Conference `Knowledge on the move: research for development in a globalising world'

The Production of Knowledge on Peace, Security and Governance in Sri Lanka

Professor Nira Wickramasinghe
University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

Introduction

When speaking about knowledge and knowledge transfers, it is important to locate one's self in this global flux. On a personal plane I am in between two worlds: I grew up and spent my formative years in the North but chose to live my adult life in the South and work in a state university. I am by training a historian of modern Sri Lanka. This particular social space forms my archive and is my privileged site of analysis although I have tried to move towards a more Southern or even global perspective whenever possible. My thematic focus has been on the construction of identities in a variety of settings taking examples from material culture and social history. My other hat is one of a social scientist who has critically engaged with the frames given to us by modernity to create knowledge today. Needless to say all the concepts I use whether, power, hegemony or justice in order to reflect upon citizenship, state, civil society, human rights, security or governance bear the burden of European thought and history. It is with these 'handicaps' as it were, that I am going to offer you some of my thoughts on knowledge production in the field of peace, security and governance in Sri Lanka.

The first part of the paper will look at asymmetries in knowledge between North and South taking the fields of peace, security and governance as entry points; the second will consider the decline of knowledge production in the humanities and social sciences in Sri Lanka before questioning the resurgence of a drained term 'local knowledge' in development discourse.

I. 1. Knowledge, power asymmetries between North-South

If this is a 'world of flows' as Arjun Appadurai suggests[1], knowledge flows between individuals, institutions and states are of an uneven and often unequal nature. In the 21st century we are still witnessing power imbalances. Not only does the North dominate in terms of knowledge construction, production and dissemination, accepted theories and methods are invariably modern/western while the rest of the world is a large reservoir of cases, events, archives and experimental sites for revision of existing theories forged in the West. The relationship between epistemological exclusion and social exclusion has been discussed at length by postcolonial scholars from Edward Said and Ashis Nandy to Partha Chatterjee, but their scholarly interventions have led to only a few practical results. If we accept that 'knowledge' here relates to the constructs, assumptions, and beliefs by which people understand and interpret the world around them, the global knowledge architecture continues to function as an instrument that justifies and sustains hierarchical relations between individuals, institutions and states as well as spaces within states.

Knowledge domination was embedded in ideas of the 'civilising mission', the 'white man's burden' and the 'trusteeship of advanced nations' (Versailles Treaty) that

spread with the acceptance of religious and racial doctrines in the nineteenth century. Today the South is confronted with another type of onslaught, one which is difficult to resist as it has entered the policies of governments in the South who endorse the process willingly or not. It is an entire view of history that tells the people of the South of the inevitability of a certain type of globalization and the futility of any attempts to resist it[2]. This entails a refusal of plurality of world views. Ashis Nandy explains this paradox: "Enlightenment vision and secular ideologies allow one to pluralize the domains of spirituality and religion' but that a 'plurality of knowledge, particularly that of science, is seen as dangerous, subversive and a challenge to the intellectual and moral values of the most deeply entrenched elites of our times'[3]. There is indeed a fear of plurality of thought in the North that has spread to decision makers in the South, a fear that explains the unquestioning endorsement by many of the aims and practices of globalization. This leads to a lack of openness to other forms of thought in everyday life as well as in the academia.

2. *Impact of power asymmetries in the field of Peace, security and governance: conflict transformation as hegemonic discourse*

Has there been a visible impact of these power asymmetries in the research areas of peace, security and governance? I hope to show that research in the South? has not been on a par with the research on similar topics in the North and offer some reasons for this situation, drawing mainly from Sri Lanka.

Before we look at the producers of knowledge and the nature of the knowledge produced it is important to underline what is meant by research in the North. Research as

defined by Appadurai, can be termed the 'systematic pursuit of the not-yet-known'. It is a practice that has transformed intellectual life in the North. Research is governed by a clear research ethic and the new knowledge has to meet certain criteria that is decided upon by a community of assessment, usually pre-existent and specialized. It is this community that checks if the producer has complied with the protocols of pedigree. There is a close link between new knowledge, systemacity and an organized professional community of criticism[4]. Our assessment of research produced in Sri Lanka will first be based on these criteria and protocols, prevalent in the North.

Knowledge producers

In Sri Lanka knowledge in the field of peace, security and governance is produced in the state universities, government and autonomous research centers (known as NGOs or INGOs). Among the government agencies, the Central Bank of Sri Lanka conducts economic research that may relate to issues of governance for the guidance of the Monetary Board and for the information of the Public.[5]   University social science departments and centres also produce research work in the field of peace, security and governance but like most university departments in Sri Lanka focus on undergraduate teaching. Research is undertaken by individual lecturers in a personal capacity. A few exceptions are the Centre for Policy Research and Analysis [CEPRA] which is a semi-autonomous multi-disciplinary policy oriented research unit of the University of Colombo affiliated to the Faculty of Law, established in 1993 and focussing on the fields of constitutional and Legislative Reforms, Conflict Management and Resolution, Human Rights, Ethics, HIV/AIDS and Law Reforms**.** The Social Policy and Research Centre

(SPARC) of the Faculty of Arts aims to build up expertise through applied research and teaching programmes on poverty and social policy issues in Sri Lanka. A recent initiative is the Conflict, Power and Democracy Project (CPD) initiated by the Department of Political Science, University of Colombo and Oslo University which combines an ambitious MA, Ph.D and research programme that I am closely involved in.

There are also autonomous research institutes, funded by government and non-government sources such as the Institute of Policy Studies created by an Act of parliament in 1988. In the early years the Institute's programme focused on macro-economic policy issues. More recently the research portfolio has been extended to other areas i.e. social and economic infrastructure, health policy, gender, poverty alleviation, energy policy and government reforms.

Among the non-governmental centers producing knowledge in the fields of peace, security and governance are the Center for Society and Religion, the Center for Women's research, the International Centre for Ethnic Studies,Colombo and Kandy , the Marga Institute, the Regional Centre for Strategic Studies, the Social Scientists' Association and the Women's Education and Research Centre, (WERC).

A very rough estimate based on the survey I undertook for the SSRC review of social science capacity in Sri Lanka would be between 250 and 500 social scientists, with 292 social scientists in university departments and 72 in autonomous research centres[6]. The numbers show that capacity for producing texts exist and begs the question as to why the production of works with a plausible shelf life is so meager. An analysis of the specific issues covered by these researchers is helpful and casts a different light on a seemingly productive sector..

Favoured themes

For Sri Lanka, one overarching theme is the huge expansion of social science research since the mid 1980s that is related to ethnic conflict. A significant part of this research comes under the theme of "strengthening of democracy". In the last twenty years the focus of social science research has been on finding the roots of the ethnic conflict, studying its various manifestations and trying to find solutions. New research areas – devolution, comparative federalism , minority rights, women and development, security – and even new disciplines – conflict studies, ethnic studies have emerged as a response to these queries[7]. The result has been a division among social scientists who are concerned with the present and use theoretical and conceptual frameworks emanating from the West to think about their own world and those social scientists who are unaware of or willingly distance themselves from these trends.

One of the most intellectually sterile themes that has now conquered the field of social sciences in Sri Lanka is the ubiquitous 'conflict resolution' rhetoric. The growth of this field is linked to the need for organizations and institutions that can contribute to the range of activities that have come to be known as 'peace building' among foreign states, international organizations seeking to encourage political stability and integration into the global economic system. There has been in the last decade an increase in the sponsorship and encouragement of international donors to foster particular models of political transformation and conflict resolution. As a result many political activists took up practices of 'peace-building' as a technical and apolitical answer to the conflict. More damaging has been the entry of this concept into research productions. The knowledge

production in Sri Lanka influenced by these frames of analysis has been imitative and unimaginative to say the least[8]. The increasing hegemomic discourse of conflict transformation has been an 'obstacle to any innovative thinking into the power structures and ideological formations that sustain Sri Lankan conflicts'.[9]

The growth of women's studies was strengthened by the trends described above but predate the civil war. Interest in feminism existed in the 1970s but it was the pouring in of aid and the conceptual link up with 'ethnicity' that consolidated its position with the emergence of at least five institutions that carried out serious research in this area. In the field of gender the production has been much closer to the Northern idea of quality research than in the field of conflict studies, possibly because in the field of gender, scholars – mainly women - had better negotiating skills with donors than scholars in the area of conflict and peace and also probably that funders in the area of gender were concerned with erasing unequal relations of power.

The argument then is not that funders are responsible for the dearth of creative social science in the country. In my view the responsibility is mainly with local intellectuals who have chosen the path of easy funds through mimicry rather than original research.

The absence of theoretical works

The question that must be asked is why there has been no theory of ethnicity or conflict emanating from Sri Lankan thinkers, no seminal work that is cited everywhere, and that would constitute a reference point for global research. Sri Lanka has remained a laboratory where other theories are tested, restated or disproved. The fact that Europe as a

subject of all histories is dominant is a reflection of a theoretical condition that goes deep in to the way in which social science knowledge is produced in the South. Since the beginning of western thought philosophers and thinkers who have determined the nature of social sciences have produced theories that embrace humanity. From Plato to Locke from Marx to Rawls these formulations were produced in relative ignorance of the majority of humanity that is of those who live outside the western cultural sphere. The paradox is that although we in the Third World are ignored by these theories we find them pertinent to understand our own societies. Gyan Prakash a prominent post orientalist scholar has asked the following questions: What is it then that permits European thinkers to develop such clairvoyance towards societies they ignore at an empirical level and why are we in the Third World not able to do the same thing?[10]

Prakash gives us an element of an answer when he points out that philosophers have attempted to answer this question by reading in European philosophy an incarnation of universal reason. Edmund Husserl for instance argued that the main difference between oriental philosophies and Greek-European science lies in the capacity of the latter to produce absolute theoretical arguments while oriental philosophies have a practical-universal or a mythico-religious character[11]. This type of argument seems dangerously similar to one that sees the East as being today in a stage of development that Europe graduated from in the 18th century, that is an argument involving a retarded East trying to catch up with the advanced west. The question for the social scientist today relates to the conditions under which history and the social sciences which have been indigenous to the West can be universal for the Rest? How do we resolve this dilemma between indigeneity and universality?

There are ideally two possible options for historians or social scientists writing from the South who are conscious of the asymmetry of ignorance between the South and North. The first is to attempt to develop an indigenous way of writing history and devise appropriate analytical tools to appraise society that do not emerge from the North. How can we reject reason and its values as part of the modernizing narrative of the state without for example referring to Foucault's work? Some scholars such as Ashis Nandy or Imtiaz Ahmed have succeeded to a certain extent but for many this has been a hazardous route that has led to parochialism and isolation from the invisible university. Apart from the danger of parochialism this position is inevitably compromised since a purely indigenous social science is simply not possible today. Indeed the historian speaks from a position in time and space, he cannot possibly erase or abstract parts of his mental heritage - years of schooling and life experiences as a modern person living in a nation-state.

The second position is to acknowledge the close complicity between 'history' and modernising narratives of citizenship, of the public and private spheres and of the nation-state and realise that inside the discourse of history produced in the institutional site of the university disapproval of such narratives is impossible if not dishonest. The reason is the universal acceptance of the nation-state as the form of community that is the most desirable and the consequent imposition of a western conception of history as a discipline in nation-states across the world. The historian of the South is therefore condemned to know Europe as the cradle of the modern and locate his own writings in relation to this situation. Prakash suggests that the answer may be the project of 'provincialising Europe'. This would not mean to reject purely and simply modernity, its liberal values,

universals, science and reason and its globalising explanation. It is not cultural relativism as an alternative that is proposed. Instead it would be to document the historical process that permitted the reason of Europe to become evident beyond the land where it was born. It is studying the modern as a contested site, to replace the given narratives of citizenship with others that demonstrate their own complicity with the repressive practices of assimilation of all other possibilities of human solidarity with the projects of the modern state. As the totality of the academic world is not independent from the totality of what the modern European has created within the university and other knowledge system this seems to be the most 'reasonable' position for the historian of the South. .

The works produced in the field of peace, security and governance in Sri Lanka are of three sorts: there are a few works that would qualify as academic writings: one of the reasons for the paucity of scholarly work of this nature is the absence of any university press or academic publisher based in Sri Lanka. This is one area which a funder could support but until now there has been no interest in creating this type of expertise and institution. The second category are a few books published in academic presses outside Sri Lanka, essentially in India and the third and by far the largest is the plethora of reports and surveys. Clearly it is the research in the first two categories that has a shelf-life. The production of the third kind serves a very ephemeral purpose and reports are immediately sent to the dustbins of history - sometimes not only rhetorically speaking!

3. Asymetrical relations

Asymmetrical relations are played out in Sri Lanka in the fields of peace, security and governance which are presently areas that funders are especially eager to address and support for altruistic reasons – helping states govern better – and for reasons based on necessity – it is well known that countries encourage funding of projects that could help stem a potential flow of refugees into the North especially fortress Europe. At various times numerous explanatory frames have been suggested by funders and adopted by recipient researchers: frames are never imposed but funding bodies have preferred thematics into which projects have to fit if they are to be competitive. It is in global knowledge centers that the dominant and acceptable conceptions of peace, security and governance are forged. In this frame there is no place for a social science theoretical knowledge for the South either based on southern concepts or grown out of universal concepts. Studies on peace, security and governance are expected to apply existing theories rather than create new ones that would be applicable universally.

Furthermore, certain themes are left out: there is a need for research from the South on areas such as the impact of globalization on health, education, trade in order to create expertise not only for research but also to negotiate on an equal terrain at discussions on WTO or GATS. Southern governments and centers funded by the North are unfortunately engaged in what would appear to be pure mimicry of Northern works and positions that rarely contest the neo-liberal social science approach that prevails.

II From Knowledge consumers to knowledge producers: the question of useless and local knowledge

What constitutes knowledge is laced with complexities and nuances. In the development world 'useless knowledge' is generally viewed as the type of knowledge generated in humanities departments of universities that has little connection with the needs of the modern world and often obey indigenous canons of authentification. The market and its devotees are promoting a complete change in the university curriculum where some types of knowledge – the study of ancient languages, sinhala, history, literature etc- would be devalued and replaced by subjects such as information technology as well as subjects derivative of the traditional 'political science' such as governance, security or peace studies. In Sri Lanka as in many other locations, liberal and humanistic education, the core of higher learning, is increasingly threatened by the constricting pressures of the marketplace. In the race for riches - symbolized by endless rhetoric about the need for Sri Lanka to become globally competitive, technologically advanced, and proficient at churning out "knowledge workers" - our universities are being forced by government policy to narrow their educational vistas. The decision-making autonomy that universities must have to provide cultural, intellectual, community-service, and training functions is being eroded.

Redesigning the university to fit the imperatives of a globalised economy would kill the little spirit that continues to exist in spite of the brain-drain of qualified staff, the despair of poverty stricken students and the lack of library and teaching facilities in a country where the needs of war are far greater than the needs for knowledge. It is not as though there were no institutions other than the university that can play this role by

providing graduates or school leavers with very focused and intensive courses on, for instance, 'the tourist industry' or 'project writing' etc.. Furthermore the worldwide trend is not towards a sacrificing of humanistic teaching. In most countries that encourage transnational institutions to advocate a streamlining and a rationalizing of universities in the South, their own age-old institutions are preserved   as relics and repositories of an elitist type of teaching and learning experience. The University of Cambridge Mission and Core Values remains in this spirit:

```
'The mission of the University of Cambridge is to contribute to society
through the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest
international levels of excellence'[12].
```

The University's core values are stated as follows: freedom of thought and expression and freedom from discrimination. Nowhere is there mentioned any commitment to servicing the needs of the economy. In another example from Britain, every year hundreds of young people compete to gain admission to an undergraduate course in medieval history at the University of Bristol. Among the privileged twenty who were selected a few years ago was the former British Prime-Minister's son. These courses remain sought after, not for their direct preparation to enter the job market but for the training they provide for the mind. The development of cognitive skills such as deductive and inductive logic, problem solving, and analogical and synthetic thinking are essential both to disciplinary learning and to moral discernment.Among scholars and policy makers ideas differ about the purpose of research and knowledge creation in the social sciences. In Sri Lanka most 'useless' knowledge , that is knowledge that has no immediate and obvious policy implication is created by university based scholars. While traditionalists would conceive that creating new knowledge is a total experience that

provides the researcher with a sense of accomplishment and his/her discipline with new vibrancy, the present trend – at least in the decision making arenas of this country – is to consider the purely functional purpose of the research i.e contribution to building and developing the state. The debate between 'humanists' and instrumentalists cannot be easily resolved. Mission statements of universities as well as autonomous research centers tend to embrace both points of view: universities are said to be founded on the understanding that 'meaning in academic studies cannot be separated from the meaning of life as a whole and that academic vitality stems from the total human experience. Together with this traditional aspiration is another underlying idea that the purpose of research is to foster an understanding of the needs of the market or the community and to help meet them. This aspect is most apparent in the newer universities of the country. The recently created South Eastern university has the following vision:

```
'To emerge as a center of excellence for dissemination of knowledge
through teaching, learning and research of highest quality, relevant
and most appropriate to the needs of the individual, the region, the
nation and the global community"[13].
```

This issue has been debated in international circles too. A recent report by the Task Force on Higher Education in Developing Countries (TFR) jointly convened by the World Bank and UNESCO broke new ground in its pitch to governments and donors to reconsider the advantages of investments in higher education, not in relation to the market alone but to the public interest. ' The best higher education institution is a model and a source of pressure for creating a modern civil society' [14]. There is a relationship between values imbibed in the experience of higher education and its effects on society. Higher education is indeed the domain where liberal democratic values flourish: the

stress on intellect and merit over wealth and connections, critical openness to new ideas and possibilities, peer review and reasoned debates to evaluate the relative strengths of competing ideas. Universities are institutions deliberately designed for thinking.

This report contrasts with the rationales for a renewed emphasis on higher education in developing countries offered by the World Bank's World Development Report (1998/1999), Knowledge for Development[15]. Although both reports recommend strengthening higher education they differ considerably in the meaning they give to university education. The first report that advocates that to be a player in global markets, scientific and technological training is what counts is narrow in its scope. Countries that lag behind must acquire the know-how but will remain consumers of knowledge rather than producers. The second report is quite different and has a more sophisticated understanding of the place of knowledge in modern society. The best universities provide sites for debates about social values, demonstrate pluralism and tolerance and act as repositories for shared social memories. In order for these values to become widespread the report makes a strong pitch for broadening access to higher education, especially encouraging women and the historically deprived.

Thus the importance of a liberal and general education has been given a new lease of life in international higher education debates. But few countries in the South are able to follow these principles. The reasons are twofold: first, in Sri Lanka liberal arts graduates have for decades joined the pool of unemployed, unskilled young people. There is therefore no case for producing more of them; second, neo-liberal policies advocating fiscal restructuring are affecting the university system and its priorities: information technology and 'English as a work tool' are stressed as the prime targets of higher

education in the future. Those who resist have often couched their arguments in terms of an elusive 'local knowledge' which has to be protected and nurtured. Decolonising knowledge and releasing systems of knowledge and people practicing them from the hegemony of a global structure was soon coopted by the development policy makers in the guise of 'participatory development'.

Local knowledge

For a long time development and tradition were at loggerheads. Modernisation theories dominated and broadly abided by Marx's famous assertion that 'The tradition of all the previous generations weighs like a nightmare in the brain of the living'. The purpose is not here to cast judgment on what constitutes the better life, traditional or modern but to understand how the reconfiguration of 'local knowledge' from the 1990s onwards is creating inequalities of a different sort.

The dream of fostering local or indigenous knowledge as a counter to an unequal knowledge system is not new nor is it the property of people living in the South. Participatory development became the new buzz word of development theory in the 1990s. Describing this ideal, R.L. Stirrat speaks of a new orthodoxy in the development industry characterized by an approach emphasizing indigenous knowledge and bottom up planning. The cultural diversity of societies and the pernicious effects of modernization were emphatically acknowledged in participatory development. One of the important features of participation as an ideology, apart from its stress on empowerment, on the marginal, on local knowledge and a bottom up approach was its distrust of the state. The state indeed fails to empower the people by constantly advocating and practicing a top down approach

to development. Participatory development privileged non-governmental organizations or private voluntary organizations, as they are considered more efficient than state bodies and already embodying the virtues of participation [16].

Stirrat argues that participatory approaches to development far from making a radical shift away from a search for an ethnocentric concept of modernity, are intimately part of the process of modernization. Participatory approaches are means through which people are trained and equipped to become part of the modern world. The difference between this approach and the top down approach is that instead of forcing the people to modernize, they are encouraged to participate in their own 'embroilment in that world'. One of the important features of this approach is the manner in which the donor agency divests responsibility from the agency of development to the participating people. The outcome of the projects is hence not in the hands of the development workers[17]. But the script is however suggested and consent from the participants obtained before starting work together.

This does not in any way contribute to rectifying power imbalances. Alan Keenan argues that the knowledge produced by NGOs aims at incorporating them into the larger apparatus of global governmentality. Most of the projects that NGOs carry out seek to train or to produce knowledge about non-elite populations (refugees, farmers, child soldiers) so that their needs or actual or potential crises can be better managed by others (state, NGOS or other international organizations[18].

Within this ideological system, the main role of local knowledge is to tell decision-makers what it is in the local situation that needs to be 'corrected' in order to allow the world of optimally functioning markets to operate. Local knowledge cannot be

the source of original solutions, since the general answers are universally prescribed. Furthermore, 'international' (Northern) knowledge centres are regarded as inherently superior in carrying out the path-breaking research leading to intellectual innovation.

So what are the options? Arjun Appadurai has suggested two different ways to build a genuinely democratic community of researchers:

Weak institutionalization entails taking elements that constitute the hidden armature of the Northern research ethic as given and unquestionable and look around for people who would join. Strong institutionalization would mean imagining and inviting a conversation about research, other perceptions of what counts as new knowledge and what communities of judgment and accountability they might deem to be central in the pursuit of knowledge. This would create communities and conventions of research where there would be no prior adherence to a specific research ethic[19]. While the second option is seemingly the most democratic, it fails to deal with the issue of power relations between North and South. To use Clifford Geertz' image the North-South conversation is bound to be an elephant and rabbit stew where the elephant would not have to worry as to its savor coming through.

.

Conclusion

Is the future role of southern knowledge centers to appropriate, generate and analyse local knowledge and to make it accessible in the widest possible form to social agents or else to create universal tools that will permit them to formulate and analyse policy options for development; to evaluate the results of previous policies; and generate new approaches. The fight for local knowledge seems to be part of yesterday's battle cry

and I would argue in favour of the second option. In the past, Indian mathematicians such as Aryabhata, Varahamihira and Brahmagupta discovered concepts that today have universal acceptance: from the decimal system to the rotating earth or gravitational attraction. Their ideas were picked up by Arab scholars such as Alberuni before being adopted world wide[20]. Can new knowledge move again today from South to North? If Southern institutions are to determine their own agendas independently of external influences and to be responsive to the local needs they must acquire and master not local knowledge but global knowledge. This can only happen if South-South and South North knowledge networks are created and a South driven and North supported system is imagined.

More democratic research practices will emerge once voices from the research communities in the South question the Northern monopoly of power to validate knowledge and decide on the excellence of research. For this the research capacity of southern countries has to be enhanced: there are many ways of doing so: through international collaborations between centers of excellence; through support to university departments in the South with a view to rekindling a research culture, through scholarship schemes for capacity building of young researchers and through the setting up of research councils that would support serious research projects in the South. There are many excellent initiatives that have begun – for instance the Oslo University-Colombo University Gadjan Mada University project on conflict, democracy and governance- that can be hopefully emulated in a near future.

1   Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large*; cultural dimensions of globalization, Minnepolis, University of Minnesota Press.

2   Norman Girvan, *Power Imbalances and development knowledge*, unpublished paper prepared for the North-South Institute Project, Ottawa, 2007

3   Talking India: Ashis Nandy in conversation with Ramin Jahangegloo, Delhi OUP, 2006, 149 pp

4   ed. Arjun Appadurai, *Globalisation, Duke University Press, Durham and London 2001, pp. 9-14*

5   Other institutes include: the People's Bank Economic Research unit, the National Integration Programme Unit established in 1997 as an independent unit in the Ministry of Justice, Constitutional Affairs, Ethnic Affairs and National Integration, the National Science Foundation which has one working committee devoted to the social sciences.

6   *Much of this data was collected for the Sri Lanka component of the South Asian report that the SSRC commissioned me to write. Eventually this led to a single report:* Partha Chatterjee in collaboration with Nirmala Banerjee, Nira Wickramasinghe et all, *Social   Science Research Capacity in South Asia. A Report,* Vol. 6, SSRC New York, 2002.

7   See for instance Pradeep Jeganathan, 'Violence as an Analytical Problem: Sri Lankanist Anthropology after July 83', *Nethra*, Jul-Sept 1998., Vol 2, No 4, pp.7-47; and Jayadeva Uyangoda, 'Academic Texts on the Sri Lankan Ethnic Question as Biographies of a Decaying Nation State', *Nethra*, Apr.June 1997, Vol. 1 No 3, pp.7-23.

8   See for instance the reports of the Center for Policy Alternatives and the books produced of the Berghof Foundation for Conflict Studies, Colombo

9   Alan Keenan, 'The trouble with evenhandedness. On the politics of human rights and peace advocacy in Sri Lanka, (pp88-117) in ed. *Non Governmental Politics*, Zone Books, 2007, p. 90

10   Gyan Prakash, 'Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography', Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 32, No 2, April 1990, pp. 383-408.

11   Ibid,

12   www.cam.ac.uk (University of Cambridge website)

13   *South Eastern University Handbook*, 2003, p.I

14   see Itty Abraham, 'International Trends', *Seminar* 494, June 2001.

15   World Bank Development Report 1998/1999 cited in *Seminar* 494

16   R.L. Stirrat , "The New Orthodoxy and Old Truths: Participation, Empowerment and Other Buzz Words" in Sunil and Nicola Bastian (eds), *Assessing Participation. A Debate from South Asia,* pp. 67-92.

17   R.L Stirrat and H. Henkel, Participation as Spiritual Duty: the Religious   Roots   of   the   New Development Orthodoxy", paper presented in Edinburgh, October 1996 at the 'Boundaries and Identities Conference'; "The Development Gift" op. cit.

18   Keenan, p. 110

19   Appadurai, 2001, p. 16

20   Amartya Sen, *The Argumentative Indian. Writings on Indian History, Culture and Identity*, Penguin London, 2005, pp 147-148.