called political economy, and one subsequently considers that the economy of reciprocity in Third World societies must be its archaic form, otherwise we are not speaking of economics...

On the basis of that tautology, it is easy for the Churches to say that they do not practise economic or political compromise when they establish their power over the gift. However, the authority of missions over indigenous communities is one which is conferred by the Natives on the donors, and religious pacification, from the very beginnings of reductions by the Franciscans and the Jesuits in South America, right up to today's North-American missions, is founded on the gift.

Moreover, the Churches have expressed their acquired authority in terms of prestige so that the Natives themselves might recognize it: a testimony to this is the extraordinary splendour of religious ceremonies. It is true, however, that religious fiestas are places of complex cultural confrontation, because Native Indians utilize the images of the saints, of virgins and of gods, in order to preserve, behind these, their own traditions which correspond to their structures of reciprocity and not to Christian motivations. But it would be difficult for the Churches to uphold that they have knowingly used and still use the gift, and that they use the fiestas, dances and songs for the benefit of religious ends in the hope of substituting Western beliefs for the ethic of Native peoples.

In the old days, the missionaries depended on the administration or on the colonists to dispose of the material goods that they redistributed: steel axes, machetes, livestock, manufactured cloth, etc... Today, they distribute a part of Third World assistance (clinics, hospitals, schools, workshops, sawmills, cooperatives, news and printing services, etc.) but it is the same principle which allows them to usurp political and spiritual authority.

Here is an example of this taken from a personal recollection. One day, when I came upon an isolated place in the Amazon where a missionary lived in contact with a community led by a legitimate chief, the latter told me: "That priest came here 10 years ago, bringing a boat with him; later he brought a clinic; then a sawmill. If he wishes to stay here, the time has come when he must give something else: could you suggest to him that he bring corrugated iron for our roofs, because since our establishment here, the surrounding palm trees have all been cut down and we no longer have any more palms to renovate the roofs of our houses".

The missionary did not seem to be aware that his power came only from his gifts. The day he would have no services to offer, his power would vanish. The bishop of the region confirmed this: "We have been here for 400 years, and when we leave, we shall be able to say that there will be no trace that we have come here."

The reason seems to be that the authority gained by giving must be reproduced periodically by another gift. Otherwise, the prestige disappears. That is the difficulty with

those missions who think they can establish their authority over the gift. They also meet with another difficulty which explains why their power is always without foundation. In the system of reciprocity, legitimate authority belongs to the one who produces the gift and Native peoples know very well that it is not the priests who produce what is distributed. The authority that the Natives confer upon the missionaries ought in their minds to be returned to the producers of the gift. The Natives easily accept that missions be dependent on Western colonial administrations. They see nothing else in them but a transitory or delegated political power which is dependent upon a superior power, that of the whole Western society and hence of its economic system, the capitalistic system.

If the gift made by missionaries and priests depends on the system which materially produces it, this reveals their alliance with the capitalistic system of production and exploitation. Thus the political compromise of the churches, in spite of their protests that they are autonomous, is very clear and very precise.

The gift obliges the one who receives it to reproduce it, whenever possible, in order to regain his loss of dignity in accepting the other's gift. Otherwise, he must enfeoff himself and accept the donor's name, the Christian name for example. That is why missionaries were able to christianize the Natives and organize their production in the service of Western civilization. To give is always to dominate and to receive is to submit. That is the way missions and reductions have imposed their laws on Third World societies.

One cannot, unfortunately, identify Western religious concepts with those of Indigenous reciprocity. Western society, by reducing political economy to an exchange economy, reduces the notion of economic value to that of material wealth, and the other dimensions of value are cast out into a metaphysical universe which becomes the field of predilection of the unconscious and of religion.

This quasi-schizophrenic dichotomy between political economy and religion is at loggerheads with what missionaries and anthropologists call Native syncretism. But syncretism seems rather to be a coherent knitting of facts and of their expressions, a dialectical life, of one and the other, a praxis and also the integration of the other into the construction of human identity and oneness. In fact, Western Churches have little chance of imposing their ideologies and beliefs, unless they succeed, first, in destroying the indigenous systems of reciprocity.

To succeed somewhat, they must associate themselves for a good length of time with direct or indirect colonial repression, as the eras of Marcos in the Philippines, Duvalier in Haiti, Somoza in Nicaragua, Stroessner in Paraguay, etc, before becoming heirs to a situation where they can try to rebuild social foundations in keeping with their objectives, in short those of Western social foundations. Ethnocide is a preliminary for the churches, and economicide is their main weapon to realize it. This is the level of the deep, indestructible alliance of the churches with colonization, and beyond, with free exchange and the capitalistic system.

Let us summarize. To give is to

dominate, but the domination by the Missions is influenced by the capitalistic system's policy of colonization whose logic is to dominate in order to overtake.

The churches' policy is a wholly objective policy of alliance which one can qualify as being conservative.

As for those who do not wish to compromise with rightist politics, i.e. with the capitalistic system, there is one solution left: that of really entering into the indigenous revolutionary game, which is then denounced by the conservatives as being left-wing politics (liberation theology in Brazil or Peru). But that silent Church, that Church of the silent and of "the poor", is then faced with a much graver problem, which requires, on its part, an important conversion.

One must recall here that communities of reciprocity and societies of redistribution are based on structures of symmetrical reciprocity that generate ethical values, even when they alienate themselves in processes of unequal reciprocity or where their ethics are dominated by the glory of prestige. No matter how complex these structures of reciprocity become, they are always based on fundamental structures that insure the human dimension of the social being. Exchange is directly opposed to the creative dynamics of a superior communitarian being, because it expresses individual and private interests. In reciprocity, the definition of Man cannot be reduced to any one identity, either one's own or someone else's. It is rather that of the "great Other", of a being who is superior to oneself and to the other and who is the result of their interaction: an "inclusive third", i.e. exactly the opposite of the "exclusive third" charac-

teristic of the logic of exchange (which is also Western logic). This "inclusive third", in societies of reciprocity, is the very being of the community, who is obviously called mankind. Anyone who participates in such relationships of reciprocity can enjoy the title "we, the true human beings". Even if that name is specific to each community in virtue of the characteristics and material conditions of reciprocity, even if it becomes petrified in symbols that can become mutually antagonistic, it arises systematically wherever structures of reciprocity are recreated. That is why it can be defined as the name mankind, and not as being the name only of an ethnic community. Thus it can be called by a universal proper name: God for example.

But it is preferable to call the reality of that social being by the name Man, and keep the name God for its alienation in an absolute whose fetishization becomes the weapon of a particular power, that of the religious leaders and of the priests. This may be the reason why many of the latter feel ill-at-ease in their churches, when they are in contact with the Third World, and break away from their churches in order to see themselves as human beings in the midst of the struggling Third World grassroot communities. This breaking away seems to be the most important religious phenomenon of our times in Western societies. For it reveals a genuine spiritual life at the very heart of the West, one that has universal import. However, these religious figures find themselves confronted with peoples' liberation forces whose praxis is often Western in character, so that many do have to accept Marxist analysis and to practise the Marxist ideology. I say ideology, because it is pure ideology to try to

impose upon the Third World a way of liberation which is based on a critique or the Western system's alienation, when Third World societies do not belong to that system. That critique is only valid within the capitalistic system. Beyond that, it is no longer relevant and must be replaced by theories of reciprocity.

### III. COLLECTIVIZATION AND COMMUNITY

The main Marxist point of confusion that one can denounce here is that of collectivization as a system of communitarian production.

In its origins, Marxism is a critique of Western society's economic system, based on private rights and exchange. That critique denounces the privatization of the means of production which results in exploiting work and in reducing value to a measure of biological labour, and finally to a certain amount of "material" energy. Prior to being materialistic in its own right, Marxism denounces the materialism of exchange which leads to a reduction of the "whole man" to a productive unit of energy within a world devoid of ethical praxis and constrained to a dependence on ethereal, metaphysical religions and morality. However, once the critique is over, Marxism is forced to propose an alternative, starting from a "zero" situation. That is where communism goes wrong, for right from that zero point, it remains riveted to a notion of exchange; what it proposes is a generalized equal exchange, measured by the amount of labour produced. To do so, it requires the socialization of the means of production. Marxism always fosters the production of material goods. The basic proposal remains a materialistic one. Without a critique of the very notion

of exchange itself, the communist system remains materialistic, and in that sense, inhuman.

Here, one must understand clearly what this antagonism between exchange and reciprocity consists of. Exchange engenders an exclusively material value, while reciprocity engenders value which is enriched by other dimensions right up to the highest which is that of ethics. It is unfortunate that Marxism has not recognized that antagonism and that it has remained a prisoner of exchange and of a materialistic notion of value, as materialistic in fact as that of economic liberalism.

It is true that ethical value can become lost in the aberrations of prestige that are peculiar to each ethnic identity; one could speak of ethnicity, perhaps, as alienation from universal ethics, but never does it become as alienated as in exchange where it totally disappears.

That alienation of ethics which, within the limits of the ethnic imagination, can create mutual exclusions has led some critics to interpret these limits as a source of racism. On the other hand, the alienation of symmetrical reciprocity within unequal reciprocity, the alienation of the gift, has made it possible for some to interpret prestige value as a sign of despotism and hence as obstacles to revolution.

But one should not forget that in all systems of reciprocity, prestige value also expresses ethical value. That equivalence is all the more accurate in that reciprocity is more symmetrical. It is less accurate when reciprocity becomes unequal or takes on the character of a tribute, as it had become in the great redistribution

systems of ancient empires. But colonization disorganized those empires, revealing their foundations as being innumerable elementary structures of symmetrical reciprocity, free from inequality and tribute. These have become so many autonomous sources of value, closely linked to a feeling of justice. This is what makes justice the economic mainspring behind redistribution and reciprocity. One can say that justice has its own strength as the dynamic force behind the economy, if it is a need of man which is even more important than subsistence needs. This feeling, which is a direct expression of parity within structures of reciprocity, is especially in opposition to the rights which leaders, enfeoffed to the foreigner, claim for themselves.

Thus it is that an alliance is possible with Marxist organizations on the theme of social justice, even if the claims of each party stem from completely opposite motivations: for some wish to improve the terms of exchange, while others try to lessen its importance in order to reestablish reciprocity. But it is empirically possible to establish an alliance on the "basis" of a "just price". Some see the just price as being the remuneration for their labour force, while others understand it to mean the respect of their equivalences of reciprocity. Ethics and materialism, in this instance, appear as a pair of forces moving in the same direction against a common enemy, but who, once in power, will reveal that they are contradictory.

One can also observe, that, just as exchange value seems to facilitate the circulation of goods when it is represented by money in the free exchange system, so prestige value

seems to motivate redistribution and reciprocity in reciprocity systems when it, in turn, is materialized in a monetary form. Prestige value, in a reciprocity system, therefore engenders production itself, as well as competition in production, overproduction and hence abundance of consumption. This is a fact that one could verify in Third World empires before they were pillaged by the colonists.

But it is clear that collectivization goes counter to such dynamics of production. For it suppresses the individualization of prestige, personal prestige and responsibility, and hence blocks any form of competition for greater or better production. The annulment of prestige has the immediate effect of discouraging creative work or the production of surpluses. The individual's only motivation to produce is biological autonomous consumption. Collectivization therefore constitutes a dynamic of underdevelopment in reciprocity communities. Its failure is, in any event, evident in peasant societies of the Soviet Union, of the R.D.A. in Poland, of Czechoslovakia, of Vietnam, of Nicaragua and of China, at least before the latter resurrected the family and communitarian endeavour.

In those countries, the mainspring of collectivist production is primarily need, the lack of consumer goods, and biological self-subsistence. The confusion between community and collectivity is, finally, as grave as that between charity and gift. For it provokes the cessation of economic growth and evolution.

One can therefore say that as Third

World communities move from Western privatization to collectivization, they are going from Charybdis to Scylla.

Marxist inspired aid to the Third World is not, therefore, of much greater value than capitalistic inspired aid to the Third World. One uses the gift as a Trojan horse in order to destroy the Third World's economic system; the other refuses to acknowledge the gift and reciprocity as being the basis of an economic system which is different from generalized exchange. Neither one recognizes the gift and reciprocity as foundations of the community and as principles of a post-capitalistic (and post-marxist) form of development.

They are objectively allied on one principle: both want to destroy the borders of Third World communities, in order to impose their own law: for some, the law of unequal exchange, for others, the law of equal but collectivized exchange. However, both are demonstrating that they are faithful subjects of the logic of exchange, while it is reciprocity which is the basis of community.

Economicide consists, therefore, in destroying the communities' economic basis of reciprocity, either to impose privatization or to impose collectivization. This economicide is today the most secret but possibly the most efficient, in any case the best conceded weapon of the West against the Third World.

#### *Notes and References*

- 1) This preposterous thesis is put forward particularly by Pierre Clastres in his preface to Marshall Sahlin's book "*Age de Pierre, âge d'abondance*", Gallimard, N.R.F., 1976.
- 2) The Trojan horse was also an offering, a gift.

\*

An Institute for Intercultural Education, Research and Training:

the **MONCHANIN CROSS-CULTURAL CENTRE (1963-1988)**

*Listening to cultures for 25 years*

Founded out of an awakening to the new needs of Quebec, which was confronted by increasing cultural pluralism, the M.C.C.C. has been forging original and clear-cut methods of intercultural research and practice. Some facts and figures:

- \* More than 45,000 people have already visited the Centre and used its library;
- \* The Centre has given 500 information sessions on the cultural communities of Quebec;
- \* It has done 200 radio and T.V. programs in Quebec, Canada, Europe, Japan, and the West Indies;
- \* It has organized 25 total immersion seminars and 70 introductory workshops involving 20 different cultures;
- \* It has given over 5,000 interviews and consultations to private, governmental and international agencies like UNESCO and SIETAR;
- \* Some 30 Quebec cultural associations were formed at the Centre or were founded with the Centre's support;
- \* Some 60 training sessions have been organized by the M.C.C.C. to train professionals in intercultural relations: teachers, social workers, psychologists, immigration officers, doctors and nurses, intercultural leaders and animators in Quebec, Canada, Europe and in Brazil;
- \* The Centre has organized 20 symposia on intercultural research, one of which, held in Namur, Belgium, was international in scope;
- \* It publishes two periodicals, both in English and French: *INTERCULTURE*, dealing with such topics as: international cooperation and development, law, medicine, economy, inter-religious dialogue, peace and cultural disarmament, Vietnam, Native Peoples, India, Brazil, North Africa; and *INTERCULTURAL HORIZONS*, which features reports on ethnocultural communities;
- \* The Centre played an active role in producing 10 videos, 3 films and 15 forms of educational resource material, including 10 books and teaching aids for Quebec and Ontario schools.

... for the harmonious co-living of cultures

Monchanin Cross-Cultural Centre, 4917 St.Urbain St., Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H2T 1L7.

## EDITORS

Jacques LANGLAIS and ROBERT VACHON

## ADVISORY BOARD

ĐỒ QUÝ TOẢN, Merrill H. JACKSON,  
Raimundo PANIKKAR, John W. SPELLMAN,  
Mary STARK

## ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR

Viivi JOEMETS

## PRINTER

A. Roy, imprimerie, enr.

## CIRCULATION MANAGER

Evelyn Lindhorst

## SUBSCRIPTIONS (4 issues per year) - as of 1988

Canada: Individuals: 1 yr. \$12 Cdn.	Foreign: Individuals: 1 yr. \$12 U.S.
Institutions: 1 yr. \$18 Cdn.	Institutions: 1 yr. \$18 U.S.
3 yrs. \$50 Cdn.	3 yrs. \$50 U.S.

SEPARATE ISSUES: Canada: \$4 Cdn. Foreign: \$4 U.S. (postage included)

CUMULATIVE INDEX (1968-78): Canada: \$10 Cdn. Foreign: \$10 U.S.

CHEQUES payable to the Monchanin Cross-Cultural Center, 4917 St.Urbain St.  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada, H2T 2W1.

---

 THE MONCHANIN CROSS-CULTURAL CENTER / LE CENTRE INTERCULTUREL MONCHANIN

is a center for education and research on cultures of the world and on intercultural relations. Founded in 1963 and incorporated (Quebec) in 1968.

## SERVICES

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| o Resource persons | o Consultations                             |
| o Library          | o Counseling                                |
| o Publications     | o Cross-cultural training for professionals |

## ACTIVITIES

- |                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| o Total immersion seminars | o Intercultural debates and discussions |
| o Symposia                 | o Colloquia                             |
| o Research                 | o Sensitization workshops               |