

JOURNAL FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSPOLITIK (JEP)

Gefördert durch das Bundesministerium für Auswärtige
Angelegenheiten, Sektion VII

Herausgeber: Mattersburger Kreis für Entwicklungspolitik an den Österreichischen Universitäten

Redaktion: Klaus Derkowitsch, Manfred Horvat, Franz Kolland, Herwig Palme

Redaktions-
adresse: Journal für Entwicklungspolitik, Resselg. 5/25
1040 Wien, Tel.Nr.: (0222) 65 42 96

Medieninhaber
(Verleger): SÜDWIND - Buchvertrieb für Entwicklungspolitik Ges.m.b.H.,
Tuchlauben 13, 1010 Wien

Preise: Einzelheft öS 50,-/DM 9.-;
Jahresabonnement (4 Hefte) öS 180,-/DM 32.-;
Für Studenten mit Inskriptionsnachweis: öS 120,-/DM 22.-;
Abonnement für Mitglieder des Mattersburger Kreises: Ordentliche Mitglieder (inkl. Jahresbeitrag) öS 250,-; Studentische Mitglieder (inkl. Jahresbeitrag) öS 150,-.

Bestellung
bitte an: SÜDWIND - Buchvertrieb für Entwicklungspolitik Ges.m.b.H.,
Tuchlauben 13, 1010 Wien (Eingang: Kleeblattgasse 4), Länderbank, Kto-Nr.: 219-103-930

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Auch Übersetzung und fotomechanische Vervielfältigungen (Fotokopie, Mikrokopie, Microfiche) von Beiträgen oder Teilen daraus bedürfen der vorherigen schriftlichen Zustimmung des Verlages.

Graphik: Peter Jurkowsch

Offenlegung nach § 25 Mediengesetz: Medieninhaber: SÜDWIND-Buchvertrieb für Entwicklungspolitik Ges.m.b.H., 1010 Wien, Tuchlauben 13. Geschäftsführer: Günther Raunjak, Dr. Heinz Gabler. Aufsichtsrat: Ulrich Trinks, Martin Jäggle, Dr. Guido Rütthemann, Gerhard Kofler, DVW. Ulrich Pleger, Wolfgang Schindegger, Manfred Schmid, Gesellschafter: Österr. Informationsdienst für Entwicklungspolitik, Institut für Internationale Zusammenarbeit und andere. Grundlegende Richtung: Wissenschaftliche Analysen und Diskussionen von entwicklungspolitischen Fragestellungen und Berichte über entwicklungspolitische Praxis.
Verlags- und Herstellungsort: Wien

ISBN 3 900592 00 4

JOURNAL FÜR ENTWICKLUNGSPOLITIK (JEP) Heft 1, 1985

Seite

Vorwort des Herausgebers

..... 1

Editorial

..... 2

ARTIKEL

Relief Instead of Development Aid

.....Gunnar Myrdal 4

Reflecting on Development: Insular Theories

and Global PretentionsArora Satish 13

OPEC - The Making and Breaking of a "Monopoly"

.....Kunibert Raffer 25

BERICHTE

Bedingungen für die Förderung von Bildungspro-

jekten im Rahmen der österreichischen EntwicklungshilfeHermann Spirik 43

Das Herumdoktern am "freien Markt Universität"

als BildungshilfeWolfgang Pumpernig 48

Ausländerstudium im Spannungsfeld zwischen Entwicklungs- politik und akademischer Solidarität

.....Manfred Nowak 52

Neun Thesen zum Ausländerstudium in Österreich

.....Harald Dossi 73

BUCHBESPRECHUNGEN

..... 78

Later on I did so. The development I observed can be described as follows: the elite upper class that had originally adopted the Western ideal of modernization and propagation of greater equality, particularly in some countries like the huge India, later betrayed this ideal. This development was more and more accompanied by the unfavourable development of the political scene in these states.

My younger colleagues here at home live in a sort of abstract model thinking, which leaves no space for class conflicts and class exploitation.

Let me add that if the new line of our aid policy I am pleading for were gradually put into effect, many aid workers now occupied with industrial projects would return to industry, while many more aid workers of another type would be needed.

A practical question would be how far SIDA - in addition to its job of distributing aid to the Red Cross and other national and international organizations - should directly run its own activity.

I also believe that SIDA should not support a research organization such as SAREC with a rather low academic status. It should leave research entirely to academic institutions.

Something similar applies to financing trips of journalists and others to the underdeveloped countries and other activities with the aim of making our aid policy - and SIDA - popular. All that can in no way be reckoned as genuine aid to underdeveloped countries.

Journal fuer Entwicklungspolitik I, 1985, S. 13-24

Arora Satish

REFLECTING ON DEVELOPMENT: INSULAR THEORIES AND GLOBAL PRE-TENTIONS *)

UNESCO, in cooperation with the United Nations University, convened a meeting of experts in Ulan Bator from August 19-23, 1980, to examine "the role of new theoretical concepts in the development process". In addition, the experts were presented with two more objectives: to discuss development from a regional perspective, so that specific experiences from differing parts of the globe might be compared; and to examine in detail a concrete case of development - the experience of Mongolia - which, according to the agenda of the meeting, exemplified implementation of the theory of "non-capitalist development".

UNESCO's "Secretariat Working Paper" had rather cogently drawn up an agenda that called for, on the one hand, examination of the dominant theories of development; and, on the other hand, an evaluation of the intellectual forays into what are often referred to as "alternative development" frameworks. The scrutiny of this range of theories of development was to be conducted with a sensitivity to the strategies implicit in them. The purpose of the discussions was explicitly declared: "to explore alternative and original paths to a form of development truly centered on man". The context within which any such exploration could take place (it was realis-

*) Dies ist ein Bericht ueber eine Konferenz, die unter der gemeinsamen Schirmherrschaft der United Nations University und der UNESCO abgehalten wurde. Die Teilnehmer waren Vertreter verschiedener sozial-wissenschaftlicher Disziplinen und kamen aus allen Teilen der Welt, aus Industrie- wie aus Entwicklungslaendern, aus marktwirtschaftlich organisierten und zentral geplanten Staaten.

tically recognized), was one in which theorizing, while deeply affected by ideologies, could be linked to the major economic theories. Such theorizing, naturally, lends direction to the manner in which global cleavages are perceived, the way in which development objectives are conceived, and the obstacles to these objectives which are targeted for attention.

In retrospect, the participants at the meeting in Ulan Bator attended closely to the issues they were called upon to deliberate. Perhaps, most significantly, they addressed themselves directly to a range of problems that would lie at the heart of any viable theory of development - problems associated with the necessity of combining economic growth with social development, and problems derived from the changes - or lack of changes - in social structures. The centrality of power, the necessity for wider participation, the threat of alienation posed by bureaucratisation were the fundamental issues which formed an integral part of the discourse.

One of the papers placed before the meeting provided a concise and useful survey of recent theoretical concepts relating to national and world-wide development that had originated within the United Nations system. These theoretical formulations - largely a product of the decade of the seventies - were the results of attempts at reassessing the nature and place of social development, of conceiving development as a unified process comprising various aspects - economic, technological, social and ecological. This conceptualization of "integrated development" embraced the concept of "development centered on man", which emphasized people rather than things, the relationship of man to his environment, and the important issue of man's conscious control over the development process. Another significant concept emerging from within the United Nations system was "endogenous development", a concept seeking to enlarge societal choices within a milieu characterized by pressures to conform to variants of the more dominant models of development. Finally, of special interest to several of the participants at this meeting was the concept of "basic needs". It received considerable attention, evoking a remarkable degree of agreement as to the form in which it could be most acceptable.

Instead of detailed discussions on the dominant theories of development, there appears to have been a broad recognition of the fact that liberalism

and marxism were the ideologies under which other analytical frameworks could be generally subsumed. Consequently, no serious attention was paid to "modernisation" theories; and discussion on the "dependence" school of thought was minimal, limited largely to the descriptive level. It is equally interesting to note that direct and serious encounters between the liberal and marxist ideological perspectives were largely absent. This does not mean that ideological persuasions were unclear or underplayed; on the contrary, preferences of an ideological order were often lucidly expounded. In fact, a series of ideological preferences emerged which bearing noting. Several experts from the socialist states, for instance, stated their allegiance to a marxist perspective that was located in the humanistic tradition. Significantly, on the other hand, no clearly liberal ideological positions were defined or defended. Instead, several of the participants from Western Europe and North America clearly emphasized the existing deficiencies of the institutions of the liberal state, and the overriding necessity to reorder and create new institutions and movements to make the state more responsive to societal needs.

Even more outspoken critiques emerged from the participants from Asia, Africa and Latin America. By and large, rather than focussing on ideologies, these delegates tended to focus upon the manifestly skewed systems of distribution of power and other resources within - and between - nations. They expressed concern regarding the rigidity of social structures, and how they were affected by the global division of power. In particular, they drew attention to the persistence of small privileged classes which presided over societies largely composed of the deprived. They enquired about the meaning of development under socio-economic conditions that reproduced inequality. They persistently raised such questions as: Development for whom? By whom? On whose behalf? They asked, in short, questions pertaining to the centrality of power, opposition between the state and society found in many nations. Conceptions of development assume different shapes, depending upon the contours of power, the nature of the state, and the class structure encountered. Moreover, the Asian, African and South American participants sought to demonstrate the linkage between particular forms of national development policies and the type of dominance exercised by forces outside their national system.

These were by no means startlingly new concerns but they were seen as pressing, and it was held that any advance toward a viable and acceptable development theory would have to take into account the centrality of these concerns. However, during the meetings, this mode of discourse remained restricted, and why it remained restricted needs to be faced up to.

The problem of cultural identity, of distinctiveness also received attention at differing levels. Discussion focussed on the unequal confrontation between a dominant majority and small minorities whose cultural profiles might be considerably different from that of the larger society. Questions here were raised about incorporation and assimilation - and sometimes annihilation - and about deliberately shielding defenceless, culturally isolated groups. This topic was interrelated with the subject of participation, and how structures, varying in size and composition, affect the nature of participation. It was also related to questions of permissible dissent, feasibility of pressing changes in existing systems - in short, to questions of talking back, as it were, to existing power structures and to exercising wider degrees of autonomy. The ideas of a wider democratization, whether within the workplace or the community, were discussed, and the necessity of social planning stressed. Such themes cropped up repeatedly in the deliberations, and raised concomitant issues such as planning at the grassroots level, and keeping control closer and in the hands of those most subjected to such control. In this sense, bureaucratisation seems to have been a concern and source of anxiety for a large number of the assembled scholars.

Presentations on "alternative development" were marked by a sense of overwhelming crisis - a crisis, moreover, conceived in global dimensions. The focus, however, was largely upon the crisis of man living in highly industrialized societies characterized by the type of maldevelopment which leads to alienation from society and self, increasing inefficacy, and not least of all, a loss of community. A common theme running through several of the papers was that excessively materialistic societies tend to foster a sense of normlessness. Prescriptions advocated to combat such tendencies ranged from creation of a "global understanding" based on the "spirituality of humankind" to strategies that were built into the analysis of the "over-developed" industrial societies of Europe and North America.

One far-ranging analysis committed to alternative patterns of development focussed upon social movements in Western Europe. It drew attention to the malaise affecting European man. This malaise was said to reveal itself in three relationships: man, in relationship to the material world, was seen as a captive of the production process, driven to consumption of things which were often artificial and alienating; in relationship to the state and burgeoning bureaucracies, man was viewed as increasingly more oppressed and overwhelmed; and finally, in relationship to science and technology, man was said to have lost a sense of control.

From this diagnosis of the malaise emerged prescriptions for transforming the scale, direction and objectives of contemporary industrial society. Strategy, therefore, flowed from the contemplation of existing conditions in the industrialized societies of the Western World. Attempts were made to link the preferred strategy to the problems of the rest of the world, to universalize the values of this alternative theory of development.

The value profiles for alternative development were constructed from both a reconnaissance of aims and objectives of Western European and North American social movements, as well as from designs for the future and preferred industrial society. The direction was clear:

- the creation of smaller-scale, self-reliant, perhaps even face-to-face communities;
- decentralization, considered a good in itself;
- moderation in consumption;
- consciousness of ecological factors;
- highly participative modes of governance;
- preference for science and technology which could be readily absorbed;
- tolerance for cultural diversity.

This was an expressed desire for a *gemeinschaft* - like society, jealous of its prerogatives but willingly outward-looking, developing new forms creatively and openly claiming mankind's heritage as its own, preserving its intimacy even as it renounces the anthropocentric and etocentric cultural forms from which it emerges.

Some criticism of such "alternative development" theories was severe. Some

suggested that supporters were acting as apologists and reformists for social systems in an advanced stage of decay; that they were simply attempting to improve upon officially-inspired prescriptions. Interestingly enough, these charges emanated from among those who also wanted to restore a sense of community, to return power to the people, but who wanted to do so through a more open confrontation with existing systems. This aspect of the debate thus centered on a tactical level, not on a level of objectives.

A few comments from outside the industrial world, however, questioned altogether this mode of theorizing, mainly because it systematically avoided the fact that even in societies where the accumulation process had been most advanced, between one-tenth and one-third of their populations had not reached the levels of real income required to satisfy minimal needs. The discussion of "alternative development", as it emerged from within the matrix of advanced, liberal, industrial societies, was perceived as reflective of the ennui of the more prosperous sectors of western society. The theory might very well reflect the malaise of such systems, but prescriptions and preferences for moderation in consumption; the limitation of wants, and hence of economic growth; and the exercise of modestly in terms of contemporary science and technology were inapplicable - indeed, undesirable - for developing countries. It was cogently argued that economic growth was necessary and desirable, and that a fruitful approach to the study of development called for a rapprochement between the theory of accumulation and theories of social stratification and of power. There was insistence on the part of participants from Latin America and Asia that it was not permissible to talk of development without simultaneously talking of the necessity for material accumulation and the need for economic growth, although perforce such growth must be related to, interwoven with social development. Even though these issues were stated with clarity and forcefulness, the discussion became stalemated; it seemed that a most fruitful line of discussion had been opened, and it deserved further reflection and serious debate.

Paralleling the critical analysing of development in Western European and North American nations, were lucid presentations of the marxist perspective on development of industrialized societies within the socialist group of states. The thrust of these presentations differed from those on "alter-

native development" primarily in that they focussed upon preferences and future directions derived from marxist theory; they also differed significantly through omission of any critical analysis of existing conditions within the industrialized socialist societies. In stark contrast to the dissatisfaction expressed about the direction of development in the Western European and North American nations, the analysis emanating from the industrialized socialist states projected uncritical perspectives of the present, while concomitantly presenting a humane and optimistic view of the future. The resultant value profile appeared - at points - to parallel some of the humanistic perspectives of "alternative development", as well as the particular emphasis upon equality frequently emphasized by several of the experts from the non-industrialized parts of the world. This convergence toward a set of humane values was reflected perhaps most vividly in the discussion that ranged around the concept of needs.

The issue of human needs was placed squarely at the centre of the paper on societies developing toward "advanced socialism". The term, "advanced socialist society" was used to refer to those countries where foundations for socialism have been already laid, and the transition to a higher stage is now contemplated. As set forth in the tense formulation of the paper, socialism developing on an existing socialist base constitutes advanced socialism. Such movement was said to be taking place in the Soviet Union and some of the other countries in the socialist group of states. The direction of the movement was perhaps most readily reflected in changes in the social structure: the principal change was identified as one where class differentiation was giving way to social homogeneity. The new social order of advanced socialism was characterized as free of antagonisms, with flexible social boundaries, and thus reflecting the achievement of a socially homogeneous social structure.

Noting that "under socialism man is really at the centre of the development of society", the paper on advanced socialism paid considerable attention to the implications that resulted from such a commitment. This is where the socialist perspective on needs received attention: the needs of man in socialist society were perceived as constantly widening in scope; it was necessary to meet these needs in a socially equitable manner in which alienation played no part. Inherent in this conception of socialism, then, was raising the level of human demands.

It should be noted that discussion of needs from varying ideological perspectives led to an agreement that the interpretation of "basic needs" in largely materialistic terms was unsatisfactory. Cutting over cleavages in ideology, stress was repeatedly put on the necessity of broadening this concept, human beings were said to possess a multiplicity of needs, needs that are latent, needs that manifest themselves with endless variety and richness. Those concerned with the conception of advanced socialism, the UNESCO secretariat, those advocating alternative prisms through which to view development, those focussing on grassroots movements in Western Europe and North America all appeared to tread a common ground, which might tentatively be characterized as resulting from a shared humanistic concern with man as an end in and of himself.

Further, there was something approaching agreement on the refusal to assign hierarchical slots to human needs. Following from a recognition that the concept of needs is both complex as well as ambiguous, a four-fold classification of needs was presented: needs for survival; needs for well being on welfare; needs for identity; and needs for freedom. If man were indeed to be at the centre of development, "then the needs concept serves as a guide for the first steps. But only for the first steps; there are infinite reaches for human development beyond satisfaction of basic human needs". Needs were conceived as necessary but not sufficient conditions for human development.

It was also pointed out that while indispensable for any theory of development, the needs concept is nevertheless individualizing; and it was only of limited use if it made no reference to culture, structure and process. The concept of basic needs was thus also criticized for being extra-social, untied to national, international or endogenous aspects of the development process. In fact, the meaning of needs, as it emerged during the course of discussion, had a dual facet. As a strategy for lifting the most deprived sectors of society it assumed one meaning; thus constricted, its relevance was limited largely to the underclass, to the most deprived, in short, to the poorer countries. The intimate affinity of this basic needs concept with apparatus which include such techniques as poverty lines was obviously apparent. On the other hand, when tied to social transformation and structural change, the concept bore quite a different connotation. It

could apply to man regarding of where one happens to find him. Thus, the question remains: Can one possibly think of needs in their wider, profoundly human sense, and still remain unaware of the implications of the basic needs concept as generally in current usage? It would appear that these two conceptions cannot exist in separate compartments, unless as deliberate instruments of self-deception. The participants thus confronted vividly important implications of the shortcomings in the present conceptual apparatus.

It is also noteworthy that no discussions took place on the relevance or irrelevance of the possibility of applying a strategy of basic needs at the international level. It appeared to be tacitly accepted that its applicability could extend no further than its current borders - namely, at the national level.

In keeping with one of the central purposes of the meeting, a series of detailed papers were presented by Mongolian scholars on the developmental experience of their country. These papers covered practically all aspects of the Mongolian society. Their experience was held to be unique in the sense that Mongolia was said to be "the first sovereign state in the world to have made the transition from a pre-capitalist society to socialism", achieving this objective while "bypassing capitalism". Thus, a comprehensive effort was made to present salient aspects about the "non-capitalist path of development", considered as a contemporary "theory of social progress".

The transformation of the nomadic Mongolian society into a socialist state was said to exemplify the successful application of the theory of non-capitalist development, a strategy that facilitated skipping the capitalist stage altogether. As one of the leaders of Mongolia had noted, "a whole series of objective indices showed that Mongolia was at the level of Europe in the Middle Ages. It had known neither the Reformation nor the Renaissance. It had not been touched either by the industrial revolution or the Enlightenment". Mongolia was said to have effected a transition from feudalism to socialism in two stages. The first, the democratic stage, called for, on the one hand, the wiping out of feudal relationships, eliminating foreign capital, and, on the other hand, the emergence of a

socialist sector of the economy. This was followed by the second stage - the socialist stage of the revolution: this effected the complete abolition of private property, the establishment of socialist production relationships, and finally, the emergence of "a unified socialist system of the economy". It was stressed that this transition was contingent upon the considerable and continuous support of the Soviet Union, along with assistance provided by other states in the socialist camp.

The clearest statement of the Mongolian experience was summarized by reference to a set of "essential transformations". In the ideological and political sphere, these included the liquidation of the old state apparatus; the creation of a revolutionary party; and the carrying out of a cultural revolution. In the social and economic sphere, the essential transformation included elimination of forms of exploitation; formation of a working class as a result of industrialization, and the resolution of the agrarian-peasant question by establishment of cooperatives and state farms. The Mongolian presentation emphasized "the special importance foreign economic relations had on the non-capitalist stage of development and on the subsequent stage of development as well".

Because most of the participants were not previously familiar with the details of the Mongolian experience, they were curious about the socio-economic structure, the development of agriculture and industry, and the cultural policies of the Mongolian state. Interest was also evoked about the extent and role of the external assistance received by Mongolia for its development. The participants appeared to express considerably more interest in the specific and concrete aspects of Mongolia's development than in the theory that was said to account for this development.

It became evident from the papers presented at this meeting, and the discussions they aroused that the consideration of development centered on man took differing forms, depending upon which type of society was at the focus of attention. When problems of the industrialized societies were addressed, concern seemed to be with the search for preventive strategies and solutions to problems of actual or potential alienation resulting from a high-technology milieu. The discussion of development in the largely agrarian, industrializing societies also referred to forms of alienation,

but with an emphasis on alienation resulting from powerlessness, from exclusion from the decision-making processes which affect those societies. One was left with the impression that no meaningful connection was made between these two types of alienation. Although there was some concern about a more realistic theoretical framework within which to locate the emerging high-technology societies, and although some thoughts were expressed that would call for integrating analysis of problems of alienation in both developing and industrialized countries, a yawning gap stretched between the two areas. A significant anxiety was expressed at the lack of a framework that would be permissive of a social science language, a methodology that would allow one to grasp international realities of life and experience at varying levels of development.

Not unrelated to this was also a repeated concern with the hiatus that seemed to exist between theoretical formulations on the one hand and discussion of strategies on the other. More than once this apparent divergence between theory and strategy made itself manifest during discussions. Emphasis was placed upon the criticality of interaction between theory and practice and the undisputed value of self-correcting feedback that ideally should result from such encounters. There appeared to be a shared desire for a theory live enough not only to be amenable to verification, but also embedded in reality itself. And such demands for a lively interaction between theory and practice cut across not only ideological persuasions but levels of development as well.

The preoccupation with new methodologies and the request that UNESCO assist in facilitating their development can thus be understood not only in terms of what was said about relating theory to practice, but also in the light of a perception shared among a number of participants that the available social science apparatus was in disarray, incapable of coping with pressing social realities. The available language of current social science discourse seemed to discourage the possibility of coherent, mutually comprehensible dialogues. Perhaps it was only when human needs were at the focus of attention that it was possible for a truly unifying perspective to appear. Otherwise, it seemed that the issues of the industrialized states - whether capitalist or socialist - and those of the developing states provided painful contrasts and a language that would join these issues simply was not in evidence. The chasm was there to observe.

The participants at the concluding session of the meeting expressed their grave concern at the state of the world. Anxiety was repeatedly expressed at the precariousness of peace, the proliferation of weapons of destruction and the persistence of inequalities of wealth and well-being. Sentiments of solidarity with the researchers of the developing countries were expressed. Both UNESCO and the United Nations University were called upon to continue the dialogue initiated at Ulan Bator, possibly by convening meetings in other areas of the world. The opportunity to examine the experience of Mongolia's development was appreciated, and suggestions were put forward that similar opportunities for exposure to other cases of development should be facilitated by UNESCO and the United Nations University.

Satish Arora
Professor für Soziologie
Nedergasse 8/5
1190 Wien

Journal fuer Entwicklungspolitik 1, 1985, S. 25*42

Kunibert Raffer

OPEC - THE MAKING AND BREAKING OF A "MONOPOLY" *)

Like any other science economics and development research have their legends and fairy tales, an especially popular and wide-spread example being the legend of oil, OPEC and Third-World-power. Whenever problems of dependency are discussed someone is likely to introduce OPEC as a precedence of reverse dependence: albeit the only example, the argument might run, it shows that industrialized countries too are dependent on the South. Oil shocks and oil crises prove it.

Interestingly this view is not limited to colleagues from the right wing but is also fairly well spread among the left. The difference lies in the degree of appreciation rather than in belief. Analysing the case of oil from a depegdista standpoint this paper therefore holds the view of a negligibly small minority. It is going to argue that OPEC is no exception from the rule although coinciding interests and special circumstances have led to a unique experience. The essential point, however, is that this experience could not have been brought about by OPEC alone. OPEC's "monopoly-power" was made by interest groups in the North and is being broken again at the moment since present economic circumstances render such a move advisable. OPEC could undeniably profit from plans masterminded elsewhere but has never been able to force its own pricing policy on a reluctant world.

The measures applied in the eighties to "domesticate" Southern oil-producers are the same instruments that are used in the cases of other raw material exporters [1]: regional substitution by the development of new

*) Paper presented at the Fourth General Conference of EADI (European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes) at Madrid, September 1984.