

die Kette des Todes zerlege, die Vorgänge anprangere, die über zwischengeschaltete Nummernkonten, Börsen und lokale Diktaturen viele Millionen Menschen in Afrika, Asien und Lateinamerika zu einem menschenunwürdigen Dasein verdammen, dann möchte ich damit auch an der Befreiung des Schweizer Volkes mitwirken.“ (S. 195)

In dieser Eigencharakteristik des Autors scheinen dem Rezensenten zugleich Wert wie Dilemma des Buches enthalten zu sein. Natürlich ist es verdienstvoll, als Parlamentarier eine weithin immer noch ahnungslose Öffentlichkeit im „eidgenössischen Emirat“ auf die Rolle der Großbanken im internationalen Drogengeschäft hinzuweisen (im Kampf gegen das isolationistische Schweizer Establishment springt Ziegler hier auf die von US- und befreundeten Regierungen vorangetriebene Anti-Drogen-Kampagne auf⁴) und die Verwahrung von Korruptions- und Fluchtgeldern blutbefleckter Dritte-Welt-Diktatoren (der Autor beschreibt im einzelnen die Fälle Marcos, Duvalier und Mobutu) im Schutz des Bankgeheimnisses anzuprangern. Spektakuläre Entwicklungen auf innenpolitischer Ebene wie der „Fall Kopp“ geben zudem modellhaften Einblick in das Netz der personellen Verflechtungen, das hinter dem wirtschaftlichen Verhalten der Institutionen zu stehen scheint. Insgesamt also vor allem ein voll zu unterschreibender moralischer Aufruf, die Infiltration einer jahrhundertealten Demokratie durch das organisierte Verbrechen (S. 18) zu stoppen, geht Ziegler auf der anderen Seite jedoch nicht erheblich über die bereits von Dritte-Welt-Gruppen und Kritischen Aktionären zusammengetragenen Fakten hinaus. Nicht selten scheint (berechtigte) Empörung die Recherche, Skandalisierung die Gewichtung der belegten oder (wohl begründet) vermuteten Tatsache zu ersetzen. Jean Ziegler hat damit sicher ein wichtiges und angesichts der weltweiten Drogenproblematik auch aktuelles Thema in die Diskussion gebracht. Von einer zusammenfassenden Analyse des staatstragenden Bankensektors in der Schweiz und seiner Rolle im internationalen System sind wir gleichwohl noch weit entfernt.

Walter Sauer

ANMERKUNGEN

1Vgl. z.B. Peter Hans-Balz, Schweiz — Dritte Welt. Bibliographische Dokumentation (Adliswil 1975); Jean Ziegler, Eine Schweiz. Über jeden Verdacht erhaben (Darmstadt — Neuwied 1977); ders., Das Schweizer Imperium (Rowohlt-Verlag, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1982); Rudolf H. Strahm, Wirtschaftsbuch Schweiz. Das moderne Grundwissen über Ökonomie und Ökologie in der Schweiz (Ex Libris-Verlag, Zürich 1987), insbesondere S. 213 ff.; Die Schweiz in der Weltwirtschaft; Bernard Michael Gilroy, Die Schweiz im Spannungsfeld der Welthandels- und Strukturanpassungsprobleme, in: JEP 4 (1988/2), S. 33 — 45; Mascha Madörin, Urs Hänsenberger, Mark Schmid, Goldgier (Bern 1989).

2Vgl. Centre Europe — Tiers Monde (Hrsg.), Suisse — Afrique du Sud, Relations Economiques et Politiques (Genève 1972); Mascha Madörin, Laurence Baysan-Fehlmann, Bankenbeziehungen Schweiz — Südafrika (Bern 1983), sowie einige Beiträge in Madörin, Hänsenberger, Schmid (Anm. 1).

3Vgl. dazu Walter Sauer, Ein Update zum Thema: Österreichische Investitionen in Südafrika, in: Informationen über Multinationale Konzerne (1/1990), S. 25 — 28 (betr. Hämmerle).

4Eine Kampagne, die allerdings in vieler Hinsicht den Kalten Krieg zu ersetzen scheint: Waltraud Queiser Morales, The war on drugs: a new US national security doctrine?, in: Third World Quarterly 11 (1989), 147 — 169.

Andre Gunder Frank

HOLIER THAN THOU IN THE GULF: A CURSE ON BOTH YOUR HOUSES

Read My Lips: Remember Tonkin Gulf and the Ten Commandments

A Kinder, Gentler Presidency?

YOU MAY WORSHIP NO OTHER GOD THAN ME. YOU SHALL NOT MISUSE MY NAME NOR USE IT TO SWEAR A FALSEHOOD — the First and Third Commandments say.

When both presidents Hussein and Bush publicly invoked ALLAH / The LORD as they went to war against each other, they carried blasphemous cynicism to new heights — and not only via the satellite TV that showed them praying and at Church. For honest believers, it is difficult to know which of them is holier than thou and who does more violence to several of the Ten Commandments of the Holy Bible and their equivalents in Verses 151 — 155 of Chapter 6 in the Holy Koran. Both presidents take God's name in vain — or rather misuse it to violate several other Commandments of the Holy Bible and the Holy Koran. Among these are you must not murder, you must not steal, you must not lie, and you must not covet thy neighbor's house and goods. Is it not especially sinful to violate the first several commandments in a deceitful attempt to cover up the violation of the last one?

Already much video tape has been aired, ink has been splattered, and now blood is being spilled to cover THE BIG LIE about this war. However, only very little attention has been devoted to a few Biblical, Koranic and homely truths in this Gulf War. Yet many previous Crusades already have invoked the Name of God in a Just Cause Holy War against the infidel to cover up their earthly economic and political motives. The 11th and 12th century Western Christian Crusades did so in their commercial enterprises against the Muslim East. President Bush's 1990s crusade against Muslim Arabs is doing so again; and so is the Holy War Jihad against the infidels led by President Hussein. Both are guilty of blasphemy of the highest order. The Spanish Conqueror of Mexico at least recognized publicly that he went there for gold, and his Christian legitimizers at least observed that "the evangelical does not enter where there is no gold." [In the meantime, Africans observed from bitter experience that "in the beginning we had the land and you had the book; now you have the land and we have the book]. Now it is time again to read the presidents' lips! Where is the promised kinder, gentler presidency?

DO NOT COVET THEY NEIGHBOR'S HOUSE AND GOODS — OR SERVANTS as the Tenth Commandment says.

Both presidents covet Kuwait's oil and its control. Already on August 20, Time Magazine quoted an advisor to President Bush: "this has been an easy call. Even a dolt understands the principle. we need the oil. It's nice to talk about standing up for freedom, but Kuwait and Saudi Arabia are not exactly democracies, and if their principal export were oranges...we would have closed washington down for August. There is nothing to waver about here." Later, placards carried in street demonstrations around the world expressed the same still more simply NO BLOOD FOR OIL.

Both presidents started this war to manage their own domestic political economic problems in the face of a new world economic recession. During the last world recession, both General Galtieri in Argentina and Prime Minister Thatcher in Britain started and escalated the Malvinas/Falklands War because they both faced political problems at home, which were generated by the world economic recession. Only one of them could win the war gamble and thereby assure his/her political survival. Significantly, that war already pitched the entire west [and its nuclear arsenal] against a single country in the South.

President Hussein invaded Kuwait for political economic reasons: to shore up his political capital at home and in the region in the face of increased debts from the Iraq-Iran war and declining earnings from oil revenues with which to settle these debts. Kuwait had loaned Iraq money with one hand, but with the other it had siphoned off extra oil from the field that straddles their border; and it had ganged up with others to increase the regional and world production and decrease the price of oil, on which Iraq depended to reconstruct its postwar economy and power. Iraq pressed its political economic case against Kuwait for months, but to no avail even at the Arab Summit in May 1991. Hussein invaded on August 2 — a week after receiving the green light from President Bush's Ambassador in Baghdad.

The United States, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, has escalated Military postures or gone to war in each and every recession since World War II: the 1949 recession was followed by US escalation and war in Korea; the 1953—4 recession by intervention in Guatemala and more rearmament at home; the 1958 recession by intervention in Lebanon; the 1967 recession by escalation and intervention in Vietnam; the 1969—70 recession by more of the same; and the 1973—75 recession again. The 1979 recession led to the abrogation of detente and the Second Cold War [NATO double track decision and 3% annual military spending boost, China card, etc.] started by President Carter many months before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. Then came the [by the Soviets unexpected] strong American response to escalate the new cold war. The 1981—82 recession led to President Reagan's intervention in Nicaragua and invasion of Grenada, and then to his Military Keynesianism and his "Star war" Strategic Defense Initiative, which was designed to and did spend the Soviet Union into bankruptcy [and the USA as Well]. The recession of 1989—1990—19?? began months before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and led first to President Bush's "Just Cause" invasion of Panama and then to the Crisis and War in the Gulf. Even Secretary of State Baker once let on undiplomatically that the American stance in the Gulf was to maintain jobs at home; and The Chairman

of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Michael Boskin, was quoted by the International Herald Tribune (Jan. 3, 1991) to say that the American economy would have been even worse off if military operations in the Gulf had not helped stabilize it. Thus, the discussion by the US administration and press about whether the Gulf crisis brought on the recession or not is totally turned around; for both the timing and the causation were the other way around.

That world renowned moral authority, Richard Nixon, has sermonized us under the title "Bush Has it Right: America's Commitment in the Gulf Is Moral" (International Herald Tribune Jan. 7, 1991). Nixon wrote "When Senator Bob Dole said we were in the Gulf for oil and Secretary of State James Baker said we were there for jobs, they were criticized for justifying our actions on purely selfish grounds. We should not apologize for defending our vital economic interests. Had America not intervened, an international outlaw would today control more than 40 percent of the world's oil ... [However] it will not be just a war about oil. It will not be a war about a tyrant's cruelty. It will not be a war about democracy. It will be a war about peace ... That is why our commitment in the Gulf is a highly moral enterprise." It is hardly necessary to recall that before this same Richard Nixon resigned the US presidency to evade congressional impeachment for fraud and deceit, he directed a war in Vietnam in which it was said that "we had to destroy it to save it."

So the issue is the other guy's oil and control of his house, where the production and pricing decisions are made. Now the issue is also blood — and not oranges. Therefore, both presidents spent not only August, but also the months since then desperately looking for ways to make even dolt misundersand the issue. President Hussein came up with the Palestine issue and an appeal to all Arabs and Muslims to launch a Holy War Jihad. President Bush answered we cannot link the Gulf to Palestine, but we must link it to his and Secretary of State Baker's post cold war "New" World "Order." We may ask what is new or orderly about a world in which the Israel that invaded the West Bank and Gaza strip continues to impose military rule on the Palestinians and to violate the resolutions of the Security Council: When the United States invaded Panama and continues to impose military rule on the Panamanians, and there is not even any Security Council discussion or resolution about the same, is that the new world order? In this new world order, both presidents are trying to use appeals to morality and to subvert international institutions in the attempt to buy off the other's servants and convert them into his own allies — or the other way around, to buy off the other's allies and convert them into his own servants. Thus, both presidents — and their supporters — are violating several other commandments as well.

THOU SHALT NOT MURDER, STEAL, LIE OR GIVE FALSE TESTIMONY — Nor Make Them and Cynicism Thy Religion

President Hussein showed little regard for Palestinians or any other Muslims when he waged an eight year war against Islamic Iran abroad and in so doing exploited Palestinian and other Muslim workers at home. President Hussein took little notice of human rights and welfare when he suppressed and gassed Kurdish and other

people at home and deprived millions of foreign workers, including many Palestinians, of their livelihood through his annexation of Kuwait. President Hussein did not invade Kuwait for the sake of the Palestinians, and the Palestinians did not support his invasion until he made this linkage.

Of course, link[age]s there are many in the real world, without anybody having to "make" them. Even President Bush recognizes the big picture links in which Perestroika and Glasnost in the Soviet Union and peaceful revolution in Eastern Europe eliminated the cold war. They threatened with a peace dividend, and required a "new world order" that as we will observe pits the North against the South more than ever in the Gulf and elsewhere. President Bush also recognizes enough regional linkages to make him ask Israel to keep a low profile and even to leave its defense to the US, lest some of Bush's Arab allies turn on him in a holy war against Israel. Less recognizable perhaps are the links between events in the Soviet Union — the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel — the pressure to settle them in the Occupied Territories — the Palestinian and Arab fear of the same and of an Israeli military adventure to provide a cover for the same — and additional pressure on Palestinians and other Arabs in Kuwait and elsewhere arising from the same, and expressed but not resolved in the last Arab Summit in May 1990. These link[age]s can only be denied in blindness or cynicism — and the same linkages are no less cynically used to serve other interests as well.

The allegation that the Gulf War is to protect the world order from lawless might-is-right aggression against the weak is a lie and the height of cynicism, especially by President Bush, but also by those who support him in the United Nations. Many have already made the "link" with the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, which merited Security Council resolutions, but no economic sanctions, let alone a war against Israel. Less links have been made with apartheid in South Africa and its continual aggressions against its neighboring Front Line states in Southern Africa. They merited embargoes by the UN and its members, but no one ever suggested going to war against South Africa. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan merited condemnation and opposition, albeit of course not by the Security Council, but certainly no counter invasion of the Soviet Union. The Iraqi invasion of Iran received, but did not merit, de facto political and even military support by the same coalition of allies, which now wages war against Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

Perhaps most significantly however, no one except some Latin Americans — not even President Hussein and certainly not President Bush — has made the obvious linkage with Panama. Only eight months before President Hussein invaded Kuwait, President Bush himself invaded Panama [some might say under the cover of the uprising in Romania, which distracted media and world attention as it now does from Soviet intervention in the Baltics and as the Suez Crisis in 1956 lent cover to Soviet intervention in Hungary]. Be that as it may, President Bush's "Just Cause" for his invasion of Panama with 27,000 troops to catch one man was a cynical lie. So much so that one year later his Justice Department has been unable to unearth a single shred of documentary evidence to use in court against General Noriega. Indeed, he may never get to court, not the least because Noriega himself probably has evidence on George Bush from when they were collaborators no so long ago. The real reasons for President Bush's invasion of Panama have still not been revealed. One may have

been the need to replace the no longer usable bogey of the Soviet evil empire with a new one in the personalized form of a narco-terrorist in the Isthmus — until a better bogey became available in the Gulf. However, more material incentives have also been suggested: To forestall a deal with Japan, which was threatened by Panama's accession to a majority on the Canal Commission on January 1, 1990. More important and more like Iraq's take over of Kuwait however, is the also hidden fact that the US foreign invasion of sovereign Panama cost 4,000 to 7,000 lives [far more than the domestic violence in Romania], used armed brutalization of part of the population, caused wanton destruction of property for which no amends have ever been made, and that Panama is still under US military occupation and rule to this day! What limit then is there to cynicism when President Bush can now appeal to God, morality, and international law to condemn President Hussein's invasion and occupation of Kuwait, when he himself did and still does the same in Panama?

Unfortunately, lying cynicism is not limited to Presidents Hussein or Bush and their immediate supporters. No Security Council resolutions were passed, or even proposed, to protect the President Bush's new world order from his own violation of the sovereignty of Panama. On the contrary, President Bush received only acquiescence or even outright support for his violation of international law and human right in Panama. So had President Reagan when he invaded and occupied sovereign Grenada [which also is still administered by the United States]. Indeed, the entire European Community, not to mention the United States, also already supported Prime Minister Thatcher when she escalated her war against Argentina and its military junta [notwithstanding that she literally torpedoed on the ocean all efforts in Lima to defuse the situation and prevent war in the South Atlantic, and that she threatened to nuke the Argentine city of Cordoba]. The Malvinas/Falkland War was the first major war of all the West against a single Third World country. The latter received no support of any kind from any other country in the North, and only moral support regardless of political ideology from its regional partners in Latin America. Therefore, it cannot be credible now that today the same old Western NATO allies — and now the ex Warsaw Pact foes and new allies to boot — appeal to God and justice from their high moral horses to condemn another violation of international law and to band together to wage war against a Third World country for the same. There must be other — even more cynical: — reasons at work.

DO NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS — NOR CONJURE UP TONKIN LIKE FAITS ACCOMPLIS IN ANOTHER OTHER GULF

Far from going "an extra mile for peace," Presidents Hussein and Bush seem to have taken steps, each of which was measured or designed to lead across one Rubicon after another. However, several of these steps were taken in secret, or even in collusion, and all of them were calculated also to lead the allies who follow them beyond points of no return. It is still too early for any possible Tonkin Gulf revelation in the Persian Gulf. However, it is already time to piece together some of the Tonkin like fatal steps to war in the Gulf. Overproduction of oil in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia and the decline in the price of oil may or may not have occurred in concert with

American interests to begin to cut President Hussain's power in Iraq down to size after the end of his war with Iran. Certainly, American and Western support was increasingly withdrawn from Iraq. Nonetheless, in late July the American Ambassador in Baghdad was informed by President Hussein of his intentions perhaps to use military means to press Iraq's increasing grievances with Kuwait. On explicit instructions from his immediate superior in the State Department in Washington, the American Ambassador indicated to President Hussein that the United States would have no objections. [The New York Times declined to publish a letter by a friend who asked what President Bush's administration told the Kuwaitis at the same time!] A week later, President Hussein invaded Kuwait. More precisely, first President Hussein claimed he was only helping a rival government in Kuwait, which had asked for his help. Since the international response was mild, he took the next step to complete military occupation, and then to annexation, and finally to making Kuwait the 19th province of Iraq. After several days' reflection, President Bush decided it was also time for him to act. Both presidents deliberately proceeded to cross Rubicons from which there was no face saving way back.

President Bush and his Secretary of State Baker put together a coalition in the Security Council first to condemn Iraq, then to impose an embargo, to authorize military teeth to enforce it, and finally to legitimize recourse to war. In all, they got twelve UN resolutions in their pocket, as President Bush and Mr. Baker never tire to point out. However, they do not say how much their diplomacy paid, bribed, blackmailed or strongarmed some member governments to do their bidding. Most significantly, President Bush maneuvered the United Nations into legitimizing his actions, without revealing that each step of the way would be irreversible nor how it would lead on to the next step to war. Yet the Washington Post (International Herald Tribune Jan. 17, 1991) quotes a senior official and long time aide to President Bush to the effect that he has been prepared for war since August. The London Sunday Telegraph (Jan. 20, 1991) agrees: "President Bush and Mrs Thatcher took the decision to go to war long before there was any hope of getting UN sanction, and they did so with a justifiable clear conscience." President Bush "always knew what he was going to do and has now done it in his own good time in the most favorable diplomatic and military circumstances." The United Nations surely did not know, and certainly was not told by President Bush, and is not likely to have given him its support for the purpose President Bush had known and prepared for "in good conscience" since August. The UN would not be likely to vote the same way today, if it had the choice. But it does not.

The opposite is true of Congress, which was equally manipulated by President Bush. Congress would surely have refused to vote Mr. Bush war powers in November or perhaps even in December. That is surely also why President Bush did not send his war resolution to Congress before he had crossed so many Rubicons, that Congress could hardly deny its support to the American men and women, whom President Bush had sent to the battle front. A crucial step by President Bush was to double the number of troops in Saudi Arabia by bringing in American NATO troops from Germany, not as initially announced to rotate them with, but now to add them to, those already there. Thereby also, the mission of the American troops was changed from the supposed defense of Saudi Arabia against a possible attack by

Iraq to the "liberation" of Kuwait through the planned American attack of Iraq itself and to the defeat of its military forces. In view of this commitment by President Bush, the ever astute Henry Kissinger then observed that any withdrawal without victory now "would lead to a collapse of American credibility, not only in the area but in most parts of the world" (quoted in the International Herald Tribune Jan. 17, 1991).

These far reaching decisions were made before the November 6 American congressional elections. However, they were deliberately withheld from the public and Congress before the elections and only implemented thereafter. Neither the American public, nor the American Congress, would have agreed to this deliberate escalation towards war by President Bush if they had been given a choice. That is why President Bush gave them no choice, but instead deceived them and pursued his covert policy of *faits accomplis*. At the time, some proposed that President Hussein could do no better than agree to withdraw from Kuwait and thereby show up President Bush's war making policy for what it was and is. But President Hussein also wanted war. Nothing could be further from the truth than the BIG LIE by each president at the choice was the other's or that his own steps to war were forced on him by the other. No, both presidents themselves knowingly and deliberately — as if in concert with each other — engineered the steps to war from which there was no retreat. Both presidents wanted war, and they put it over their respective supporters and people, willing or not.

The imposition of the January 15 deadline and the commitment of military forces to the Gulf war by other countries were other ineluctable steps on the road to war. These steps were (deliberately) made necessary by the foregoing ones to begin with. That is, both presidents Hussein and Bush built up military forces and political positions, which made further escalation necessary. The American military forces and perhaps the coalition alliance could not be maintained in the Gulf without further escalation. In particular, it was realized that the military forces could not continue to sit on their hands indefinitely and especially not after the onset of the sandstorms in the spring. Then and during the Islamic holy month of Ramadan, these forces also could no longer go on the offensive. Therefore, it became necessary to get an earlier deadline for them to be put into action. Better sooner than later, and the Security Council obliged with a January 15 deadline for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

Therewith, the United Nations itself became the first major casualty of the Gulf War, and the American Congress became the second. At the time, some American commentators remarked on the irony that President Bush was able to get the authorization for going to war in the Gulf from the United Nations, which he was unable to get from his own American Congress. Then, of course, he used the one in his *faits accomplis* policy to get the other as well. Thereby, the two major United Nations and Congressional institutional safeguards against war became major casualties of President Bush and those who supported him before the first shot was even fired in the Gulf War. The end of cold war bi-polarity raised high hopes that in a more multi-polar world the old principle of balance of power and its expression through the UN peacekeeping function could finally be realized. In 1988, the UN was indeed instrumental in bringing peace to several regional conflicts; and it was awarded the Nobel Peace prize for the same.

The opposite happened with the regional conflict in the Gulf. In the name of maintaining international law and peace in the region, the United Nations was

maneuvered into legitimizing a major war instead. This war now involves many powers outside the region, which bring to bear military forces and fire power exceeding all since World War II. There is great danger that the war will expand and perhaps escape all control. Indeed, some commentators fear that all this spells the beginning of World War III. That brings the world back to the situation during the Korean war and its threats of escalation and nuclearization, except that this time the United Nations has not supplied its blue flag, but "only" its blessings to the combatants on one side. Efforts to replace them by neutral blue helmeted and noncombattant United Nations forces in between were very belated and at best half hearted. The institutional United Nations Peacekeeping mechanism was subverted into warmongering instead and became the first major casualty of the Gulf War. The major reason for this momentous failure of the United Nations of course is its leadership by the United States and its President Bush. However, some of the responsibility for failure also lies in the opportunistic irresponsibility of other member states, and particularly the other permanent members of the Security Council.

The second major casualty was the American Congress, its constitutional mandate to keep the President in check and balance, and especially to exercise its authority to declare war for good cause. President Bush's maneuver of Congress through deceit and blackmail was functionally analogous to another Tonkin Gulf affair [when President Johnson faked a Vietnamese attack in the Tonkin Gulf to deceive Congress into authorizing escalation in Vietnam in 1964]. All through the autumn, the American Congress and public were against a US war in the Gulf. However, President Bush maneuvered and blackmailed Congress to back him up to go to war in the Gulf by adept if not deceitful timing in using his UN resolutions on the Gulf, his deceitful decision to bring US NATO troops from Germany to the Gulf, and his diplomacy to build up an international coalition in the Gulf, not to mention his use of television media around the Gulf. The latter also forgot Exodus 23 "Do not pass on untrue reports. Do not cooperate with an evil man by affirming something you know is false."

Thus, President Bush used the powers of his office first to overcome congressional and popular opposition, then to get reluctant approval, and finally to achieve jingoistic enthusiasm for his war. President Bush had already made over 400,000 American troops ready for battle in the Gulf, which in itself exerted pressure on Congress now to accept this fait accompli and to authorize their use. Moreover, President Bush threatened to give the order to send them into war with or without the approval of Congress, to whom the Constitution reserves the right to declare war [which it never did in Vietnam]. Even so, in its predeadline resolution early half the Senate still dared to oppose or at least to delay the use of these troops for war. However, President Bush's war resolution passed, the January 15 UN deadline came and went; and the US Commander in Chief gave the order to fire. Then, of course, Congress [now the Senate voted 980] and the American people were faced with President Bush's [so far] final fait accompli. Which now oblige them to rally around their troops, their flag and their President. Thus, President Bush won. The big loser is the American Congress and its constitutional mandate to exercise checks and balances on the President, and especially on his ability to wage war.

Poor Congress, American people and world! Their memory was too short to recall the "truth" value [or his Democratic Party rival Michael Dukakis' explicit warning] of

President Bush's "READ MY LIPS!" and "A KINDER, GENTLER PRESIDENCY." President Bush had solemnly promised "No New Taxes," to be "The Education President," to "Take Care of the Environment," and to create "a Kinder, Gentler Presidency." Then, new taxes were raised and will have to rise further with recession and war; and education and the environment were neglected and will suffer further in the war. And where in this war world [or God forbid, world war] is the kinder, gentler presidency?

The same issue of the Telegraph offers aid and comfort: "Not that the danger from the peace movement has wholly passed ... If things start going wrong in the Gulf, we may need to have recourse to jingoism, if only to combat the fire and fervour of the peace movement ... For so long as primitive, irrational pacifism can continue to cloud the minds of men — as it can and does as never before — so long will it be necessary for there to be an equally strong emotional antidote on the other side ... It would be a foolish Western leader who threw this indispensable, if ancient and primitive, psychological weapon [of jingoism] onto the scrapheap before victory was assured." The London Telegraph must be proud to have such attentive and obedient readers in Downing Street and the Mother of Parliaments, in the White House and Capitol Hill, and of course in Baghdad and all over the Arab and Islamic world too.

America's allies also suffered from memory loss, short sightedness, and a touch of jingoism too. As President Bush increased America's military and political commitment in the Gulf, its allies came under increasing pressure to make some commitment of their own. The British came in with enthusiasm, and used their say in the European Community to tone down expressions of reservations against President Bush's policies and to derail or veto alternative proposals, such as the last ditch French attempt to avert war. For the more reluctant allies, first the commitment was more symbolic and/or only to help police the UN embargo on Iraq. By and by, these governments were also trapped by the two presidents' policies of faits accomplis. Now even the most reluctant French, Italians, and Dutch find their own military forces fighting under American command in a shooting war against Iraq. Opportunism and irresponsibility played their significant roles in this drama as well. Therefore, the potential peace dividend of a more independent Europe was the third major casualty of the Gulf war before it started. In reshaping this scenario, the Soviet Union, Japan and Germany had special roles.

TAKE CARE IN MISUSING OLD ALLIANCES AND MAKING NEW ONES

A very serious consequence — or rather instrument — of the Gulf War policy of President Bush has been his manipulation and misuse of old and new alliances. The hastily convened Helsinki summit with the Soviet Union and no doubt much quiet diplomacy was used to extort Soviet political compliance, acquiescence, and initially even approval for President Bush's policies for war in the Gulf. President Bush took full advantage of President Gorbachev's domestic and international difficulties. The new de facto alliance between the Soviet Union and the United States was not used to promote peace in, and a peace dividend for, the world. Instead, this new Soviet-American alliance was turned around to lend support to President Bush to start war

in the Gulf and maybe beyond. Japan was not subject to American blackmail. On the contrary, Secretary of State Baker went there and elsewhere hat in hand to beg for financial support for the American that President Bush sent to the Gulf and/or for the third party countries in the region, whose finances are very negatively affected by this conflict, not to mention war, in the Gulf. President Bush and Mr. Baker are visibly disturbed by the faint response they received from Tokyo.

The other important case is Germany. It is preoccupied with its own unification and is scarcely interested in direct support for President Bush's war policies in the Gulf. So President Bush found a round about way to involve Germany too. Fellow NATO country Turkey shares a border with Iraq. Its government has been an American client all through the cold war, and still is. Thus, it was not too difficult for President Bush and Mr. Baker to bring Turkey first into the embargo and then into the alliance against Iraq. That exposed Turkey to a potential threat from Iraq. Therefore, why not have Turkey call on its NATO allies for protection against this real or imagined threat by Iraq. Still better, Turkey could make a direct appeal to fellow NATO member Germany. It did, and Germany was obliged by NATO rules to send at least a squadron of military aircraft to Turkey. Germany like Japan, is prohibited by its American imposed constitution from sending its military forces abroad, except in its own defense. However, it is permitted to so dispatch its military within the framework of NATO. This cold war alliance, however, is prohibited by its statutes from intervening directly in conflicts outside of its own region, and especially not in the Third World.

Where there is a will, there is a way — to kill two big birds with one little stone. Now President Bush has also managed to divert both Germany and NATO from their regional concerns and potentially to engage them in the war President Bush is waging against a Third World country in the Gulf. As I am writing, Turkey has just agreed to permit the use of its soil for American military aircraft to attack Iraq. [First the announcement was withheld; then the American flights were called "training missions;" finally it turned out they had been flying bombing missions every six hours for three days]. That is another one of President Bush's *faits accomplis*, which exposes Turkey to retaliation by Iraq. However, that would be an attack by a country that is not a member against one that is a member of NATO — and therefore on NATO itself. This NATO alliance includes its most reluctant member country Germany. Such *de jure* diversion of the NATO alliance and institution by President Bush from East-West conflicts to North-South ones portends a most serious precedent for the world as a whole. Indeed *de facto*, President Bush already set such a very serious precedent in November, when he sent to the Gulf the American NATO troop contingents, which had been stationed under American NATO command in Germany. *De facto* also, President Bush used NATO facilities and American supplied military hardware — and no doubt soft war also — for deployment to the Gulf and asked his NATO allies in Europe to step into their place with their own. This quiet diplomacy and *de facto* policy of *faits accomplis* by President Bush to transform the function and direction of NATO threatens to become one of the most dangerous legacies of the Gulf War for the rest of the world. Thus, the integrity of NATO and the peace dividend from the end of the cold war were the fourth major casualty of President Bush's Gulf War policy even before the first shot was fired.

Fifth and further casualties already before the fighting started are the Arab governments, which sided with presidents Hussein and Bush, and these govern-

ments' and the Arab League's own pretensions at Arab solutions, not to mention Arab unity. This tragic drama is still only in Act I as the shooting starts. The autocratic Arab governments that sided with and/or were bought off by President Bush have thereby sacrificed what little popular support and legitimacy they still had. They have further cemented their dependence of the United States, and the United States is now obliged to prop them up politically and subsidize them economically [which it can ill afford] even more than before. Popular uprisings, if not military coups or splits, are now likely in one country in the Middle East after another. In these circumstances, it was another sham for President Bush to have promised to bring the American troops back home just as soon as possible after completing their job in Iraq. For President Bush knowingly committed American troops to "stabilize" the Middle East for a long time to come. His counterpart President Hussein, in the meantime, is cajoling or bribing Muslims world wide to enter the fray on his side. "Take no bribes, for a bribe makes you unaware of what you clearly see. A bribe hurts the cause of the righteous" (Exodus 23).

There have already been many other important casualties even before the first shot was fired: The million plus refugees and the environment in the Gulf region; the many countries and millions of people who lost sources of their livelihood from the occupation of Kuwait and the embargo against Iraq; the importers of petroleum whose price has skyrocketed for the old Third World countries in the South and the new Third World countries in Eastern Europe; and the hundreds of millions of people around the world whose most urgent problems [like renewed famine in Africa] are neglected by focusing attention on the Gulf. All of these suffer from President Hussein's occupation of Kuwait and President Bush's escalation of the same into a major war. All of these casualties are bound to multiply in the course of the war itself. Yet only some of these costs and casualties have merited little concern at best, and then only when it was necessary in order to tie some regional governments into the alliance, like Turkey and Syria, or maintain them neutral, like Jordan and Iran. Most of these momentous problems and their costs to countless millions of people have received no, or virtually no, attention from the "responsible" presidents, their allied prime ministers, their governments, the United Nations, or the mostly warmongering media. Their violations of the Ten Commandments and the Koran are far too many to recount.

BRAVO FOR AMERICAN POWER! THAT IS THE REAL NAME OF THE GAME

The real reasons, as distinct from the sham pretexts, for the unfolding of this tragic drama have not yet been clarified. Both presidents Hussein and Bush may well have taken their first belligerent steps for economic reasons, as suggested above. However, neither stood or stands to derive direct economic gain from their ever more belligerent escalation of their conflict and from the war itself. We must presume that both presidents are shooting for other benefits they desire. The very intransigence they share offers an indication of what both desire: power through strength. That is also what the proverbial man in the street sees and even his governments respect: "Now there is a leader for the Arabs and he is Saddam Hussein ... The world said

Saddam Hussein is weak. Today he proved he is not" as two men interviewed in Jordan put it (International Herald Tribune Jan, 19 — 20, 1991). By taking Kuwait, and especially by taking on, albeit belatedly, the Palestinian issue and then bombarding Israel, Saddam Hussein now aspires to the mantle of Gamal Nasser to make Iraq hegemonic on a regional level. That is also precisely what the United States and its allies in Europe and also those elsewhere in the Middle East want to prevent. That is why they want to cut President Hussein and Iraq back down to size.

President Bush has similar ambitions. Of course however, the ambitions of President Bush and the United States are not limited to the Middle Eastern regional scale; they encompass the globe as a whole. BRAVO FOR AMERICAN POWER celebrates the "serious" London paper Sunday Telegraph (Jan. 20, 1991) in a five column editorial which concludes "bliss is it in this dawn to be alive; but to be an old reactionary is very heaven." Blissful or otherwise, the same editorial is certainly realistic when it writes "who matter are not the Germans or the Japanese or the Russians but the Americans. Happy days are here again." The same paper adds farther down the page, "this is not going to be a multi-polar world. If there is to be a new world order, it will be based on US military power with Britain playing a key role. Saddam's scalp will be its first trophy." Thus the London Telegraph also makes its own the observation of the aptly named American National Interest: "The fact [is] that the military power of the United States was the only thing capable of mounting an effective riposte — when the economic Power of a Japan or a Germany was virtually irrelevant." Not only that, but military power is the only thing the United States has left, and it is the only thing it is capable of still flaunting to maintain any political power in the face of the "virtually irrelevant" growing economic power of Japan and Germany, "no matter" the Russians.

Even so, the United States never did offer any similar response to the Soviet Union in Europe or Afghanistan, and it still does not and cannot do so in the Baltics today. However, the same Telegraph editorial has an answer also to why President Bush chooses to flaunt American power in the Gulf instead: It "does sound cynical. But it also goes to the heart of the matter. For there is a clash of interest between the First World and the Third World, and no international order satisfactory to the former should rely on the say-so of an institution [like the United Nations] dominated numerically by the latter.... Sooner or later the Third World will throw up other challenges. But if the Gulf war ends as it has begun, there can be no doubt who are the masters now — at any rate for another generation.... Not only will our arms have prevailed in a most spectacular fashion. So also will our ideals" (Emphasis in the original, Amen). Here we have the real reasons for the Gulf War now promoted and led by the "ideals" of the Commander in Chief of this military power President George Bush. That is his NEW WORLD ORDER! No matter that the Bible (Exodus 22, 23) also admonishes us not to take advantage of the weak and that "a man's poverty is no excuse for twisting justice against him."

Beyond being a war between the North and the South, perhaps the clearest gulf in this war is between the rich on one side and the poor on the other. Obviously, the Western powers in this war represent above all the interests of the rich in the world. Perhaps the Texan President Bush and Secretary of State Baker also represent the rich Texas oil interests more than they would like to admit. However, the Saudi Arabs

[the original dispatch of troops war for *their* protection!] and the Kuwaitis are also among the oil rich. The latter alone have US \$ 200 billion of investments overseas and much of it in the West [from which they continue to draw income even without another drop of oil]. Suffice it to ask whether the rich West would send over half a million troops to defend the poor elsewhere in Africa or anywhere else. The other Arabs and the coalition are the American client *governments* also representing the rich in their respective countries. The poor populations of these same Arab countries are massively on the other side of this conflict and support Iraq, whose President Hussein has opportunistically declared himself their and the poor Palestinians' and other Muslims' spokesman.

The decisions and faits accomplis to go to war were made at the highest national and international levels. These governmental leaders not only failed to consult their populations and voters. President Bush deliberately avoided putting the issue to Congress until long after the Congressional elections and his subsequent doubling of American Gulf troops in November 1990. In doing so, these government leaders ironically also pulled the rug out from under the social movements in civil society both in the United States and Western Europe, after these movements had already been bypassed in Eastern Europe. The mobilization of civil society around a myriad of local, national, and international issues of gender relations, environmental issues, and ironically since the shooting started the peace movement received a brutal blow. Even the director of that old cold war think tank, the International Institute for Strategic Studies, observed in the International Herald Tribune (February 11, 1991) "the current collapse of pacifist movements in Western countries, not the least Germany, in one of the notable features of the war".

The media confronted people in Europe with a choice between the Iraqi Saddam Hussein and the American George Bush. With *that* choice, the man in the street and in front of his TV set chose the white American. More women, fortunately or wisely, refused that false choice and opted for peace instead. Nonetheless, European civil society rapidly became shot through with rapid racism and chauvinism directed against any and all Arabs and Turks — in total disregard of the fact that many governments of Arabian countries and Turkey [which also has its eye on some Iraqi petroleum producing territory] are loyal and active members of the allied coalition of the Americans and Europeans. Thereby, these West Europeans may also be demonstrating a preference for replacing cheap non-European labor from the South by the newly available source of European cheap labor from the East. Certainly, the *people* in Europe, and of course in the United States as well, demonstrate that they are not entirely duped by the myths their leaders and media propagate about any supposed "principles" in this war. Instead, these people in the North demonstrate through their own belligerent action against colored immigrants or workers from the South on the Streets at home that they feel and understand the war in the Gulf is between *their* North and the South. At the same time, the people in the South feel and understand the same thing. That is why all around the equator not only Arabs and not only Muslims, but all kinds of other people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America demonstrate against the United States, which is making war against the Third World, and in support of Saddam Hussein who, however cynically, has been cast in the role of defender of the South.

President Bush's most enthusiastic foreign support has come from Britain, first under the leadership of Prime minister Margaret Thatcher and then under that of her successor John Major [and beacons of truth and morality like the Telegraph]. The London Telegraph offers an interpretation for that too in a column entitled "TO THE POINT": "Britain goes up in the world" again thanks to its support for President Bush in the Gulf, which "suggests that Britain, not Germany, is the more natural leader for a Europe aspiring to greater political unity." In support of this thesis, the same paper also cites "so influential an American organ of opinion" as the Wall Street Journal. The Telegraph admits "President Bush as been proved right and his critics, this paper included, have been proved wrong." Power and its successful exercise attracts, especially opportunists of every stripe for whom kowtowing to this power offers hope for some crumbs off its table. That their avarice violates still another of the Ten Commandments is a minor Point. BRAVO FOR BRAVADO!

The question remains whether President Bush's bravado will really save the United States or even himself. Only time will tell. Or will President Bush's adventurism bankrupt and sink the United States even further than his mentor Ronald Reagan, who promised to make "America Number One Again" and nearly bankrupted the United States instead? It well may, especially in face of the new world economic recession and the "virtually irrelevant economic power of Japan and Germany" to whom President Bush had to send Secretary of State Baker hat in hand to help finance his war in the Gulf. This recession/war is not likely to turn out like previous ones. World War II pulled the United States out of the Depression and made it hegemonic. The Korean War pulled the United States out of the recession of 1949 and launched the military Keynesianism, which helped ward off the feared economic stagnation. The Vietnam War was enough for the United States to avoid the recession, which hit Germany and Japan in 1967. It was not enough to prevent the recession of 1970, and certainly not to ward off the first severe post war recession of 1973 — 75. On the contrary, the Vietnam War already weakened the United States relative to its Japanese and German rivals. The costs of that war obliged the United States to abandon the fixed exchange rates and the institutional mechanisms established at Bretton Woods, and then to devalue the dollar.

For American economic power, it has been downhill ever since. President Reagan's recklessness and "Reaganomics" [which in good time George Bush himself baptized as "Voodoo Economics"] put the America economy at the mercy of Japanese bankers and German industrialists. It is even more at their mercy for financial and political support during the new recession, which began in 1990 before the crisis in the Gulf, and now during the war in the Gulf itself. The real responsibility of President Bush, not to mention his electoral Promises, was to tend the store at home and in the world, instead of gallivanting off to make war in the Gulf and let the world economy go to hell. Now President Bush can only count on continued support, if at all, as long as he shows quick military success. And if he can't? A severe and prolonged recession, not to mention a prolonged war, would sink him. Unfortunately, President Bush would take many innocent people — and a few of his not so innocent sycophants — down with him.

The United States was long obsessed with its political and ideological security in [successfully] defeating the Soviet Union in the cold war. In doing so, the United

States neglected to maintain its real economic base in competition with its real competitors in Japan and Europe. So now the United States no longer has sufficient economic clout to be a super power either.

Yet with President Bush waiving the American flag, the United States rushed in where angels fear to tread. It rushed into war in the Gulf in a probably vain attempts to shore up its declining power on the world stage one last time by the only means it has left and knows how to use — its military power. However, without an adequate economic base, military power is insufficient to keep a great super power afloat. On the contrary, the foolish use of its military power may instead sink that power. It is not for nothing that Paul Kennedy became a best seller [apparently not in the Bush White House or the Pentagon] when he wrote that foolish military overextension beyond the economy's means to support it is the basis of *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*.

Thus, both Presidents Hussein and Bush took enormous and totally irresponsible gambles with their own future and with that of the world. Both Presidents, and unfortunately all the world with them, are very likely to loose this gamble. Their hubris and irresponsible unconcern for the consequences of their faits accomplis are further deadly sins. They may pray to Allah / God to save them — and we must pray for him / her to save us from them. AMEN!

Andre Gunder Frank, H. Bosmansstraat 57, 1077 XG Amsterdam, Holland

ABSTRACTS

Ayad Al-Ani

The Role of Institutions in Development.

An Institutionalist Approach Forwards Development Economics

The issue of institutions has often been neglected by traditional neoclassical economics and, thus, by modernization theory. The two main reasons for this can be found in the simple assumptions so far incorporated in neoclassical theory, which make it difficult to explain institutional non-maximizing behavior for one, and in the traditional focus of economists on resource allocation and not on institutional means of using the allocated resources for another. An attempt is made to describe the effects of institutions on the economic behavior of individuals in developing countries. This is done by using the transaction cost approach as an analyzing tool. Specific phenomena of developing economies and their societies can, thus, be theoretically tackled and analyzed.

Herbert Strunz

Organizations as Determinants of Economic Development

Various approaches and theories dealing with economic development are not considering the role of organizations in the process of economic development. The paper assumes the relating importance of organizations; both an adequate social and economic environment as well as successfully managed structures and processes within the organization are necessary for their optimized functionality ensuring positive influence on economic development.

Manfred Nitsch

Revolving Loan Funds: Risks and Opportunities of a Popular Instrument of Development Aid. An Institutional Analysis

"Revolving Fund" is a suggestive label for many structurally decapitalizing, short-lived funds which serve the purposes of administrative convenience, electoral campaigning or community solidarity, without strict insistence on the repayment of loans, let alone real positive interest rates. These funds may merit support in individual cases, but in general they are rather hurtful for the poor target groups, and they are inappropriate for official development assistance, since a fund which spends money for grants as well as credits and which is lenient in loan collections is impossible to monitor from the outside.

Official international aid agencies can only control and should therefore only foment revolving loan funds which are embryonic banks for the poor. Institutionally, every bank is a revolving loan fund, and it is a guarantee fund, too. The path on which to send the managers of a viable fund, then, is to seek self-financing through sound mass banking practices and to open deposit accounts for the public rather than to

look for subsidies and further aid monies indefinitely. Administrative rules and statutory provisions could ensure that it does not develop into a common commercial private bank serving the interest of only wealthy customers.

Hartmut Elsenhans

Political and Economic Foundations of Democratization in the Third World

Democratization requires certain social and economic structures which — right now — do not exist in the Third World. Particularly the internalization of capital goods production which allows fiscal, monetary and distributional policies to create a growth stimulating incentive structure is lacking. The replacement of state classes, that had been oriented towards the western model and that emerged during the 1930's as well as during the period of decolonization, by a new type of rising middle classes that expects nothing from the state, will not necessarily lead to such structures. Depending on the specific economic policies one has to expect different institutional structures in the Third World, namely the takeover of economic decision making by western experts, the improvement of the competing abilities within a global market and the transition towards capitalistic middle class structures which have to be established at high costs against the aversion of the ruling classes.

Gerald Braun

The Poverty of Conventional Development Concepts

The article deals critically with three different concepts of development: (1) European growth and industrialization (2) Third World basic needs and (3) the global concept of sustainable development.

(1) The assumptions of the growth model have proved wrong. (2) The basic needs concept is mainly rhetoric without politics. (3) Ecodevelopment is threatened by the oligarchic levels of consumption in industrial countries or by an eco-dictatorship.

AUTORENNOTIZEN

Ayad AL-ANI,

Mag. Dr., geb. 1964. Studium der Handelswissenschaft und der Politikwissenschaft an der Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien und an der Universität Wien. Promotion 1990. Forschungsschwerpunkte: Entwicklungsökonomie, Institutionen in Entwicklungsländern, Verwaltungswissenschaft. Tätigkeit als Unternehmensberater in Wien.

Gerald BRAUN,

Dr. rer. pol., Mitarbeiter am Arnold-Bergstraesser-Institut und Lehrbeauftragter an der Universität Freiburg i.Br. Veröffentlichungen u.a.: Nord-Süd-Konflikt und Entwicklungspolitik, Opladen 1985 (Westdeutscher Verlag); Nord-Süd-Konflikt und Dritte Welt, 3. Aufl. Paderborn 1991 (Schöningh-Verlag); (zus. mit Karl Hillebrand), Dritte Welt. Fortschritt und Fehlentwicklung, Paderborn 1991 (Schöningh-Verlag).

Hartmut ELSENHANS,

ordentlicher Professor für Internationale Beziehungen an der Universität Konstanz, Lehrtätigkeit an den Universitäten FU Berlin, Frankfurt, Marburg und Gastprofessuren in Montreal, Dakar, Salzburg, New Delhi, Lissabon.

Andre Gunder FRANK,

is Professor of Development Economics and Social Sciences at the University of Amsterdam. Frank was born in Berlin in 1929 and is a citizen of Germany. He was educated in the United States and received the Ph.D. in economics at the University of Chicago in 1957. He has taught in departments of anthropology, economics, history, political science and sociology at universities in Europe, North America and Latin America. His earlier work was primarily on dependence and "the development of underdevelopment". It became known especially through his book *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, first published in 1967, reprinted 12 times, and also published in translation in 10 other editions, some with several printings.

Frank's more recent work has been in the fields of world system history, contemporary international political economy, and social movements. His 800 plus publications have appeared in 24 languages. These publications comprise some 300 articles published in translation in over 600 issues of periodicals, chapters in over 100 edited readers / anthologies, and over 100 editions in various languages of his 30 books, including *World Accumulation 1492 — 1789* (1978), *Crisis in the World Economy* (1980), and *The European Challenge: From Atlantic Alliance to Pan-European Entente for Peace and Jobs* (1983).

Manfred NITSCH,

Professor für Politische Ökonomie Lateinamerikas am Lateinamerika-Institut der Freien Universität Berlin. Publikationen über Entwicklungsplanung, wirtschaftliche

Nord-Süd-Beziehungen, Institutionen-Ökonomik, Bankwesen in Entwicklungsländern und das „brasilianische Modell“. Beratungstätigkeiten in Kolumbien, Ekuador, Guatemala, Peru, Brasilien und China.

Herbert STRUNZ,

Mag. Dr. Jahrgang 1961, Studium der Betriebswirtschaft, Promotion 1986, seit SS 1988 Lehrbeauftragter an der Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, Interdisziplinäre Abteilung für Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungsführung.

Linguistics & Language Behavior Abstracts

LLBA

Now entering our 24th year (135,000 abstracts to date) of service to linguists and language researchers worldwide. LLBA is available in print and also on-line from BRS and Dialog.

Linguistics & Language Behavior Abstracts

P.O. Box 22206
San Diego, CA 92192-0206
Phone (619) 695-8803 FAX (619) 695-0416

Fast, economical document delivery available.



Leading the field in sociology and the related social sciences:

**sociological
abstracts (sa)**

and

**Social Planning / Policy & Development
Abstracts (SOPODA)**

Our subject specialists track the broad spectrum of theoretical and applied sociology from the more than 1,800 discipline-specific and related journals published in North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and South America.

sa and **SOPODA** each offer you in-depth abstracts and precise indexing of timely journal articles and books, enhanced dissertation listings, and a bibliography of book reviews from the journals screened.

sa and **SOPODA** are available together on the **sociofile** CD-ROM and are hosted online by BRS, DATA-

STAR, DIALOG, and DIMDI. Hardcopy subscriptions can be ordered from the address below.

The **sa** and **SOPODA** information products are supported by:

- Database-specific user manuals
- The latest journal coverage list
- The **sociofile** Quick Reference Guide and User's Handbook
- The **Thesaurus of Sociological Indexing Terms**
- Your Guide to Searching **sa** using a Personal Computer
- A professional workshop program

The **sa** family of databases — your fast track to the information you need, in the format you want.

sociological abstracts, inc.

p.o. box 22206 • san diego, ca 92192-0206
phone (619) 695-8803 / FAX (619) 695-0416 / Help Desk (800) 752-3945

INFORMATIONEN FÜR AUTOREN

1. Manuskripte sind zu senden an: Journal für Entwicklungspolitik, Weyrgasse 5, A-1030 Wien.
2. Senden Sie zwei Kopien. Diese werden zwei externen Begutachtern zur Stellungnahme vorgelegt.
3. Der Beitrag darf den Umfang von 30 Seiten (2zeilig) nicht überschreiten. Darin eingeschlossen sind die Titelseite mit Zusammenfassung, Text, Literaturhinweise, Anmerkungen, Tabellen und Schaubilder.
4. Legen Sie eine kurze Zusammenfassung (ca. 100 Worte) bei und eine Kurzcharakteristik ihrer wissenschaftlichen Tätigkeit.
5. Auf dem Manuskript sollte Ihr Name nicht angegeben sein.
6. Zitierweise: Generell sollte ein Verzeichnis aller ver- und bearbeiteten Literatur am Ende des Beitrages stehen. Im Text selbst geben Sie bitte den Namen, das Jahr und bei wörtlichen Zitaten die jeweilige Seite an.
7. Wenn möglich, schicken Sie Ihren Beitrag zusätzlich auf Diskette, wobei das Manuskript mit Microsoft Word V 5.0 oder einem anderen MS-DOS-compatiblen Programm erfaßt sein sollte.

INFORMATIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS

1. Submit manuscripts to: Austrian Journal of Development Studies, Weyrgasse 5, A-1030 Vienna, Austria.
2. Submit two copies and retain the original for your files. All papers deemed appropriate for the AJDS are sent out anonymously to readers.
3. A full-length article is seldom longer than 30 manuscript pages, including title page, abstract, text, references, footnotes, tables, and figures. Manuscripts must be typed double-spaced.
4. Include a brief abstract (fewer than 100 words) and a short curriculum vitae (not more than 40 words).
5. Delete all identifying references from your manuscript.
6. Reference Format: In the appendix: List all items alphabetically and, within author, by year of publication. In the text: All source references are to be identified at the appropriate point in the text by the last name of the author, year of publication, and pagination where needed.
7. Manuscripts on diskette will reduce the processing time. Compose with a word processor on a PC/MS-DOS computer using, e.g. Microsoft Word V5.0.

Vorschau auf die nächsten Hefte:

2/1991 Multikulturelle Gesellschaft und Entwicklungspolitik

3/1991 Indien

4/1991 Lateinamerika 1492 - 1992

Satz: Ch. Weismayer, A-1080 Wien

Druck: HTU-Wirtschaftsbetriebe Ges.m.b.H., A-1040 Wien