

Atelier 8 : Retrouver le sens de la mesure

Remettre en cause le développement c'est d'une certaine manière remettre en cause nos besoins «illimités», nos désirs «démésurés», nos utopies «éternelles» et nos aspirations «universelles»... Pas difficile à franchir pour nos sociétés qui s'imaginent déjà mortes si elles ne croissent pas chaque jour. Interrogeons-nous donc sur ces notions qui nous sauveront peut-être: les limites, la durée, le provisoire, l'aléatoire, le temps humain. Soyons plus modestes. Devenons raisonnables. Retrouvons le sens de la mesure.

- > Jacques Grinevald (IUED, Genève) – Introduction
- > Marie Dominique Perrot (IUED, Genève) – De la démesure ordinaire à la démondialisation nécessaire
- > Samuel Sajay (Docteur en administration des affaires, Inde) – Development was a success
- > Frédéric Apffel-Marglin (Smith College Northampton Etats-Unis) – The origins of the lacks of limits: Anthropocentrism and its Cure
- > Wolfgang Sachs (Wuppertal Institut Allemagne) – The Abolition of Measure
- > Matthias Rieger (Musicologue) – Olympus and the Art of Proportionality

> Introduction

Jacques Grinevald (IUED, Genève)

Un de mes maîtres, Nicolas Georgescu-Roegen, était un épistémologue qui a remis en question les fondements de la science économique en partant précisément de la mesure. Il a rappelé quelque chose de tout à fait élémentaire en épistémologie, c'est qu'avant de mesurer un phénomène, il faut définir le phénomène, mais comment définir le phénomène indépendamment de sa mesure? Autrement dit, il y a une dialectique entre la grandeur ordinale du phénomène que vous voulez mesurer et sa mesure qui sera de l'ordre cardinal. Blaise Pascal l'avait compris lorsqu'il opposait l'esprit géométrique et l'esprit de finesse. Georgescu-Roegen disait « il y a des choses que l'on peut faire sans les mathématiques, sans les nombres et il y a des choses que l'on ne peut pas faire sans les nombres ». Alors j'introduis là un premier paradoxe pour lancer le débat : comment se fait-il que c'est notre époque, caractérisée par cette volonté de tout mesurer très précisément, qui a perdu tout sens de la mesure ?

> De la démesure ordinaire à la démondialisation nécessaire

Marie-Dominique Perrot (I.U.E.D. Suisse)

Retrouver le sens de la mesure, l'expression pose un premier problème, par l'usage du singulier. Est ce qu'il y a une

seule mesure ou bien différents rythmes, différents tempos ? Il ne faut pas retomber dans les mêmes ornières qui consisteraient à définir une seule mesure pour tout le monde.

Cette question de la mesure peut s'envisager dans plusieurs domaines : philosophique, politique, économique, épistémologique, etc., c'est un peu vertigineux, nous ne pourrons pas tout aborder.

La démesure, puisqu'il faut commencer avec elle, existe dans toutes les sociétés, il n'y a pas de sociétés sans démesure. La première démesure qui fonde la société est celle de la dépense, c'est à dire satisfaire à la triple obligation de donner, savoir recevoir, savoir rendre. Cette démesure positive qui crée le lien social se traduit par exemple en français par les expressions « claquer du fric », « se saigner aux quatre veines », « faire la fête », c' est le monde de l'excès, plus ou moins flamboyant, plus ou moins théâtral, on détruit ou on consomme ou on donne des biens pour créer du lien, mais sans calcul. Cette démesure est nécessaire et indispensable. Repenser la mesure ne signifie pas simplement retrouver un bon sens de la mesure un peu étroit, un peu étriqué et être très raisonnable dans le mauvais sens du terme, repenser la mesure ne signifie pas abandonner la démesure qui est nécessaire pour créer le lien.

La démesure économique est une médaille à deux faces. Sur la première face, il y a la démesure du manque, dont on a beaucoup parlé et dont on continuera à parler, la destitution économique qui a pour conséquence d'anéantir le lien social, qui aggrave la destruction de la nature et toutes ces destitutions

et destructions sont articulées les unes aux autres, se renforcent. Sur l'autre face, il y a l'overdose productiviste, consommatoire, l'extraction systématique de la valeur, la planète Terre qui est un vaste chantier, en état de surexcitation permanente, un sorte de champ de bataille où le plus, le trop s'est installé de façon semble-t-il définitive, et d'ailleurs toute la question est de savoir comment s'extraire de ce chantier. D'un coté, trop de dettes, de difficultés financières, de soucis de survie, de l'autre coté trop de biens, de pouvoir, de mobilité. D'un coté survie, surendettement, surcharge, de l'autre coté surchauffe, suralimentation, saturation.

Qu'avons nous comme critère pour penser la mesure ? Nous avons d'abord l'homme, qui a beaucoup été mis au centre de développement, développement pour l'homme, par l'homme etc., mais est ce que l'on peut faire confiance à l'homme comme mesure ? Avons nous été trop loin dans cette mise au centre de l'homme ? Je laisse cette grande question ouverte, je me référerai seulement ici au mythe de Prométhée et à un très bel article de Roger Bastide, un anthropologue décédé il y a quelques temps déjà, qui s'appelle Prométhée et son vautour. Prométhée a volé le feu aux Dieux et il a permis aux cultures de se créer, en quelque sorte, grâce à ce feu, par la cuisine, la technique, la guerre, toute une civilisation, selon le mythe, mais son acte démesuré a été puni, il a été condamné à avoir son foie mangé par le vautour. Je crois que nous sommes aujourd'hui, comme le disait Bastide, dans l'ère du vautour. Notre civilisation occidentale prométhéenne s'est crue longtemps à l'abri du vautour, nous voulions la croissance économique sans la pollution, tous les avantages de la démesure économique mais sans les inconvénients.

Le monde comme mesure

C'est la mesure que l'on nous propose avec la mondialisation, tout devient mondial, nous allons avoir une éthique mondiale, une culture mondiale, nous avons déjà une économie mondiale, il y aura une gouvernance mondiale peut-être. Le monde devient une sorte de sujet virtuel, inédit, mais qui n'est pas un véritable sujet car il n'a pas de vis à vis, c'est un monde tautologique qui se parle à lui-même et sur Internet, notamment, il y a toutes sortes de prophètes de ce monde mondial, qui nous disent que l'on pourra avoir accès à tout et que c'est la première fois que l'humanité se fait face à elle-même, dans un mouvement de miroir que je trouve effrayant. Ce monde mondial s'est un peu Narcisse comme modèle.

La justice comme mesure

La balance est un des symboles de la mesure et surtout de la justice. La justice doit être rendue. Après que l'on ait reçu et quoi que cela ait pu être, on doit rendre. Dans le cas qui nous occupe, il s'agit de justice sociale. Je citerais un philosophe allemand, Peter Sloterdijk, qui écrivait «La modernité, c'est le renoncement à la possibilité d'avoir un alibi », être moderne c'est être sur le lieu du sacrifice. La justice consisterait déjà à

prendre conscience des sacrifices anonymes, c'est à dire des sacrifices où ceux qui sont sacrifiés sont les autres, pas des sacrifices au sens originel du terme où l'on sacrifiait une part de soi pour rentrer en contact avec les Dieux. Là, on sacrifie la Nature, on exporte les déchets, on rend abstraits les dégâts du développement parce qu'ils se passent ailleurs, c'est le sacrifice exigé par la logique du tout économique.

Comment passer du plus, du trop, au moins ?

Je parle ici de l'Occident, bien sûr.

Le plus et le moins sont réversibles, on pourrait avoir plus de ce que l'on a moins et inversement. Que donnerait moins de temps passé devant les écrans, moins d'information en temps réel, moins de communication interactive mais alors plus de rencontres, moins de transparence, moins d'accès, moins de liberté, moins de nourriture, cela pour tous ceux qui, de toute façon, possèdent déjà tout cela. Il ne faudrait pas qu'il y ait d'ambiguïté là dessus, retrouver le sens de la mesure pour qui, de quoi, avec qui etc.. En essayant de pratiquer le moins et le plus différemment, en voyant en quoi ils sont réversibles, on découvrirait que la liberté peut aussi être fatale, comme le disait Fellini dans un film; que l'abondance des choix, définition du développement par le P.N.U.D., peut entraîner un surcroît d'embarras et d'obligations; que le droit peut être injuste, inéquitable, cruel ou méprisant; que les informations en continu suscitent l'hébété et non pas le savoir ou la connaissance; que trop de communication tue la conversation; que trop de rapidité abolit le temps etc.

Tout ces domaines du quotidien pourraient être investis pour retrouver la mesure. Il s'agit de prendre le contre-pied et de s'allier à ceux qui ont déjà réfléchi à ces questions là, je voudrais citer Ivan Illich, bien sûr, et sa notion de seuils au delà desquels on bascule dans la contre-productivité, dans le négatif, Le principe responsabilité et l'heuristique de la peur de Hans Jonas, l'éthique de la sauvegarde de Michel Lacroix, la notion de pédagogie des catastrophes de Denis de Rougemont, toutes ces notions peuvent nous aider à cultiver une précaution infinie à l'égard du fini, puisque le développement propose l'infini alors que ce qui est donné est fini.

> Development was a success

Samuel Sajay (Docteur en administration des affaires, Inde)

I want to suggest what might be an unpopular thesis or what might certainly be unfamiliar. That development was a success. And that post-development might be. Development was a success because it succeeded in universalizing the idea of the human. That we are all human. Integral to the idea of being human is that we live in a man-made world. Post-development might fail because it will reinforce the already

existing certainty that we live in a man-made world. And it might therefore inaugurate the age of management and administration - pure administration. This is the thesis and I will beg your indulgence, I will try to do this rapidly but it is a slightly complicated argument. We go about remaking the world by rediscovering a sense of proportion, a sense of measure. The sense of proportion of what is fitting, appropriate, the good, cannot exist in an unnatural world. If the world is made then it will not be natural, that is to say, given. It is difficult to elaborate on the sense of what is given in a short span of time.

I think I can give you two examples and my friend and colleague - with whom I have worked for a long time - will elaborate on the sense of proportion.

It is well known for example in South India that you don't drink cold water when you have a running nose and that a running nose expresses an excess of cold. It is cured by warm pepper water. In the present time in South India, when a young man brings home his bride for the first time she must step over the threshold of the house with her right leg, to be yoked with a gold chain to the house by her mother-in-law. By just the right step she releases the appropriate measure of good fortune on the household. Doubtless a wrong step, a lesser step, would be catastrophic.

A sense of proportion, then, which I have tried to illustrate with examples, presupposes the world as given. It follows that a world can only be made disproportionately. I'd argue that, as a consequence, I think it would be appropriate to leave out the sense of proportion or just measure in the remaking of the world.

When Truman opened the development era, he implied that human development entailed developing humans. The idea that humans can be developed also meant that human development is a manufactured, shall we say, man-made process. Things that are manufactured do not develop naturally.

Aristotle says death follows birth naturally, in a cycle. Man-made and unnatural development trades, exchanges the many varieties of nature's rhythms for the modern and uniform processes and crosses nature's thresholds of legal limits. No wonder then that parenthood is planned no less than a vacation is planned. It is reasonably well-known by now, especially among people who are familiar with the arguments against development, that development programs have failed. Failed to vanquish what Truman called ancient enemies : hunger, misery and despair.

Whether in the industrialized North or the less developed South the so-called war on poverty has been decisively lost. One example should be sufficient and even that perhaps is unnecessary. In India, as Arundati Roy points out, large dams were built to generate electricity by uprooting people from the soil and putting them down into slums. The uncertain generosity of the sun was replaced, traded in for the certain monopoly of stolen electric lines by slum landlords.

But I have argued that development was a success. In what

sense do I mean this? Latouche points out that development expresses the westernization of the world. He is certainly right on this and perhaps it is worthwhile running over the central question of what does it mean to be human from the point of view of modernity.

One way of doing this might be to go through a careful textual elaboration of philosophers on modernity - Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Gassendi, Descartes - and then go through the different shades and accents of the different enlightenments - French, German, Scottish - even American. I avoid that for the purpose today.

I think I will take a simpler route and one more convincing because we are all kind of familiar with it. What does it mean to be human? I think the American phrase is very telling: "You can be anything you want to be." All American children are told in one way or another, sooner or later, that you can be anything you want to be.

Now what does that mean? What does that sentence mean? How do we understand it? First, it means I am what I have made of myself. John Locke in the 17th century said it better: "Man makes himself." Modern man is he who makes himself. In Locke's case, through labour. Second, it means that I am free of all constraints. I, the human, am free of all constraints except those to which I consent. If it is too hot, get an air conditioner - free of nature's constraints. If my parents are too demanding, move out into a different house - free of ancestral constraints. From Hobbes to Rousseau and so on, all moderns would say that only consent binds men to one another. Modern law and modern society is made, not given. You make the law just as you make up society.

Third, anything and everything is changeable. Of course everything is changeable, from the senses I mean You can be anything you want to be implies that everything is changeable - and you can change yourself. Where everything is changeable only because man has no nature there is no such thing as nature for modernity, for modern philosophy, for modern political thought. Again, I can call up Locke, who says nobody knows what substance is, against the Aristotleans, and man is a substance so no-one knows what man is. I don't want to elaborate, I think you can get the point.

Fourth, that since everything is changeable how does it become changeable because we cannot change it? Talking about experimental science, Thomas Hobbes says we only know what we make. Modern experimental science, modern technology and the institutionalization of morals is based upon this little precept. It was a famous statement in the 17th century and it animates a lot of discussion and thinking. We can only know what we make. You make the institutions - you know it. You make science - you know nature. You make technology - you understand it. So the consequences of this are fairly clear. A twofold result and I don't want to get into the details, of course we all know it already: uprooting from nature, uprooting from tradition.

To escape the sometimes kind and sometimes cruel vagaries of nature, to increase man's estate, to guarantee his easy living, modern man made the world through science and technology and I don't use the word "made" lightly. That's the term that Hobbes would have used, that's the term that Descartes used. The modernization of men, women and children as humans consists of forcibly uprooting them from nature, which also means excluding them from the commons as, whether through the market or the State, more housing, more electricity, more and more of everything is delivered to transform what is free into what is less. To escape tradition and custom, on the other hand, because man is free - to be human is to be free of all constraints which means to escape tradition and customs. Modern man therefore destroys his milieu through science and enterprise. He replaces traditional bonds with engineered social, duties with rights, obligations with a return of a seat. Modern man is the sort of person who does not like to receive a gift because he might have to return the favour. And this process of uprooting is especially intensified in the late 19th century through experts who transformed the common milieus of people into social problems: prostitution, urban design, unemployment and sickness benefits - the list is endless. Experts of every stripe define the very problems they would solve, rationally reorganizing everyday life. And since social problems are handled expertly ordinary people could rest at ease in their indifferent to each other. In fact one might say that humans who make the world are necessarily estranged from each other. It is because humans are strangers that they are related by need rather than what is due, rather than what is obliged.

There is a lovely line from Shakespeare. King Lear was horrified that his daughter would ask him the following question: "Tell me what you need and I will give it to you." King Lear replies: "Need? What need do I have of need? Give me what is my due.", expressing the distinction between what is owed versus what is given as a consequence of need. So the modernization of men, women and children as humans also consists of scientifically removing them from their milieu and replacing what people are owed by giving them what the need. But this is all old history. Nothing new.

This double uprooting is the very definition of the long history of development and development and progress. It does not define what post-development is but if the ubiquitous prefix "post" is to mean anything - it must mean something - we might ask what has changed with the symbolic success of development. Now, just as it would be absurd to think that the symbolic success of development was a total victory, so also it would be unreasonable to speculate on the future. The technical failure of development was however matched by symbolic success. The goal to develop humans was a resounding success. People all over the world now believe that they are human.

It has been said that the messianic seal animating the

development era has grown weary from its failures. It ought to be remembered that sometimes the well-earned rest from successful labour can be mistaken for weariness.

To restate the central argument, development has fulfilled its symbolic link, we are all human now, no savages, no primitives, we are only less or more developed. For example, I occasionally - when bad luck strikes - teach management and management economics, where we do a lot of scenario building. I don't want to do scenario building, I want to speak about the present. Development is not a total success, that goes without saying. It would be too much to make that up. After all, in South India the Goddess of good fortune still responds to the right set of stimuli. But nevertheless I think we can understand something of post-development by looking at what happens now in the West. If development was the westernization of the world we can understand something of post-development by looking at what is happening right now in the West - no scenario building. I stated earlier the end of development could be understood as the worldwide development of humans. To become human, men, women and children have to be extracted from their natural milieus. The different ways, extraordinarily rich ways of inhabiting the world by expecting what was given, have to be transformed into what was made. But for the very reason that man is modern leaves him unsatisfied because to be modern means to be free, to be free means to be without constraint. To be modern is not to know what man is, because man has no nature.

But he is uneasy. This continued unease compels him now to remake what he has already made. Modern man, with Hobbes, Locke, attempted to wipe out the distinction between what is natural and artificial by making the world himself. The contemporary proposals to remake the world only reinforce the modern certainty that man has made the world, that we live in a man-made world, which is the inheritance of modernity. To state this more clearly, remaking the world takes for granted that there is no distinction between what is man-made and what is natural. It takes it for granted. Humans seeking to remake the world reside in a world that they know they have made. I would love to say that they think they know they have made, but I fear that they know they have made it. Because it goes without saying that humans also know that the world they have made is not good, or at least entirely good - ask any environmentalist - which could be another reason why they want to remake it. It is because man remakes the world and no longer can make it - having already made it once, he can only remake it. The grand narrative of progress and development went hand in hand with the man who made the world. Now that we can only remake it, we speak of management. Management is a technique of optimization, of doing what is feasible. Management is not creative, not as creative as making. It is closer to a remaking or rearranging of what is given. But what is given to management is what has already been made. This is why management has become a universal term, from

self-management to global management : all of these refer to remaking the world that is known to have been made. Perhaps then management is the consequence of successful development : humans who remake the world that they made. That is a mouthful.

I'd like to offer one little truth. Contemporary taste for identity politics, for life-style choices, is one proof that the notion of remaking wipes out the distinction between what is man-made and what is natural. When the distinction between the natural and the artificial is forgotten, all ways of life become a choice of life. A life-style choice. Remaking the world seems to lead into a world in which all life-styles can flourish for anyone. This or that is precisely its most dangerous and seductive call. Ways of inhabiting the world are now being understood as different ways of making the world. Of course it is true that in a world where people are taken to be so developed that whatever they do is a life-style choice, despair, misery and hunger are meaningless. It may well be the case that those who fight the westernization of the world in the North as some simple souls do, do so to protect themselves from this kind of management. In a man-made world that has been remade it maybe inappropriate to speak of those efforts in terms of proportion, of just measure, for proportion in a man-made world will inevitably become human proportion. It was Corbusier who dreamed of designing cities around human proportions. And systems theorists speak of fitting people into ecologies. It is a short step from Corbusier and ecological designers to cities designed to be human friendly, to life-styles that have a low ecological footprint. Therefore perhaps the intent to rediscover the sense of proportion, of fittingness, of appropriateness, of what is good, must be tempered by knowing when the sense of proportion is disproportionate. It is true that the excesses of development must be repaid in the ancient coin of social justice. That ancient coin cannot be coined, for as Socrates told, to produce justice is to bring it about so that, according to nature, the constituents of the soul hold firm and be held firm by each other.

> The origins of the lacks of limits: Anthropocentrism and its Cure

Frédérique Appfel-Marglin (Smith College Northampton Etats-Unis)

We modern cosmopolitans, heirs to the scientific revolution and to the Enlightenment are like abandoned children. We have lost the safety net of a web of extended relations and human community and find ourselves increasingly on our own, competing with others like us for the social space and the rewards that make us feel we really belong, we really exist, we really matter. These feelings are no longer our birthright: they have increasingly to be won through

tough, solitary elbowing. This social aloneness, however, does not begin to match a vaster, deeper and more radical abandonment.

Before the triumph of modernity - sealed in Western Europe of the 17th century by the advent of the scientific revolution - many of us lived in intra-actions with a host of beings, powers and spirits who tricked us, protected us, quarreled with us, guided us, taught us, punished us, conversed with us. We were wealthy in our human and more-than-human communities. There was an abundance of life, of beings, to accompany us in our earthly journey. We were never alone, never abandoned. The multifarious beings of this world taught us to share the crops with them; they taught us gestures of reciprocity; they taught us to fear greediness and accumulation. They taught us that the wealth of the plant beings, the tree beings, the water beings, the soil beings, the mineral beings, was not only ours, was not there for the sole purpose of satisfying our needs. They had their own reason for existing, their own requirements, their own agency. We needed to ask permission, to share, to give back, to give thanks. These very gestures made us aware that we were only one strand in an immense tapestry that wove the pattern of life on this earth.

And then, out of the interminable religious wars pitting two equally dogmatic versions of Christianity against each other, triumphed the scientific restoration of certainty. Europe exhaled a collective sign of relief when the One Truth re-emerged, Phoenix-like, from the ashes of the witches and other heretics burning stakes and the bloody battlefields of the 30 Year War. Europeans had become addicted to certainty through a millennial and a half of church-certified sureties. With the advent of the Reformation this surety became sundered in two, each side claiming the possession of the One indivisible Truth.

The success of the new certainty was in no small measure due to the fact that it was careful not to compete with religious truths. Protestantism had paved the way for the creation of boundaries between matter and spirit, which the scientific revolution enshrined as Reality. God, the angels and all non-visible powers were relegated to the sphere of the supernatural. From then on science would deal with the realm of materiality, and religion with the realm of the supernatural. Peaceful coexistence required such fence building on the collective turf. With Descartes cogito, the mind also completely departed from matter, transmuting the body and the world into soul-less mechanisms, transforming us into the only observers of an inert material reality: we, the humans, alone amongst ourselves, abandoned by all the other beings of the world.

Yes, we could continue to have resort to God and His heavenly retinue, but we had to keep it to the privacy of our own heart and soul and try not to mix logic and rationality into it. Reality, we had to bravely face it, unaided by any other powers save that of our own minds. The very act of knowing became an estrangement, a distancing, a controlling of matter. Knowledge became power - naked, unrestrained by sentiment

or by ethical strictures or by beauty.

Where were the voices to tell us to share the bounty of this world? With whom were we now to reciprocate? To whom were we to ask permission to partake of the wealth of the world? The powers and wealth of this world became voiceless, bereft of their old agency. We gave them a new name; we called them natural resources, meaning agency-less and mindless things lying around just for us to use. The limits, the restraints, vanished like starlight in the dawn.

God of course never lost His supreme agency but somehow the new material reality progressively escaped His jurisdiction. In this new material world we humans became indeed the masters. But how effectively could power substitute for our newfound aloneness? It promised fulfillment through the assurance of progress: things would get ever more convenient, ever more comfortable. They would surely comfort us amidst our immense loss. We would have more things, ever more things and they would surely satisfy us; they would surely fill the terrible emptiness. The bottomless hole carved by the silencing of all these voices, all these presences, was to be filled by a mountain of money and the goods they would purchase. Our desire for these became defined as infinite. Desires as bottomless as our aloneness amongst our kind.

It of this was trumpeted as a great advance of Mankind; the loosening of millennial shackles of superstition, ignorance and darkness; the dawning of an era of great light, the great light of Rationality that would enlighten the whole world. We were enraptured by our escape from the endless conflict. We were enthralled by the restoration of certainty. Certainty emerged fortified by its redefinition on a new secular basis, its opening to constant contesting, its safeguard lodged in methods of investigation rather than in dogma. The old certainty had somehow proven vulnerable to making the word of God accessible to individual interpretation. The new certainty would require the contesting of individual investigators. In due time we came to view religious certainty as a matter of faith, a matter of the heart, of the soul. Matter was another matter. We named these views discoveries. We felt emancipated, even liberated, from the obscurantism of the ancient regime.

The radical materialism and thoroughgoing mechanicism of the new secular reality is what created a sphere protected from religious conflict which at the same time was a sphere free of all restraints, all limits. Truth, now freed from ethical, aesthetic and sentimental constraints, could be pursued into what one university calls its innermost recesses. This freedom, this lack of restraints, has unleashed an uninterrupted stream of ever more powerful technologies. The effect of these technologies on the human and the more-than-human world falls outside of the purview of the new knowledge. Such considerations, if made part and parcel of the pursuit of knowledge would hobble the pursuit of truth wherever it may lead and that would be a sacrilegious stance.

In any case, all these ever more powerful, ever faster, ever

better, technologies confirm what we always knew: that this new method of obtaining certainty, of obtaining truth, is not just one more method, one more philosophy, one more cosmology, one more ontology and epistemology, among the many existing in the world, but the mirror of nature itself. Proof patent that we have not invented this agency-less this mindless, this mechanical natural reality. We have triumphantly shown the world how it works, what it is made of, what its laws are, in reality. We are its manipulators, we know how to make it do our bidding, ever more so, for ever and ever. We have become the Lords of Eternity. And if on the way we have made the air, the waters, the soils, the seas, the atmosphere toxic; if on the way we are rendering dozens of species extinct by the day; if on the way our bodies as the bodies of our animal companions also become toxic, well, we are confident that the new technologies our frontier knowledge delivers to us will take care of these unfortunate but tolerable side effects. In any case, growth, development and globalization must not be allowed to slow down, we are after all on a victorious march to economic and technological salvation.

The skeptics, the doubters and the resisters are but romantic dreamers, refusing to see Reality as it Really Is or else perverted persons who out of sheer envy and incomprehension want to tear it all down. But we are patient and generous. We will open more schools, more universities, more technological institutes. Then we will make this accessible to a greater number of persons so they too can become literate and enlightened; so that the scales can fall from their eyes and they can finally see Reality for what it truly is and stop confusing their imaginations with it. We are well on our way to globalizing this cosmopolitan knowledge, this enlightened education so that all the world can enter the 21st century and become denizens of the modern cosmopolitan world.

I want now to speak about something that has been happening in Peru. A friend, Grimaldo Rengifo, with whom I have been working for the last eight years has created an project called children and biodiversity which gives a completely different look at reality. And I shall show you one or two pictures and give you a couple of quotes.

We are now entering the Andean world. This is a drawing by rural Andean children, Quechua-speaking children living in the highland Amazon tropical region. The rain forest is Pachamama. She is the Being and many trees have spirits. The children have drawn the spirits of the trees and I will very quickly read some quotes from Andean women, campesina women:

When at night one goes out to walk and sits next to the bushes amidst the trees or on a stone, one hears the conversation among all the brothers and sisters who at night like to walk around: over there the frogs have singing tournaments, the trees speak with the wind, waving their branches and leaves, the birds send their messages to the yaquis (the humans) who are sleeping.

For us all, all who live in this pacha (world) are persons : the stone, the soil, the plant, the water, the hail, the wind, the diseases, the sun, the moon, the stars, we are all a family. To live together we help each other. We are constantly in a continuous conversation and reciprocity.

This project, created by Grimaldo Rengifo, who is the director/founder of the Peruvian organization PRATEC, is called children and biodiversity. It looks on the children who are forced to go to school nowadays as the bearers of wisdom and practice, rather than considering them as lacking, as being illiterate. They are oral, they come from an oral culture and orality is not a lack of literacy. Orality is an alternative way of being in the world. The project is to learn to establish mutual learning between the literate denizens of modern cosmopolitanism and the oral children, their families and communities, and not to see them as lacking but rather as rich, rich in wisdom.

So it is an alternative, it is a proposal for which this world has a great need, to teach us denizens of cosmopolitan modernity.

> The Abolition of Measure

Wolfgang Sachs (Wuppertal Institut Allemagne)

I would like to continue the conversation in my own way, although I shall try and insert myself into the train of thought that has been presented here so far. As I understand it, all those who have spoken before me were concerned with the back stage of history, in the sense that they were showing us the large picture, the big narrative that lies behind the everyday historical actor. I will try to move a little more on to the front stage and reflect a little more closely on everyday people and actors. In particular, I would like to begin my reflection on measure and on limits at a different historical point.

My story would begin at the moment when the disenchantment of nature had already been going on in European history for some time. However then what happened - and I would like to choose that as my entry point today - was the fossil revolution, in the decades around the turn of the 18th to the 19th century, when the steam engine began to dominate people's minds. Why is that important to me in this issue of limits and measure?

It is important to me because if you look, for instance, at somebody like Adam Smith, he had no notion of an infinitely growing economy. If you look at any of the classical economists, at least those who wrote up until 1830, there was no notion of an infinite growth of the economy. Why is that? Because the world of classical economists was still populated by trees, corn and animals. In other words, they lived in a world which was dominated by biological resources. It was a world that was dominated by regenerative cycles. The economy was built on having trees growing, having corn growing, having

animals growing. Now if you are in a situation where this is the world you are in, of course there is a truth there. And the truth is that any economic activity is constrained by, or if you want, linked to the regenerative cycles of nature. Now once you are in that situation you know, without even knowing explicitly, that you are linked to processes of maturation, of rise and decline and that everything and anything has to recover again.

In this situation it is almost impossible to conceptualize an infinite process of the economy. But that changed the moment the steam engine entered on the stage of history. Because suddenly what happened is that it seemed as if a certain power of production could generate things in an almost infinite fashion.. And in fact I would submit for discussion here that fossil fuel, or fossil power, started at the moment that mankind, or rather, the English economy dug into the crust of the earth and pulled out power that had accumulated there for millennial and was able to turn these powers into labour power. That was a very decisive moment in the history of the abolition of measure. Because now the idea of the man-made world took a decisive leap. Fossil fuels made it possible to eliminate biological limits.

Now let me just make a second point to broaden this idea. Because what happened then, in the last 200 years, if I may try to arrange the story that way, is that basically fuel-powered modality became able to overcome three basic constraints : the constraint of time, the constraint of space and the constraint in making things. And you can see the last 200 years as a period when ever more potential was developed to overcome these constraints. Let me give you one little illustration.

Take time. It is certain that transferring power from the crust of the earth into machines of acceleration has immensely changed our relationship to time. So the enormous infrastructure that industrial society has put into place to accelerate us without our trying, using ever speedier vehicles. From trains to cars to airplanes and so on. That is obvious today and indeed, if I might just repeat what I was saying earlier about the steam engine, if you go back and read about people's first perceptions of the train, you see the sudden awareness, nervousity, even shock, that now a train is not like a horse any more. Because a horse changes hooves, a horse gets tired, a horse has to eat all the time. Now look at the train which is running at an accelerating speed. It is only at that moment that an idea of history as one of infinite progress could be born.

A second constraint is the constraint of space. Sure, it is the other side of speed, the idea that place does not matter, that place matters ever less, that distances become flexible, that distances become challenges to be overcome, that distances shorten until they reach zero like today real time. This is largely due to the industrial powers that were available. So the entire history of the reach across the globe is fuel-powered. Today globalization rests on the expectation that transport won't cost anything because otherwise it would not be worth splitting up production chains across the world. Even now globalization

depends on the assumption that transport costs are reaching zero.

As for the scope of making things, the scope of economic activities, still around 1800, I would say, there was a basic perception that human things were very few in the world and natural things were very many : that the world was empty of humans but full of nature. This brought into being a type of technological and economic progress that tried to put all the emphasis on labour productivity and technical productivity and didn't care about nature. So that forgetfulness of nature in economic theory, in economic practice, has to do with that deeply-ingrained notion that we humans are few, it is only minuscule the scope of human activity and that natural activity is a lot. Now today this situation has turned around and we see the world full of humans' economic activity and nature ever receding. The entire logic of progress is changing.

Now I don't go any further into that but I would just to finish up with a third and last observation, which comes back to the various discussions about where we stand at the present time. The point I would like to make here is that the question of proportion, the question that less is more, comes up in a very particular way today and I would like to speak about it now on a more subjective level, not on the level of planning. I speak only about affluent societies, because there is one dimension left that has still not really been modified by the aspiration to make things. It is the fact that the day still has 24 hours. In other words, time is limited. And the fact that time is limited opens up a tension, which is with us every day and which forces us - and that's my hypothesis - forces us to reconsider questions of proportion, of balance in our own personal lives in particular.

Because of the particular contradictions of a multi-option society, a society that has many things, many goods, many appointments, many services, the problem is how to fit all these shiny offers into the 24 hours. And for that reason, of course, the characteristic of our society is shortage of time, it's scarcity of time, it's nervousness, it's haste, and all of that.

This has even increased now with the Internet. The Internet, whatever else it is, is another explosion of options. Now how do you integrate this explosion of options into your apparatus of experience and perception? It is impossible. I guess that what I want to say to you is that an affluent society is not confronted with poverty, the question is not shortage of something, but the real troubling question is excess of something. So it is not the lack of things that characterizes the dilemma of today, but it is the confusion arising from the excess of things.

Now in that situation, what do you worry about? In order to keep your own life as a person, in order to be faithful to what every one of us wants to do?

There is no other choice but to exercise some form of frugality if you are to survive in a multi-option society. In particular in order to survive in an internet society there is one quality we must cultivate assiduously. That is the capacity to say "No" to many things. You have to choose them off, you

have to click them off. So in a very paradoxical way, the question of proportion and limits comes back in the middle of affluence

> Olympus and the Art of Proportionality

Matthias Rieger (Musicologue)

It is a great honour for me to take part in today's workshop on proportion; I appreciate Dr. Rahnama's courage in proposing that I, as a musicologist, be given the opportunity to address a meeting that discusses ways of going beyond development and this after half a century of development has squashed the sense for what is fitting, what is appropriate or what is good. What at first seems puzzling begins to make sense if you look into the history of music. From Pythagoras until well into the eighteenth century, music was played and listened to as an echo of an *ethos*, which means the gate of a particular place.

The disciplined training both in the theory and the practice of music was meant to foster the art of proportionality (yes, the art!) : music inculcated a sense of moderation. Music tuned the student's synaesthesia. It refined the coordination between hearing, gaze and touch that recognizes what is considered as graceful and good by the community, the *polis*. Once you think of it, it becomes evident that a sense for proportionality is essential for any pre-or post-development reflection on how a good society could blossom.

When I first glanced at this programme, my heart sank. The motto of this meeting gave me the feeling to be invited to an international gathering of gods (to an anti-Olympus, but a Olympus all the same). I said to myself, only in Olympus, could these two ideas be conceived: the idea of 'RE-making the world' and that of 'un-DOING development'. I have to admit that, at first, I was afraid of disappointing my hosts. Being a drummer and a musicologist, I just could not come up with correspondingly Olympian notions. I am unwilling to explore how development can be replaced by a newfangled score, a scenario for a better world. Equally I can't offer engineering solutions for technical or social problems. All I can do is to emphasize what, for me, is crucial : I want to point out that any reflection on proportion must be guided by the awareness that a radical break has occurred in the meaning of that word.

In these times of global economy and global pop, where values count that are measured along standardized scales - be it the value of the euro or of the standard pitch -, proportions are something established; they are the result -, of calculated decision. In a world where beauty and good were illuminations of a harmonious order, proportion meant something that could not be compared with the situation today. For me, post-development has a taste of hope: and my hope is emphatically neither a return to the past nor a re-making of the globe.

When I began to delve into the history of proportionality in music I was driven by the idea that going back into the past would enable me to find a key for deeper insight into society. I wanted to escape the regime of modern certainties that cannot but thwart any critical distance from modernity.

I started by asking what 'proportion' could have meant for my ancestors. How did it affect their daily lives? Reading historical sources on the theory of music, I began to smell a rat. I realized that the modern musicological certainties, which at the University had been drummed into me, could not but frustrate my search for the place of 'proportion' in the theory and the practice of music.

'Non-musical' friends who, like myself, are set upon shedding their paralyzing certainties were crucial to my search. Until I met Samuel Sajay I took the passage from the reign of the fitting and good to the regime of values to be an issue for musicologists only. It was Sajay who opened my eyes to the implications of this issue on political history, the wide variety of resonances that 'harmony' or 'consonance' have outside the sphere of music. From Aristotle on, so Samuel claims, there is a strong tradition of writings in which the authors discuss the question how a government could fit its polis. When Aristotle writes "The only stable principle of government is equality according to proportion, and for every man to enjoy his own" he refers to the necessity that a good government be attuned - attuned! - to the citizens. This concern for fitting the statesman, literally «attuning» him, comes from Plato and Machiavelli, right into the eighteenth century. It was only David Hume who introduced the idea that all men are equal, equal however in a new way that made it impossible to talk about the proportionate dissimilars. You, Samar Farage, opened my senses, yes, my innards to a 'proportion' that was obviously felt before physicians asked patients to adopt their views of themselves. Samar introduced me to the works of Galenus for whom 'health' was the feeling of an harmonious mixture of body humours.

From the medievalist Ludolf Kuchenbuch I learned to crawl backwards into the past with my eyes remaining focused on the receding certainties of my professors. I was set on finding the watershed, beyond which the past of music lies. It was Hermann von Helmholtz, the German scientist of the nineteenth century who with his *Sensations of Tones* combined the concepts that are not only trivial in musicology but also mirror

those axioms of economic thinking that my economist, Samuel Sajay, tries to de-trivialize.

Helmholtz was convinced that the time had come to reject the millenary notion of music as the enjoyment of perceived proportion. Like Galileo he had constructed the necessary instrument to measure (operationally to verify) the acoustic parameters of each sound (frequency, tone colour) and reduced the human ear to registering device for frequencies between 30 and 16.000 oscillations per second. As Galileo is called the father of modern astronomy so Helmholtz is often called the father of acoustics. To him it was obvious that the grounding of music on the notion of proportionality had lost its validity.

Sound up until then was the name for a sense perception; the fit between the ear and the sounding flute. A sound independent from a listener's ear the ear attuned to the speaker a sound which was not the proportion between flute and ear was something unheard of until then. With his "*Sensation of Tones*" music was transmogrified into the name of a physical phenomenon that is independent from the presence, and even from the existence, of an «audience», so actually I don't need you to speak here.

Step by step Helmholtz convinces his readers that their understanding of music as an arrangement of harmonious sounding proportions is utterly wrong, that he can train them to enjoy music as a combination of values which have each been calculated and measured separately, even to the inherited ear the combination of any two sounds is slightly off-key.

So here I am, a musicologist. I daily drums two hours under Ali's guidance and then I perform for belly dancers in Bremen, northern Germany. Ali woke up my hearing of proportions, a hearing with the belly as much as with my ears, but I learned at the University that after Helmholtz turned music into a score of esthetically managed values, I had better not try to discuss what I do when I drum.

I talk to you as a musician. Ali nurtured my sense for harmonies. Two hours of daily drumming synchronized me to the certainties Plato held about proportions. And, further, I do care for those German housewives who imitate their Turkish neighbours. But, at the same time, I am keenly aware that I live 150 years after Helmholtz: that sounds no more require the complement of a listener.

I have no intent to unmake the development of acoustics, nor do I propose to remake music.

Débat

Simon Charbonneau

Chez les Verts ou au sein du mouvement Attac, il y a une carence totale d'une politique de décroissance, alors qu'il devient urgent d'anticiper l'effondrement du système, en particulier au Nord. Nous parlons ici beaucoup de l'impact du développement au Sud, mais il me semble plus important de parler de décroissance au Nord, d'une politique de décélération qui pourrait être fondée, non pas sur le concept de développement durable, très bien ridiculisé ici, mais sur le concept d'équilibre durable, le concept d'équilibre me semble tout à fait opposé au concept de développement.

Il faudrait travailler aussi à la reconnaissance de nouveaux droits fondamentaux, comme le droit de moratoire, le droit aux racines, ce serait une nouvelle génération de droits de l'homme qui iraient dans le sens de la mesure, c'est à dire ramener l'homme à sa vraie dimension, qu'il renonce à cet « hubris » prométhéen qui est proprement suicidaire.

Bernard Dangeard

J'ai deux questions à poser à Wolfgang Sachs.

La première, comment pensez-vous que l'appel à la frugalité puisse être entendu ?

J'explique un peu d'où je parle. Je sors de 25 années de frugalité, d'agriculture biologique avec des chevaux, en groupe et depuis deux ans je suis en phase de réflexion. Mon expérience dit que c'est très dur, que c'est épuisant voire décourageant. Alors quelle perspective pourriez-vous donner, qui ne soit pas un regard vers le monde d'avant la révolution industrielle, mais qui regarde l'avenir à partir de notre monde tel qu'il est ?

Et la deuxième, au nom de quoi accepter aujourd'hui les limites, les frontières, puisqu'elles sont dépassées, transgressées chaque jour ? Je lis aujourd'hui à la une du journal « Le Monde », « jusqu'où iront-ils », à propos d'une transgression de frontière dans le domaines

des bio-technologies. L'article fait référence ensuite à la Genèse, or une des caractéristiques de ce texte c'est de dire que l'homme a été mis dans un jardin avec des limites à ce jardin, notre monde lui transgresse sans cesse ces limites, alors au nom de quoi peut-on dire qu'il y a des limites à ne pas franchir, car sinon nous allons à la catastrophe ?

Wolfgang Sachs

What I have tried to indicate is that, yes, today, in the present, an unspoken and implicit curiosity for frugality might be growing and I said that I do believe that there is in our experience a contradiction growing between in one side affluence of things and services, on the other side the limitation of time. That contradiction is giving birth to a curiosity for frugality, for looking for a new balance, for keeping our own identity by saying no. So I rooted my argument in a diagnosis of today.

Jacques Grinevald

Je voudrais dire un mot sur la deuxième question, en tant qu'historien des sciences. Il y a une énorme littérature qui montre que les fondements de notre science moderne, que l'on croit laïque, sont profondément chrétiens et dérivent de la théologie naturelle médiévale, le mythe de la création au XII^e- XIII^e siècle va fonder cette orientation, et ce n'est pas par hasard si la nation qui domine la science moderne est profondément biblique. Notre civilisation judéo-chrétienne a inventé cette science moderne, il y a une responsabilité collective de cette civilisation, et Wolfgang Sachs nous a expliqué qu'elle était liée à la puissance que nous avons pu développer à partir du pétrole. Nous sommes les héritiers d'une révolution stato-militaro-scientifico-industrielle.

Un autre intervenant

Je fais partie du mouvement « Avec Cela », nous encourageons la mise en place de communautés villageoises

intentionnelles qui cherchent à s'autonomiser, à vivre d'une économie paysanne pluri-active. Nous sommes surpris de constater qu'il y a peu de passages à l'acte, peut-être est ce dû au sentiment diffus de manque qui empêche de s'intéresser à l'appel à une austérité joyeuse. Tant que l'on n'a pas pris conscience que le téléphone portable ne permet pas une meilleure communication, ou que la voiture ne permet pas forcément d'aller plus vite, l'alternative n'apparaît pas clairement.

Alain Gras

Il faut bien situer, comme l'a fait Wolfgang Sachs, l'origine de notre société dans la machine à vapeur et le moteur, comme machines à bouffer la planète. Mais il faut situer cela dans le contexte historique, et la question que je voudrais lui poser, c'est de savoir si, pour lui, la machine à vapeur est un accident de l'histoire, une bifurcation tout à fait inattendue et catastrophique ou bien si elle est le produit d'une histoire intellectuelle qu'elle prolonge en matérialisant des idées qui étaient bien plus anciennes qu'elle.

Wolfgang Sachs

If you look into the history of increasing measurelessness, there are many ruptures and many watersheds. Taking a retrospective view, you can identify many small rivers which lead into the big river, into the stream. I have taken one rupture, however, as you say, that rupture has been prepared, and it has been prepared, in connection to what Frédérique said at the beginning, by the shift from animated beings to natural resources, that shift precedes of course the fossil fuel shift. Today, when everybody knows that the fossil fuel age is over, you will have to face this question: what kind of performance, what kind of achievement can be maintained only with renewable resources ?

Jacques Grinevald

Je crois que le problème de l'ère des

combustibles fossiles est double. Il y a la question de l'accessibilité, du stock de ces ressources; mais nous brûlons ces ressources et la matière ne disparaît pas, cette matière que nous avons pris dans la lithosphère, dans les entrailles de la terre, elle se retrouve dans l'atmosphère. Et aujourd'hui l'une des graves contraintes, c'est l'excès de matière que nous avons mis sous forme de gaz carbonique, etc. dans l'atmosphère, cela perturbe très gravement l'équilibre écologique de la planète.

Et là, nous avons un nouveau sens de la mesure, le monde est réellement le monde aujourd'hui, autrement dit, ce n'est plus seulement le monde entre nous, dont parle le journal « Le Monde », « Le Monde » se moque du monde, « Le Monde » parle très peu du monde au sens premier du terme, nous sommes en train de passer, comme Michel Serres l'avait très bien dit dans « Le contrat naturel », de la terre à la Terre. De même nous passons de la biosphère, qui veut dire pour les scientifiques la masse de carbone stockée dans les êtres vivants, à la Biosphère, qui est la sphère à la surface de la terre fabriquée par quatre milliards d'années de co-évolution entre la vie et la Terre. Nous sommes à un carrefour aujourd'hui, nous avons le problème de l'alimentation de la machine économique, mais aussi le problème des rejets de cette machine économique dans le monde. Je crois que c'est aussi cela l'après-développement, notre conquête du monde nous est retournée comme un sorte de boomerang.

Samuel Sajay

In response for the question of the floor on legal limits. In standard economic analysis, the mathematical apparatus used to understand economic phenomena is constrained optimization, you recognize a constraint then you optimize. The recognition of global constraints will lead to global management. Rights, legal rights must necessarily address themselves to humans, not to you and me. Post development is the recognition of constraints, and is the recognition of the

optimization of constraint, and it is the recognition that this constraints can only be optimized through legal rights. We are in the age of global human management.

Marie-Dominique Perrot

Il y a une distinction à faire entre la planète Terre et la Biosphère, qui sont préexistantes et le monde mondial construit idéologiquement, traversé par une sorte de néo-eugénisme technico-financier.

Pierre Johnson

Je crois que nous sommes tous convaincus ici qu'il faut retrouver la mesure, mais comment y arriver? Nous avons vu les origines, Wolfgang Sachs nous a donné à ce sujet des idées très intéressantes, complétées par d'autres, mais maintenant que nous sommes au bord de la catastrophe, comment allons nous arriver à retrouver la mesure? Allons nous y arriver par la somme de choix personnels ou par une gestion globale comme vient de le dire Samuel Sajay?

Est-ce que ce sont les mouvements sociaux qui vont y arriver? Je voudrais avoir votre réponse de chercheurs, de personnes qui ont réfléchi à cela, comment l'humanité va-t-elle retrouver le sens de la mesure?

Un autre intervenant

Pour moi la mesure peut avoir deux significations, l'unité de mesure, je mesure un mètre cinquante ou bien, comme le dit Robert Hainard, en parlant de la sculpture, garder de la mesure, ne pas aller trop loin. Nous devons donc prendre la précaution de définir notre vocabulaire.

Il y a aussi la question de l'échelle. Quand on parle de l'homme, est ce que l'on parle de l'individu ou bien de l'espèce? On ne peut pas toujours dire que ce qui est favorable à l'individu est favorable à l'espèce, ou que ce qui est favorable à l'espèce est favorable à la vie sur la planète dans l'ensemble.

Une autre notion à définir c'est ce que l'on appelle la réalité ou les réalités,

c'est très relatif la réalité, si je vous montre cet objet et que je demande « qu'est ce que je tiens? », certains diront un morceau de métal, d'autres une pièce ronde et un économiste dira une pièce de un euro. La société actuelle crée des qui-proquo, nous ne savons plus de quoi nous parlons.

Une autre intervenante

It is a question for Matthias Rieger. He was talking about the two sides of how you can understand proportion, the philosophical side, and the musician side, by drumming. He formulated a fundamental criticism to this kind of conference, saying we are sitting here and talking and I don't know if people talking here have the other side, namely something that they do, and can know about not in their head but in their fingers or feet or belly.

So I want to ask you if it is your hope that people don't talk any more, but maybe learn dancing or make each other dancing?

Matthias Rieger

I tried to discuss this with my drumming friends. They asked me "What's people doing there?", and I said they will discuss the state of the world. So they answered me "Don't they have anything better to do?" And another friend from Africa was very upset, because people from all over the world will talk about him without knowing him. So they were not delighted that I came here today, but for me it was a good experience...

Ivan Illich

J'entends deux musiques, l'une est jouée sur le piano tempéré, l'idéal de la société dont parlait Wolfgang Sachs, au XIX^e siècle dans chaque maison d'industriel il y a un piano et de l'autre coté je vois un flûte et un tambour. Le piano, je l'ai appelé tempéré, je passe à l'anglais un moment, the piano is tempered and it produces tempered with sounds. Ce sont des notes que l'on a aménagées, on ne pouvait pas le construire avant d'avoir les instruments mathématiques pour établir

ces sons. Sur ce piano, si Rieger a raison, on ne peut pas reproduire des harmonies, Helmholtz le savait, il disait qu'il faut apprendre les relations entre sons qui sont à peu près harmoniques. Il faut un nouveau sens de l'ouïe, pire, l'oreille doit être transformée, comprise comme instrument de mesure de cette gamme extraordinaire de laquelle il peut écouter seulement une partie de ces sons artificiels. De l'autre côté je vois le monsieur avec son tambour qui me dit qu'il n'écoute pas des sons mais des harmonies. Je lui dis que ces harmonies sont locales, inévitablement, et le monsieur sur le piano me dit moi je peux te jouer n'importe quoi sur le piano, parce que je n'ai pas besoin des contraintes que le

joueur de tambour m'impose.

Je parle de deux cotes, des deux modes, pour parler de deux visions de la mesure, la mesure comme « operational verification » et la mesure comme proportionnalité.

Pour revenir sur la question de la frugalité, posée tout à l'heure par Bernard à Wolfgang Sachs, on peut poser cette question sous deux formes.

Je peux parler de ma frugalité, alors je parle d'ascèse, non pas comme un descendant d'Adam au paradis, mais d'Ève, hors du paradis, dans un monde écologiquement brisé par cet homme, qui n'est pas adapté, il n'a pas la pelure, il n'a pas de griffes, alors Dieu, pour compenser, lui à donné la capacité technique.

Mais dès que je parle de votre frugalité, « soyez frugal ! », je deviens quelque chose de bien pire que ce que j'ai appris à appeler un fasciste. Vous m'excuserez, mais je vois dans le mouvement de ces journées, auxquelles Majid m'a invité, le grand danger que l'on soit, tous ensemble, des collaborateurs à l'imposition de la frugalité.

Il y a deux voies : que nous soyons les promoteurs de quelque chose de bien pire que le fascisme, ou que l'on soit très humble, que l'on joue de la flûte, du sourire, de la danse et que l'on abandonne cette terrible idée de la responsabilité qui n'est que l'envers d'un sentiment d'omnipotence. •