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Abstract

The gap between the rich and the poor is widening. This comes as a result of the driving force of Neoliberalism and Globalisation, in which the many are benefitting at the expense of the few. Ultimately, this has resulted in the downward spiral of global inequality. Development has been virtually unexplored outside the context of the homogenous Western model, which attributes development to that of aid, barring the shift toward the plethora of human-centred approaches, and the recent, yet limited discussion, on the engagement of theology and development. The Neo-Liberation Model provides a new way of thinking about poverty that exists outside of the Western context, in an attempt to provide a revolutionary, low-cost model for development from a Southern hemisphere perspective. Currently, there is no existing theology of laughter concerning issues of development. By exploring development from the position of the marginalised, whereby the function of laughter becomes a carnivalesque experience of subversion and redemption, it enables the poor to create a new way of thinking about their socio-political conditionings, as they become autonomous agents of change. This enables the injustice concerning oppressed/oppressor dichotomy to become challenged through the power of laughter, as development is reconsidered as resistance.
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Introduction

Who are the poor? How is their identity defined? Is their global positioning a determinate of their hierarchy in society? Do any of these factors contribute to their personal development? Ackah (1999) in Pan-Africanism: Exploring the Contradictions, raises important considerations with regards to these questions concerning identity and sense of being, in relation one’s personal development. As Ackah (1999, p 106) notes:

In Africa too many of the schemes examined are based on free trade philosophy and a Western style agenda that is irrelevant to the ordinary African. The West economically and psychologically has too much influence on the African agenda and on those skilled Africans who should be viewing the problems of the continent through the eyes of their less fortunate brothers and sisters.

In agreement of Ackah’s positioning, the focus of this research is framed by a personal interest upon the widening gap between the rich and the poor and the desire to provide an “alternative way” for the marginalised African concerning development. The result of Neoliberalism has thrust the subject of inequality into further urgency. Poor countries become vulnerable counterparts as they become forced to open up protected free markets at the benefit of the West, who consequently gain control and power. The subjugation of the poor to the homogenous Western “blueprint” model, which this thesis shall argue is furthering the problem of poverty, must be reconsidered in response to the voices of the Southern hemisphere, and therefore place the identity and experiences of the poor African at the heart of the development agenda. A new revolutionary model which will enable Africans to be subjects as autonomous agents of their own transformation, has therefore been the driving force of this research.

This image of suffering became my first insight into poverty and continues to haunt today. What is striking about this image, firstly, is that the child presented, whom acts as a representation for the collective Third World community, experiences suffering and pain that no human being should ever have to endure. The child is dependent upon the mother to feed, the image speaks therefore of the mother requiring a radical solution to protect her child and her country’s suffering. This visual representation, and many others similar, illustrate that the discussion on poverty, is a very serious one indeed.
Development agencies and public interest have acknowledged this serious conversation, with a serious response.

Christian Aid’s mission (http://www.christianaid.org.uk/aboutus/who/aims/our_aims.aspx#mandate, no date) is to ‘expose the scandal of poverty’ and ‘help in practical ways’. Oxfam’s work (http://www.oxfam.org.uk/what-we-do/issues-we-work-on, no date) focuses on ‘vital issues to tackle the root causes of poverty, from life's basics - food, water, health and education - to complex questions around aid, climate change and human rights’, and CAFOD (http://www.cafod.org.uk/About-us/What-we-do, no date) speaks of difficult challenges concerned with ‘Conflict. Climate change. Inequality. HIV and AIDS. Together, we tackle challenges head on every day, using our passion and expertise to bring about positive change’. All of these agencies tackle poverty with a serious tone, in which development is sought through active partnership. However, it becomes clear upon analysis, that these very fundraising agencies are actually part of the problem.

In search for a solution, development in terms of assistance and goods, seems like an innate moral reaction, however one of the greatest challenges in terms of dialogue of the poor is what is actually meant by development? This thesis explores this notion as it sets out the exploration of the evolution of development in Chapter One. This chapter argues that the current models of development, which are governed by interests of money and capital, in the form of aid assistance, hinders the development of Third World countries as it immobilises dissenting voices and promotes a cycle of dependency. Owing to this consideration, this analysis highlights that concepts of development in the North,
are very different to that of Southern interpretations (Cooper, 2007). Despite a paradigm shift in development thinking, to that of a plethora of human-centred approaches to development, the chapter illustrates that this alternative still falls short, owing to the fact the theorists have neglected the impact of faith, especially for those in marginalised communities.

This issue has grown in importance in recent years, religion once silenced and believed would disappear as society modernised, as a result of the Marshall Plan; faith now becomes vital within development dialogue in which this thesis aims to address. Chapter Two therefore responds to this extended space, in which the discussion on theology and development is moving from ‘estrangement to engagement’ (Clarke, 2007), in which faith is considered an important tool for development. This chapter’s aim is to explore various development frameworks within contemporary Christian denominations in order to establish the variety of responses to poverty. This paper therefore provides an investigation of denominations concerning Anglicanism, Roman Catholicism, Liberation Theology and Pentecostalism, in which this chapter proposes four theological models of development, in light of their responses to development in practice.

The first model of theology and development this paper is concerned, is that of the Anglican Church, in which this thesis titles the model One of Charity. The emphasis on love thy neighbour as a duty becomes instrumental in the response to poverty, as an exercise of personal transformation of sin, in which the Church performs through community action to restore broken relationships (Barth, 1958). Secondly, the action of the Catholic teaching, which this thesis titles One of Many, pays focus to the interconnectedness of humankind which is reinforced through sacramental ritual and practice. The concept of suffering, within this tradition, becomes a suffering of unity (1 Cor 12:26) in which a moral duty to act and serve the poor unites humanity in the body of faith. Thirdly, Liberation Theology, a theology which arose in the 1950/60’s from the Catholic Left in Brazil, arose as a response to challenge political structures and inequality, as it adopts a position of a preference for the poor. This thesis titles this model, Becoming the Poor One. This model focuses on theology as praxis which challenges the emphasis on the intellectual discourse of classic theology (Rowland, 1999) by re-reading the Bible from the position of the poor, and enter onto the path of the marginalised in order to experience liberation and challenge the oppressed/oppressor dichotomy. The Bible becomes an important tool as a ‘vehicle of hope’ (Rowland, 1999, p 2) in which the poor
can identify with Christ as a sufferer, whom overcome his oppression and become the ultimate liberator (Boff, 1978), experiencing freedom and a renewed utopia. Lastly, this chapter focuses on Pentecostalism, owing to the recent popularity which has emerged within the developing world. This model shall be titled One is Born Again, as its emphasis heavily centres upon the notion of experience of the Holy Spirit of the believer, and the encouragement of spiritual freedom, which gives rise to transformation of an individual’s socio-economic conditionings. One of the most significant considerations of the Pentecostal movement is to provide a theology which offers a way to cope within a hostile environment (Anderson, 2004), to create dignity and freedom for the oppressed. Whilst the engagement of theology and development has provided fruitful discourse concerning poverty, and as a beneficial tool for the marginalised, this chapter argues that each model will ultimately produce defined outcomes and limitations.

As a response to the limitations represented within the theological models presented in the discussion within the previous chapter, Chapter Three aims to explore the visual rhetoric prescribed of development within popular culture through a theological lens. Images present and give rise to a realm of meaning, in which one is able to formulate and make sense of the world we inhabit. The importance of imagery is so valuable that visual aid performs as the dominant function of how one makes meaning of development issues and informs representations of policy. Therefore, the engagement of religion and popular culture becomes fundamental in the discussion on development, owing to the fact that the sacred-secular dichotomy, thus generates and prompts a reaction of orthopraxy through community action.

This chapter will therefore explore the evolution of development imagery during The Marshall Plan, 1980’s and Post-1980’s and highlight the importance of communicating the correct ideology through visual rhetoric, and thus illustrate the consequences of misrepresentations which lead to common stereotypes which further breed dependency. The Dreamland Model presents development as the American architect prototype for the European economic downfall after the Second World War. The imagery within this period presents an alternative vision for those in development need, which likened America as the powerful and sacred land worthy of the superior status to embody. Whilst a paradigm shift in development imagery occurred during the 1980’s, as ‘shock effect’ (Benthall, 2010) appeals come to dominant the period, in which this chapter titles The Western Sovereign Model, and the post-1980’s encountered a surge of positive
imagery which is framed as The Liberation Model; both created little more than a voyeuristic entity of the poor, in which despite the evolution of development imagery, the ideology remains the same - the South depend on the West.

Considering this information discussed, Chapter Four and Five will address the problems concerning current contemporary development rhetoric, as it proposes a new model which goes beyond partnership explored in The Liberation Model, into a Post-Liberation phase which will allow the poor to become autonomous agents of change. This chapter therefore offers a new model beyond the Western context, in which this thesis has argued does not work, in favour of a Southern hemisphere model, which offers a more viable approach to development thinking. No previous study has investigated development within the context of a theology of laughter, therefore both chapters aim to respond to this limitation.

De Certeau’s notion of resistance and opposition become instrumental in the investigation of a theology of laughter. In The Practices of Everyday Life (1984) he explores the distinction between “resistance” and “opposition”, in which opposition (those within a socio-political system) can challenge and revisit the system when individuals place themselves outside of the dominant system (resistance). Burton (1997, p 51) summarises the points of de Certeau as he states ‘opposition belongs to periods of pessimism when all outlets seem blocked; resistance belongs to periods of hope’. Therefore, as all other outlets of development appeared blocked and unsuccessful, development becomes explored, from outside of the current Neoliberalism model, as resistance, in order to challenge the Neoliberalism model, which prescribes only one way for development, in order to create space and “hope” for a new world.

The Neo-Liberation Model this thesis sets forth adopts Bakhtin’s theory (1984) of the ‘carnivalesque’, as a subversive function of laughter, as a new way of thinking about poverty. The function of laughter is thus explored through case studies on fundraising agencies Comic Relief, whereby laughter is used to heighten the spectacle (Lim, 2015, p 528) and The Norwegian Student’s and Academics’ International Assistance Fund (SI AH) and The Samaritans, which adopts laughter as a redemptive category to challenge the dominant Western stereotypes of Africa. The chapter also raises question to how the Church can engage in a theology of laughter, as a meaningful theological movement for the poor, in which it can learn from the representation of seculars theologies explored.
Chapter One

Development: The Un-developer?

‘Why has globalization - a force that has brought so much good - become so controversial?’ (Stiglitz, 2002, p 4). The reason – the result of Neoliberalism has fuelled the process of globalisation which has benefitted the “many”, whilst reducing the “few”, and as a result, the ‘gap between the rich and poor countries is actually widening’ (Steger, 2013, p 42). Ultimately, this has shifted the debate on development into further urgency. The discussion on development therefore, takes centre-stage, as the globalisation agenda appears to foster a ‘disproportionate share of the benefits, at the expense of the developing world’ (Stiglitz, 2002, p 7). Now more than ever, an accurate understanding of “development” and its aims need to be evaluated in an attempt to provide equality, justice and solutions for marginalised communities. Owing to this consideration, this chapter will focus on the critical evolution on the understanding of development in the Post-War years in the West. This evolution will highlight how early ideas of development are now being hotly contested by developmentalists and activists, and how the debate has made space for fresh interpretations on development centred on personhood, in order to produce meaningful results.

The term development has been an important notion of discussion, especially since the end of the Second World War. Since this period, the term has been at the forefront of dialogue concerning the relationship with the poor, whereby the notion of development and its understanding have been hotly contested. After WWII and the success of the Marshall Plan, ‘development became a shibboleth for progress’ (Goulet, 1992, p 468) and ‘it became a widely excepted view that investment capital was critical for economic growth’ (Moyo, 2010, p 13). It was thought that rapid industrialisation and capital investment would produce a more productive, modern economy. In 1949, President Truman in his inaugural address advocated that ‘development required capitalism and democracy’ (Cooper, 2007, p 24). Owing to this view, economists of the time mirrored President Truman as they spoke of development as to ‘aspire to
Westernisation’ (Akinrinade and Barling, 1987, p 2), whereby the ‘West provided an established model of the 'developed state’’ (Akinrinade and Barling, 1987, p 2). This understanding of development would then result in a ‘homogenous world culture’ (Akinrinade and Barling, 1987, p 2), inspired by the West and the “American dream”.

Lerner, a sociologist carried out research in 1958 on The Passing of Traditional Society within six countries in the Middle East (Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Jordon, Turkey and Iran), which conclusively highlighted that individuals on the receiving end of development spoke of it as an ‘unalloyed good’, which brought hopes of improvement. Lerner revisited his earlier studies twenty years later, in which they now saw development as a mixture of good and evil. The study highlighted that Western value system places emphasis on materialism, industrialisation and progress, by destroying the value of culture, tradition and religion. Is the rise in capitalism a destroyer of values? Cooper (2007, p 25) interestingly assesses that ‘development initially aimed to raise nations in the South to the level of the North; economically, politically and discussion to the North tended to narrow. Thus, what they called development in the South was called capitalism in the North’. This raises an important consideration in terms of development in practice, as it presumes that Western ideology is the superior, dominant driving force of success, and acts as a blueprint for development for that of the South. Furthermore, the interpretation of language plays an imperative role in the objectives of development. As Cooper highlights, the concept of development presents ambiguity and assumptions. Cooper argues that the Southern understanding of development does not support the relationship with that of capitalism of their vision, and therefore, objectives of development are not being read from the same page. Owing to this consideration, it appears that modern notions of development are “part of the problem rather than the solution” (Tucker in Munck and O'Hearn, 1999, p 1). Clearly, it appears that the North has an instilled notion, that through economic investment, they will redeem and play God, with the destiny of the South. Groody (2012, p 22) expands on this concept as he argues that humans are currently being faced with one of the world’s largest problems to date - idolatry. Worship of money and capital. This ungodly obsession was coined “money-theism,” whereby humanity is tempted by the capital arena in which they worship the gods of the market place (Groody, 2012). It could therefore be seen that traditional values have been undermined as a result of Western notions of development, and as a
Consequently, ‘development wanted the capitalist economy to define whether one is rich or poor’ (Cooper, 2007, p 27), and as a result ‘poverty became a term with one global definition based on economic factors’ (Cooper, 2007, p 27), which ultimately placed the global focus upon consumption and labelled humanity according to wealth. Moyo (2010, p 14) argues that ‘aid become the key tool in the contest to turn the world capitalist or communist’ which, as a result, gave rise to a society of inequality. Moreover, the result of Neoliberalism in the 1970’s aimed at ‘deregulating national economies, liberalizing international trade, and creating a single global market’ (Steger and Roy, 2010, p X) furthered the state of inequality within society; despite the neoliberal argument affirming that the ‘world’s people has become more equal over the past two decades’ (Wade, 2004, p 567). The emphasis of free market ideology and investment of the period fuelled the process of globalisation, whereby poor countries were forced to open up protected markets. As a result, poor countries were unable to successfully protect themselves and consequently, the West gained control over the free market at the expense of the vulnerable developing world. Steger and Roy (2010, p 119) note that ‘neoliberalism created both winners and losers in the globalizing economy’, in which they explain that ‘despite African’s adoption of free-market imperatives constructed in the global North, the continent’s commodities trade fell from 7% of the world’s trade in the mid-1970’s to less than 0.5% in the 1990’s’ (Steger and Roy, 2010, p 110). Moreover, ‘the past quarter century of neoliberalism has seen the lowest rates of economic growth ever recorded in Africa, along with rapidly rising disparities in wealth and wellbeing’ (Steger and Roy, 2010, p 110). Indeed, the neoliberal policies implemented on society are not necessarily a universal model that can be applied to the developing world.

Towards the end of the 1980's it was recognised that ‘most of the traditional theories that were used to examine and delineate development were regarded as having fallen into doubt’ (Parfitt, 2002, p 1) and that ‘old theories had failed’ (Parfitt, 2002, p 1). Much of the Third World had been ‘struggling under the weight of accumulated debts to the industrialised countries for more than a decade, while also attempting to apply the market- influenced Structural Adjustment Programmes that had been forced on them by the West’ (Parfitt, 2002, p 1). Therefore, the West playing saviour to the Third World - remained unsaved. Despite this, advocates of development aid argued that ‘an increase in
aid is necessary to finance a boost in investment, which may help a country to escape from the poverty trap’ (Hermes and Lensink, 2001, p 2). However, Moyo (2010, p 17) explains that ‘Aid costs money. And unless it’s in the form of grants, it has to be paid back, with interest’. It could be argued, that the West had used its position of power and wealth to exploit the developing world by what seemed charitable and heroic, but ultimately will benefit their own financial gain through attributed interest. Rooted within this concept, Esteva (in Parfitt, 2002) asserts that the term development began with Western origins which is used by imperial powers to benefit their own ideological projects. This understanding is at the heart of the problem for Olutayo (www.biblicaltheology.com/Research/AdewunmiJuPO01.pdf, no date, p 3), as he states that ‘a good economic system should favour the satisfaction of human needs: and not purely out of the desire for profits’.

Significantly, the very ideology of the North could indeed be considered the root cause of the extreme poverty that is present in society. Whereby, development could be considered the source of the underdeveloped. The result of spiralling debt that engulfed the poor, which still, remains a burden too heavy. Trainer (1996, p 73-89) would appear to support this reasoning, in which his paper argues that the obsession with growth as a prerequisite for development is the origin of the problem. It is believed that poverty would be reduced by economic growth, but interestingly ‘it may increase’ (Cooper, 2007, p 12). Moyo is seen to support Cooper's observation, as she reinforces the consequences of development in the form of aid assistance. Interestingly, she states that ‘the most aid dependent countries have exhibited an average annual growth rate of minus 0.2 percent’ (Ferguson in Moyo, 2007, p X). Moreover, not only does development in this form inhibit grow, but it also leads to ‘increased economic, political, racial, gender, sexual, environmental and other types of poverty’ (Cooper, 2007, p 13). As far as Cooper and Moyo are concerned, the poverty crisis is further problematized owing to this focus, due to the additional pressures it generates.

Barker reinforces the notions of Cooper and Trainer, in which he provides a critique of the dominant model of development. He asserts that ‘Western development model sustains inequalities and lead to underdevelopment in the Third World’ (Barker, 2006, p 159). In support of such a claim, Easterly (2006, p 35), a major advocate of aid abandonment, raises an important implication to this assessment. He affirms that ‘the poorest countries can grow and develop on their own’, thus arguing that development in
the form of aid stunts growth. This assessment is further reinforced by the examples of countries such as China, Malaysia, Chile and India whom have ‘performed above average while not receiving substantial amounts of official development assistance’ (Loots, 2006, p 365). It appears evident then, that after decades, development in the form of the Western model, the result, as Moyo's book is titled, Aid Isn’t Working.

Conversely, Sachs (2005, p 19) asserts that the problem of development is not aid, but the lack of. He supports this claim by highlighting that within the world's population, the statistic of the ‘extreme poor (at around 1 billion) and the poor (another 1.5 billion) make up around 40 percent of humanity’. Despite decades of aid assistance, Sachs urges more is needed to release those in need from the ‘poverty trap’ (Sachs, 2005, p 19). Arguably, it appears that rather than abandoning a model of development that, as argued, has flaws, Sachs vehemently defends the theory and asserts that the reason for poverty still existing, is that the West has not given enough. If ‘$2.3 trillion’ (Easterly, 2006, p 10) dollars of investment through sixty years of reform cannot eradicate poverty, then there is indeed a problem with the model of development.

Despite this observation, notions of development appear to be entering a new paradigm shift, in order to respond to the reflections of such tensions. Närman (1999, p 149) illustrates that ‘development theory’ is being replaced with ‘development thinking’. This shift seeks to reverse notions of ‘people as homogenous entities’ (Schuurman, 2000, p 7), to a world which inhibits a ‘civil society, social capital, diversity and risk’ (Schuurman, 2000, p 7). Riddell (2007, p 5) attempts to rationalise the transition of development being “reconsidered”, in which development must parallel the evolution of society, as it embarks upon the globalised ideology. Owing to these considerations, one could argue that it is necessary for stale homogenous models of development to change in the face of modernisation, if one attempts to produce effective practice.

Allen and Thomas (2000, p 5) describe the second half of the Twentieth Century as the ‘era of development’, not as a new concept, but original in the ways of definition, as descending voices questioned existing notions of the term, in favour of new paradigms. Easterly provides an innovative explanation and solution to such shift, in which he labels traditional approaches of development as ‘Planners’, and ‘agents of change’ (Easterly, 2006, p 5) as ‘Searchers’. Interestingly, he explains:
Planners announce good intentions but don’t motivate anyone to carry them out; Searchers find things that work and get some reward. Planners raise expectations but take no responsibility for meeting them; Searchers accept responsibility for their action. Planners determine what to supply; Searchers find out what is in demand. Planners apply global blueprints; Searchers adapt to local conditions. Planners at the top lack knowledge at the bottom; Searchers find out what the reality is at the bottom (Easterly, 2006, p 5).

Fundamental to the approach of development, it seems, is where one holds their initial position within the context of such discussion. For Easterly (2006, p 5), a Planner is one whom ‘thinks he already knows the answers; he thinks of poverty as a technical engineering problem that his answers will solve’. In contrast, a Searcher ‘admits he doesn’t know the answers in advance’ (Easterly, 2006, p 5), but maintains that ‘solutions must be home-grown’ (Easterly, 2006, p 5). This distinction reinforces the parallel objectives as a result of one’s motivations, however it seems the dominant Planners need to be challenged in order to produce authentic benefits for the poor.

Moyo, it could be argued - a Searcher, within her “development thinking”, strongly urges for the abolishment of aid, in order for underdeveloped countries, to develop. After five decades of the ‘wrong diagnosis’ (Moyo, 2010), a better path must be sought. Moyo appears to present a convincing argument owing to the foundered relief effort. Change, it seems, may be the only possible and realistic path to take. Shockingly, ‘the proportion of people in sub-Saharan Africa living in abject poverty increased to almost 50 percent’ (Moyo, 2010, p 5), this meaning that between ‘1981 and 2002, the number of people in the continent living in poverty nearly doubled, leaving the average African poorer than just two decades ago’ (Moyo, 2010, p 5). In terms of Moyo's thinking, it appears that the evidence against aid is so compelling, that even ‘the IMF - a leading provider of aid - has warned aid supporters about placing more hope in aid as an instrument of development’ (Moyo, 2010, p 47). It appears then, that the statistics provide strong evidence in supporting the claim that existing attitudes towards development have failed, and that aid being the root cause to such a problem, despite Sachs plea for a “big push” on aid. Ferguson (in Moyo, 2010, p X) explains that ‘between 1970 and 1998, when aid flows to Africa were at their peak, the poverty rate in Africa actually rose from 11 percent to a staggering 66 percent’, thus highlighting an urge for aid is the not the right diagnosis in aiding development. The implications of these assessments, therefore drive
one towards supporting Moyo in her ambition for an ‘aid free world’ (Moyo, 2010, p 76) due to the result of further suffering, for which many term "development". The problem however, is that it appears not so simple just to cut aid flows and install an alternative model of development, the problem is that ‘Africa is addicted to aid’ (Moyo, 2010, p 75). Moyo compares the withdrawal of aid to that of an addict withdrawing from narcotics, a process which will always face challenges and pain, yet a necessary course of action in order for one to achieve a clean and burden-free existence. Moreover, Moyo (2010, p 48) argues that aid fosters and breeds corruption which is a ‘way of life’ for Africans, thus resulting in a vicious cycle which is difficult to break free from, and thus the urge for aid heightens.

As a reaction, Moyo provides a ‘home-grown’ (Easterly, 2006, p 6) development solution, inspired through her personal experience in poverty, and on reflection of the effects an aid intervention she has witnessed in communities in Africa. The ‘Dead Aid Proposal’ Moyo (2010, p 76) sets forth ‘envisages a gradual (but compromising) reduction in systematic aid over a five-to-ten year period’ (Moyo, 2010, p 76). One of course, could feel uncomfortable with this model and question Moyo’s moral duty in assisting the poor, however it appears she presents a strong case in arguing that humanity is actually harming the poor by assisting in this function of development. Does our moral duty therefore encourage individuals to not support aid for the kindest result? Owing to this consideration, Moyo (2010, p 119) asserts that if one is to be moralistic concerning the lack of development ‘trade is the issue it ought to address, not aid’. Injustice and inequalities stunt the opportunities and growth of underdeveloped continents such as Africa. For Moyo, it is unfair trade laws which damage the economy of countries striving to develop. ‘Like cotton, sugar subsidies hurt Africa. The charity Oxfam estimated the regime has deprived Ethiopia, Mozambique and Malawi of potential export earnings of US$ 238 million since 2001’ (Moyo, 2010, p117). It appears ludicrous that countries have produce, in which other countries are in so desperate need of, but are prevented due to trade and export laws. Moyo (2010, p 119) explains that ‘what China so desperately needs, Africa has: tea in Kenya, coffee in Uganda, beef in Botswana, cashews in Mozambique, cotton in Mali, oil in Gabon’. Fundamental to Moyo’s model is that the ‘Dead Aid Proposal’ will create positive opportunities for those living in underdeveloped countries, as she argues that ‘trade creates employment, improves trade balances, lowers the price of consumer goods through greater imports and generates income for the
country's exports’ (Moyo, 2010, p 122). Africans, according to Moyo's position, should be given the opportunity to create their own destiny without Westerners making decisions; it is rather the responsibility of the West to ensure fair trade law are instilled, to give developing countries the hope they require to develop, manage and function by its own people. However, the problem, explains Bolton (2008, p 2) is that ‘Africa gets what we decide to give it, well intended or otherwise’. If undeveloped countries sought development, it needs to be from the bottom up, not through the interference of the West. Bolton (2008, p 49) firmly argues that ‘it is Africans actions that do most to determine Africa's prospects’. In order to correct failings, Africa must be responsible for itself. Tandon (2008, p 77) terms this emphasis, 'endogenous development', which provides individuals the opportunity to participate in decisions independently, without imperial interference and take ‘the destiny of the nation into one's own hands’.

Fundamental to the dialogue of development, Forrester (1997, p 87) argues that ‘it is important to remember in this discussion that we are not just talking about ideas, but about people, about community and human flourishing or human degradation’. The language used to express notions of the South and the North, generate complexities when attempting to provide resolutions to poverty. The common stereotypes used via these labels indicate that he is not ‘one of us’ (Forrester, 1997, p 88) affects humanity's behaviour and response, thus creating the attitude of the poor in which they remain on the fringes of society. Forrester explains that this misinformed language only widens the gulf between the poor and the non-poor, and makes it more difficult to empathise with the problem, thus generating a hindrance to development. Moreover, this point is reinforced in Easterly's "Planner" versus "Searcher" dichotomy, whereby the Planner places himself above that of the poor man through his position in society, and his superior attitude towards development. In order to aid this tension, it is vital to understand that ‘poverty is a social construct which cannot be separated from values, attitudes, and beliefs of people in a particular culture, society and age’ (Forrester, 1997, p 93/4). Therefore, poverty cannot be spoke of in terms of the abstract, but rather personal, real people. Interestingly, Forrester provides a unique interpretation to that of development which has not yet been discussed, in which he highlights that the poor feel they have been misrepresented in society as subjects by those who do not understand their experience. In his research on the experiences of poor communities, Forrester (1997, p 92) highlighted that the poor did ‘not like being treated as "a problem", the solution to which lay in the hands of others.
They had fierce pride in their communities and what they had achieved through community action, in festivals societies, self-help groups and organisations like Women's aid. They resented being patronised. They wanted justice not charity’. It is therefore imperative that society's misinformed language is regenerated through education, which seeks to serve to empower individuals.

This implication of misinformed language, is further explored by Goulet, whom asserts that the terminology and practice of development are ambiguous, which ultimately generate challenges. For Goulet, the term development is both used descriptively, to describe a present condition, and normatively, by those whom desire an alternative vision of development. As like Forrester argues, fundamental to society's response to development is hugely informed by the interpretation of the language. Goulet (1992, p 468) urges for the reductionist interpretation of development which is sought by economics, in a plea for a ‘multidimensional advance on society in all realms- economic, social, political, cultural, environmental, and spiritual’ which seeks to view development inclusively. Development, it appears, is now being discussed as an ethical concern. Wisdom, Goulet argues, is the solution to appropriate and effective solutions. He addresses that ‘modern men and women must come to recognise that they are bearers of multiple, partial, overlapping identities and loyal systems, no single one which can claim their total allegiance’ (Goulet, 1992, p 473). In view of this consideration, Goulet argues that this approach is vital in the assessment of development. He maintains that what one considers beneficial to those in the developing world, could be viewed as detrimental to those of that culture. Goulet (1992, p 473) provides the example of an interview he conducted with an elderly Guarani Indian chief in Eastern Paraguay. The forest he inhabited was destroyed due to the construction of Icaray Dam, however amongst the natural devastation was the destruction of values, culture, language and people of his tribe. What one considers as development, can in reality be destruction. Therefore, the notion of behaving as ‘one-eyed giants’ (Van Der Post, 1955) is being challenged, as a new phase of dialogue is being sought via re-education, in order to give view to the wider, multi-layered complexity.

In terms of Forrester and Goulet's thinking, Lupton (2007, p 26/27) argues that ‘honourable work produces dignity’ and that effective development is achieved through education and exchange, not by doing work that the poor can do for themselves. It appears that education of the donor is not only sought, but also that of the receiver. He explains
that betterment projects give a man a fish but development teaches a man how to fish, in such a way that a transaction gives pleasure for the purchaser and the seller (Lupton, 2007, p 43). Therefore, like Forrester and Goulet, it is imperative to understand the lives of the poor communities in order to engage in effective development. According to Lupton (2007, p 50) the problem lies in the root of the “feel good factor” society which humanity thrives, as ‘betterment is easier and feels better’. Society, for Lupton, is obsessed with the personal satisfaction in aiding the poor which creates a polarisation of "doing for" approach, which hinders development. Instead, Lupton insists development must be sought as "doing with", whereby partnerships and exchanges are established in order to empower the marginalised. Frances, expands on this concept as he argues that charity cannot deliver alleviation of poverty, instead through partnerships, social change can transpire. Frances challenges the concept of what people believe the market is, rather than a money centred system which cripples the opportunity for challenging ones politics, Frances urges a value-centred market economics. Instead, value is contributed to “real” concerns which juxtapose the notions of value in monetary terms. Frances (2008, p 37) considers “real” values with that of ‘quality education and health - care systems; work for all; clean water and air; affordable sustainable energy; open, democratic government; cultural and religious tolerance; and harmonious vibrant communities’, all of which should be given a price and be counted in the market and work in partnership with the poor. Similarly, Ingham argues that development must defined as people-orientated, whereby human life is the paramount value within the context of development. She explains that there are ‘more than a billion persons in the developing world in absolute poverty and the number is increasing. Fourteen million children die each year before their fifth birthday’ (Ingham, 1993, p 1813). It therefore appears incomprehensive to view development in abstract terms, when vast amounts of individuals and communities with personal stories and dreams, die each and every day. Fundamental to the enquiry of development for Ingham, appears to be the ability and courage to confront ethical questions, and like Goulet, be ‘culturally sensitive’ (Ingham, 1993, p 1814). For Ingham and Frances, it is important to understand that it is insufficient to pool more money into activities such as health and education, but rather the goal for development is spoke in terms of the people and their perspective.

The shifting paradigm on the importance of human-centred development is discussed in great depth in Sen's capabilities approach, which emphasises development
as an expansion of freedom. Sen's work became greatly influential during the 1990's, whereby it ‘become the core of the widely used Human Development reports of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)’ (Giri, 2005, p 21) and guided the Millennium Development Goals in 2000. Capabilities, argues Sen ‘allows us to acknowledge the role of social values and prevailing mores, which can influence the freedoms that people enjoy and have reason to treasure’ (Sen, 1999, p 9). Sen's notion on development is influenced by the lack of freedom by those marginalised in society, in which he views freedom as the ‘building block’ (Sen, 1999, p 18) of progression. Sen reinforces the notion of effective partnership in order to lead to lives which the poor will have reason to value. He explains that ‘capabilities can be enhanced by public policy, but also, on the other side, the direction of public policy can be influenced by the effective use of participatory capabilities by the public. The two-way relationship is central to the analysis presented here’ (Sen, 1999, p 18). Freedoms, are both viewed as constructive roles, in which Sen (1999) labels as “functionings”, avoiding starvation and mortality and ensuring humans are literate; and as instrumental, in which Sen (1999) refers to as capabilities, whereby a person has effective access to secure rights, opportunities and entitlements. This interlocking relationship therefore seeks to address the complex web of underdevelopment, in which it is only through effective functioning, that one can make informed effective capabilities. Development in terms of Sen's assessment, advocates justice of basic needs and rights and generates an ethical obligation of society, to work in partnership to abolish unfreedoms of the poor. However, despite placing humans at the centre of development, rather than a means of development, Sen's approach, it could be argued, appears limited due to his inability to prioritise and outline the capabilities he sets forth. How can one strive towards effective development, if the importance of such capabilities and functionings are not hierarchically measured? The problem with this consideration, is whom should take responsibility and ownership of prioritising capabilities? The West, the poor, the governments, whom has the right on such decisions? Qizilbash (1996, p 1211) addresses this critique, whereby he highlights that Sen's approach is ‘too exclusively concerned with freedom as an ends, as compared to the means of freedom’. Rather than Sen's emphasis of development as liberation from constraints, one could argue that more importance should be placed upon the means of the freedom which must be ethically sought, in order to stimulate ethical development for all. One man's freedom, could be another's unfreedom. Therefore even within broader,
multi-dimensional conception of development as human flourishing, is development still the un-developer?

The exploration of the evolution of development, has importantly highlighted that the impact of globalisation on the economy, has furthered the gap between the rich and the poor. As a result, the desire and emphasis on capital, in which aid become a model for development, provided progress for the many whilst reducing the unfortunate “other”\(^1\). This thrusts the discussion on development of the poor into further urgency. However, this discussion has provided fruitful reflection concerning the interpretation of language in relation to development. As explored, this infatuation of development as a homogenous model of Western aspiration, has become the dominant practice for tackling issues of poverty. This analysis, however, argues that development within this paradigm is actually the result of underdevelopment. Despite the shift in development thinking, in which this chapter has highlighted various human-centred approaches, does the rethinking and re-examining of development still fall short within the development debate? Despite, the dissatisfaction concerning the notion of development as material prosperity, does the human-centred interpretations discussed, go far enough in an attempt to bridge the gap between the rich and poor nations? Owing to this critical evolution of development, theorists appear to have neglected the fact that faith is a powerful force within the developing world. As a result, a new ideological paradigm within the development dialogue is emerging, whereby theology is seen to intersect with development and is considered a beneficial tool to Third World communities.

\(^1\) By “other”, this thesis uses this term to mean those in the Third World, the marginalised, the poor.
Chapter Two

In Development, We Have Faith

Poverty is still a problem. It still exists. The Millennium Goals (MDG’s) are currently the most prominent force for tackling development issues and the review of its success is heavily looming. This chapter will discuss the implementation of the MDG's and highlight that despite the model being the current front-runner of development, its aims have been unsuccessful. There has been recent interaction of theology and development, in which the human-centred approach could be seen to have paved the way for the religious turn within the development debate. Despite the economic emphasis during the Marshall Plan, which believed religion would disappear as societies modernises, religion has now in fact taken an important role in the discussion. This chapter will provide a response to the limited discourse on faith and religion within the MDG’s, by highlighting four theological models of development in an attempt to provide various development frameworks within the contemporary Christian denominations. However, as this chapter will highlight, all of these models take place within the context of the Church and therefore produce limited outcomes. This thesis aims to search for a revolutionary approach to development which will be explored in later discussions concerning the “Theology of Laughter”.

commitment to fighting poverty’. Sachs (2005, p 25) affirmed that the authoritative declaration is ‘bold but achievable’ and provides a solution to escaping, what Sachs calls, the ‘poverty trap’ (Sachs, 2005).

The issue of world poverty was further thrust into the media spotlight when the MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY campaign was launched following the G8 summit in Gleneagles, Scotland in 2005. The response of the campaign fuelled society to respond to the inequalities between the world's rich and poor and the fight to break the cycle of poverty. ‘Nine out of ten people in the UK had heard of MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY, 7 million bought the white wrist bands which were a symbol of the campaign, and one-third of 16-25 year olds were involved in the campaign’ (Ross, 2007, p 80). However, the hope of the MDG's and the MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY campaign have only provided further disillusionment and disappointment owing to the reality that the targets of the MDG's are not likely to be met by 2015, and despite its aim, poverty is still not history. Easterly (2006, p 8) reaffirms the disillusionment, as he provides a critique to Sach's enthusiasm of the ‘beautiful goals’. He asserts his position as he boldly highlights the West's previous failed track record for not completing goals. Easterly's argument is supported by evidence in which ‘a UN summit in 1990, for example, set as a goal for the year 2000 universal primary-school enrolment. (That is now planned for 2015)’ (Easterly, 2006, p 9) and ‘a previous summit, in 1977, set in 1990 as the deadline for realising the goal of universal access to water and sanitation. Under the Millennium Development Goals, that target is now 2015’ (United Nations Habitat, 2003). The sentiment expressed in these statistics highlights how the West has failed to learn from its past efforts, in which the ‘legend’ (Easterly, 2006, p 33) of foreign aid from the 1950's ‘is the same legend that inspires aid today’ (Easterly, 2006, p 33). In a changing world, the model of the MDG's remained unchanged which has only provided a void utopia. The ‘covenant’ of the MDG's which Marshall and Van Saanen (2004, p 19) addresses appears unattainable within this current model of development, and in the face of such criticism, looks as if it is lacking a major dimension. Could religion be the necessary component of the development “covenant” in order to produce effective, long term solutions that The Millennium Goals and the MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY campaigns have failed so miserably on?

As a reaction to the experience of globalisation and the uncertainty the world presents, a new wave of development thinking is emerging, whereby theology is seen to
intersect with the discussion on development. The expanded space has promoted faith-based activity which invariably has evoked a new ideological paradigm for development. Beyer (1994) explains how the dominating praxis of development, in which development means to become 'like the West' and the favouring privatisation of faith, has paradoxically created an important shift which encounters religion. ‘Globalization of society, while structurally favouring privatization in religion, also provides fertile ground for the renewed public influence of religion’ (Beyer, 1994, p 71). In spite of modernising societies, religion within the Third World has ‘retained a much higher level of social importance’ (Haynes, 1997, p 713). With this in mind, one should not dismiss the importance of engaging with theology within the development praxis, and the value religion has for those within those societies. Significant to this notion, Clarke (2007) explains that the gradual shift in the relationship between theology and development is moving from ‘estrangement to engagement’, whereby the development debate was once seen as devoid of religious privilege, to an adoption of theological discourse as a beneficial tool.

As a result, the recent rise in discussion has led to research within the World Bank during the year 2000, in which it recognised the intersection of faith and development and constructed the Development Dialogue on Values and Ethics. Marshall and Van Saanen (2004, p 1) in a DDVE publication titled Development and Faith: When Mind, Heart, and Soul Work Together explores the correlation on both concepts in relation to the ‘heightened interest in how religion affects development, how development institutions should approach faith-based ideas and institutions, and (to a lesser extent) the impact of development on religious groups themselves’. Thereby, this ‘engagement’ (Clarke, 2007) illustrates the impact of both religion on development and the realities of development for that on religion. Hence, this discussion is thus inducing a reflection and re-education within the dominant paradigm of development, which seeks to explore the impact of the correlation of faith and social deprivation.

De Kadt (2009, p 783) explains that the market forces have dominated people’s lives for the last thirty years, in which, ‘they are seen to value people for what they are worth rather than for who they are’, and as a reaction, religion is providing individuals with real value and as an important nucleus of modern living. Moreover, Gaskill (1997, p 74) provides a critique of the Neoliberalism model, and argues that as a consequence of the economic orthodoxy ‘family and religion are experienced as the principal remaining
private enclaves in which meaningful and fulfilling social interaction can take place’. Each of these theological positions makes an important contribution to our understanding of religion and its impact within the modern society. This notion underpinned significant research explored by the World Bank in a study titled Voices of the Poor, in which it conclusively highlighted the importance of religion, especially for those on the fringes of society. Narayan et al (2000, p 47) highlights in the study that ‘spirituality, faith in God and connecting to the sacred in nature are integral part of poor people's lives in many parts of the world. Religious organisations are also valued for the assistance they provide for poor people’. Owing to this evaluation, religion it seems, provides a moral compass for individuals as a way to provide a sense of meaning and direction to one's life. Furthermore, it suggests the response to religious organisation is viewed positively and greatly welcomed. Research conducted by Gallup World Poll constructed by Tortora (2007) highlighted that ‘people often rate religious leaders and organisations as the most trusted members of their communities’. Therefore owing to this consideration, one could argue that those within the developing world are more likely welcome support from those of religious communities than that of the secular development sector. In view of this consideration, one could claim the beneficial significance of the joining of faith with that of development institutions, in which religion provides an access to trust and privilege in vulnerable communities, that development organisations could not access independently.

O'Brien and Palmer (in Clarke, 2011, p 3) highlights the prominence of religion within today's society in which ‘eighty percent of the world’s population profess religious faith; including 2.1 billion Christians, 1.3 billion Muslims, 950 million Hindus, 400 Buddhists and 13 million Jews’. It appears then, that religion is a significant principle in the majority of lives and the once polarised notions of theology and development need to be reconsidered in response to the statistics of religious followers. Lunn (2009, p 946) echoes this notion in which she proposes that religion should not be compartmentalised or seen as an ‘optional extra’ for development; just as religion is imbedded within the identity of an individual, she argues religion should be imbedded within the practice of development as an invaluable counterpart. It is only when the dismissal of a secular and technocratic framework is adopted, argues Clarke (2007, p 81), that individuals through theological discourse become ‘agents of transformation’. Despite the tension of religion and modernisation, it could be argued that religion can work alongside the technocratic framework. The effect of globalisation is, in many senses, not driving secularisation, but
is in fact driving individuals to put further emphasis on faith, as Beyer discussed. Owing to this consideration the technocratic environment need not be seen as a threat to that of religion, as Clarke claims. Perhaps Lunn (2009, p 946) could be seen to adopt a “middle way” in which she does not see the place of religion and the modern world quite so separately, but rather the ‘path forward for effective development lies in integrating the sacred and the secular and dismantling the pervasive dualisms’. Owing to this position, it would seem only appropriate to suggest that religion can still have a prominent place within the society, if it responds and moves with the modernising world.

As a response to the interest of the relationship of religion and development within the context of the postmodern world, a new discussion termed “Theology of Development” has sprung into the forefront of development dialogue. It is argued that this framework seeks to provide alternative models of development, in which one can use theology as a dominant tool to dismantle and comprehend the fatalities of previous models and drive effective practice. However, a key question that needs to be discussed, is who is the driving force within this relationship? Is religion responding to development? Or is development informing religion?

Duneulin and Rakodi (2011, p 46) in the paper Revisiting Religion: Development Studies Thirty Years On discusses how the role of religion affects the interpretation of, and engagement of development. He explains that ‘religion deeply influences people’s construction of meanings of the world, development studies needs to engage with the believer’s interpretations of social, economic, and political reality in light of their faith’. The interpretation of this relationship is also explored by Lunn (2009, p 945) whom argues that religion provides a unique lens which provides sharper focus to the injustices present in society, and attempts to reengage effectively. She explains that ‘religions have a vision of creating a better world that is not centred upon economic factors, their values and moral codes provide strong foundations for a more sustainable and appropriate development strategy’ (Lunn, 2009, p 945). The question in relation to Lunn's observation that arises is whether religious knowledge informs development thinking more effectively? And if so why? Naidoo (in James, 2009, p 3) argues that ‘FBO's probably provide the best social and physical infrastructure in the poorest communities....because churches, temples, mosques and other places of worship are the focal points for the communities they serve’. Similarly, Olutayo (www.biblicaltheology.com/Research/AdewunmijuPO01.pdf, no date, p 2) claims that ‘orthodoxy will lead to orthopraxis’,
therefore for Olutayo, the right belief is the foundation for right action. Russell (in Brady, 2006, p 353) provides an interesting contribution to religious practice and the effect on development. This is illustrated through the use of the metaphorical language of the table as an image of inclusion and empowerment. The altar as the ‘welcome table’ argues Russell (2006, p 354), provides a haven for those whom feel ‘least welcome’ (Russell, 2006, p 354) as a place where all can share the bread of God, as one community of people. Therefore, the table provides a powerful symbol of partnership between God and humanity, but also serves as a reminder to seek justice and inclusivity. In review of these considerations, one could argue that it is religion informing the service delivery of development and how one's faith identity can be an instructive tool for development in practice.

However, the relationship between faith and development presents challenges. Marshall and Van Saanen (2004, p 4) explains that despite aspirations, development and faith institutions are far from ‘harmonious’ and the relentless tension of ‘different languages (of disciplines, not tongues) and complex intuitional bureaucracies help keep the two worlds, separate’ (Marshall and Van Saanen, 2004, p 4). It appears that this contention is owing to issues such as ‘HIV/AIDS prevention strategies, approaches to ethical norms, environmental protection, and gender roles’ (Marshall and Van Saanen, 2004, p 4/5), whereby secular and religious responses can at times generate conflict. These issues not only seem to be creating a barrier between faith and development organisations, but also between faith communities themselves, whereby an array of voices can be heard. Furthermore, it appears the faith and development dialogue is narrowly constructed, and as a result, the emphasis is placed upon Christian organisations and less on world faiths. This consideration is addressed by Parfitt (2009, p 641) whereby he argues that ‘what may be alternative to “mainstream” development is very much the mainstream within that alternative’. Yet, despite the recent discussion it seems that faith initiative within the development discourse is still very much limited and owing to this consideration is it possible for the role of faith and development to produce an effective model?

This consideration if further problematized, as there not only seems to be limited research within the field, in which world faiths are rarely exemplified, but also within the Christian faith itself. Jones and Petersen (2011, p 1298) argue that ‘while the study of religion has typically focused on ritual, traditions and inner belief, this is rarely referenced
in writing on ‘religion and development’. Instead there is an engagement with religion only as institutions and organisations, and further narrowing of focus to those institutions and organisations that can be expressly categorised as religious or faith-based’. In order for the discussion of theology and development to be engaged effectively, it is vital that religious actors must be considered in multidimensional terms rather than institutionally, in order to prevent a normative model of development.

The need for a broader analysis of theologies and development is necessary due to the limited research and the unwillingness to ‘open itself up to exploring the different ways in which faith or religion is signified and practised in these organisations, something that requires micro-level ethnographic or sociological work’ (Jones and Petersen, 2011, p 1298). In agreement with Jones and Peterson, it is vital that one must challenge the current theological discussion concerning development and engage with the deeper religious affiliations of individual’s faith in order to fully establish its development trajectory. This thesis will respond to the limited discourse and engagement of religious beliefs and practices within the theology and development discourse, by presenting various models of theology and development through the case study of contemporary Christian denominations.

The first model of theology and development this paper is concerned, is within the Anglican Church. This model shall be titled the One of Charity. This model seeks to call Christians to act through love to one's neighbour. The vodcast of current Archbishop of Canterbury in his New Year statement shares (Welby, 2014): ‘Christians speak out and act on poverty and social justice because they have received the love of God and want to share it with others’. This interpretation of charity appears to be rooted in Edward's sermons discussed in Charity and Its Fruits, whereby he provides a theological account of love as meaning of charity, influenced by 1 Corinthians 13:1-2 which states ‘Though I speak with tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or tinkling cymbal.......and have not charity, I am nothing’. Edwards (2012, p 38) sermon 1.1 explains that charity ‘properly signifies love, or that disposition or affection by which one is dear to another’. The Biblical text provides moral instruction on charity, whereby one can respond in action to the personal needs of the poor. This model therefore illustrates how religion is informing development through the message of charity in the gospel. The mandate of development is highlighted in Mark 12:31 ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself. There is no other greater commandment greater than these’. 
Clifford (2010) in a Christian Aid report titled Theology and International Development explains that the foundation of charity is based on the relationship with God and humanity and the relationship between humanity and other human beings. She explains ‘First it is based on our understanding of God, who is characterised by entering into relationship with human beings and by his inherent nature, which includes love and justice’ (Clifford, 2010, p 12). The basis of this analysis can be illustrated in Genesis 1: 26-27 ‘So God created humankind in his image, in the image of God he created them; male and female he created them’. Humanity therefore enters into a special relationship with God as they are created in his likeness. A Church of England (2014) statement echoes this stance on development as it states ‘The church's position on international development grows out of an understanding of human dignity and wellbeing. This understanding recognises that since we are all made in the image of God we all have the prosperity to be creative, productive, responsible and generous beings’. Secondly, Clifford (2010, p 12) argues it is ‘our understanding of God as one who enters into a special relationship with human beings demands that they reflect that relationship in their dealings with one another’. This notion can be echoed in Luke 6:31 ‘And as you wish that others would do to you, do so to them’. Clifford explains ‘a restored relationship with God must entail a change in relationship with others’, whereby structural and personal sin are tackled. The transformation of sin and renewal is expressed by Barth (1955, p 401/2) in Church Dogmatics I, 2 The Doctrine of the Word of God in which he explains that the church only knows of broken relationships as it is members to sinners, however it is through community action of charity which unites believers. Therefore, development in this understanding not only creates an opportunity to restore broken relationships with humanity, but within this act it also enables individuals to restore their relationship with God. Therefore, this model could be understood as a triad of development relationships. Finally, Clifford explains that the relationship between human beings is to be spoken in terms of ‘human rights and responsibilities’ (Clifford, 2010, p 12) which seeks justice through the love of God. The ultimate aim, explains Williams (2009), is the ‘distribution of dignity’, where humans act as agents of transformation and development is perceived as an act of self-recovery.

The One of Charity model therefore focuses on the renewal of oneself and humanity, and restoring of sin through the love of God. Interestingly, the vodcast (Welby, 2014) firmly states that development is an issue of religion, whereby it is not concerned
about ‘politics, it's about love’. However, Cooper (2007, p14) challenges Welby's position as she argues that ‘Theology puts faith into action. Your theology is determined not by what you say you believe, but what you do with those beliefs. Theology then is never neutral. It demands that a stance be taken on all issues. Theology deals with the reality and is developed from reality. Therefore, theology is always political’. This critique is also held by Bedford-Strohm (2008, p 146) in which he argues that ‘all moral issues of today have personal and political dimensions’ and asserts that the denial of political significance could be a dangerous hindrance to the development model. However, in response to Welby's position in which he claims that religion is not a political issue but a statement of love, is this enough to challenge the present injustices in society? This tension is explored by Christian Aid whom withholds that poverty is a ‘scandal created and perpetuated by humankinds own systems and structures’ (Christian Aid, 2010), and despite Welby arguing that development is an issue of religion, at the same time it must be argued that even through love in action, one must engage and challenge political injustice owing to the imbalance of social structures. Love is an action of politics as it confronts marginalisation and structural inequality.

The second model of theology and development in which this thesis titles One of Many is rooted within the Catholic teaching, which is heavily focused upon sacramental emphasis and social teaching of inclusion for all. The Beatitudes have provided a great influence for how Christian life can be fulfilled within this tradition, with particular reference to The Sermon on the Mount, which looks closely to the community of the poor and hope for the future. It reads ‘Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied’ (Matthew 5:7). The struggle represented in the Beatitudes serves as a mission to Christians to function out of love for those in need, in which love of thy neighbour and God empowers the marginalised. A statement provided in the Catechism of the Catholic Church (1997, par.2444) highlights that the ‘The Church's love for the poor.....is a part of her constant tradition’, which reinforces the interconnected natures of theology and development, which are intertwined within the foundation of belief and practice which is deeply rooted by the Gospel of the Beatitudes. Moreover, in this sense one could deny this as theology and development as separate entities, but theology itself, where moral duty and response to need are the very foundations of one's faith. Development in this sense could be viewed as an ancient
practice implemented within Christian traditions, long before the term was even established.

This model further develops the position of unity of theology and development, in which rather than concentrating on the broken relationships and sin through charity presented in the One of Charity model, this model emphasises the interconnectedness of humanity, in the same way theology and development are intertwined. This notion is the foundation for the Catholic Social Teaching in which the 'preferential option for the poor' is lived and acted out. Pope John XXIII (1961, par. 157) in Mater et Magistra states that ‘solidarity which binds humanity together as members of a common family makes it impossible for wealthy nations to look with indifference upon hunger, misery and poverty of other nations whose citizens are unable to enjoy even elementary rights’. The interconnected nature of humanity as a model for development is also reinforced through the Church as a sacrament, which was formed by ‘God to preach and realise God's love to mankind’ and to ‘serve those in need’ (Kugler, 2012, p 1). Moreover, Martelet discusses the symbolic nature of the Eucharist as an image of unity between the rich and the poor, within one community, as they share in the body of Christ. Therefore, because of the interconnected nature of humanity ‘if one member suffers, all suffer together with it’ (1 Cor 12:26). An equally significant consideration in relation to this thought, is that it is fundamental that one recognises that ‘as the bread and wine bring to the table of symbolic loading of the world's culture, so we must accept that they evoke, to the world's distress’ (Martelet, 1976, p 36). Owing to the principle of humanity as one community, one is loaded with a moral imperative to respond to their neighbour's needs and suffering. This instruction serves as a reminder during each Eucharistic offering, as it unites in a body of faith.

The notion of the Catholic Social Teaching goes further than utilitarian objectives of “the greatest good for the greatest number”, it is rather the Church's responsibility to care for all people not just the greatest number. Therefore, the common good is fulfilled development of the entire world. Hollenback (2002, p 173) states that 'recovery of an active social commitment to the common good is a critical element in a serious effort to reduce poverty and advance economic justice'. In contrast to the One of Charity model, this model shows a willingness and necessity to engage within the political arena in order to challenge systems of injustice. The Populorum Progressio clearly voices the need for Christians to engage with political injustices as a religious duty. The statement illustrates
that ‘we cannot tolerate public and private expenditures of a wasteful nature; we cannot but condemn lavish displays of wealth by nations of individuals; we cannot approve a debilitating arms race. It is our solemn duty to speak out against them’ (Pope Paul VI, 1967, par.53). However, this call of action for humanity for equality and freedom of all, could be seen to be juxtaposed against the hierarchy and gender inequalities presented with the Church system itself. How is it possible for humanity work towards a “common good” if the church does not fully immerse itself within this principle?

An important notion that needs to be explored within the debate on theology and development, is whether the term “development” itself is appropriately titled, or does the term create restriction? Is “liberation” a more suitable expression in what one understands development and its aims to be? The emergence of Liberation Theology in the 1950/60's which proceeded from the Catholic Left in Brazil, forcefully challenged and made redundant the notion of development and replaced with the concept of liberation. The theology arose contextually, whereby it ‘speaks from and to a particular situation’ (Sindima, 2008, p 1) as it challenged political structures in order to release the marginalised from bondage, as it criticised nations for creating situations of dependency. It claimed capitalism, as the root of underdevelopment. Rowland (1999, p xiii) explains that ‘the Third World setting in situations of abject poverty and human need has given theology a particular urgency and distinctive outline’. This urgency which fundamentally places emphasis on the experiences of ‘oppression, vulnerability, or marginalisation have led to a sustained reflection on the Christian tradition’, challenges classical theology emphasis on ‘intellectual discourse’ and ‘detached reflection’ (Rowland, 1999, p 2), in favour of ‘doing theology’ as opposed to ‘learning theology’ (Rowland, 1999, p 2). Within this context, it is not theology informing development, but situations of underdevelopment informing reflections on theology, in which ‘practical discipleship becomes the dynamic within the theological understanding which takes place’ (Rowland, 1999, p 3). The important motif for this model of development is the re-reading of the Bible from the eyes of the poor, and a commitment to liberation and mission of the poor through a reflective praxis. This thesis titles this model of theology and development Becoming the Poor One.

Gutiérrez (in Assmann, 1975, p 36), a key scholar of Liberation Theology, argues that the term development is insufficient within the boundaries of theology, but instead ‘liberation’ leads more directly to the biblical sources that inspire man's presence and
action in history; liberation from sin and the bringing of a new life by Christ the Saviour’. For Gutiérrez (1973, p 17), the origin of development places focus on the negative, in which developmentalism came to ‘be synonymous with reflection and modernisation, that is to say, synonymous with timid measures, really ineffective in the long run and counterproductive to achieving a real transformation’. In addition, Cooper (2007, p 13) explains that development places emphasis only on negative freedoms, and as a reaction, the rejection of development in the South resulted in the emphasis on liberation. Liberation requires ‘freeing from oppression, a negative freedom....Importantly it is also freedom to act, a positive freedom’. In order for development to be effectively implemented, it must express ‘the inescapable moment of radical change which is foreign to the ordinary use of the term development’ (Gutiérrez, 1973, p 17). According to Cooper, the term development and liberation, are in fact, opposites. She argues that ‘people who are poor need liberation from development’ (Cooper, 2007, p 13). In response to Cooper's observation, the preconceived notion of development must shift and engage within the all-encompassing concept of liberation in order to flourish. Bouillard (1944, p 219) goes as far as to say that ‘a theology which is not up-to date is a false theology’, which further reinforces the importance of redefining the concept of development, and constantly adapting and shifting in response to social immorality and injustice.

The biblical basis central to Liberation theology is Luke 4:16-21 which reads: 'The spirit of the Lord is Upon me, because he has appointed me to bring good news to the poor, He has sent me to proclaim liberty to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to set free the oppressed, to announce that the time has come when the Lord will save his people’. Fundamental to this model is the Bible, in which it ‘becomes a vehicle of hope’ (Rowland, 1999, p 2), whereby the gospel reaffirms good news is preached to the poor and not their oppressors, and that Jesus identified with those in marginal societies. However, it is not the text's meaning itself which is important, but rather ‘the meaning the text has for the people reading it’ (Mesters cited in Gottawald, 1983, p 14). The Bible read contextually offers a ‘language so that the voice of the voiceless may be heard’ (Rowland, 1999, p 7). Despite this, Rowland (1999, p 131) argues that the ‘Bible is not merely a strategic tool for liberation; the Bible is the source of ‘God's project', which is a project of liberation'. Owing to this consideration, it is argued that God is a necessary
component for liberation, and therefore theology and development must work together simultaneously.

The process of liberation in light of faith, focuses on development of a ‘new humanity’ or ‘new society’ (Engler, 2000, p 341) which requires a process of conversion. This enables one to enter into the experiences of the marginalised, reflect upon the situation and ultimately come to know God through this reflection. Ruether (1972) argues that the poor in their situation as victims have internalised dominant self-images of themselves, and in order to generate self-esteem and empowerment they must move from views of self-hatred and destruction. Boff (1978, p 64) explores this notion and illustrates that ‘in the first place the Kingdom of God concerns people. It demands their conversion. Conversion means changing one's mode of thinking and acting to suit God, and therefore undergoing an interior revolution’. Importantly, Boff highlights that the interior conversion not only is encountered by the oppressed, but all participants, which suggests that to enable access to liberation, all must become liberated. Therefore, essential to the Becoming the Poor One model is the requirement of "bottom up theology”, whereby the only effective “option for the poor” is achieved when the neighbour becomes “the man on the path I deliberately place myself” (Gutiérrez in Assmann, 1975, p 7). For Gutiérrez (in Assmann, 1975, p 13), conversion means to follow ‘a new path’ and to ‘enter the world of the other, the poor man, and its demands, is to begin to be a "new man”’ (Gutiérrez in Assmann, 1975, p 17). Importantly, ‘it means thinking, feeling, and living like Christ’ (Gutiérrez in Assmann, 1975, p 17). The conversion requires one to place himself on the same path, in which he becomes part of the community and experiences of the poor by Becoming the Poor One.

But whom is the liberator? Fierro in The Militant Gospel (1977) uses Gutierrez to illustrate that humans are agents of their own transformation, and that liberation is a gift from God. This notion highlights the interwoven relationship of humanity and God, but ultimately illustrates the poor are successors of their fight for liberation. However, Fierro critiques Gutierrez, in which he presents a paradox of the liberator, in which he ‘fails to make a credible theological claim that God is the liberator’ (Brown, 1989, p 268), and therefore does not allude that theology has a definitive role in the liberating process. Boff (1978, p 43) claims that Christ is the ultimate liberator ‘of the sad human condition in its relationship with the world, the other, and God’. The ‘violent death undergone by Jesus must be explained as a re-action to his liberating action and as a price of God's liberation.
in the conflictual reality of history; the resurrection of Jesus is the anticipatory irruption of the definite liberation by means of which the u-topia of the Kingdom becomes topia in history’ (Gibellini, 1987, p 21). It is through Christ's salvation, and as the ultimate redeemer, and through Christian’s discipleship of the modelled Christ, that the Kingdom of God completes a full circle.

If, as expressed by Gutiérrez, the concept of liberation is all encompassing, is it possible for the oppressor to also become liberated? Freire (1970, p 42) discusses the important notion of the oppressed and oppressor dichotomy, whereby he argues that ‘it is only the oppressed who, by freeing themselves, can free their oppressors’. In Freire's (1970) view, development seekers are considered "non-worlders" as they exist outside the community of the poor and therefore cannot generate liberation. It is only through the empowerment of the poor that the oppressor will encounter a personal revolution. Gutiérrez reinforces this notion in which he insists that it is only in the context of the community of poor themselves, that a ‘true cultural revolution’ (Butcher, 1976, p 523) can occur. However, does this become problematic concerning dialogue of development and alienate the "non-worlders" that Freire discusses? Boff and Boff (1987) explores the concept of how Christians respond to injustice presented in society, and illustrates that it is only through making common cause with the poor and working out the gospel of liberation that freedom is experienced.

Howson (2011) explains that Liberation Theology has survived in the presence of today's society owing to the response it offers to the realities of social injustice. He explains that the movement is ‘driven by the belief that we are called in our daily life to build the Kingdom of God on earth as it is in Heaven’ (Howson, 2011, p 3). However, despite the Kingdom of God requiring human participation on earth, Boff (1978, p 281) clearly highlights that it ‘reaches its culmination in the eschatological future’ through Christ the redeemer. Owing to this consideration, does the Becoming the Poor One model purely generate a false ideology in which it serves to empower the poor through channelling notions of self-hatred into empowerment through reading the Bible contextually; but in fact, only provide provisional hope in the midst of poverty in the waiting of the eschatological redeemer? For Cone, there is no false hope. Christ is the perfect example of how one overcomes oppression and conquers freedom. He explains that ‘freedom is the opposite of oppression, but only the oppressed are truly free’ (Cone, 1990, p 160). This paradox serves as a reminder that Jesus connects with those in their
struggles, and only those who participate in oppression, experience authentic development. Fundamentally, Christ's 'resurrection is the discourse that God is not defeated by oppression but transforms it into the possibility of freedom' (Cone, 1990, p 118). Therefore, Christ suffered for humanity, and is present in humanity's suffering, as his salvation provides hope for the future.

An increase in recent popularity has emerged within the Pentecostal Movement, which ultimately has become ‘one of the fastest-growing religious movements of the Twenty-First century’ (Vondy, 2013, p 1). This movement is especially present within Latin America, whereby it provides individuals the opportunity of ‘seeking security in the face of an un-certain socio-economic future’ (Anderson, 2004, p 63). Moreover, Anderson (2004, p 103) claims that Pentecostalism has become ‘big business’ in Africa, which suggests that religion has become the market force of the marginalised in a fight to win over support. A possible reaction of the new found following could lend itself to the fact that the theology is firmly tied to the grassroots of the particular culture. The conditions of poverty provide a ‘socio-cultural reality that affords new and effective means to cope with and to overcome economic and political oppression’ (Vondy, 2013, p 93). In this sense, Pentecostalism is embedded within contextual theology, in a similar way to that of Liberation Theology, it starts with those ‘in a marginalised and under-privileged society struggling to find dignity and identity in the face of brutal Colonialism and oppression’ (Anderson, 2004, p 122). Theology, therefore, responds to issues of development and social inequality which serves as a function to ‘"construct a space" for freedom and dignity’ (Martin, 2002, p 140) and begin a journey of self- renewal. This thesis shall title this model of development, One is Born Again.

It is important to acknowledge that ‘if there is one central and distinctive theme in Pentecostal and Charismatic theology, then it is the work of the Holy Spirit’ (Anderson, 2004, p 187), in which it is ‘only by the spirit is Christ present to the believer’ (Land, 1993, p 59). This emphasis is derived from Acts of the Apostles (2:1-4) when a room gathered of disciples ‘were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit was giving them utterance’. Fundamental to this model, is the emphasis which is placed upon experience and spirituality of the believer, which gives rise to transformation. Owing to this consideration, Vondy (2010, p 78) explains that an intentional rejection of creeds and rigid liturgy is due to the 'limitation of spiritual freedom, a hastening of institutionalization and formalizations of the Christian life’, is to
allow one direct experience of the Holy Spirit. Anderson (2004, p 199) critiques the work of Western missionaries as he argues they were ‘out of touch with the real, holistic world that African experienced’ and, owing to this, the theology which was employed, appeared to stunt development. As a result, Pentecostalism aims to address unanswered questions in the South, in which the desire is to ‘meet the physical, emotional and spiritual needs’ (Anderson, 2004, p 199) of individuals, and provide a theology which offers a way ‘to cope in a threatening and hostile world’ (Anderson, 2004, p 199).

The way in which Pentecostalism provides solutions to problems, it is claimed, is through the ‘indwelling spirit’ (Anderson, 2004, p 203) which allows individuals to accept ‘genuine problems, consciously attempt to provide explanations for them and expect something to happen to resolve the problems through faith in God’ (Anderson, 2004, p 203). Importantly, transformation is driven by Christ, whom by his spirit transforms the individual through a "born again" experience. Owing to this consideration, theology acts as a liberator, to empower and transform the individual as it creates a ‘new mind-set of discipline, hard work, and self-reliance’ (Vondy, 2013, p 94) from within communities of poverty. Therefore, a new ideology is constructed whereby Pentecostals have taken on the cause of the powerless, in order to become representors of liberation for those whom have no other hope. Development within this model of theology, becomes active through the entrance of the Holy Spirit inspired by the narrative of Christ's salvation, in which individuals can be saved through Christ's grace. Surmond (1994, p 164) explains that ‘the crucified and risen Lord is the primal charism, the source and measure of all charisms. These gifts of grace are concrete expressions of the new (‘eternal’) life which overcomes death. This is the life of God's kingdom, and therefore of the eternal Sabbath play. Without gifts of grace there is no grace and no pledge of this new life’. Christ's death and resurrection provide a model for overcoming deprivation, which allows individuals to thrive in the triumph of Christ, and as a model to adopt a new mindset in which they become developers of their own destiny, through Christ.

However, the centrality of individual salvation and experience of the spiritual gifts to be reborn could be viewed as problematic in relation to development. Anderson explains that this model of theology and development ‘individualises social problems’ (Anderson, 2004, p 261) and assists believers to ‘feel independent and loosen ties connecting them with the members of their extended family’ (Meyer, 1999, p 104). In view of this assessment, one could argue that the One is Born Again model does not
appear to extend to worldly problems of the wider community, and could therefore be viewed as a paradox to development itself. Moreover, the emphasis of transformation and dismissal of the old self, has entered into a new revolution for some within the Pentecostal movement through the growing influence of the prosperity gospel. The position of poverty and injustice has placed further emphasis on material desires. Central to health and wealth gospel is the "law of identification", which is concerned with the relationship with Christ and humanity. Kenyon (1937) highlights that ‘material prosperity and physical health are the promises of God fulfilled in Christ and given in the atonement’. This embodies the position that through the incarnation and the cross, humanity is automatically identified with Christ and His victory, including material prosperity. Individuals are required to give offerings in return for overnight material success. Despite this belief, ‘the absence of receiving the desired results is blamed on the absence of faith in the believer’ (Barron, 1987, p 108). Lack of material success has fundamental repercussions for that of the believer owing to the relationship with Christ. As a result, the situation of poverty is ascribed to personal blame, in which development therefore becomes dependent upon authentic faith. The prosperity gospel consequently generates a distorted view on salvation, which questions what Jesus saves people from? The emphasis urges on Christ the redeemer of material prosperity rather than that of sin, due to this, development becomes self-centred, as opposed to Christ-centred. How are poor communities ever going to achieve development within this interaction of theology if development is materialistically constructed?

The dialogue of theology and development has provided a wide and fruitful dichotomy. On the one hand, religion is a ‘reflection of and a model for a lived reality’ (Hasu, 2006, p 679) whereby the lived reality shapes beliefs and moral conduct. Conversely on the other, ‘religious beliefs and ideas inform the ways economic circumstances are perceived, interpreted and acted upon’ (Hasu, 2006, p 679). Owing to this consideration, the complexity of the theology and development paradigm is apparent, whereby not one single model of development is generated, but rather models of theology. It appears that this engagement has however provided not just a new wave of development thinking, but as an alternative to the economic and capitalist framework which in many respects has furthered underdevelopment. However, despite religion offering individuals meaning to their circumstances, does the engagement of theology and development go far enough to provide long-term effective solutions for marginalised communities? Or is the
discussion a normative representation of faith owing to the little engagement of world religions and development, and therefore attracts a limited audience? Ultimately, whichever model is used will have a defined outcome and limitations, which can be problematic. In an attempt to universalise and widen the theological model, the next chapter will evaluate the significance of images in popular culture, by investigating how development is interpreted theologically throughout the Post-War years, which goes beyond the solidarity of the poor.
Chapter Three

The Irony of Empowerment: Iconography of the Silent

Images matter. Why? The practice of looking has become an important component within the world we inhabit, and as a reaction give rise to a realm of meaning. Rather than the textual and oral emphasis of the past two centuries, it is now visual aid which dominates how one perceives reality and makes sense of our purpose within the world. Sturkem and Cartright (2001, p 1) explains that ‘images have never been merely illustrations, they carry important content’. Due to the fact that images are loaded with meanings, means that ‘we are presented with a new set of challenges: to understand how images and their viewers make meaning, to determine what role images play in our cultures, and to consider what it means to negotiate so many images in our daily lives’ (Sturkem and Cartright, 2001, p 1). This observation expressed by Sturkem and Cartright is fundamental in relation to development, as it is images which govern how humanity thinks about issues of development and representations of policy. Owing to this consideration, this chapter will highlight the transformative nature and power behind imagery which ultimately contributes to a plethora of meaning and beliefs for an individual. Ultimately, as a result the engagement of theology and popular culture becomes an important notion of discussion. This chapter will evaluate the importance of communicating the correct ideology through visual rhetoric and will discuss the consequences of common stereotypes and misrepresented realities within the context of the developing world. Three major areas of development history represented through imagery will be explored: The Marshall Plan, 1980s and Post- late 1980’s onwards. The theological evaluation of development imagery despite its evolution, it is argued, still needs to go further than the current liberation imagery model into a Neo-Liberation phase which will allow the undeveloped to create their own destiny without Western dependency.

The power of the visual environment invites us into a communicative relationship that is ‘constantly addressing us, inviting us to interact with it and to define our own place
within it’ (Rompley, 2005, p 147). This visual rhetoric, explains Hall (1997, p 1), is the ‘privileged medium in which we make sense of things, in which meaning is produced and exchanged’ whereby ‘culture is about "shared meanings"’ (Hall, 1997, p 1). The notion of "shared meanings" expressed by Hall, seeks to remind individuals of the persuasive nature of images and the common ideology they can generate. Peters (in Gupta and Fergus, 1997, p 79) reinforces this hypothesis in which he states ‘part of what it means to live in a modern society is to depend on representations of that society. Modern men and women see proximate fragments with their own eyes and global totalities through the diverse media of social description’. Therefore, it appears that whilst images are transformative, they do not necessarily mirror reality, but rather ‘representing’ it according to conscious or unconscious conventions’ (Lewis, 2014, p 4). However the "representing" notion which Peters discusses, can impinge on the interpretation of what is the reality in which one perceives. Interestingly, Plate (2002, p 21) questions ‘Is seeing believing? Can we really trust what we see to be an accurate perception of reality?’ He explains that 'vision' is the process of transmission merely as a function, but it is through 'seeing' that the transmission is meaningful and a learning process. Fundamental to issues of development, therefore, is the question of whether the reality perceived through visual rhetoric as being the authentic reality experienced.

Structural linguist and semiotician Saussure, provides a two-fold mechanism whereby language is internalised in terms of denotation, which is used to describe the literal meaning of the sign, and connotation which refers to the deeper, complex meaning an image for an individual. This analytical recognition provides a useful tool in deciphering underlying background meaning of development imagery, which serves to provide a wider knowledge on the reality of the developing world, which becomes fundamental in the instruction of development policy. Barthes, further developed the model of sign generated by Saussure, in which he provides an additional level of language analysis which he titles "myth". Interestingly, Barthes (1974, p 9) assets ‘denotation is not the first meaning, but pretends to be so; under this illusion, it is ultimately no more than the last of the connotations (the one which sees both to establish and close the reading), the superior myth by which the text pretends to return to the nature of language, to language as nature’. Therefore, a connotation which is naturalised becomes a denotation with a dominant ideology, and the two-fold mechanism becomes intermingled and less distinct. Barthes responds to this process, as he generates a third order of
signification which reflects prevailing cultural worldviews, myth. In reference to this point, Barthes (1993, p 109) explains ‘every object in the world can pass from a closed, silent existence to an oral state, open to appropriation by society’ and paradoxically ‘myth hides nothing’ (Barthes, 1993, p 121). This understanding becomes important when seeking representations of development, as a dominant ideological paradigm can be generated through the language of image with an undesired portrayal of "representing" a reality, as opposed to the reality itself, in which Lewis points too. Moreover, a semiotic approach appears within itself, a restricted process which confines representation to that of language, which is ‘treated as a closed, rather static system’ (Hall, 1997, p 42) and conditions one to think about imagery in certain ways. Foucault, addresses this very point, he is rather concerned, not with language, but discourse relating to wider social practices. He asserts, ‘I believe one’s point of reference should not be to the great model of language (langue) and signs, but to that of war and battle. The history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than that of language: relations of power not relations of meaning…’ (Foucault, 1980, p 114/5). Foucault then, challenges this dominant discourse, which he terms ‘discursive formations’ (1972, p 38), in ways to provide significant meaning beyond the disciplined interpretations in order to relate to the wider histories. If, as Foucault suggests, discourse also influences how ideas are put into practice, one must adopt this projection in light of development, if one is to challenge the discursive discourse that currently dominate images of poverty.

Ultimately, images need to serve the correct ideological interpretation in order for development policy to produce effective solution, which reflect the reality portrayed in visual culture. However, despite the capacity for articulating powerful messages, there is no guarantee in the receiving of the message within the sender/receiver relationship. Hall (1973, p 134) notes that ‘different areas of social life appear to be mapped out into discursive domains, hierarchically organised into dominant or preferred meanings’. Despite this, Hall (1973, p 135) argues that since there is no necessary association of encoding and decoding, the ‘former can attempt to ‘pre-fer’ but cannot prescribe or guarantee the latter, which has its own conditions of existence’. Owing to this consideration, this chapter seeks to channel the evolution of development through the discourse of popular culture and how like Foucault, development imagery needs to provide a counter discourse in order to provide a platform to challenge pre-existing discursive formations.
Why is the engagement of religion and popular culture important? Culture, it seems is not a neatly defined term, however a general consensus is that it is the process ‘by which meaning is produced, contended for, and continually renegotiated and the context in which individual and communal identities are mediated and brought into being’ (Brown et al, 2001, p 5). Under this canopy of visual mediation, exists the religious traditions and communities. The religious/cultural dichotomy therefore, is the desire to link that of ‘aesthetics and ethics’ (Plate, 2002, p 9) in which the visual medium enables one to view the world, in a similar way in which religion creates a worldview. The natural urge to make sense of the universe grounds a new space in which the sacred and the profane intermingle in order to appropriate a sincere expression of cultural understanding.

Morgan (in Lynch, 2007, p 21) argues that to ‘ignore television, film, magazines, toys, fan clubs, souvenirs, or posters would be to miss fundamental aspects of religious behaviours since these activities and experiences are ingredients with which many, even most people religiously practice world-building and maintenance’. Moreover, the sacred-secular dichotomy generates a valuable ‘shared stock of symbols that embody people’s hope, desires, fears, and hatreds’ (Morgan in Lynch, 2007, p 21), which according to Morgan provide a common foundation for the dialogue. Lynch (2005, p 96) proposes that theology is better understood in light of ‘contemporary questions, beliefs, values, practices, and experiences’, because ‘culture is always revealing something of our humanity and potentially of God’ (Graham in Lynch, 2007, p 76). Yet, this working definition of popular culture is not purely limited to questions of meaning, but more importantly as a way of articulating a ‘realm of practice’ (Lynch, 2007, p78). Lynch (2005, p 22) argues that ‘in recent years, religious studies as a discipline has tended to shift its focus away from religions as abstracts systems of ritual and belief, or from studying the practices of religious elite, towards exploring how religions function in everyday contexts’. Therefore “culture” as a category, in which Lynch highlights, provokes one to reflect theologically in terms of practical concern and right action, and as a result, has a dual function which places further emphasis on orthopraxy. Hence, it seems important that a theological hermeneutic lens, whether one is shaped by faith or belief system or not, becomes a fundamental function in which it shapes contributions on community action and generates a creed of personal theologies.

Kobb (2005, p 7) explains that the media world has come to formulate its own doctrine in which it has become ‘a new cultural sphere with its own distinctive good and
guiding norms, its own productive institutions, its own creeds, laws, monuments, prophets, myths, and rituals, and discipline of inquiry’; and arguably sits within a sacred framework as opposed to the dominant secular model which it appears to perceive. Hopkins (in Brown, 2001, p 89) goes as far to say that ‘culture is always religious insofar as the way of life of all human beings entails some yearning for, belief in, and ritualization around that which is ultimate’. Owing to this consideration, it seems there is an important ‘affinity between the arts and theology’ (Lynch, 2007, p 79), whereby ‘secular culture reveals sacred reality, and sacred reality adopts the profane world’ (Ostwalt, 2012, p 2). The juxtaposed blurring of these two concepts in society, is defined by Lynch (2005, p 185), whom terms this entanglement, ‘theological aesthetics’. The ‘performative’ (Graham, 1996) function towards a theology of culture, it is argued, drives one towards questions of ultimate being through a dialogue of culture and practice. Ostwalt (2012) asserts that rather than theology being concerned with abstractions, such as the Word of God, the theology of culture shifts its focus towards active participation, whereby words are from God. In these terms, God speaks to humanity in a dialogue of culture responding to the "renegotiated" world through its evolution. This thesis argues that the interpretation of theology as praxis, embedded within the framework of culture, is fundamental concerning the engagement with development and visual culture, as its approach is ‘bold and barrier busting’ (Ostwalt, 2012, p 226). The response to the relentless “renegotiated” development space must be reflected through development policy, in which an urgent shift is crucial if a model seeks to adopt meaningful and long-lasting poverty eradication.

Quarry and Ramirez (2009, p 6) argues that ‘like a chameleon, communication is embedded in international development. It changes colour to reflect the development thinking of the day’. Owing to this evaluation, this thesis aims to channel the evolution of development policy represented through visual imagery, and decode the implication of such an image, by deciphering the meaning it has for its audience. Kothari (in Lewis et al, 2014, p 151) explains that ‘the significance of visual representation of contemporary development in, for example, charity campaigns, is receiving increasing attention’. Despite the intended aims, policy representation has been inadequate and a producers of African stereotypes.

Imagery become an important tool for construction of policy after World War II and the implementation of the Marshall Plan in 1947. With the situation of Europe in economic disrepair, the solution of development became associated with an American
architect model, in which this thesis shall title The Dreamland Model. Scott explains (2014, p 33), ‘after the Second World War and for several decades afterwards, modernisation was the dominant way in which development was conceived’. Modernisation within this understanding come to mean that underdeveloped societies should ‘aim to replicate the political, economic, social and cultural characteristics of 'modern', 'developed' Western societies’ (Scott, 2014, p 33). Fundamental to the concept of development in this sense, was that ‘development policy drew inspiration from the large scale ideology’ (Karabell, 1999, p 160), in which America adopted a sense of power and influence necessary to father Europe. Theologically, America could be perceived as ‘the way, and the truth, and the life’ (John 14:6), in which the architect model seeks to make ‘man in our image, according to our likeness’ (Genesis 1:26). Europe as the son, becomes adopted by the great father America, in order to develop.

Fundamentally, it is the United States which ‘has become, and remains, the country most identified with the idea that economic, political and even ideological reconstruction is the way to embed liberal ideas in the defeated illiberal state’ (Williams, 2006, p 125). This understanding therefore prompted the observer's country as ‘superior to the country or countries’ receiving aid assistance (Van Alphen in Bryson et el, 1994, p 261). This notion of reconstruction of the Americanisation paradigm is powerfully represented in the visual rhetoric of Post-War poster campaigns. (See Fig.1) Campbell et el (2014), explains that this notion of development is bound up with the ‘increasing 'footprint' of America’ as an established model of success. Initially, the imagery of the period can be seen to reflect a union of countries collectively working together to establish development. Upon deeper analysis, interestingly, the position of the American flag outside the circle of unity is striking as it appears to mirror the notion of dominance as it exists outside the scope of dependency, and acts as a model for the represented countries to follow. Jack (2002, p 11) argues that ‘America shapes the way non-Americans live and think. Before the Cold War ended, that had been true of half the world for several decades...Now, with the possible exception of North Korea and Burma, it is true of all of it’. Therefore, the connotative ideology generated within the imagery, paradoxically generates messages of American success and power which overrules presiding countries, juxtaposed to the unison the imagery immediately seeks.

However, Campbell et el (2004, p 133) argues that ‘for many in post war Britain, America's "dream-world" represented a positive alternative to the stuffy established
values of conservatism, rationing and repression’. The disneyfication\(^2\) of Europe generated a shift from fear, to that of ‘wonderment and joy’ (Campbell et al, 2004, p 181) in a similar way to the Americanisation of European folk tales. The fairy-tale development paradigm provided a notion that within the ‘supernormal or maybe "ideal" world, dreams can be realised’ (Campbell et al, 2004, p 182). This ideology evoked within development iconography became significant for the interpretation of development. The dominant interpretation of development became associated with materialism and capitalism, which provided a model for the Third World through aid implementation, and a "happily ever after" for the marginalised. Biblically, the sacred coming of the new world in the Kingdom of God as the ultimate sphere of salvation, is mirrored through the birth of a new creation of Europe. 2 Corinthians (5:17) states ‘the old has passed away; behold the new has come’, as eschatologically the underdeveloped attain new life through the adoption of a capitalist framework. Owing to this, the American dream could be seen as ‘at hand’ (Mark 1:15) and as a literal kingdom ruling God's whole creation. Daniel (7:27) asserts ‘the sovereignty, power and greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven will be handed over to the saints, the people of the Most High. His kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom, and all rulers will worship and obey him’. Instead, America is portrayed as the ruler of the coming Kingdom, giver of the sacred land, and as provider to the solution of "everlasting" development and future sacred reality. However, despite this utopian reconstruction The Dreamland Model has ultimately become greatly problematic and created an undesired reality, in which development became to be to inspire to the West: Development as the un-developer?

The era of the 1980's was a period of rock concerts, celebratory advocacy and shock campaigns. The ‘shock effect’ (Benthall, 2010) images of the period aimed to document an accurate representation of the lived reality of the poor, by illustrating starving infants and emancipated communities. (See Fig. 2). Scott (2014, p 141) explains that ‘the most frequently cited examples of this come from the campaigns associated with the famine in Ethiopia in 1983-85’. The images scream - help, desperation and need. Biblically, owing to the portrayal of this visual rhetoric, scripture seeks individuals to respond the vulnerable, and ascribe a responsibility to the poor, ‘when you see the naked,

\(^2\) The term disneyfication is defined as a transformation of something, or an environment with similar properties to produce a homogenized collective. The term was originally associated with the transformation of European Folktales of fear to joy perceived in Disney reproductions. The process of disneyfication can be liken to the removal of heritage and character of Europe, through the dominant repackaging of the American architect model of development during the Marshall Plan.
cover him; And not to hide yourself from your own flesh?’ (Isaiah 58:7) Therefore, the role of the medium in these campaigns becomes a fundamental function to evidence ‘the physical conditions of suffering, so that audiences cannot deny its existence’ (Scott, 2014, p 141) and further emphasises a common duty to the marginalised. The situation within the developing world was further documented worldwide through events of Band Aid and Live Aid, whereby participants of the nation were fuelled by support of celebrity activists, each cultivating a global solution to poverty. Owing to this representation tactic, it appeared impossible to reject the duty of the West in order to facilitate the development of the Rest. Boltanski (1999, p 20) attributes this enforced guilt to the fact of attributing knowledge of the suffering, in which individuals then have an obligation to give assistance. This condition is further reinforced through the representation of the innocent figure, in which Lamers (2005, p 47) clearly asserts that ‘everybody understands that you need to protect a child and take care of a child because of its vulnerability and innocence’.

In view of this consideration it appears that the pornography of poverty drives suffering to sell, whereby victim centred images appeal for sponsorship and donations. However, this representation is in fact, part of the problem. Chouliaraki (2013) explains that the repetition of such negative imagery embodies two responses, which ultimately creates the “compassion fatigue”. Firstly, the ‘bystander’ (Chouliaraki, 2013, p 60/1) effect produces a ‘reluctance to act on suffering’ (Chouliaraki, 2013, p 61) owing to the extensive problem of poverty which appears too permanent to resolve. Secondly, the "boomerang effect" in which images generate feeling of misery and shame. As a result, the media consumer is so engulfed by the seduction of suffering that one becomes neutralised by the shocking imagery, that it becomes ineffective and sufferers become ‘distant others’ (Chouliaraki, 2013, p 1). Conversely, Moeller (1999, p 37) explains that the arresting imagery may attribute to the compassion fatigue, but she argues that ‘no pictures for a crisis is worse’. This is owing to the notion that images not only provide information and knowledge, but they also have the power to inspire and undertake action.

However, this portrayal subsequently results in the construction of sufferers as ‘ideal victims’ (Höijer, 2004), whereby individuals through the power of visual imagery become common stereotypes of Africa. Moeller (1999, p 47) asserts images can provide opportunity for change, but also they are in danger of generating preconceived stereotypes due to the fact that ‘images are often married to known metaphors’, which can be greatly problematic for issues of development. The common typecast created through negative
iconography has subsequently depicted the West as the 'heroic saviour' and 'selfless aid workers' (Moeller, 1999, p 47), to the "desperate sufferer" in the South, which further engulfs the polarized positions in society. Chouliaraki (2013, p 84) vehemently refutes the Orientalist discourse of celebrity propaganda as it ‘glamorizes the idea of a Western sovereign subject who acts in the name of those unable to represent themselves’. This notion was reinforced in the later Live 8 concert, whereby Geldof stated that the complex poverty dilemma was a ‘mission accomplished, frankly’ (Burkeman, 2012). The status of a rock charisma to announce the situation on poverty as "accomplished", further highlights the status of Western saviours in which ‘heroes of a new sort’ (Dayon and Katz, 1992, p 26) are born. This adopted Messianic motif, as a liberator and fulfiller of promise, appears to have been adopted by the West, as Geldof ‘will tell us all things’ (John 4: 25) and ‘proclaim good news to the poor’ (Luke 4:18), as he plays redeemer of the marginalised, in which he acts as Father to the Sons of Africa (2 Samuel 7: 14-17) and announces the end of poverty. Conversely, this Western Sovereign Model is flawed, as it proclaims false prophecy for the poor, owing to the fact that the situation on poverty is far from accomplished; but rather its function appears to alleviate humanity's guilt, and satisfy a “feel good factor” born out of the Neoliberalism culture. Proverbs (22:9) illustrates ‘He shall be blessed; for he giveth to poor’ whereby ‘whoever oppresses a poor man insults his Maker, but he who is generous honours him’ (Proverbs 14: 31). Interestingly, this scripture places the giver of the poor as the subject rather than the poor themselves, which appears to further reinforce the dominance of the West in the situation of poverty. This interpretation can be seen to be mirrored through the iconography of the weak and vulnerable poor, in contrast to the powerful and stronger North, as donors of solutions to poverty. However, the vulnerable representation of the poor may not redeem, but in fact oppress. The representation of the African stereotype can entrap the marginalised in a cycle of “non-doing”, and generate reliance on the West in order to pull them from the poverty trap. Therefore, the imagery used in this Western Sovereign Model appears as a reflection of the critique on development discussed in chapter one, whereby the implication of Western aid assistance, consequently leads to Southern dependence and one being caught in the poverty trap.

Owing to the analysis of the Western Sovereign Model of visual rhetoric, one could argue that Western solidarity has been reduced to commodified practitioners of
rock spectacles and trendy wristbands\(^3\) which ultimately turns humanity into the ironic spectator\(^4\). Interestingly, ‘various studies conducted on direct mail fundraising in the donor community have suggested that most people have a distinct preference for positive photographs’ (Moeller, 1999, p 35). The use of negative imagery can be criticised on moral grounds for depriving victims of poverty of their dignity, which ‘exploit the poor for little more than voyeuristic ends’ (Plewes and Stuart in Bell, 2007, p 23). Consequently, there was a distinct shift in the late 1980’s towards to use of positive image appeals (Lidchi in Allen and Skelton, 1999). This adoption is often referred to as deliberate positivism which focuses on the positive effects of beneficiaries. Imagery illustrates ‘photos of smiling children’ (Scott, 2014, p 149) which present agency and individuality, unlike shock-effect visual. (See Fig 3.) Scott (2014, p 149) explains that many of the positive image campaigns present subjects as being ‘personalised by being named, being given a voice, or being depicted in situations which may confound our existing stereotypes’. Arguably, this representation aims to illustrate individuals as having a greater degree of agency, in which through solidarity of donors, have the ability to make a difference and create liberation from suffering. The notion of the solidarity for the poor became a central motif for Liberation Theology, as discussed in the previous chapter, whereby preference for the poor became a reflective praxis towards a process of liberation. ‘The spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to proclaim the good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to set the oppressed free’ (Isaiah 61: 1). Therefore, theologically the image evokes a profound message that through world cohesion and commitment to the poor, one can impact the lives of the marginalised and stimulate activism.

The positive imagery within The Liberation Model is centred on the partnership of ‘a shared humanity’ (Scott, 2014, p 149) working together, as opposed to the Western dominance and desperate depiction of vulnerability represented in The Western Sovereign Model. The West revert to the same grounding as the poor, in order to lift them up. This notion is reflected theologically through the Incarnation of Christ, in which he humbles himself to become a servant of God, in order for God to lift humanity. ‘Though he was in the form of God did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but he made

---

\(^3\) The white wristband initiative was employed in 2005 in Geldof’s \textit{MakePovertyHistory} campaign to raise the profile of the suffering of poverty.

\(^4\) Chouliaraki (2013) uses the term “ironic spectator”, whereby solidarity has become fashion conscious and momentary. Owing to this, solidarity becomes about the self, rather than the subject of the suffering.
himself nothing, taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even on the cross’ (Phil 2: 5-11). Although the positive depiction serves as a representation of joy, within the connotative interpretation the imagery serves to express a deeper a complex analysis, in which humanity’s own humbling is actioned in order for the poor to lift themselves. Despite this, the liberation iconography speaks of a change in circumstance of those in poverty, but also attributes ‘a sense of relief of being having “saved”’ (Manzo, 2008, p 640). Therefore, it appears the poor only generate a shared agency in which they cannot fulfil their own liberation, it is only through the resource of partnership of the West. Chouliaraki (2013, p 63) addresses this consideration as she argues that whilst ‘deliberate positivism appears to empower through discourse of dignity and agency, the continued reliance on charitable donations as a means of action ensures that 'they' remain objects of 'our' generosity’. Hence, a deeper understanding of the imagery implies that the beneficiaries are grateful to donors but they still ultimately rely on the continuation of donations, and are thus still dependent on the West to obtain happiness. Is deliberate positivism and shock effects therefore two sides of the same coin?

It appears despite the differing approaches to visual representation, ‘both appear on generating a sense of realism in order to produce appeals for action’ (Scott, 2014, p 151). It appears that positive imagery is no more an accurate representation of the lived reality than that of shock appeals, but instead further emphasises the power of North in which the South is ‘compounded by a reliance on gratitude’ (Scott, 2014, p 152). In this sense, the notion of smiling children appears to not reinforce the belief of humankind as one, but rather reaffirms the juxtaposed hierarchies of Western development partners, in which the North act as power figures, in which the South depend on to gain empowerment. Therefore, the positive rhetoric is no more concerned with empowerment of the poor than that of shock appeals.

Considering this evaluation of development imagery, one cannot doubt that imagery serves as an important function to facilitate development policy. Moreover, the process of seeing involves individuals into a reflection on the images which evoke meaning and action, and provide individuals with the opportunity to reflect on the meaning of life. Importantly, development iconography generates strong ideology and therefore conceptualises how humanity thinks and responds to issues of development, and consequently the reason for its evaluation. Therefore, it seems that images not only enable
individuals to make sense of the imagery, but also to conceptualise the social world and its demands. Owing to this consideration, the representation of reality through visual rhetoric can be greatly problematic if the imagery shapes the incorrect ideology. The "dreamland" imagery during the period of the Marshall Plan sought to provide America as the established model of success to develop Europe. The imagery strikingly asserts America's dominance, power and success in which it will father Europe through a capitalist framework. This generates a superiority of the donor country juxtaposed to the dependence of the beneficiary, thus creating an unhealthy hierarchy. Moreover, this notion of development, reinforced through iconography, has generated a dominant conception of development as materialism and seeking to be like the West. Therefore, the common ideology created is one of dependence and parallels. Despite the shift in depicting what was believed to be a lived "reality" through the "shock-appeals" in the 1980's, the negative images of suffering continue to reinforce the Southern dependency of the North in order to access development. Furthermore, the West play a new figure of "Saviour" to the Third World, and act as redeemer of poverty. The negative imagery sought to represent the extent and reality of suffering and desperation, in order for humanity to respond with compassion. However, the imagery became dangerously tangled with common stereotypes of Africa, and resulted in a problem in which many in the West believed was too great to tackle, and led many to become the 'ironic spectator' (Chouliaraki, 2013). Again, the ideology generated was the South depended on the West for development. The rise of positive imagery during the late 1980's portrayed the marginalised with dignity, individuality and a voice. Despite the imagery creating, what appeared to be, empowerment for the poor, thus still portrayed a message that the poor heavily rely on the West in order to facilitate images of joy and laughter. Owing to the evaluation of development imagery, it appears that despite the evolution of development visual imagery, the ideology remains the same - the South depend on the West. Therefore, owing to this consideration this thesis argues that the model of development imagery needs to move beyond the Liberation Model towards a Post-Liberation paradigm, in which the poor create their own development independent to that of the West.
Appendix

Fig.1

“Whatever the weather we must move together”.

“Beyond Hope, Beyond Life: A child, its eyes covered with flies, tries to take milk from its mother’s shriveled breast.”
Fig.3

Young girls in Sanankoro village, Mali, practise good hygiene by washing their hands in clean water from their new water points. Photographer credit: WaterAid/Layton Thompson.
Chapter Four

The Power of Paradox: Laughter in the Midst of Suffering

‘Poverty, inequality, violations of human rights and other forms of social justice are rarely associated with humour’ (Cameron, 2015, p 274). Despite this, this chapter will argue that laughter provides a valuable and effective model not just for the liberation of the poor, but also to raise awareness of social justice, whereby laughter provides a platform for political resistance and a counter reality. This thesis will highlight how a secular humour movement within the comedy circuit has created a counterculture to destabilise dominant ideology through humour. This notion has however been virtually unexplored within the Church; hence this work will establish a new theology of laughter, whereby development becomes re-packaged through a comedic lens in which the theological function of laughter provides a reflective praxis, as a subversive tool for liberation of the oppressed. This thesis will therefore place emphasis on the function of laughter beyond the traditional exegesis, and instead will evaluate laughter ‘from below’ (Bussie, 2007). The reason why this thesis adopts laughter is owing to the limitations of current models of development, as explored within the evaluation of the Millennium Development Goals in Chapter One, and the examination of the importance of religion within the dialogue of development, especially its place within the lives of the marginalised and the suffering; a notion which was reported within the analysis of theological models of faith in Chapter Two. Therefore, a theological humour movement can prescribe laughter as a weapon for the weak which is used as a revolutionary, low-cost and universal tool which can challenge social injustices it is presented with, and become a more meaningful model within the discussion on poverty. This thesis adopts a laughter “from below” owing to the Christian insight which argues how humanity has a shared relationship with Christ. It is through the commonality of suffering and a notion

---

5 Bussie’s (2007) term ‘from below’ will be adopted throughout this thesis, in which laughter will be explored from the position of those in marginalised societies. Development will thus be explored, from a Southern hemisphere perspective, providing those “from below” dominance and privilege in the outcome of their destiny.
of hope which become an important Christian category concerning laughter. Importantly, the performance of the carnival act proves fundamental in the discussion of laughter ‘from below’ (Bussie, 2007), whereby laughter is exercised as a ritual embodiment through subversive humour, in which the utopian laughter can be experienced as an alternative reality. This thesis will highlight how mocking play provides the marginalised a socio-political counter reality which disrupts the dominant hegemony and suspends hierarchies, as laughter becomes a unison experience, which extends to the wider social and political context. Fundamental to this position is how laughter within the theological paradigm creates agency which goes beyond partnership for the poor highlighted within the liberation model, which still requires dependency upon the dominant. This chapter will therefore illustrate how those who suffer can create their own destiny through the participation of the theology of laughter “from below”.

Fundamental to the discussion of theology and laughter is an understanding of what is meant by laughter? Laughter is considered a universal human activity, whereby every individual has the power and potential to exercise laughter. Laughter, it appears, is a form of communication which articulates an expression that goes beyond that of speech, in which it prescribes a spontaneous and overwhelming quality which becomes difficult to control. The Concise English Dictionary (1976) expresses laughter as an act or sound of laughing. Whilst this definition is simplest, it does however articulate an expression whereby laughter is seen as a reaction to a particular stimuli, and therefore provides a valuable starting point for discussion. In order to laugh, one must be confronted by a particular circumstance or social context. An obvious stimuli of laughter is that of humour, which can be exercised as a function to excite amusement and comedy, and the ability to perceive to joke or express laughter (The Concise English Dictionary, 1976). Is humour therefore the same as laughter? Although laughter and humour can be synonymous counterparts which ultimately overlap within the discussion, both have clearly defined meanings and can be considered as separate entities independent upon one another. When humour is the source of one’s response, laughter becomes the ‘language of humour’ (Zyderveld, 1983), as an expression of the social context or circumstance in which it arises. However, it is important to acknowledge within this discussion that humour is not the only stimuli of laughter. Laughter prescribes diverse functionality, in which can be exercised as lively amusement or that which denote scorn or derision (The Concise English Dictionary, 1976). Owing to its pervasive characteristics, it is not
surprising that ‘no single theory encompasses the phenomenon and meaning of laughter’ (Campbell, 2015, p 197). Laughter has been analysed from a plethora of perspectives: evolutionary, physiological, medical, ethical and theological (Campbell, 2015, p 197). It becomes clear when exploring the functionality of laughter, that its nature is highly paradoxical. Whilst in one instance laughter can create community, it can also create division. It can provide relief in moments of sorrow, as well as stimulate the sorrow of others. Laughter is comedy, but also occurs at times of tragedy (Campbell, 2015, p 197). Therefore, laughter must be explored as an expression not just of the humour incentive, but also as a response to non-humorous conditions.

Laughter within this context is not only a prescription of the ‘language of humour’ in which Zydeveld (1983) expresses, but it also becomes the language of the incomprehensible. This notion is suggestive in the imagery of laughter in which language such as, a crowd erupts with laughter, or a joke ‘cracked me up’ (Campbell, 2015, p 196) shatters the neat totalities in which one can make sense of the world they inhabit (Davis, 2000). Laughter, therefore has the ability to interpret, even for a moment, as it disrupts the static. Escarpit (1969) states that the role of laughter is one which changes ‘the angle of view on reality’ as a paradigm of growth (Shaw, 1960). Laughter, therefore can be seen as transformative. Laughter as the language of those within the midst of tragedy, as a response to non-humorous conditions, becomes the driving force of this thesis which considers laughter from below. This thesis will therefore explore laughter independent of humorous stimuli, but rather as a redemptive tool for expressing humiliation, shame, and marginalisation of one’s situation, in order to de-stabilise the current reality.

Firstly, it is important to consider the diversity of laughter portrayed within the three dominant theories. Humour within the various discourses provides valuable discussions in which laughter adopts various roles, whilst acknowledging that not one theory alone can provide a neat definition for laughter. Firstly, the superiority theory ascribes the relationship between power and humour which dates back to Aristotle and developed later by Plato. Laughter here is used as a devise to ridicule and mock those who are powerless, to make one feel more superior. Morreal (1987, p 12/13) explains ‘those who are weak and unable to retaliate when they are laughed at may rightly be called ridiculous……to feel delight instead of pain when we see our friends in misfortune- that is wrong’. This notion is further enriched in the work of Thomas Hobbes in which he maintains that laughter is the ‘sudden glory’ (Morreal, 1987, p 20) of the realisation of
superior dominance. Laughter within this context is used as a function to exploit the vulnerable to gain successive power through expressions of mocking. Owing to this, each position within the superiority theory all derive laughter from a particular position, in which superior dominance takes precedence. Alternatively, the function of laughter in the later development of the Incongruity Theory, postulated by Kant and Schopenhauer, maintains that humour derives from inappropriateness, whereby humour arises from situations which are least expected. In the Critique of Judgment, Kant (1951, I, I, 54), illustrates that ‘in everything that is to excite a lively laugh there must be something absurd (in which the understanding, therefore, can find no satisfaction). Laughter is an affection arising from the sudden transformation of a strained expectation into nothing’. Schopenhauer develops the rhetoric of Kant by expanding on the relationship between the paradox and laughter. He argues that ‘the sources of the ludicrous is always the paradoxical…accordingly the phenomenon of laughter always signifies the sudden apprehension of an incongruity between such a conception and the real object thought under it, thus between the abstract and concrete object of perception’. (Schopenhauer in Morreal, 1987, p 45-55). The subsequent exploration of laughter contributed by the materialist philosophers of the Nineteenth Century, use the relief theory to argue that humour is a form of release from physical pressure and psychological tensions. Spencer (1860) in The Physiology of Laughter withholds that excitement produces energy which needs to escape in one form or another. Freud (1905) develops the work of Spencer in Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious, whereby he defines three categories of laughter- humour, joking and the comic. He argues that all the categories repress physic energies which are released through laughter. Humour in this category does not however consider the political function of laughter beyond the moment of release, and appears to be limited by its discussion on the individual bodily experience. It becomes clear when exploring the functionality of laughter, that one theory alone cannot define it. Laughter’s functionality does indeed crack up and disrupt the theories which attempt to define it. Laughter’s power fractures whatever seeks to restrain it, as it serves to encompass fluidity beyond dogmatisation (Campbell, 2015, p 197).

Upon evaluation of the three dominant humour discourses, this thesis will explore the function of laughter within the religious social context, in which the dialogue discussed does not explore. Therefore, within a theological framework, this thesis shall argue how the power of laughter becomes most intense from within ‘the “religion
sphere”.....it encompasses the greatest “contradictions” and “tragedies” of all, but does so in a way as to take the suffering of existence into the unanticipated absurdity of our redemption’ (Bentley- Hart, 2009, p 95). Critchley (2002, p 1) argues that ‘humour defeats our expectations by producing a novel actuality, by changing the situation in which we find ourselves’. The change in situation in which laughter brings about the surrealisation of the real, can in itself in this sense, be considered a form of ‘liberation or evaluation’ (Critchley, 2002, p 9). The redefinition of humour within the Christian framework provides a new theology of laughter as a redemptive category, which paradoxically presents itself in the most unlikely of situations as a function of relief, hope and political challenge. This notion will be further explored later in this chapter.

However, despite the engagement of theology and laughter, the Church has not always considered the presence of humour to be an appropriate response to human mission or as a reaction to social struggle. The seriousness and sombre environment of the early Church came to dominant the view that ‘laughter alienates humanity from God, whilst tears unite the human and the divine’ (Bussie, 2007, p 18). This expression has unfavourably prevailed much of the modern era, whereby the ‘comic and the serious became, like the sacred and the profane, severed twins whose common parentage had to be scrupulously ignored’ (Sands, 1996, p 502). The sacred therefore, becomes an association of the non-humorous. This interpretation appears to be supported within the Biblical text, whereby it suggests lamentation draws one closer in relationship with God as sorrow transpires transformation. ‘Blessed are you who weep now, for you will laugh...Woe to you who are laughing now, for you will mourn and weep’ (Luke 6:21-15) and ‘Lament and mourn and weep. Let your laughter be turned into mourning and your joy into dejection’ (James 4: 9). It appears then, ‘the vast majority of traditional, Western theological and ethical thought steeped in unexamined presuppositions, either ignores laughter or rejects it as nihilistic and irresponsible, especially if occurring with tragic circumstances’ (Bussie, 2007, p 3). Niebuhr (in Hyers, 1969, p 135) goes as far to say that laughter has no place within the sacred, and ‘must be heard in the outer courts of religion; and the echoes of it should resound in the sanctuary; but there is no laughter in the holy and holies’. This notion appears to reject the beneficial qualities of laughter, especially concerning those within positions of affliction. Therefore, this interpretation can be somewhat misleading as laughter is presented within the Biblical text in its
diversity, which not only challenges the notion of laughter as a juxtaposition of the sacred, but also contests to the limited theological discussions on laughter held by the Church.

Much of the literary evidence of laughter within the Biblical text is dominated by mocking at periods of seriousness. Psalm (1:6) allows the reader to understand that God has the last laugh as he separates those who are good and evil, ‘for the Lord watches over the way of the righteous, but the way of the wicked lead to destruction’. Moreover, Christ is mocked as he is laid bare on the cross in which the laughter exposed is that of ridicule, as ‘He saved others; Himself he cannot save’ (Matthew 27:39-44). Laughter here questions the authority of Christ’s omnipotence. However, upon deeper critical Biblical reflection of laughter within the traditional narrative, there are several examples whereby a more encompassing dimension of laughter interprets the narratives which seek to contain it. Campbell (2015, p 198) argues that ‘interruption becomes a central theological category’, which becomes even more fundamental concerning the relationship of theology and laughter, and the paradoxical narratives that this interplay presents. Laughter that cracks and breaks through the dominant narrative, is laughter, in which this thesis argues, is most powerful and meaningful.

A recount of the Biblical scene whereby the elderly couple Sarah and Abraham are told they will bear a son (Genesis 18:9-12), initially provides a favourable example of much of the mocking humour presented within the Biblical narrative. Sarah responds to the news of her receiving a son through laughter, which becomes an unfathomable expression of disbelief in God’s promise. Biblical critic, Von Rad (1972, p 207) highlights Sarah’s laughter as a ‘mis-trust [of] Yahweh’s omnipotence’ which expresses the ‘doubting unbelief of human beings in the promises of God’ (Kuschel, 1994, p 51). However, a critical analysis of Sarah’s dismissive laughter considered “from below” provides a valuable interpretation, which challenges the expression of laughter as disbelief, but rather as an assertion of faith in the face of suffering. Laughter within this context provides a significant contribution beyond the traditional exegesis, and acts as an example whereby laughter is used as a theological interruption. This becomes an important notion within the discussion of the theology of laughter of the marginalised, which will be explored by Bussie in her work on The Laughter of the Oppressed later in this chapter.
The exploration of redemptive laughter can be further evidenced in the journey of Christ. The incarnation, and most notably, the Christian festival of the Feast of the Fools, provided a celebration of God becoming flesh. The paradox of embodiment of the child becoming king, provides a powerful assertion of a revolutionary, ritualistic laughter. ‘He brought down the powerful from their thrones, and lifted up the lowly; he has filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich away empty’ (Luke 1:52-53). The festival laughter therefore projects a subversion of the old order, in favour of an equal revolutionised new world. Moreover, the paradox of the crucifixion and laughter initially appear incongruent, however, within the context of the Roman culture, laughter was considered an important counterpart to the act of crucifixion (Campbell, 2015, p 200). The context in which crucifixion took place becomes an important consideration, owing to the fact that society was structured on positions within hierarchical ranks. The elite were those whom possessed power and were considered “high” positions, and the peasants and slaves were marginalised in communities as “low” members of society. Owing to this, the act of the crucifixion can be seen as a public humiliation of the royal king in which the ‘cross is literally his throne’ (Campbell, 2015, p 202). However, crucifixion laughter is paradoxical in its nature as it becomes a symbol of Christ’s coronation. Laughter therefore becomes subversive and ironic, as Christ overcomes death within the act of the resurrection. The laughter of Good Friday displays a final rebuke of power over the Devil, in which Christ has the last laugh as he continues to reign in His kingdom. The resurrection, therefore becomes the ultimate example of laughter as a political and revolutionary expression, which provides a biblical legitimisation for the use of redemptive laughter within the development dialogue, in order to “interrupt” the dominant and ineffective existing model.

The common characteristics of “breaking through” within the Biblical narrative of laughter, therefore provide an invitation for the Church to minister the relationship in practice. The importance lies in the understanding that genuine Christian laughter is characterised by its openness of its serious potentiality. However, to date, the Church has not used the function of laughter within a powerful and political context in order to unmask power and create resistance to oppression, despite examples of subversive laughter present in the life of Jesus. The current theological expressions of laughter which, in practice, are currently limited, has somewhat paved the way for the secular interaction of humour as a platform for resistance. The secular humour movement initiated in the
1970’s within the comedy circuit, which used humour as a device exploitation of sexuality, homophobia and racism stereotypes, were vocalised in television programmes such as The Comedians (1971) and Love Thy Neighbour (1972). Issues of migration were exemplified within the television series Love Thy Neighbour during a period whereby Britain struggled with the surge of Black immigrants. This tension was evidenced through racial sentiment through phrases such as “Nig-Nog” “Ali Baba” “Snowflake” and “White Honky”, but as a result has been greatly criticised for its political correctness concerning race. A first generation counterculture proceeded during the late 1970’s and early 1980’s as a reaction to the dominant hegemony, in which “alternative” comedy arrived on the media scene with Not the Nine O’Clock News (1979). The series provided a platform for reflections on current world affairs, through the use of sophisticated media footage and editing, in order to create a political counter movement. Furthermore, a recent second wave within the secular humour movement can be witnessed by counterparts such as Russell Brand and Al Murray during the May 2015 elections, in which they both exercise humour to challenge current political affairs and expose power. Murray created a counter political party to that of Farage’s UKIP, with FUKP (Free United Kingdom Party) in his Pub Landlord sketch. The patriotic manifesto inscribed on the back of a “fag packet”, noted ‘teach more stuff in schools’ and ‘free dogs for all’ (Smith, 2015). The parody campaign challenged the bigoted notions of Farage, with his “common-sense” pledges in order to establish an alternative movement through a secular comedic framework. The countercultures generated through the secular humour movement, evidences the emergence of an alternative reality through the challenge of dominant ideology, which is unmasked through a subversive laughter.

This thesis withhold that the secular humour movement provides a valuable framework, in which theology can adopt, in light of issues of social injustice in praxis. The use of laughter as a revolutionary, low-cost, universal tool, this thesis argues, provides a powerful weapon to the weak which can be adopted within a theological narrative, in order to ignite a theological humour movement and create a counter-reality in the same way as the secular theologies of laughter. Owing to this consideration, this thesis will use laughter as a critique of development in order to challenge the dominant model, through a theological framework, in which humour, as a redemptive category, provides a counterculture to de-mask power. Moreover, laughter within this context is not considered a profane category, but rather as a visible expression of the sacred upon the
theological reflection of the comic. Fundamental to the exploration of a theological humour movement model is the origin in which laughter arises. Importantly within this discussion, is the notion in which laughter grows out of its social context within the midst of struggle, injustice and marginalisation? Interestingly, this can be supported and evidenced within the Biblical text. Proverbs (14:3) highlights ‘even laughter the heart may ache’ and even in the midst of ‘destruction and famine you shall laugh, and shall not fear’ (Job 5:22). Laughter, it seems, is not an inappropriate reaction to situations of suffering in which the dominant view of the early church continues to prevail, but rather, as a positive response which creates comfort and hope.

Cruz (2012, p 388) argues that ‘at first glance, humor and laughter could be seen as a form of toleration of one’s oppressive situation’ or ‘making light of a situation in order to make it more bearable’. However on further reflection, it shall be argued that laughter of the oppressed provides a voice to the voiceless and as an instrument for empowerment as a response to non-human situations. Theologically, laughter within this category can provide a valuable tool to challenge social injustice and the oppressed/oppressor dichotomy which prevails much of the Third World.

Bussie in The Laughter of the Oppressed provides an account of laughter beyond the traditional exegesis, whereby she evaluates its function through the discourse of literature. Laughter is explored “from below”, just as Sarah’s expression of laughter can be analysed within the critical exploration of the Biblical text. In Nobel Peace Prize Winner Elie Wiesel novel Gates of the Forest (1966), Bussie evaluates that the oxymoronic laughter presented in the Holocaust literature provides a mode of theological resistance within a system of oppression. ‘The marginalized are by definition those who are forcibly silenced and denied language as a means of resisting their suffering’ (Bussie, 2007, p 39). Therefore, laughter not only provides a platform for challenging the oppressor/oppressed relationship and the refusal to be silenced in a non-violent approach, but also as a ‘subversive form of protest’ (Bussie, 2007, p 39). One could challenge this style as being ineffective and unable to challenge deep rooted injustices through the emotive, as opposed to the written. Arbuckle (2008, p 13) refutes this notion and firmly argues that laughter induces a prophetic function, in which it has the ability to ‘re-imagine alternative ways of behaving’, and provides an ethical and theological framework. Even if only for a moment, the ‘defiant power of his laughter is forever etched in the memories of the oppressors’ (Bussie, 2007, p 42), it has a lasting effect.
This paradoxical nature is further heighten as laughter becomes inextricably at play with theological thought through the language of oppositions: horror/love, oppressor/oppressed, crucified/resurrected and suffering/laughter. Gustav Aulèn (1931, p 20) in the Christus Victor theory on atonement argues that fundamental to the basis of Christian thought, is that ‘the work of Christ is first and foremost a victory over the powers which hold mankind in bondage: sin, death, and the devil’. Therefore, the oxymoronic language which dominates theological discourse is underpinned by the redemptive nature of triumph and liberation of unfreedoms, thus highlighting impossible situations of suffering can be overcome.

Moreover, the work of Moltmann in The Crucified God by its very nature reaffirms that the world can be viewed from the perspective of the sufferer, in which the body symbolises hope and fulfilment. ‘The Christ of the poor has always been the crucified Christ, they find in him a Christ who does not torture them, as their masters do, but becomes their brother and companion’ (Moltmann, 1989, p 49). Christ therefore becomes powerless in the visible world through his kenosis (self-emptying) out of love for his humanity, just as the voice of the voiceless becomes evident through the bodily act of laughter, and disembarks the invisible suffering. Therefore, Christ and humanity through their shared relationship and experiences of unfreedoms, become a symbol of redemption through the power of physical bodily experiences. Bussie (2007, p 184) reinforces the nature of laughter as a theological expression of anticipated hope and rejection of unfreedom explored by Moltmann, in which she argues ‘life is a conflict between two narratives: the narrative of reason/reality and the narrative of faith, the narrative of facts and the narrative for longing. This collision can lead to despair or hope, but when it leads to hope, that hope is heroic but appears to many eyes as madness. We hope because it is absurd’. The interrelationship therefore provides a powerful communication of the inexpressible when language becomes an inadequate tool, and bodily performance becomes sacramental. Laughter becomes a tool to therefore destabilise oppression, which this thesis argues, goes beyond the Liberation Model which requires partnership of the poor; laughter here is autonomous and self-governing, in which the oppressed themselves sets forth an ‘imperative chain of resistance in motion’ (Bussie, 2007, p 41) and acquire independent empowerment.

Critchley (2002, p 16) argues that ‘humour both reveals the situation, and indicates how the situation might be changed’. The invisible therefore becomes visible
through the redemptive power of laughter, which can begin to challenge an oppressed system. The oppressor/oppressed juxtaposition is fundamental in the discussion of poverty, in which this thesis argues that dominant notions of development, Western Aid assistance, is the largest oppressor threat, furthered by corrupt recipient governments, within the debate on oppression.

Foucault largely explores the notion of power, in which he is concerned, not with oppressive aspects of power which can be owned and exploited, but rather, power in terms of the resistance which is exerted upon those “from below”. For Foucault, ‘power is everywhere’ (Pylypa, 1998, p 23) in which all individuals are vehicles of power due to it being ‘embedded in discourses and norms that are part of the minute practices, habits, and interactions of our everyday lives’ (Pylypa, 1998, p 23). Interestingly, he explains ‘where there is power there is resistance’ (Foucault, 1978). Within this framework, power operates as a production of knowledge rather than repression, in which he defends ‘power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations’ (Foucault, 1977). Therefore, power within this context provides a model for individual’s “from below” to mobilise people as authoritative agents through power as ‘resistance, productive, producing positive effects’ (Kelly, 2009, p 38). This thesis therefore uses Foucault’s position on power within a theological model for development, in which laughter “from below”, enables individuals to access resistance of oppression and become agents of transformation.

The model of development within the theological framework in which this thesis withholds, provides a fresh insight beyond the dominant, in which laughter as a reflective theological praxis provides a counterculture and social movement through the subversive character of humour. The alternative development paradigm this thesis provides, has been greatly inspired by the work of Mikhail Bakhtin’s Theory of Carnival in the (1984) Rabelais of His World. He asserts that the practice of the carnival goes beyond a singular event, but rather as a social movement which challenges oppression and renegotiates power as a semiotic expression of the carnivalesque. Through the discussions of Rabelais, Bakhtin highlights how the medieval folk culture provides an opportunity, in which ‘for a day the fool or the fattest glutton in town became ‘king’, and, to a lesser extent, or at least by implication, the ‘king’ became a ‘fool’” (Crichlow and Armstrong, 2010, p 400).
The oppositions of “play” provides a relief from the rigid social code and authority as a countercultural system. The suspension of hierarchies during the carnival is ‘not a spectacle seen by the people; they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all the people. While the carnival lasts, there is no life outside it. During the carnival time life is subject only to its laws, that is, the laws of its own freedom’ (Bakhtin, 1984, p 7). Importantly, during the procession ‘all were considered equal’ (Bakhtin, 1984, p 10), whereby in the ‘carnivalesque game of inverting official values he sees the anticipation of another, utopia world in which anti-hierarchism, relativity of values, questions of authority, openness, joyous anarchy, and the ridiculing of all dogmas hold sway, a world in which syncretism and a myriad of differing perspectives are permitted’ (Lachmann, 1988/9, p 118).

The carnival, therefore provides a platform for a vision of change and an imaginary revolution, whereby social status becomes immobilised through the socio-political humour which unites humanity. The kinetic performance of laughter is thus derived from the autonomous self-governance of the body, which becomes an identity of liberation when language becomes an inadequate tool for development. The process of rebirth is not just imagined but a lived experienced. In this sense, ‘the carnival, not as a license to be free, but rather now as a free license to become’ (Hiebert, 2003, p 113). The medium of political play enables the self to encounter the transformation of the ‘becoming-channel’ (Hiebert, 2003, p 119), in which one is no longer a victim of social forces, but rather possess it. Interestingly, the carnival can not only be considered an exercise of a utopian counterculture, but also, as Hiebert (2003, p 124) points to, ‘can be read as a performative strategy for the unlimited reinvention of reality and the self”. The body itself becomes ‘carnivalesque’(Bakhtin, 1984) in which, “those who have been constructed by others as objects of desire and undesirable objects to enter into discourse and create an immediate subject position from which to address the social” (Downe, 1999, p 76). Individuals therefore generate agency through the discourse of humour. This understanding becomes fundamental concerning development, as those “from below” can equip the self through the power of the carnivalesque subversive humour as a collective identity, which does not require partnership and dependency that previous models of development thus require. By establishing a theology of laughter within the context of embodiment, allows for development of personhood and mobilisation of positive community life.
Afolabi (2009, p 151) argues that ‘partnership is the illusionary ideal often aspired to by exponents of popular participation in development’. However, is development as carnivalesque also only an illusionary model? The utopian environment which is created through the carnival parade ‘only lasts three days may give the outsider-observer the illusion that its role is to promote fun/happiness’ (Da Matta, 1977, p 19). Leading from the points made by Da Matta, firstly the appearance of performance could wrongly imply a harmonized condition which masks the deep rooted social inequalities that exist beyond the carnival experience. Moreover, what may appear as a form of empowerment ‘may serve as a manipulative tool for those who use the appearance of participation to fulfil a hidden agenda that, in essence, maintains the status quo - that is, the pretext of change through cosmetic adjustments instead of structural alterations that can actually redress poverty’ (Afolabi, 2009, p 163). It was believed that ‘owing to the fact that such festive periods were limited in time these protests carried little direct threat to the existing order’ (T'Hart in T'Hart and Bos, 2007, p 4). Therefore, one could argue that the polarized world of the carnival merely provides as a function of a momentary imagination, which does not outlive the participation of the performance. Despite this, fundamental to the carnival experience is the power one accesses through the mocking play which disrupts the existing affairs. Even for three days, its motivation long out lives the carnival as it is continuously readdressed at forthcoming parades, as the collective identity becomes negotiated. The strong bond generated through the subversive humour ‘often cuts through great obstacles better and more forcefully than being serious would’ (Horrace in Morreal, 1987, p 35). The impact of positive emotions therefore can strengthen and ignite a social movement and break down barriers of authority as laughter becomes a unison experience to all human feelings (T’Hart in T’Hart and Bos, 2007, p 8), and a more powerful weapon for the weak, than that of anger. Orwell (1945) advocated the power of laughter and its impact on the wider socio-political network, in which he deemed ‘each joke is a tiny revolution’ which enables change to be permissible and influential to the wider context. ‘The “unimagined” is made “imaginable”’ (T’Hart in T’Hart and Bos, 2007, p 20) for those “from below”, which may turn into a reality. This notion is evidenced within the Trinidad carnival which ‘seems to change its implications almost each decade, facing about to address different aspects of Trinidadian society, now emancipation, now class, now gender’ (Miller, 1994, p 130). It appears that the carnival dimension is driven by issues of social injustices which are addressed through its performative function, whereby the “unimagined” does in turn become a reality, and thus the cycle is constantly re-
addressed. As Burton (1997, p 156/7) expresses, the experience becomes either ‘undermined, strengthened, or renewed according to ideological taste’. Importantly, it is the experience of the unimaginable which may not provide an immediate reality, but generates hope for those marginalised. The dominant norms become subjugated through the act of subversive laughter which through knowledge, freedom and creativity within the aesthetic, provides a utopian human hope. Significantly, hope is an important notion not just within the theology of laughter, but also as a powerful Christian category. The biblical narrative highlights the greatest hope for all of Christian faith in humanity’s anticipation as they await the returning of Christ. ‘Blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ’ (Titus 2:13). Faith, in this instance, provides a reassuring commitment of God’s promise which can support individuals within their own periods of struggle, just as Christ overcome his struggle in death. Proverbs (23:18) affirms that ‘there is a future and your hope will not be cut off”. This strengthens and supports the interpretation in which one puts faith into the “imaginable”, in which the hope of a becoming a reality is experienced through the promise of God.

Laughter possesses diverse functionality. Whilst it may appear a paradox to the subject of suffering, and an inappropriate reaction to situations of hardship, a dominant belief held by the Church; this thesis has highlighted the power of paradox, in the midst of suffering. The juxtaposition of oppositions becomes most intense within the theological paradigm, in which Christianity is challenged by oxymoronic tensions which are overcome by positions of faith. A critical exploration of the Biblical narrative thus highlights examples of subversive laughter during the time of Jesus. Despite this analysis, laughter as a socio-political counterculture has been unexplored within a Christian framework. A theological interpretation of laughter biblically, therefore supports the use of laughter as a redemptive category concerning development, which aims to address the limited discourse of laughter by that of the Church, and an important notion which the Church can learn from and adopt.

The secular theologies of laughter have provide an “alternative” reality which generates a comedic social reality, which can provide a framework for a theology of laughter. The theological narrative explores laughter not from a position of the oppressor, but rather as a fundamental tool for those “from below”, in order to de-mask power and challenge dominant hegemony. Power in this formation is not concerned with exploitation, but is rather exercised as a resistance. The theology of laughter from this
perspective, generates an autonomous and self-governing agency which moves beyond the partnership of the poor within the Liberation Model, and as such, becomes a more meaningful theological and ethical exploration of their positions. In light of this, a genuine Christian laughter is at the heart of the Christian faith, and therefore laughter as a redemptive tool within a theological framework must be exercised inclusively. In other words, the Church and its ministry must expel this universal proclamation through its message and most importantly, its practice. A theological expression of faith as praxis, can be explored within Bakhtin’s carnival model which uses subversive humour in order to create a socio-political counter reality through the experience of performance. Those “from below” can use the carnivalesque as a tool to dismantle superior ideology and encounter transformation and liberation through the opposition of play. This ritual of the utopian laughter of the carnival becomes fundamental concerning development dialogue, as its performative function is in line with theological and ethical voices which seek to address issues of social injustices. The experience of carnivalesque will be further explored within the next chapter, in which it becomes fundamental to The Neo-Liberation Model of development, and the visual representation of development policy.
Chapter Five

Becoming Carnival: A Laughter of Liberation

The current ‘humourless’ (Bruner, 2005) state has provided a driving force to the critique of the dominant hegemony of development, owing to the preference of partnership, which ultimately breeds power struggle and strengthens hierarchical structures. As a result, the notion of power has to be an important component within the discussion of poverty, and as previously noted, this thesis adopts the theological framework of laughter “from below” to disable oppression and generate liberation. Significantly, notions of power are nowhere clearer than when development dialogue is represented through visual rhetoric. As explored in Chapter Three, imagery is a powerful tool in relation to discussions on poverty owing to the fact that visual aid has come to dominate how one makes sense of the world we inhabit, and as a result, how humanity is informed on development. Therefore, it is fundamental that representation generates correct ideological development policy in order to make a meaningful change to the lives of the marginalised. Owing to this consideration, it is the focus of this chapter to evaluate the current visual development rhetoric which adopts a comedic framework in order to create awareness on poverty. In view of this, this chapter will provide a theological critique in light of Christian insight, which will predominantly analyse case studies on the British development organisation, Comic Relief, whom alerts viewers on issues of the poor through their campaigns of Red Nose Day and Sport Relief; and Norwegian development agency SAIH (The Norwegian Student’s and Academics’ International Assistance Fund) through spoof development commentary. Notably, this analysis aims to illustrate that humour is used paradoxically with reference to Comic Relief, whereby this thesis argues that laughter is used as a device for the transgression of the celebrity endorser and African ‘subject’; as opposed to the carnivalesque parody represented by SIAH, whilst both attempting to establish a new reality. Whilst this chapter aims to highlight SIAH’s adoption of laughter as a redemptive category, it also aims to address that development imagery still must enter into a third-wave counterculture in order to create meaningful solutions to poverty. Owing to this, this chapter will also focus its
enquiry on a theology of laughter, in which this thesis argues, adopts a full carnivalesque experience, independent of Western voices, in which the marginalised can create their own destiny. This thesis shall title this model, The Neo-Liberation⁶ - A revived assessment beyond The Liberation Model.

The British organisation Comic Relief, founded in 1985 by comedy scriptwriter Richard Curtis and comedian Lenny Henry, arose as a result of the widespread famine in Ethiopia (1983-5). The first Red Noses Day telethon employed in 1988 was supported by 150 celebrities and comedians in order to raise awareness on famine, and still continues to show on our television screens every March. To date, the Comic Relief initiative has raised in excess of £1bn throughout its 30 year history, by its ethos of ‘Do Something Funny for Money’ (Comic Relief, 2015a). The annual telethon seeks to provide comedic entertainment, whilst raising funds to tackle worldwide poverty in which celebrities and comedians embark upon gruelling challenges of hardship and struggle, with events such as a 24hr Dance-a-thons and swimming the English Channel. This celebrity involvement, one might want to argue, brings further awareness to the problem of poverty, even Kofi Annan appears to support this view, as he believes that celebrity humanitarians ‘help instil in young people the values of understanding, solidarity, respect and communication across cultures….so that those values come to them naturally for the rest of their lives’ (UN News Centre, 2002). However, does this celebrity involvement raise further awareness of their own social status through the use of laughter, rather than that of the subject of poverty?

In March 2015, the public saw television presenter Dermot O’Leary endure a 24 hour day of dance, in which he was joined by a whole host of celebrity friends such as Jamie Oliver, Caroline Flack, Stephen Merchant and John Bishop. Its fundamental intention it seems, is to create a response of laughter to the boogie shaking of the two left footed endorser. Moreover, the seemingly impossible task which created horrific ‘blisters’ (Comic Relief, 2015b) and necessitated ‘ice-baths’ (Comic Relief, 2015b) provided an experience for the celebrity humanitarian to encounter “suffering” and “despair”, in which he could in some way relate to the helpless African. This comedic

⁶ This thesis creates a new model for development thinking, in which this thesis titles The Neo-Liberation Model. The prefix “neo” represents a new, revived model of The Liberation Model, which still gives preference to the marginalised, but goes further than that of partnership. The Neo-Liberation Model provides a model of development which generates autonomous agency through the experience of carnivalesque laughter.
task is set against O’Leary’s visit to Kisumu, Kenya whereby the viewers witness his journey of 24hrs with the street children. O’Leary (Comic Relief, 2015b) speaks of the experience ‘It was extraordinary. I met these three young men - two 12 year olds and a 14 year old – who have had to grow up in an instant because they don’t have the safety net we have in this country. Their lives are so stark, they live on a day to day basis, they try to make as much money as they can to survive, and all they want to do is to go to school’. A twelve year old boy named Fred was met with emotion provoking questioning by O’Leary (Comic Relief, 2015c) whom poses:

   **O’Leary: Where are your mother and father?**

   Fred: They have died.

   **O’Leary: When did they die?**

   Fred: I was young.

   **O’Leary: What was it like when you came here at first?**

   Fred: I was scared.

   **O’Leary: Who looks after you?**

   Fred: Nobody…..it’s so very hard.

   The absent “Nobody” is reinforced during O’Leary’s 24hr homeless experience. The boys sleep on cardboard boxes and in sacks along an unsafe, busy road. O’Leary, of his journey, witnesses a car crash just feet away from him and the boys whilst sleeping, but still O’Leary seeks further clarification:

   **O’Leary: How did you sleep?**

   A similar pattern can be seen in the 2012 Sports Relief challenge of John Bishop, whereby he tolerated 290 miles of cycling, rowing and running within a five day period described as, ‘A Heavenly Finish to One Week of Hell’ (Comic Relief, 2012) as he travelled from Paris to Trafalgar Square. The ‘fighting against extreme fatigue, sickness, and chafing limbs’ (Comic Relief, 2012) becomes juxtaposed by Bishop’s victorious greeting by the Liverpool FC anthem “You’ll Never Walk Alone” by crowds of supporters. The metaphorical account of his journey is mirrored in his witnessing of A
Life No Child Should Have to Live, as he learns of the experiences of living and working in a slum in Sierra Leone. Viewers of the imagery are immediately presented with Third World children being asked what they would like to be when they are older, followed by the raising of hands of all those currently in education whom used to work on the dumpsite before school - shockingly all partook. Margaret, the ten year old girl whom Bishop (Sport Relief, 2012) meets is asked:

**Bishop:** What is the best thing you have found on the dump?

Margaret: Rice, as food.

**Bishop:** Rice, that’s the best thing you have ever found?

Margaret: Yes, it is.

Bishop’s reaction is startling, in which he cannot comprehend the young girl’s response.

It appears that much of the reason for celebrity involvement in the development narrative, is as a discursive tool to heighten the agenda of poverty and stimulate compassion. Douzinas (2007, p 11) highlights that ‘in recent years, humanitarianism has arguably turned into the ‘ultimate political ideology, bringing together the well-being of the West with the hardships of the global South’. Therefore, Western politics it seems is becoming ‘increasingly constructed through emotional appeals, management of symbols, affections, and imaginaries of being and becoming’ (Yrjölä, 2009, p 3). Owing to this consideration, the political agenda becomes personalised, as it is intertwined amongst emotional appeals which seek to challenge injustices. For the celebrity humanitarians, the intention to educate citizens is that in which ‘human beings are all the same, that the relationship between the West and the Rest is one of equals, and therefore that distant sufferers are worthy of compassion’ (Kogen, 2015, p 48) is of paramount. Humanitarianism in this context, becomes a fundamental tool to frame contemporary politics. Despite this, Kogen (2015, p 48/9) asserts that despite the political intention, an apolitical outcome is generated, whereby ‘the comparison is only between human beings at their most basic level; victims are portrayed as “like everyone else” but without the ability to properly understand the context of their condition, or any possible solutions for it’. The seemingly political intent of the celebrity diplomat it is argued, is overshadowed
by the notion of the celebrity as a spectacle. Rather, the public are drawn and become transfixed on the spectacle image itself, and in turn, opposes the charity’s function.

Guy Debord’s critique of the spectacle and the celebrity in his works The Society of the Spectacle (1967/1994), provides a valuable contribution concerning the notion of entertainment provided by celebrity fundraising campaigns. The 221 numbered ‘theses’ Debord frames, strongly critiques the projection of celebrity suffering, which as a result, has erased the charitable causes in which they lend their name to. For Debord (1994, [25]) ‘separation is the alpha and omega of the spectacle’, whereby the logic of everyday life appears as a fragmented nature of existence which is devoid of any unitary aspect of society. The spectacle is the reunification of these fragmentations in which the image presents a state of wholeness and totality. In other words, celebrities act as a voyeuristic entity which ‘commodifies social relations and experiences into consumable goods’ (Lim, 2015, p 528), whereby the ‘framing of this commodification is the spectacle’. The transformational journey of physical hardship and emotional suffering of the spectacle becomes paradoxical through its visual representation, as the narrative ‘silences anything that it finds inconvenient’ (Debord, 1994, 13), and as a result, the pornography of suffering becomes a drifting signifier devoid of meaning (Baudrillard, 1981). Consequently, in the case of Comic Relief, it is not only the marginalised which are masked by the all-consuming spectacle, but also ‘the charities themselves are not heard or seen, except in very brief glimpses’ (Lim, 2015, p 528). Rather, the narrative rests upon the notion of the transgression of the spectacle, as a heroic symbol of surviving hardships and victory over physical and emotional restraints, as a commodified package of the distant sufferer who endures life threatening suffering on a daily basis. Lim and Moufahim (2015, p 543) explains that ‘they did not start as heroes - the journey creates them as such’. The spectacularisation of the event glamorises the celebrity as a figure of bravery, whilst it dehistoricizes the life of the aid recipient, thus further engulfing the gap between the two relations.

The visual representation of the spectacle ultimately reinforces neo-colonialism (to deny Africans their own voice) through the orientalist imagery. Chouliaraki (2012, p 1) terms this experience the ‘theatricality of humanitarianism’, in which ‘entertainment and staged events become the organising principle of the capitalist society’ (Lim and Moufahim, 2015, p 529), in a way that is both ‘fun and deeply unequal’ (Best & Kellner, 1999). The representation of the spectacle as ‘beautiful people in stark contrast to the
African poor perpetuate historical relationships of power between Western missionaries and indigenous locals’ (Chouliaraki, 2012, p 4). The notion of juxtaposition between the portrayals of the black and white image further creates a dividing boundary of “them” and “us”, as the white image dictates the propagation of power over poverty. Theologically, Beckford (1998, p 35) also notes this emphasis as he argues that Biblical language and imagery is inclined to that of the white superior, which theologically, is associated with purity and holiness, and in part, can ‘be self-debasing, as it fails to affirm the positive aspects of darkness within scripture’. Owing to this, this white dominance further validates the system of oppression and unequal positions of status as it portrays poverty as a spectacle without moral content. As a result, unless the spectacle is subverted, the mental scripts of the visiting celebrity will continue to predetermine them as instigators of salvation (De Waal, 2008, p 43). Individuals will continue to ‘consume a world fabricated by others rather than producing their own’ (Best & Kellner, 1999, p 132), and so, the Band Aid narrative will live on. Theology as praxis, therefore must adopt a position “from below” in order to place dominance on the inferior “other”.

‘In the past few decades, the picture of Africa as the archetypical continent of suffering that requires charitable intervention has been reinforced’ (Müller, 2013, p 475). Given this analysis, this thesis argues that the use of comedy projected by Comic Relief serves to further stabilise the disparity of the binary British superior, against the homogenized African through use of patronising giving. The powerful elite provide a voice for the inferior poor, in which despite their individualisation, the African is constructed through the celebrity as a shared autonomy and reality. In other words, the oppressor/oppressed dichotomy is exemplified through O’Leary and Bishops’ condescending and emotion provoking questioning, which ‘serves a purpose in the maintenance of hegemonic Western activity in Africa’ (Yrjölä, 2009, p 279). The discussion is dominated by the powerful elite through the use of leading questioning, in which the hegemonic counterpart remains a subordinate, in which he is not provided his own voice, but rather becomes represented through the Western cultural discourse. The positioning of the camera gets close the subordinate ‘as though aiming to capture the smallest detail turning them into objects through symbolic expression’ (Sontag, 1979, p 14). The close up shots highlight the blank expressions and emotionless state of the African child. Chouliaraki (2012, p 6) refers to this experience as personification which ‘refers to the sufferer, who cannot speak of her/his misfortune, refracted as this is through
the celebrities own performance of emotion about the sufferer’s experience’. As a result, the destiny of the passive victim is in the hands of the celebrity humanitarianism, in which the African continent is empowered by the West (Mayer, 2002). The communicative exchange between them interestingly highlights how these power relations are maintained, and the quest for change becomes an illusionary mirage, in which celebrity humanitarians are absorbed in ‘systems of meaning production [which] are intimately related to practices of power – the power to define and defend ‘reality’’ (Shepherd, 2006, p 21). For this reason, it is argued that celebrities become carries of its message in which it obligates and constructs the imagined world of the poor through a system of power. As a result, the reality they are attempting to enforce on the poor is a blueprint of the Western lifestyle model - a domination of materialisation, power and status. Kogen (2015, p 55) asserts:

By emphasising the context of the situation rather than the powerlessness of the victims, emphasising the power of individuals, and privileging justice over charity by acknowledging the historical role of the West and the current economic incentives that exacerbate suffering, communicators may bring about change through political action, and indirectly through changed perceptions and attitudes.

In order to discuss the global humanitarianism crisis more effectively, media forms need to define humanity’s moral order and societal space. Development in this sense, this thesis argues, must become carnivalesque (Bakhtin, 1984). By carnivalesque, this thesis means that the hegemonic dialogue represented by relief efforts such as Comic Relief, are challenged and turned upside down in order for the media to generate a progressive cosmopolitanism (Boltanski, 1999); whereby the media illustrates ‘not only in the passivity of suffering, but also in the action they take to confront and escape it’ (Boltanski, 1999, p 190). Littler (2008, p 237) argues that the ‘impoverished “others” and the non-destitute, non-celebrity “ordinary” subject can tell us something both about how such power relationships are maintained, and how the possibilities of change to global injustices are maintained and disavowed’. Instead of employing unrelated forms of humour, as explored with the Comic Relief agency appeals, the functionality of laughter

---

7 Carnivalesque, a term adopted by Mikhail Bakhtin in Rabelais of His World (1984) meaning a renegotiation of power, whereby the world is turned upside down to create an alternative counterculture through the experience of the subversive carnival laughter. Carnivalesque development, is therefore a model which challenges stereotypical hegemonic fundraising campaigns, by providing the marginalised an autonomous voice through the no-cost weapon of redemptive laughter, in order to create an alternative reality to their situation on poverty and development thinking.
within Bakhtin’s parody of the carnival festivity, and Bussie’s positioning of laughter from that of the oppressed, provide a fundamental framework concerning comedy’s subversive task and development representation. This framework seeks to challenge the dominant discourse by mobilising an alternative counterculture, challenge oppressor dichotomy and provide a voice for the marginalised which speaks freedom. All of which can be seen to be reflected through the communicative function of SIAH. Development, therefore becomes critiqued, as the carnivalesque model generates a new alternative, in which the marginalised become universal representatives of their own destiny.

Norwegian development agency SIAH, this thesis argues, creates a carnivalesque media platform, whereby laughter is adopted as subversive function to ‘challenge dominant Western images and stereotypes of Africa, with focus overwhelmingly on the continent as a place of hunger, poverty and AIDS, whilst ignoring both positive development in the region and the many ways in which Western countries have had negative impacts on developing countries’ (Fridell, 2013, p 1492). The Radi-Aid Africa for Norway spoof video of the Euro-American fundraising song “Do they know it’s Christmas?” produced in 1985 by Live Aid and 2005 Live Aid concerts, was launched in November 2012 which features a group of ‘un-named’ (Cameron, p 2015, p 283) African musicians urging people to donate used radiators to ‘save freezing Norwegians from frost-bite’ (The Norwegian Student’s and Academics’ International Assistance Fund, 2012). The only visual representation of Norway is that which is of ‘winter storms, which portray the country as an environmental and humanitarian disaster’ (Cameron, 2015, p 285). The simplistic representation of Ethiopia as “Africa” within the lyrics in the Band Aid song, becomes a vessel for the “African” interpretation of Norway in the Radi-Aid representation. Thus, the parody becomes a meaningful socio-political objection of the inaccurate portrayal of Africa. The “African” depiction is not one as the dominant passive victim, but rather through the use of subversive humour, becomes the object of the Norwegian destiny. The lyrics ‘Here in Africa we’ve had our problems too/with poverty, corruption, HIV and crime/ Norway gave a helping hand/they taught us what to do/ and now it’s payback time’ (The Norwegian Student’s and Academics’ International Assistance Fund, 2012) provide a mocking response to the “helping hand” of Western aid assistance. Importantly, the development organisation questions people to re-think their interpretation of Africa with their strong message:
Imagine if every person in Africa saw the Africa for Norway video and this was the only information they ever got about Norway. What would they think about Norway? If we say Africa, what do we think about? Hunger, poverty, crime, or AIDS? No wonder, because in fundraising campaigns and media that’s mainly what you hear about. (The Norwegian Student’s and Academics’ International Assistance Fund, 2012)

Therefore, the video uses self-deprecating humour to exploit the commodified practices of well-established fundraisers, by ‘reversing the role of the victim and saviour’ (Cameron, 2015, p 285), which seeks to challenge the notion of unequal power and segregated identities. The incongruity of the “Third World” homogenized victim adopts the celebrity role in a moment of imagination within the lyrics, in an attempt to save the “First World” country. Thus, the embodiment of the reversal provides a performative function, whereby existing hierarchies and social status are challenged and provoke an alternative reality in an attempt to create an alternative consciousness, free from Western dependency. Given this, the governing paradigm of the oppressor/oppressed relationship, in which this thesis argues, is at threat by current development models, is turned upside down, in the same way as the ambivalent ritual of Bakhtin’s carnival which ‘allows subjects to enter a liminal realm of freedom and in so doing create a space for critique that would otherwise not be possible in “normal” society’ (Bruner, 2005, p 140).

The liberational transformation in which the carnivalesque function provides, also becomes an important consideration within the Christian framework. Fundamentally, for Beckford, it is the task of theology to seek and fulfil its function as praxis, in which the need to fight oppression and justice is of paramount. Ultimately, the holistic outlook is not only concerned with that of struggle, but of fulfilment and becoming. The paradox set forth by Beckford provides a valuable consideration concerning this discussion, whereby, in Jesus is Dread (1998), Beckford highlights the use of language as a form of empowerment and liberation. Dread, within the English translation, is a negation of fear and anxiety, but within Caribbean terminology, ascribes that of freedom and elevation. Beckford (1998, p 73) explains ‘the dread Christ is one who sides with all the oppressed people in their struggle against all that denies them full humanity’. Western theology, Beckford argues, is an inadequate expression for those of the Black Church owing the dominant Eurocentric focus and placing of superior, white language. Rather, he urges for a counter reality which places Blackness at the heart of the theology. Similarly, Bussie’s literature on the laughter of the oppressed places the marginalised in a forefront position.
of theology, in which ‘laughter interprets the system and state of oppression, and creatively attests to hope, resistance, and protest in the face of shattering language and traditional framework of thought and belief’ (Bussie, 2007, p 4). Unlike Beckford, this thesis does not use language as a form of liberation and empowerment, but laughter as a response to non-humorous conditions, in which language can offer no solution. Goldstein (2013, p 10) argues that humour’s task is to ‘open up a discursive space within which it becomes possible to speak about matters that are otherwise naturalised, unquestioned, or silenced’. Laughter placed in the nexus of popular culture goes beyond the expression of language, in which ‘laughter holds the hope of political liberation; it suggests that the world does not have to be accepted at face value’ (Sanders, 1995, p 5). This thesis reinforces the notion of the world seen “from below” which goes beyond the instruction of language, in which transformation becomes kinaesthetically performed in the act of the carnival. The ritualistic movement was a ‘true feast of time, the feast of becoming, change, and renewal. It was hostile to all that was immortalized and completed’ (Bakhtin, 1984, p 10). This notion therefore goes beyond a commitment to the poor with Liberation Theology, which provides a voice for the voiceless through partnership; but rather, the marginalised themselves experience a transgressed embodiment of renewal through the ritual of autonomous laughter.

Blackness or “Third Worlders”, within the development dialogue of the SIAH video spoof, becomes the dominant through the embodiment of laughter, and in turn generates a reality, which allows Africans to create their own destiny on their own terms; and a reminder that development does not need to be a stale static entity. This representation is in line with ethical and theological voices, in which hope, an important Christian notion, becomes a vital category in the anticipation that the world can be different. Bussie (2007, p 4) argues that ‘real people are laughing, yet regrettably theology has not asked them why’. Therefore, theology’s task is to ‘imaginatively live by and sustain the world of promise even in the face of ostensible negation’ (Bussie, 2007, p 106). Theologically, the participation of theology as praxis in development media in this way, highlights how the world can be different through its political function of the carnivalesque in order challenge to social injustice. The media output may not provide an immediate counterculture and transformation process for that of the marginalised, however, symbolically the ‘third space’ (Picard, 2015, p 7) allows them to ‘separate from their previous identity’ (Picard, 2015, p 7), and thus ignites a theological humour
movement driven by political and ethical prophecy. Whilst, the SIAH campaign is not a representative of a theology of laughter as such, its portrayal evidential emulates notions of theological and ethical discourse, and therefore could be considered a secular theology of laughter, which challenges dominant stereotypes of fundraising agencies by a carnivalesque embodiment and reality of the “other”.

However, despite SIAH’s challenge of the dominant Euro-American representation of Africa through the carnivalesque media platform, is this just another example of the humanitarian speaking on behalf of the other? In many instances, this could appear true. The project was established by a Norwegian development agency, which does echo the notion in which the West provide a voice for and of the poor. Moreover, the organisation’s work is rooted in ‘solidarity and development’ (Jefferess, 2013, p75) in which its main aim is to educate society on issues of poverty, whilst providing assistance to those in need in Africa and Latin America. Yet, despite the representation of the powerful African agency illustrated within the video campaign, it appears that SIAH’s aim is not to allow the “other” to create their own destiny independent of the development agency. Rather, owing to this, the carnivalesque appears to not only be fully exercised. Whilst it could be argued that the agency create a carnivalesque visual rhetoric as a political tool to challenge media representations of fundraising campaigns, it does not however fully embody the experience of the carnivalesque in view of the transgression of individual and autonomous liberation, owing to its position on partnership. With this in mind, it could be argued that the carnivalesque experience could be development further in order to maximise the outcomes and reality of the poor. Despite this, SIAH is however, successful in its illustration of African characters, representing African voices. This is important concerning development dialogue as ‘knowledge that begins from the lives of people who have struggled against oppression or exploitation can offer critical insight into existing beliefs and institutions and can help us transform those beliefs and institutions towards the end of a more just, democratic world’ (Stone-Mediatore, 2003, p 162). Upon analysis, is the SIAH project merely projection in which the white superior maintains power, just as the Band Aid narrative? The portrayal of discursive voices through the use of laughter certainly goes further than that of Comic Relief, owing to the radical politics which evoke questioning of complex structural injustices and positive depictions of the “African”. However, this thesis withholds the view that development agencies can enter a further counterculture,
which adopts a Neo-Liberation Model of development, whereby Africans fruitfully create their own destiny independent of Western development agencies.

There are few examples of this narration, and it appears that development agencies perhaps have a long way to come before this type of media representation is explored. Currently, SIAH’s endorsement does however provide a platform for the “African” voice, which arguably is hugely valuable, but it does not go all the way in the totality of the carnivalesque. It does however, show society that the world can be different and the next humorous social movement can become a reality for the marginalised, whereby the world can be different. The Samaritans (Xeinium Productions, 2013), Kenya’s first mockumentary by Hussein Kurji, whom lives and produces the show in Kenya, prescribes laughter in order to critique the absurdities within the NGO world, namely the Western consultant, lack of workplace ethics and the saviour complex of agencies. The company Aid for Aid is an NGO, “in the words of its creator, “does nothing”’ (Chandler, 2014). Development here appears to reflect the notions held by Moyo (2010) in which Western aid becomes the source of un-development, and development becomes the object of the “Other”. The motivation behind the comedy is driven by the dark side of NGO’s and their practice. The creator of the mockumentary, Kurji, explains how he has witnessed NGO representatives ‘gathered around eating lobster bisque discussing how to reduce poverty. Something didn’t seem right’ (Chandler, 2014). Therefore, the series aims to tackle injustices through the portrayal of humour in which it creates an alternative reality for Africans by Africans.

This thesis thus highlights how through the visual representations presented by The Samaritans mockumentary, that development can enter into a Neo-Liberation Model, which allows Africans to create their own socio-political reality in which development becomes a meaningful, autonomous and a universal reality through the discourse of laughter. Development in this context, this thesis argues, embodies the full carnivalesque, as dominant Euro-American fundraising campaigns are not only challenged, but also the inferior “other” becomes the liberated, superior subject through the revolutionary tool of laughter, which provides a new way of thinking about poverty.

To conclude, Africa has undertaken many kinds of solutions to development. However, the current dominant model of development, Western aid assistance, as explored within the Millennium Development Goals, are limited within their approach,
as discussed in Chapter One. Therefore, a new radical solution is necessary in order to create meaningful outcomes for marginalised communities. This thesis argues that this can be achieved through development media, which serves as an important function in the discussion of poverty, owing to the fact that visual aid dominates how one perceives social injustice and how development agencies articulate policy. Whilst the place of faith is an important component, especially within the lives of the marginalised, the current response within the theological narrative prescribe defined outcomes, and ultimately produce limitations. The solution – a theology of laughter, as a universal model for the poor.

The analysis of case studies concerning British development agency Comic Relief, and Norwegian development agency SIAH, highlight that both institutions adopt a comedic framework to generate awareness of poverty. Laughter however, as explored within the previous chapter, possesses diverse functionality, which is greatly evidenced within both case studies. Upon analysis, it has been evidenced that whilst Comic Relief uses laughter, it does so in an unrelated way to that of the subject of poverty. Rather, laughter frames the spectacle of the celebrity endorser as a voyeuristic entity of their own transgression and liberation to “White Saviour” status, at the expense of denying African’s their own voice. Moreover, this position of laughter further reinforces the unequal hierarchical power relations in which the West preside in the destiny of the inferior “other”, which continues to reproduce stale and inaccurate representations of Africa. In contrast, SIAH’s Africa for Norway campaign uses laughter within a subversive context, as a socio-political, redemptive tool in order to challenge commonly mis-held images of Africa. The visual rhetoric adopted prescribes African characters as subjects, as they create a counterculture through parody, in order to highlight a reality in which they desire. This notion can be seen as a reflection of Bakhtin’s carnivalesque, whereby the inferior “other” adopts a position of superiority which suspends the positions of hierarchy and status, in a moment of imagination and as a stimulant of hope. The position of play, it is argued, challenges social injustices as a laughter “from below” is favoured, which functions in line with ethical and theological voices. Despite, creating a counterculture to the dominant Euro-American fundraising campaigns, SIAH development agency’s work is driven by ‘solidarity and development’ (Jefferess, 2013, p 75). Owing to this, the carnivalesque cannot become a fully embodied experience for that of the African “other”, due to the participation of partnership. This thesis has highlighted,
that in order for development to enter the third wave counterculture, in which this thesis terms The Neo-Liberation Model, then a secular theology of laughter must be originated by Africans, for Africans. This will allow a full carnivalesque experience which will pave the way for an autonomous, universal solution to poverty, where the destiny of the poor is created through the subversive function of laughter.

This thesis argues that whilst this will provide a revolutionary tool, no cost weapon to the marginalised and provide a new model for development; the issue is still only explored within secular theologies of laughter. To fully engage within a theology of laughter as a theological movement, the Church must also engage the message of faith as praxis, alongside development dialogue and its visual representations. The Church, this thesis argues, can learn valuable insight from the portrayal of the secular theologies represented in development rhetoric, as explored in Africa for Norway and The Samaritans, whereby faith must enter into a relationship with the carnivalesque of secular agencies, in order to create a meaningful theological movement for the poor.
Conclusion

In this investigation, one of the fundamental aims was to explore the concept of the term development, and assess how the interpretation thus has impacted the situation on poverty. This thesis has argued that dominant notions of development originated from the success of The Marshall Plan, in which development come to be associated with money and capital in the form of Western aid, actually has resulted in the un-development of the South. Development of society fuelled by Neoliberalism and Globalisation has ultimately widened the gap between the rich and the poor, resulting in further global inequality, thus creating further urgency for a revolutionary development model. Furthermore, this study has highlighted that despite The Millennium Goals, which is currently the most prominent model for tackling issues of development, the interaction on faith and religion has been dormant within the strategy, despite the importance it has for those within marginalised communities and the beneficial impact it has concerning development. Owing to this consideration, and the fact that The Millennium Goals are unlikely to be met with the review of its success heavily looming, this study set out to determine how contemporary Christian denominations engage with development.

This evaluation presented four theological models used within the Church, but has concluded that each model prescribed will ultimately produce a defined outcome, which in turn will have limitations. The findings of this investigation therefore prompted inquiry into how development is communicated universally, beyond the prescribed method within each denomination. Chapter three therefore addressed the power of visual aid, in which imagery has come to dominant how one makes sense of the world we live in and gives rise to a realm of meaning. This chapter highlighted the significance of the engagement of popular culture and theology and the importance of this communicative relationship to portray the correct ideology, owing to the fact that imagery serves as a fundamental signifier of development policy. The major finding was that despite the evolution of development iconography, the theological analysis highlighted that the ideology remained that same – the South are dependent of the North.

Owing to this consideration, this study argued that development must move beyond notions of partnership in which the West facilitate power and control over the
South, in favour of a paradigm shift, whereby the marginalised can imagine a new way of considering their socio-political conditionings. The main goal of this study was to determine a new theological model which challenges the Neoliberalism model, in which there is only one way for development, in favour of a Southern hemisphere approach which offers a low-cost, revolutionary tool to equip the poor. There is currently no existing theology of laughter concerning development, therefore the purpose of this study was to respond to this limitation by producing a new model of development thinking.

This paper has argued that marginalised communities can become autonomous agents of their own change through a theology of laughter “from below”. Laughter, which has been virtually unexplored within the Church is re-addressed through issues of development, whereby laughter as a redemptive and subversive category in the experience of the carnivalesque, challenge dominant hegemony and de-mask power. In light of this claim, this thesis therefore argued that development visual representation must also adopt a carnivalesque platform in line with ethical and theological expressions, which not only challenges commonly mis-held stereotypes of Africa, but also considers development independent to that of Western voices, in order to stimulate hope for a new reality of the poor.

This thesis has acknowledged that greater efforts are required by that of the Church, in order to engage a theology of laughter as a theological movement of development. It has been argued that the secular theologies of laughter examined in Chapter Five can provide a valuable framework for the Church as a universal model of development. This thesis proposes that the Church can adopt this task in two ways. Firstly, the Church must consider development beyond The Liberation Model, which seeks a politically driven approach to development in order to challenge the binary relationship of the oppressed/liberator. The alternative, this study argues, favours the emotional intelligence approach of development thinking within the carnivalesque of The Neo-Liberation Model. The redemptive laughter of the Bible transcends that of the Church through the Kingdom of God, in which its task is bigger than the confines of the Church. Theology of development therefore, becomes wherever people are doing the bidding of God. Laughter, like the Parable of the Sower, fails to take root within certain context but is now taking root and growing for the poor. Secondly, the Church needs to move beyond Tillich’s (1952) notion of “correlation”, whereby theology’s main task is to respond to concerns within the contemporary world. For Tillich (1959, p 49), ‘to give such answers
is the function of the Church, not only to itself, but also to those outside of the Church’. However, the revised correlation method proposed by Browning (1991) becomes the notion in which contemporary culture becomes the dominant mediator of the critical dialogue of Christian theology. Fundamental in the instrumenting of a theology of laughter for development for the Church, is the acknowledgment that the world source offers valid prescriptions. Contemporary culture, this thesis argues, is illustrating the value of laughter within a secular framework, which must exchange dialogue within the Church, in order to learn from each other and revive ideas and practices which move on from Tillich’s ‘one-way street’ (Hiltner, 1958, p 223).
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