

dence, or false evidence.

Like our ecophilosopher, Lyotard found that the *différend* with his friend and comrade Souyri over the ability of Marxism to provide a revolutionary critique of the contemporary world and orient intervention in that world forced him into a "sentence universe" (every sentence presents the four poles of sender, addressee, referent and meaning) in which he could only give up his position: "[Marxism] thus presented itself not as one party in a suit, but as the judge, as the science in possession of objectivity, thereby placing the other in the position of stupor or stupidity in which I found myself... a point of view... incapable of making itself understood, unless it borrowed the dominant idiom — that is, unless it betrayed itself." Still, this *différend* revealed to Lyotard "what in Marxism cannot be objected to": there is one of several incommensurable discourses which seeks to transcribe all the others. That discourse is "capital, bureaucracy" and it is not enough to philosophize about it because "one must also destroy it." But even this admission does not make the *différend* demonstrable. However, it is out of such cruel silence that new idioms emerge, those which enable *différends* to be expressed. It is the task of philosophy and politics to find such idioms.

The main lines of argument in *Le Différend* yield easily to Bennington's introductory "summary and critique," showing themselves as aspects of a "philosophy of sentences," although even such close attention to them in no way reaches the depths of Lyotard's text, running and roaming as it does through the history of philosophy from little known Greek rhetors to modern revisionist historians. Bennington compensates by producing abundant quotations and "quotations" between quotations (from Lyotard and others) marked by a stationary bar of difference. What is more, two "patchworks" consisting of several pages of quotations (primarily from Lyotard) link the book's chapters like textual cartilage perforated by libidinal runs to nowhere in particular.

Le Différend begins with an "ironic summary," as Bennington puts it, entitled "Fiche de Lecture" which, Lyotard muses, "allow[s] the reader to 'talk about the book', if the fantasy so takes him, without having read it." Bennington offers his book as an act of resistance against "its commercial *raison d'être*" as a sort of "Modern Masters" introduction-summary which gains one time in examination rooms and at cocktail parties by enabling one to speak, as Lyotard put it, without having read the books under discussion. Even this review, twice removed from Lyotard's "real books," might gain one some time in a chat about Bennington's book, in which case it stands as a degenerate source of knowledge about Lyotard.

The very fact of Bennington's book, however, despite his assurances, aggravates the question of the relation between the introducer and the introduced. And that discomfort is entirely appropriate.

Gary A. Genosko is an associate member of *Border/Lines*



Ciencia propia y colonialismo intelectual. Nuevos Rumbos.

by Orlando Fals Borda

Bogota, Colombia: Carlos Valencia, editores, 1988.

Science and Intellectual Colonialism. New Directions, is the most recent edition of a volume published for the first time in 1970, and again in 1973, both times with several printings. The book is a collection of essays written by Orlando Fals Borda, a Colombian historical sociologist who has had an intense, long-term involvement with *campesinos* in rural areas of his own country, and whose work is known internationally.

In this volume, the author presents reflections on his earlier work, as well as his current views on sociological issues that, although pertaining primarily to social research in Latin America, also constitute a challenge for social scientists elsewhere. When the book first appeared, it was received as a radical rejection of Euro-American social thought by the Latin American community of scholars. In this light, it is interesting to note that the work has not been translated into other languages, nor (to the best of my knowledge) has it been published elsewhere. The title translation is my own, and might perhaps be more faithful to the original if it read "independent" or "autonomous" science and intellectual colonialism.

Fals Borda's prestige has grown throughout Latin America for his original contribution to a new perspective in sociology, which can be paralleled to that of Anthony Giddens (*New Rules of Sociological Method*), while arising in very different sociopolitical contexts, an important fact indeed. Fals Borda's thought was born in the midst of various developmentalist

schools that have dominated Latin American sociological inquiry. This fact underscores his importance as theorist and practitioner on the continent, and has recently earned him further recognition in the position of President of the Latin American Council for Adult Education (CEAAL). While some researchers might claim that Fals Borda is on the "Border/lines" of social science, others obviously recognize his place in the leadership of an alternative sociology of/for Latin America. This is one of the reasons why this selection of his work seems so appropriate as an introduction to his thinking. Indeed, it would provide excellent translation material.

The essays are organized into three parts. The first, "Crisis and Compromise," consists of six works dating from 1969 to 1970. This section refers to two important historical events within which the role of science and technology in development was called to question. These were, initially, the IX International Congress of rural sociology in Enschede, followed by the IX Congress of Latin American Sociology held in Mexico City in 1969. In these encounters a diagnosis was made of the sociological crisis in the region and the need for new approaches in the social sciences clearly identified. This process of reflection gave rise to the initial challenge to the collective "sociological imagination" of researchers, to find new, innovative solutions to longstanding, pervasive sociological problems.

The second part of the book, "Reflections of Transition," consists of two essays dated 1972 and 1974, in which the author looks back to the first publication of his work and reflects upon the changes that have already become apparent within the human sciences, over the ten years since the first edition appeared. One of these changes is the possibility of questioning both "objectivity" and "neutrality" on the part of social researchers in general another is the recognition of the political value of social research. Starting from this rather liberating stance, Fals Borda urges fellow social scientists to move in the direction of a unification - or synthesis - of research and agency. That is to say, given the recognition of the political dimension of research activities, it is now possible for research agents to consciously steer their work towards serving the broadest of interests.

The third part, "Lived experience and knowledge," is composed of four essays, written from 1980 to 1987. They constitute a reflection about the meaning and the position of science within society, with an emphasis on the production of knowledge and the relationship between knowledge and power. In a Foucauldian fashion, politics and epistemology are brought together to explain the birth of participatory action research, a new integrative method proposed by this author, amidst the renewed awakening of social movements throughout the world. The connection between the production of knowledge and its uses seems more clearly identified within these movements.

As indicated above, the work encompasses the development of the author's

thought throughout the last two decades, which incorporate the contribution of earlier writers, such as Albert Memmi (*The Colonizer and the Colonized*), Barrington Moore (*Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*), Dilthey and Cooley, among others.

The main thrust of the book, as the title suggests, is the need to de-colonize science, to break with the previously existing models that dichotomized the researcher from the researched and to foster new integrations, new possibilities, new knowledge. Thus, the introduction of a new paradigm for the understanding of social reality, not only in Latin America, but in all situations within which colonialism may persist. How would we recognize intellectual colonialism? In this author's view, it manifests itself, primarily, by a lack of insight into the consequences of social research, by a blind faith in the scientific paradigm (as an absolute that will solve all social ills), by a limitation of the kinds of questions that are posed, particularly when what is questioned is the organization of social relations (i.e., the institutional order).

There is a need to reintroduce the use of reflexivity into the methodology of the social sciences, recognizing that this is a critical aspect which has been absent from a great deal of modern, positivistic thought. Without this critical element, social research becomes a sterile academic exercise that only contributes to the status quo. Of course, intellectual colonialism can be more readily accepted in the case of the so-called Third World, where so many developmentalist experiences have shown to be fruitless. It may be somewhat more difficult to acknowledge the lack of autonomous thought in other contexts where the colonized have not maintained a historical memory of their earlier identities, but have assimilated into the hegemonic influence (in Gramscian terms) of the colonizer, as was the case in pre-nation-state Europe, for example. This possible resistance motivates Fals Borda's insistence on the need for an autonomous science in Latin America. Rather than continuing to accept, a-critically, the diffusion of innovations created in the colonizing centres, the critical approach will foster a sociology of liberation for the colonized. This proposal gives rise to epistemological questions and carries political implications that need to be explored.

Perhaps the most important factor underlying "new paradigm science" is the open recognition that any kind of science is political by nature, a clear distinction from the more readily accepted "non-political," "objective science," which is clearly a myth. Outrageous! cry the "objective scholars." Science *has* to be "objective" or it ceases to be "science!" This is now a questionable statement. Current critical sociology posits a hermeneutic that seeks to demystify and understand what is meant by objectivity, rather than blindly accepting, as heretofore, that neutrality is achieved by maintaining some ideal "objective distance." In Fals Borda's view, this is the critical essence of social science which has somehow given way, histori-

cally, to a much more formalist approach. In his view, therefore, "new paradigm" social science seeks to recover its own essence, not to change it. It seeks to awaken the human sciences from the political complacency that has veiled their utility as a means of domination and control, a social science at the service of the elite that produced it. It seeks to reconstitute the awareness of the researcher about the broader implications of the uses of his knowledge.

But this would be falling short, in terms of the Latin American and other Third World experiences, where, throughout history, a vast majority of people have been excluded from the access to both the production and the appropriation of knowledge. Fals Borda therefore proposes a *participatory* social science, also recognized as a "militant" social science, one that incorporates "the researched" into the production of knowledge in a dialectical process. The emphasis of this research process is not so much on quantification, but on the interpretation and understanding of a social reality and the generation of new knowledge. Once an awareness has been developed both on the part of the researcher and of the researched, and once reflexivity is incorporated into an analytical practice, it would be naive to pretend to be "neutral" (is there such a position?). Knowledge can be generated by an elite to serve an elite, or it can be generated cooperatively to serve all those involved. The potential of this new science is considered socially transformative.

Is this a new prescription to bring about social change? Because of its em-

phasis on the generation of new knowledge, there cannot be a prescription to "magically" change the order of things. If the reflexive process is carried out as a one-time event, of course, the generation of knowledge will again lapse into some type of complacency, a "domestication" that becomes mechanistically reproduced and deprives the creative impetus of the critical edge. Thus, social researchers are called to incorporate the reflexive element into their methodology. Such a process challenges the scientific community to become more overtly conscientious so that the full implications of its agency can no longer be disregarded nor veiled.

The questions that remain unanswered are: how can the scientific community achieve greater control over the uses of the knowledge they produce? What kinds of institutional changes need to take place so that an "autonomous science" can be sustained? Fals Borda perceives that there is a movement from the "periphery" to the "centre," from the base upward, that aims to reformulate the rules of "the political game;" it is a move towards the creation of new international networks that strive to work consensually towards an increasingly participatory socialization of power. The future of this new social movement with its ensuing re-structuring of social relations, social action and social thought is the challenge that Fals Borda puts to social and humanistic researchers throughout the world.

Maria-Ines Arratia is in the Graduate Programme in Social Anthropology at York University.



Rasta and Resistance:
From Marcus Garvey to
by Horace Campbell
Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press, 1987, 236 pp.
[Africa World Press, Inc.,
Trenton, New Jersey 08611
First published London 1983]

People of African descent in the Americas have struggled to preserve a sense of their identity as beings. They share a long history of resistance with other colonized native Canadians, a history with implications for the experience of white people who find themselves fronting a world which is white-dominated. Disrespect on the basis of perceived or imputed race means that specific identities are defined negatively. It is this racial dimension that distinguishes the experience faced by other oppressed workers or women.

The fact of racial oppression at the centre of the Rastafarian experience, a Western experience, is a culture that is based on a history of resistance that experiences a social and political dimension. De-emphasizing the racial dimension of Rastafari and casting it in anthropological terms situate Rastafari within the struggle in the Caribbean. It suggests that the Rastafarian experience is not only a critique of the Western World but also a history of slavery, racism and the permanent struggle for community and self-respect.

Analyzing the contribution of Andean men and women

From the National Film Board of Canada

BEYOND THE SUN: A Portrait of Margaret Peterson

"Art is a search in rhythm for communion with the gods"

Margaret Peterson



A short melodic video profiling a woman artist and her insight into the process of making art.
A complimentary addition for a variety of art programs.

To order/preview contact your nearest NFB office:

Vancouver (604) 666 0116
Edmonton (403) 495 3013
Winnipeg (204) 983 4131
Toronto (416) 973 9093
Montreal (514) 283 4823
Halifax (902) 426 6001

National Film Board of Canada / Office national du film du Canada

VIDEO OFFER \$29.95