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Introduction

Theories of development have been motivated by the need to explain mass poverty. Interest in development issues is of rather recent origin, dating back not much earlier than the nineteen fifties and early sixties. As represented by their more influential proponents, the development schools of thought reflect roughly the following chronological order of appearance:

1) **Modernisation theories** (1950’s, early 1960’s) The modernisation school of thought was the first attempt to articulate the problem of development in terms of the need to transform the backward "traditional" nature of third world economies into “modern” economies. Drawing from the historical experience of the Western Europe after the Second World War, under the Marshal Plan, it advocated the need for accelerated economic growth through an import substitution form of industrialisation, a process seen to entail securing the right quantity and mix of saving investment and foreign aid. Given the relatively low levels of new capital formation in most third world countries, one obvious policy implication was the need for massive capital investment through foreign aid. There is wide agreement that economic development based on modernisation theories failed to bring about the much hoped for rapid growth, dynamic industrial sectors, the expansion of modern wage economy and the alleviation of the impoverished rural subsistence sectors.

2) **Dependency theories** (late 1960’s, early 1970’s). The theoretical trust of the dependency perspectives was that capitalist penetration leads to and reproduces a combined and unequal development of its constitutive parts. The policy implication is that indigenous economic and social development in third world social formations must be fundamentally predicted upon the removal of industrial capitalist penetration and dominance.

3) **World economy view** (late 1970’s, early 1980’s), The third school of thought, the world economy school, poses the problem of development, not in terms of desired self sustained autonomous growth and not in terms of undesired dependency, but in terms of necessary global interdependence. Just as third world countries depend on developed countries for
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aid, private investment, technology and trade, so do the latter depend on third world markets and natural resources. The policy implication is that a restructuring of the interdependent relations between the developed North and under-developed South is necessary in order to achieve a ‘New Economic Order’.  

4) **Basic needs approaches** (late 1970’s). The other school of thought, the basic needs approach, shifts development emphasis from a singular concern with restructuring of the world economy to that of restructuring the domestic economy towards a new internal economic order, primarily aimed at the eradication of mass poverty and social injustices. The third word problem of mass poverty is seen as the consequence more of the pattern of economic growth, rather than the rate of growth, as such. The implication is contrary to Kuznets’ hypothesis, that there is no justifiable economic rationale for high and increasing income inequality as the basis for rapid economic growth in third world countries.

5) **Alternative modes of production perspective** (1980’s) Counter-poised against the foregoing four schools of thought are the newly emerging AMP perspective. Under this perspective, contemporary third world societies are seen essentially characterised by the coexistence of sharply contrasting sectors. On the one hand, there is the overwhelmingly dominant (in population terms) traditional sector, geographically constituted in the rural sector and distinguished by its predominant engagement in backward, low-productivity subsistence agriculture. On the other hand, there is also the overwhelmingly dominant (but now in economic and political terms) modern sector, geographically constituted in both the urban (industrial) sector and the rural enclaves engaged in large-scale extra-active and cash crop agricultural sub-sector. While the traditional sector is socially and economically organised predominately along non-capitalist lines, reflecting the unity of production and consumption, the modern sector is organised on the basis of the capitalist mode of production, in which the direct producers are separated from their means of production. It is this coexistence of (at least) two modes of production that forms the theoretical object of investigation for the AMP perspective.

The contemporary realities of third world societies must be analysed from within historical materialism as a social formation which is dominated by an articulation of (at least) two modes of production-a capitalist and a non-capitalist mode-in which the capitalist mode is or is becoming increasingly dominant over the other. In general, from within historical materialism third world social formation are viewed as transitional. The specificity of this transition lies in it being brought about largely by capitalist penetration, and, more particularly, by one of its forms, imperialist penetration, the specific economic of which is the separation of direct producers from their means of production. The object of imperialist penetration is to ensure the increasing dominance of capitalist mode of production. But this means that the transition will be characterised by a series of economic, political and ideological dislocations both between and within the different articulated modes of production, as imperialist penetration intervenes to guarantee the reproductive requirements of the capitalist mode. Moreover, the specific pattern of imperialist penetration has the effect of creating uneven and restricted forms of economic development, specific to third world social formations.
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6) **Sustainable livelihood approach**: The SL construct has emerged as "the integration of population, resources, environment and development in four aspects: stabilising population; reducing migration; fending of core exploitation; and supporting long term sustainable resource management. The Brundtland Commission developed it as an integrating concept. Livelihood meaning adequate stock and flows of food and cash to meet basic needs; security refers to secure ownership of, or access to, resources ... to meet contingencies and sustainable refers to the maintenance or enhancement of resource productivity in the long term. Adaptive strategies and capacities generate and maintain means of living and enhance well being and that of future generations. They represent permanent change in community strategy, and structure, organisational processes; these capacities are contingent upon availability, stability and accessibility of options, which are ecological, socio-cultural, economic and political. They are predicated on equity, ownership of resources and participatory wise decision-making - notions of SHD and SL that incorporate the idea of change and uncertainty.
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**Fig. 1 Participation synergy in sustainable livelihoods programme planning**
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10 Fig 3. Relates the interface between the various elements that contribute directly to the synergy that enhances livelihoods sustainability. The can be clustered under the following categories: Capital formation and accumulations encompassing human capital, natural capital, physical/material capital, and social capital, which in turn refers to its element - socio-political, psychosocial, organisational, and cultural and spiritual capital. The tools for planning: Multi-track communications for participatory assessment and planning policy, institution and strategic analysis and programme review. The SL benchmarks: Resilience, ability to recover from stresses/shocks, economic efficiency, social equitability, ecological sustainability and Processual and strategic elements that determine the nature of agency and ideology are preconditions and preparedness participatory and wise decision making, production and availability of livelihood resources, access and control of livelihood resources, and stability and sustainability.
Section II

DISCUSSION ON THE DIFFERENT THEORIES

We tend to be critical of all the four development schools of thought. The ideas of the modernisation school are seen as lacking general empirical validity and as being historically impoverished. The opportunities that shaped the development path for capitalist penetration into the rest of the world are no longer available to third world countries. On the other hand, reducing all expansion of dependency and underdevelopment to a conflated capitalist penetration renders the theoretical insights of the dependency school of doubtful validity. The world economy perspective recognises the interdependency between North' and 'South'. It does not, however, theorise the nature of this interdependency in terms of articulation, which is structured by the reproductive requirements of the 'North' and its local supports and their restrictive effects on the development of the 'South'. Its policy implication for restructuring the international economic order is therefore confined to seeking 'charity' from the 'North'.

The ILO's basic needs philosophy, while appearing radical in intent, nevertheless remains at best a valuable vision of an alternative: a more just society, essentially a utopia rather than a development strategy. This is because, in practice, the over-riding concern centres on peripheral problems. These include basic needs qualification, the technical feasibility of combining such measures as appropriate planning and resource allocation, rather thin political feasibility and strategies for realising the program's radical implications for social structural changes. Relevant to any discussion of Marxist and neo-Marxist development theories is their points of similarity and difference. Both Marxism and neo-Marxism regard social and political relations as determined by the primacy of production relations. However, as far as development theory is concerned, the differences between the two schools of thought are considerable. The major points of difference are the following:

Marxism is Eurocentric in its approach. It examines imperialism from the perspective of the central capitalist countries (the core), looks for reasons for imperialism's existence (the search for markets, cheap raw materials and labour so as to maintain profits at the core) and, consequently, for imperialism's function in the economic development of the core countries. Neo-Marxism, on the other hand, looks at imperialism from the perspective of the peripheral countries, studying the consequences on the periphery of imperialist penetration. The best-known neo-Marxist development theories are the dependency theories, the modes of production theories and the world systems theories, which will be dealt with later.

Marxism emphasises the historically progressive role of capitalism. Marx and the 'early' Lenin describe the role of the spread of capitalism in eastern despotic societies as historically progressive. Economic development was stimulated as major feudal landholders transformed themselves into capitalist entrepreneurs. Simultaneously the feudal yoke was lifted from the shoulders of the peasants, who would in due course form a working class (impossible under a feudal system), that could then be recruited for a socialist revolution. In his later publications, Lenin (1917) pointed out the dangers of exorbitant profits being transferred from the periphery to the core countries, retarding capitalistic development potential. Further, he pointed to the relationships between the local bourgeoisie in the periphery and the bourgeoisie in the core, preventing the genesis of a progressive bourgeoisie (as in Western Europe during the Industrial Revolution). The unilinearity of orthodox Marxism is obvious: societies evolve from feudalism to capitalism and finally to socialism. This unilinear thinking will be criticised below. Neo-Marxists disagree with this historically progressive role of imperialism and capitalism, arguing that they are more likely to lead to underdevelopment in the periphery than development.
Second, they see other potentially revolutionary actors apart from workers, namely peasants. In the 1980s this vision had to make room for the attention focused on yet other actors, the 'new social movements'.

Marxists still adhere to 19th-century development optimism. For example, they view the concept of scarcity as an invention of the bourgeoisie to legitimise economic inequality. Increasingly, neo-Marxists integrate an ecological consciousness in their vision, although this approach is very recent and rather problematic (Benton 1989). In discussing the appropriation of economic surplus, neo-Marxists look not only at class relations (where one class exploits the labour of another), but also at relations in a spatial sense where appropriation of surplus can play a role, namely between countries. This follows the 'later' Lenin, who signalled the possibility of excessive profiteering in this way.

Dependency Theory

One of the best-known neo-Marxist development theories is the dependency theory. As with most social science theories, this theory was a child of its time (the end of the 1960s), the major characteristics of which were:

- The failure of the import substitution strategy - After World War II a number of Latin American countries (Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Argentina) adopted an industrialisation programme emphasising the so-called 'infant industry' argument, that goes back to the 19th-century German economist Friedrich List. Analyses by the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), under the direction of Raul Prebisch, confirmed a deterioration in the terms of trade for traditional Latin American primary product exports compared to imported industrial goods. A number of countries consequently decided to produce industrial goods themselves, both to limit their dependence on imported goods and to set an autonomous development process in place.

- Towards the end of the 1960s it was becoming increasingly clear that this import substitution policy was not decreasing dependency on foreign countries. Foreign companies went behind tariff walls, national industry remained dependent on the import of machinery, and the internal market was too limited (through unequal income distribution) to generate sufficient demand. The dependent countries showed a pattern of increasing influence of foreign capital and increasing dependency. According to the dependency theorists, dependentistas, this process led to a growing social, political and economic marginalisation of many Latin Americans. This large-scale marginalisation could not be adequately explained by the then-current modernisation theory, which blamed the traditional (meaning non-functional or even dysfunctional) values of the marginalised population for preventing their integration into the economic dynamic. A number of political events were also of significance in the birth of dependency theory.

- The Cuban revolution. In 1959 this event presented Latin America with the possibility of socialist revolution. This created the demand for theoretical support, which was not provided by orthodox Marxist writings on revolution. The military coup in Brazil. This coup d'etat in 1964 led to a policy that opened the floodgates for foreign capital, resulting in increasing marginalisation of the working population. Many critical academics, among them the future dependentistas, were exiled abroad, where they began to examine, and to criticise, the economic model of the Brazilian government. The US invasion of the Dominican Republic. In 1965 this invasion quashed a popular uprising (supported by some enlightened army officers), emphasising that imperialism was prepared to defend its
interests in Latin America. Anti-imperialist feelings in Latin America stiffed up by this intervention played a distinct role in the development of dependency theory.

Dependency theory drew on a diverse range of earlier theoretic schools. Hence, it is hardly surprising that there has been a diversity of elaboration of the dependency idea. Nonetheless, the common spirit of the time allowed the following consensus to be reached with respect to the dependency concept: Underdevelopment is a historical process. It is not a condition necessarily intrinsic to the Third World. The dominant and dependent countries together form a capitalistic system (a standpoint which would later be developed by world systems theoreticians). Underdevelopment is an inherent consequence of the functioning of the world system. The periphery is plundered of its surplus: this leads to development of the core and underdevelopment of the periphery.

There was also a reasonable level of agreement about the role of multinational corporations: Multinationals impose a universal consumption pattern, without taking local needs into account. They use capital-intensive techniques in areas with large labour resources. They out-compete national capital, or undertake joint ventures with local capital. They use a variety of methods to transfer capital (e.g., fictitious price systems). They involve themselves in national political and economic affairs, via (among others) their relationships with the local bourgeoisie.

In short, the contention was that both penetrations of bank and industrial capital, and a consumption ideology that alienated the periphery from itself and made it dependent on the core, led to large-scale marginalisation and the non-realisation of development potential. In the beginning there was little criticism from the modernisation school; increasingly, however, orthodox Marxists took the neo-Marxist renegades to task. In the early 1970s the critique concentrated on André Gunder Frank (1967, 1969), not necessarily because he was the most typical of the dependency school, but for a number of other reasons. First, Frank wrote in English - the Spanish of the other dependentistas seems to have been too inaccessible to the critics. Second, Frank was both polemical and outspoken in his arguments. He was also sometimes placed with the world systems theorists because he not only wrote about Latin America but also about the historical development of the capitalist world system, and the 'true' world system writers based themselves on his work.

We will now look at one element of this criticism, as it led to the formation of the modes of production theories and emphasised the contrast between Marxists and neo-Marxists. Frank asserted that Latin America could be characterised as capitalist practically from the start of the colonial period. There was no question of the dual society proposed by modernisation theorists. There was something approximating production for the world market and there was a system for appropriation of the economic surplus. The way in which the surplus was appropriated varied over time (from plunder to unequal trade), but the surplus was always usurped in one way or another.

Frank's assertion that Latin America was capitalist from the beginning of the colonial period brought him under heavy fire, particularly from the Argentinean economist Ernesto Laclau (1971). Laclau argued that Frank had used a mistaken definition of capitalism, that capitalism was a mode of production, rather than a mode of exchange. He concentrated on the sort of labour relations, which created a product in the first place, rather than on what happened to the surplus. If, rather than the manner of production, matters such as production for a market and appropriation of the surplus were of prime importance in defining capitalism, reasoned Laclau,
then capitalism should be defined as having existed since the Ancient Greeks. According to Laclau, such a definition turns capitalism into a meaningless concept.

In the meantime, the modernisation theorists had recovered from their shock, and began to direct their criticism at the inadequate empirical evidence supporting the dependency thesis that differences in degree of dependency were causally related to differences in economic development (Ray 1973, von Albertini 1980, Bairoch 1980). In general this criticism followed the tactic of erecting a straw man (of dependency theories) which was then knocked down. Soon, however, modernisation theorists became more interested in computerised global growth models (Kahn and Wiener 1967, Rostow 1978, Kahn et al. 1979).

**Modes of Production Theory**

Laclau went further in his criticism of Frank, attempting to develop an idea where the emphasis lay not on the circulation sphere (trade, appropriation of surplus) but on the production sphere. The question of how products were produced (the production relationships) was further examined. In France, especially, the modes of production concept were given a clearer theoretical form, particularly by anthropologists Pierre Philippe Rey (1971, 1973) and Claude Meillassoux (1971, 1972, and 1981). The anthropologists found an opportunity to address what they saw as a 'need' in the dependency theories, namely, lack of attention to the local level.

The basic idea of the modes of production theory is that a number of modes of production coexist in a society, and that they have a relationship to each other (regarding exchange of labour, goods, capital, etc.): they articulate with each other. Further, it was thought that a relationship between capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production was favourable for the capitalist mode of production. Apartheid was used as a classic example of an articulation between capitalist and non-capitalist modes of production. The workers lived in their traditional homelands, where they had land that didn't produce enough to live on, and so had to offer their labour to South African industry. Salaries, however, could remain low, because workers had some income from their land. This example shows that a capitalist mode of production not only relates to existing non-capitalist modes of production, but it can also create new ones. The conclusion was that in many developing countries capitalism articulated with non-capitalist modes of production and so retarded the development of these countries.

From the time this concept became known in international literature there was a boom in the number of modes of production identified by anthropologists. In addition to Rey's colonial (see also Banaji 1972), lineage and transitional modes of production, other modes of production were 'discovered', such as the peasant mode of production (Bartra 1975, Harrison 1977), the African mode of production (Coquery-Vidrovitch 1969) and the petty-commodity mode of production (Poulantzas 1975, Amin 1974, 1976). Eventually it appeared as if every village could be identified as having its own unique mode of production, and the concept threatened to become meaningless (Foster-Carter 1978).

The Marxists argued that this neo-Marxist interpretation of modes of production was incorrect. Marx's standpoint was that 'mode of production' was a concept that had to be used at a national level, and that at any one point in time, there was only one mode of production. Opinions on the articulation of production modes also diverged among supporters of the theory. Some felt that non-capitalist modes of production had resisted capitalist penetration, others argued that the non-capitalist production modes were kept alive by capitalism, if not even created by capitalism. The modes of production concept maintained itself successfully for a
reasonably long time; however, interest in it began to wane in the 1980s. Nonetheless, the development of this concept offered many fruitful studies during the 1970s, above all because these discussions offered insight into why development projects can be problematic.

**World Systems Theory**

Just as the dependency school was a child of its time, so were the world systems theories. This approach was developed in the mid-1970s, when East Asian countries were experiencing swift growth that could no longer be described as dependent development, particularly as they had begun to challenge the economic superiority of the USA in a number of areas. Another factor conducive to the rise of world systems theories was the oncoming crisis in socialist countries. The failure of the Cultural Revolution in China and economic stagnation in the Eastern Bloc led to an opening in the direction of international capital. Previously unthinkable alliances were formed: for example between Washington and Peking. These were developments to which revolutionary Marxism could contribute nothing. It could be said that developments were happening on a world scale that was not covered by contemporary development theories.

Wallerstein was the most outspoken figure in this new terrain. His work from the mid-1970s onwards was strongly based on the ideas of André Gunder Frank and other dependentistas. Unequal trade, the exploitation of the periphery by the core, and the existence of a world market were concepts taken from dependency school thinking. Like Frank, Wallerstein argued that a capitalist world economy had existed since the 16th century, that is, since the beginning of the colonial era. He saw non-capitalist modes of production as a part of capitalism, the definition of which (based on 19th-century England) he saw as too narrow. Increasingly, countries, which were previously isolated and self-supporting, became involved in the world economy.

The final result is the creation of a core and a periphery, with a number of semi-periphery countries in between. The core consists of the industrialised countries, the periphery of the agricultural export countries. The semi-peripheral countries (like Brazil), which act as a buffer between the core and the periphery, are differentiated from the periphery by their more significant industrial production. The semi-periphery functions as a go-between: it imports hi-tech from the core, and in return exports semi-manufactured goods to the core. It imports raw materials from the periphery and exports to it industrial end products. Wallerstein saw the Newly Industrialised Countries as examples of the semi-periphery. A peripheral country can achieve the status of semi-periphery and in this way can be brought into the core. The spread of as large a market as possible is essential to his reasoning. These were areas where Wallerstein clearly diverged from dependency school thinking, if only in that dependentistas did not reason in terms of a semi-periphery.

The world systems concept was seen, in this period, as a handy solution to a problem that dependentistas were increasingly confronted with: how to differentiate between internal and external factors as explanations for underdevelopment. The world systems theory offered a simple solution: in moving to a more abstract level (with countries as global analysis units) there are no more external factors. There are also no longer different sorts of capitalism, such as core capitalism and peripheral capitalism; instead there is one capitalist world system. The origin of development and underdevelopment is then found in the incorporation of countries within the world system. Underdevelopment occurs because countries are subject to a trade regime and produce for a world market that is characterised by unequal trade. Wallerstein was criticised by followers of the modes of production theory, who argued that there were a number of production modes, each articulating in its own way with the dominant capitalist mode.
Another world systems author is Samir Amin, who began publishing on this topic in 1976. In contrast to Wallerstein, Amin did not agree with the presence of a capitalist mode of production in Latin America from the 16th century. He did agree with the existence of a non-capitalist mode of production, which saw its surplus appropriated through unequal trade. This unequal trade led to a stagnation in the expansion of the national market and thus to a disarticulated economic system. Like Wallerstein, Amin argued for the existence of the go-betweens, the semi-peripheral countries. In general, the criticism of the world systems approach is the same as that of the dependency theories: the neglect of class analysis, the neglect of the diversity of the Third World, and the assumption of non-workable political options such as self-reliance and a socialist world government. In taking a global view, the findings are difficult to translate to the concrete realities of Third World countries. As with previous approaches, the world systems theory was also pushed to the background in the 1980s.

Section III

SOME CAUSES OF THE IMPASSE IN DEVELOPMENT THEORIES

The criticism of Marxist and neo-Marxist development theories as well as of modernisation theories led to a theoretical vacuum in the 1980s, which for many Third World countries was a decade of economic crisis. In the past 30 years (the period of the existence of development theories) developing countries have realised an improvement in life expectancy, child mortality and literacy rates. However, these are averages only and are less valid for lower socio-economic groups. In the 1980s there was actually a reversal in these indicators. From the mid-1980s the vacuum in development theories was raised in an increasing number of publications in terms of a crisis, an impasse, for the following reasons:

1) The realisation that the gap between poor and rich countries continued to widen and that the developing countries were unlikely to be able to bridge that gap whatever strategy they would follow and the realisation that developing countries, in the 1980s, were preoccupied with short-term policies aimed at keeping their heads above water in terms of debt. Policies did not take intermediate or long-term goals into consideration, nor did it seem likely that they would be able to do so in the future.

2) The growing awareness that economic growth has had, and is having, a catastrophic effect on the environment. It was calculated that if developed countries maintained their current level of growth, by 2050 they would need an output eight times higher than the current level. That this would cause an ecological disaster is obvious. Advocates of sustainable development argued that growth = development is not only invalid for the Third World, but also for the wealthy industrialised countries and why wait for a major ecological
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11 (the outbreak of cholera epidemics in Latin America and Africa point to this). With the current per capita growth of 1.3-1.6 per cent it will take another 150 years for Third World countries to achieve half the per capita income of Western countries, and that is without taking into consideration the sometimes negative growth figures of the 1980s. Instead of a self-sustained growth (to use Rostow's terms), many developing countries are up to their ears in debt. Problems such as unemployment, housing, human rights, poverty and landlessness are increasing at alarming rates. UNICEF estimated a fall of 10-15 per cent in the income of the poor in the Third World between 1983 and 1987. In 1978 the Third World received 5.6 per cent of the world's income; in 1984 that had fallen to 4.5 per cent. The 'trickle-down' process had failed absolutely. Two hundred years ago the income ratio between the world's rich and poor countries was 1.5:1, in 1960 it was 20:1, in 1980 it went up to 46:1 and in 1989 the ratio was 60:1 (Trainer 1989, World Bank 1991).
catastrophe before we realise this? The 'zero growth' options increasingly came into the picture, but found no foundation in any of the already discredited development theories.

3) The delegitimisation of socialism as a viable political means of solving the problem of underdevelopment -- Although Marxist and neo-Marxist development theories were never particularly strong in presenting realisable policy alternatives, socialist-inspired development trajectories were now totally removed from the policy agenda and the conviction that the world market is an over-arching whole, which cannot be approached using development policies, oriented at the national level. Individual nation-states are assigned an increasingly smaller function. Development theories, however, still used the nation-state as a meaningful context for political praxis.

4) The growing recognition of differentiation within the Third World that could no longer be handled by global theories assuming a homogenous First and Third World. The 1980s saw an avalanche of books on the subject of whether or not 'the' Third World exists as an entity.

5) The advancement of post-modernism within the social sciences, where there has been a tendency to undermine 'the great narratives' (capitalism, socialism, communism, etc.) by arguing that there is no common reality outside the individual. Political alternatives, which always exist by the grace of a minimum of common perception, are in this way manoeuevred out of sight. Development theories based on meta-discourses have no right to exist, according to post-modernists. At the end of the 1980s, the only groups not touched by the crisis (and who reacted with a sometimes irritating and unfounded triumphalism) were the neo-liberal adherents of the open market ideology. This post-Keynesian vision (also known as Reaganomics) has, since the middle of the 1970s, turned the crisis to its advantage.

Neo-Liberalism

From the mid-1970s this development ideology enjoyed increasing popularity. The oil crisis at the beginning of that decade and the subsequent restructuring of international capitalism led to a redefinition of the role of the state. This meant the end of Keynesianism and the idea of the welfare state. Publications by Bauer (1981, 1984), Little (1974, 1982), Lal (1983) and Balassa (1982) gave substance to what John Toye (1987) labelled the counter-revolution in development thinking. What started in the 1970s as a neo-monetarist vision on the problem of hyperinflation in many Third World countries grew into a new development ideology.

1) State interference with the market mechanism was considered ineffective, counterproductive and basically inconsistent. According to David Lehmann (1990), Chile under Pinochet exhibited one of the clearest examples of neo-liberal policy. The state should primarily endeavour to lower the fiscal deficit through devaluation, deregulation of prices and decreasing state subsidies. The circumstances in Chile at the time - a military dictatorship - were highly suitable for the introduction of this neo-liberal and neo-monetarist economic policy. The rounds of applause, which Chile earned in international financial circles, encouraged many currently democratizing governments in developing countries to follow Chile's example. Limiting the role of the state, a liberal economy and a strict monetary policy according to the guidelines of the International Monetary Fund (IF) and the World Bank, are the major policy options in many Third World countries.

2) However, as Chossudovsky (1991) rightly observes, the structural adjustment package of the IMF can increasingly be considered as the cause rather than the solution to the economic problems experienced in the Third World. The withdrawal of the state led to the increasing impoverishment of low-income groups. Liberalisation of the economy and the growing
emphasis on export-led industrialisation resulted in a dual economy, with one sector producing for the international market and another sector producing for a shrinking national market. Euphoric interpretations of Mexico's and Argentina's recent economic upsurge seem rather premature because the state deficit has been cut back primarily by large-scale privatisation which cannot go on indefinitely.

3) As a development ideology, neo-liberalism most resembles the well-known modernisation paradigm, but in fact it has less to offer because the role of the state has been minimalised. After so many years of neglect of their people, many Third World countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia alike have currently entered a process of transition to democracy which could create the conditions for states finally to start caring for the poor and the excluded. However, the neo-liberal trajectory denies the Third World states the policy tools to intercede actively in favour of those without jobs, houses, health care, schooling and food. Instead, national assets are sold out on a large scale to (inter) national private capital, leading to a recolonisation of the Third World. The current status of the concept of modernisation and modernisation theory for that matter - seems increasingly to refer only to political aspects of the transition to democracy in the Third World (Apter 1987).

**Substantiating the Impasse:**

Although in the preceding section some criticism of neo-Marxist development theory has already been dealt with, it must be pointed out that much of this criticism has been generated within the (neo) Marxist camp itself. In 1985, David Booth published an article in which he approached the problem somewhat more thoroughly, raising questions over both the neo-Marxist and Marxist development theories as such. This article has since functioned as an important reference for the theoretical substantiation of the impasse. Stuart Corbridge (1989) identifies three dimensions in Booth's critique of (neo) Marxist development studies: 'essentialism', 'economism' and 'epistemology'. Regarding the first dimension, Booth argues that (neo) Marxists, from the perspective of their meta-theory, attempt to prove the necessity of economic development casu quo underdevelopment as such, instead of attempting to explain the underlying dynamics. In this respect, Booth criticises both the circulationists and productionists in the Marxist camp. 10 According to Booth, the similarity between these two schools of thought is that capitalism is defined in terms of laws that produce inescapable and fixed outcomes (for example, a socialist revolution).

Theories with this characteristic have been named teleological. Booth also places the publications of Bill Warren (1980), which have a structural Marxist character wherein Warren positions himself against the dependency theories, under the 'teleological' banner. The dependency school was further criticised on the basis of the tautological relationship between underdevelopment and dependency. It is worth mentioning here that modernisation theory also exhibited a teleological trait: the example of the United States was held up to developing countries as an end goal that was reachable by following the rules laid down by the modernisation theory. The second dimension in Booth's critique refers to the economism in Marxist development studies. With this he means that the complex of political, social and cultural factors in developing countries is seen as a consequence of the national and international economic structure. According to Booth, this interpretation interferes with the study of these factors as independent dimensions. To interpret culture patterns in developing countries exclusively in terms of the functional needs of the metropolitan capital is meaningless in Booth's eyes.
The third dimension that of epistemology, concerns Booth's comment that Marxists have closed their eyes to relevant issues in what he calls 'mainstream' literature. They have ignored, for example, literature about industrialisation processes in the Third World, where the state fulfils a pioneering role. Booth claims that Marxists were placed in an epistemological confrontation with 'mainstream' literature that led to concepts (such as unequal trade and exploitation) which were rarely based on empirical data, were almost never calculable and, on top of that, were wrapped in pseudo-scientific jargon. Although Booth's article attracted much attention, the basis of his critique was not in itself new. In 1979 Henry Bernstein was already moving away from the dependentistas and the modes of production school. Bernstein reproached the then-radical development theorists for wanting to have their cake and eat it too. The fundamental difference between the developed core in the industrialised world and the underdeveloped periphery was, according to Bernstein, cast in terms (respectively) of autonomous and dependent development processes. On the other hand, there is talk of exploitation of the periphery by the core to oppose the fall in rate of profit. According to Bernstein this logic is not consistent: one cannot describe the development process of the core as independent if that process depends on exploitative relations with the periphery in order to keep the dynamics of its own development going. Further, Bernstein scorns the modes of production school for the 'shopping list' of production modes which turns it into an empty concept. His conclusion-- that underdevelopment is not a uniform process with uniform causes and consequences - led to Bernstein's conviction that a theory of underdevelopment was not possible. He sees attempts to construct such a theory as ideologically coloured. With this critique, Bernstein in fact pre-empted both Booth and post-modernist thoughts. However, neither Bernstein in 1979 nor Booth in 1985 offered a concrete way out of the impasse in radical development theories.

Continuation of the Impasse Debate:

In an article published in 1988, Leslie Sklair added weight to Booth's argument for a temporary shift of attention within development studies from the level of theory to the level of meta-theory. Sklair sees the only way out of the impasse described by Booth as the combination of meta-theory, theory and empirical research in one project. According to Sklair, the impasse arose from the confusion of meta-theory and theory, where attempts were made to test a meta-theory, which was, by definition, untestable. On top of that is the problem that diverse, and sometimes divergent, theories can be derived from one meta-theory. These can be internally consistent, but are not necessarily consistent with each other.

As an example Sklair cites the historic-materialist meta-theory from which were derived theories of 'dependent underdevelopment' (Frank 1976, 1969), 'dependent development' (Cardoso and Faletto 1970) and 'dependency reversal' (Warren 1980). Sklair follows the same reasoning for gender theories such as liberal feminism, socialist feminism and radical feminism, which he sees as deriving from the same historico-materialist meta-theory, and which take as their central substantive element the conflict between '. Patriarchy and the liberation of women under capitalism'. Sklair argues for a cross-fertilisation between theories that are derived from the same meta-theory, for example, between 'dependent development' and particular gender theories that can then be empirically tested by a study of the role of women in the internationalisation of production.

Sklair's differentiation between theory and meta-theory is not in itself new; however, it is worth bringing it to the fore again in the light of the development theory impasse. The suggestion of cross-fertilisation can also be useful. However, two problems are still with us.
First is the postmodernist criticism of meta-theoretical assumptions, such as those inherited from the Enlightenment. (I shall return to this point later in this chapter.) Second, I get a hint in Sklair's article of a not-unknown manoeuvre, namely, that if a theory is untestable, or falsified through testing, then it can be promoted to the rank of meta-theory. That looks to me like merely shifting the problem, rather than solving it. I say a 'not-unknown manoeuvre' as it puts me in mind of the way world systems theorists 'solved' the problem confronting the dependentistas: the difficult empirical difference between internal and external factors that play a role in (under) development. World systems theorists solved this problem by shifting their analysis to a higher level. On a world level we are no longer confronted with the problematic differentiation between internal and external factors.

Vandergeest and Buttel (1988) have also picked up the thread of Booth's critique of the underlying meta-theoretical assumptions of Marxism. Furthermore, they have established that neo-Marxism set itself against an orthodox Parsonian version of Max Weber (Parsons 1937) that was subsequently annexed by the modernisation theory. They feel that this version does not do justice to Weber's thinking, and point to a recent school of neo-Weberians to which Claus Offe (1985), Charles Tilly (1984), Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Anthony Giddens (1981, 1984), among others, belong.

According to Vandergeest and Buttel, Weber accused Marxists of failing to see their model as an ideal type and attempting to identify reality with the model. At the same time Weber held the opinion that socio-political analyses should put more emphasis on the 'historic-interpretative specificity'. This approach stands firmly against the way Parsons and the modernisation theory have reified Weber's concept of ideal type. Neo-Weberians handle the concept of ideal type as neither outcome deterministic (teleological) nor as explanatory of reality. The identification of obstacles to development (as happens in Marxism and the modernisation theory) is irrelevant, according to neo-Weberians, because this assumes a particular, identifiable route to a defined end-situation that is called 'development'. Thus, in the modernisation theory, culture is seen as something static and, in the Third World, a possible obstacle to development. In Marxist analysis, on the other hand, culture is seen as being determined by the economy. The neo-Weberian approach, however, sees culture as a creative process that must be studied in locally oriented research.

Vandergeest and Buttel also label analysis of the state, where political power is placed in a cultural context, as belonging to the neo-Weberian approach. As a possible disadvantage they cite Weber's lack of attention to practical political intervention. Concerning what must be done with a quantity of locally oriented research, Vandergeest and Buttel point to the possibility, in fact the necessity, of looking within the heterogeneity of developing countries for common denominators. It is a pity that these authors have not developed this line of thought further. The necessity of historical comparative research is precisely the point here, and something Vandergeest and Buttel correctly refer to in their introduction.

Mouzelis (1988) takes up the baton handed on by Vandergeest and Buttel. So as not to become bogged down in generalities such as 'the reality in the Third World is so complex and diverse, Mouzelis proposes ' ... to go beyond the case study, without sacrificing context in terms of time and space'. He proposes an attempt to analyse specific development trajectories and use that analysis as a basis for typologies, as Barrington Moore (1966) has done for industrialised countries. Mouzelis assumes that if development trajectories plotted for Argentina, Chile and Brazil (for example) were compared to those of the Asian Newly Industrialised Countries, we would then be presented with essential factors that influence the development process. (Such as
the amount and form of state dirigism, the influence of agrarian reform, relations between agriculture and industry, and the development of the internal market)

Mouzelis's approach emphasises that it is not necessary to limit comparisons to regional studies; for example, it is valid to place Greece in the same category as the countries of the Latin American southern cone. He argues here for a more autonomous position for the political dimension in the analysis. Thus he sees military regimes in Latin America more as independent actors than as promoters of ruling class interests. According to Mouzelis, development trajectories in the Third World are more often characterised by competition for the means of domination and coercion than competition for means of production. He refers explicitly to concepts developed by the French regulation school, namely regime of accumulation and mode of regulation, which is discussed in the following section.

Section IV

INITIATING A POST-IMPASSE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT THEORY

The continuation and development of the debate begun by Booth (detailed above) over the impasse in (neo) Marxist development theories has shed light on a number of attempts to give substance to post-impasse development theories. It is remarkable that a number of these attempts are not particularly recent and even predate the generally felt impasse. In this section I will discuss the French regulation school, the actor-oriented approach, post-imperialism, gender studies, and finally the research agenda on sustainable development, which is in fact more concerned with defining development strategies than with theoretical explorations.

The Regulation School:

The French regulation school, led by Lipietz and Aglietta, formulated its thinking in the early 1980s. The essence of the regulation school was clearly presented in a succinct article by Lipietz in 1984. Like Mouzelis, Lipietz is of the opinion that regularities in development trajectories are observable through historical comparative research. He explicitly warns against the deduction of a concrete reality from supposed regularities that are themselves deduced from a universal concept such as imperialism or dependency.

According to Lipietz, regularities (that is, a sequence of contradictions, crises and transformation) in development trajectories can be abstracted in two concepts: 'regime of accumulation' and 'mode of regulation'. A regime of accumulation describes the way in which the economic product is allocated between consumption and accumulation. In Marxist terminology this leads to a particular stabilised reproduction scheme. 16 This is coupled with a particular mode of regulation: regulating norms, values and laws - in short, a set of internalised rules and procedures that integrate social elements in individual behaviour. 17

Lipietz cites Fordism as an example of a regime of accumulation and a mode of regulation. He warns against the approach that a predictable dynamic in capitalism produces a particular consecutive combination of his dyadic concepts. He opts for a posterior functionalism, where the furthest one can go is to assert that a particular combination of regime of accumulation and mode of regulation can reproduce itself for a period without crisis. The stability and consistency of an economic world system is therefore not the consequence of the working of the 'invisible hand' of capitalism: rather it is the result of the interaction between relatively autonomous...
national regimes of accumulation. Thus the functioning of multinational corporations leads to an international division of labour; however, there is still the prerequisite of the co-operation of the individual countries, which can be further complicated by involvement in a completely different project.

Lipietz's approach can offer a way of giving a more precise form to the historical comparative research supported by a number of authors previously discussed. In any case, it prevents Argentina failing into the same category as the 'banana republics' because of the export of primary products. Nevertheless, Lipietz finds it difficult to heed his own warning that the theory of international relations is extremely sensitive to functionalism and holism. He suggests that so-called peripheral Fordism, just as Fordism is a particular combination of a regime of accumulation and a mode of regulation. At the same time he argues, justifiably, that there are vast differences in the mode of regulation between, for example, South Korea and Mexico (in terms of land reform, for instance). Lipietz's observation that development strategies cannot be seen out of the context of the position the countries ('social formations' in Lipietz's terms) take in the international circuit, leads us to two other attempts to go beyond the development theory impasse.

The Actor-Oriented Approach:

In contrast to the work of Lipietz and Aglietta, which concentrates on the level of nation-state and internationalisation, sociologist Norman Long (1990) is more interested in the relationships between the meso level (the 'habitus': the wider context wherein access to power and resources plays a role) and the micro level. In his 'actor-oriented approach' Long asserts that the actors' behaviour is not derived from their structural position - a similar standpoint to Lipietz, but on a lower analytical level. Long argues that both the modernisation theory and the neo-Marxist approach are too deterministic, that their vision of development trajectories is too linear, and that they see social change as emanating from external impulses. For Long, human (re)action and consciousness play a central role.

Long indicated his actor-oriented approach as early as the 1970s, in his work with Brian Roberts in Long and Roberts, 1978. On the basis of his research in Peru and Mexico, Long came to the conclusion that even where structural conditions and types of external impulses are relatively constant, behaviour of actors can take a diverse range of forms. He expressly did not reduce behaviour of individual actors to individual motives and interests. This would lead to an empty voluntarism. Instead, Long is interested in the interface between the meso level and the individual actor. He suggests that the latter have a wider range of actions available than is usually presumed. Furthermore, these actions can have an effect on a meso level, contrary to the widely held view that it is primarily meso-level impulses that determine the behaviour of individual actors.

Referring to Hindess (1986), Long asserts that actors have access to a variety of discourses upon which to base their actions. Long labels not only individuals as actors (or 'agents') but also corporations, the church and the state bureaucracy. On the other hand, he does not see gender or class as actors or agents. He denies having reverted to the trap of ethnographic particularism, because he specifically concentrates on the relation between the meso and micro levels. Reacting to Long's actor-oriented approach, David Slater (1990) asserts that Long correctly refutes the Marxist 'econocentric' vision of class as actor. Class is an abstract concept and is therefore not capable of social action. However, he finds Long's rendering of the neo-Marxist dependency idea somewhat one-sided, in his neglect of Cardoso's concept of dependent development, for example. Moreover, Slater - à la Leslie Sklair - would like to see more attention paid to the
integration of meta-theory, theory and empirical research, and to social movements and resistance on a regional/local level.

**DEFINITIONS COMMONLY USED IN SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS, GOVERNANCE, ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT**

♦ **Accountability:** The requirement for officials to answer to stakeholders on the disposal of their powers and duties, to act upon criticisms or requirements made of them, and to accept (some) responsibility for failure, incompetence or deceit. Mechanisms for holding officials accountable can be inter-organisational, as between branches of government; intra-organisational, as between supervisors and subordinates; and/or extra-organisational, as when an organisation and its functionaries answer directly to customers-stakeholders-members-those governed. Accountability mechanisms can address both who holds office and the nature of the decisions those in office make. Accountability requires freedom of information, stakeholders who are able to organise, and the rule of law (see separate entry). (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Aid co-ordination and management:** Aid Co-ordination is the process by, which a recipient government integrates and plans international assistance in support of national goals, priorities and strategies. Aid Management is the process of integrating external and internal resources in the implementation of national development programmes and activities. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Capacity, capacity development, capacity building:** Capacity is the skills, knowledge and resources needed to perform a function. Capacity development is the process by, which individuals, groups, organisations, institutions, and countries develop their abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems, and achieve objectives. Capacity building is distinguished from capacity development in that it builds on a pre-existing base of capacity. The aim of capacity development and building is to help governments; organisations and people attain a level of self-sufficiency that enables them to manage their own affairs effectively. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Carrying capacity:** The ability of a defined ecosystem to support all users [animals and human beings] with sustained production of resources needed for their survival, reproduction and growth at any given time.

♦ **Civil society, civil society organisations:** Civil society refers to individuals and groups, organised or unorganised, who as citizens interact in the social, political and economic domain, and who are regulated by formal and informal rules and laws. Civil society constitutes a dynamic, multi-layered wealth of perspectives and values, seeking expression in the social discourse. Civil society organisations are the multitude of associations around, which society voluntarily organises itself and can represent a wide range of interests and ties, from ethnicity and religion, through shared professional,
developmental and leisure pursuits, to issues such as environmental protection or human rights. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Consolidation:** The consolidation of a regime begins when a political transition ends. A democratic transition ends when a government is installed as the result of a free and fair election. Whether such a regime becomes consolidated depends upon the acceptance by all political actors of a new and stable set of political rules including the convocation of regular subsequent elections.12

♦ **Decentralisation:** Decentralisation is the general term relating to a transfer of authority and/or responsibility for performing a function from the top management of an organisation or the central governance level of an institution to lower level units or the private sector. The literature on decentralisation frequently distinguishes degrees of authority effectively transferred away from central government, between: Deconcentration -- assigning basic functions to locations outside the home office, without delegating significant responsibility or devolving much discretionary authority. Delegation -- broad policies are determined at the centre but local agents have considerable scope for their own initiative in implementing them and carry much responsibility for results. Devolution -- the most ambitious form of decentralisation, that is usually statutory, under, which authority (decision-making power) is transferred to local agents. Some of the possible benefits of decentralisation, especially devolution, are: expanded participation and empowerment, especially by disadvantaged groups; greater accountability and transparency of government; increased responsiveness and tailoring of programmes to local needs by government. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Democracy.** Democracy is a regime in, which the authority to exercise power derives from the will of the people. At minimum, a democratic regime maximises opportunities for both political contestation and political participation. Political contestation refers to open rivalry and competition among diverse political interests. Political participation refers to the entitlement of citizens, considered as political equals, to be involved in choosing governmental leaders and policies.

♦ **Democratisation.** Democratisation is a process of rule-making in, which citizens obtain opportunities for political contestation and political participation. While no single set of rules by itself defines democracy, there is a procedural minimum, which participants can agree upon as necessary elements.13 Onset of democratisation, as opposed to mere liberalisation, is distinguished when the incumbent government calls competitive elections of genuinely uncertain outcome.

♦ **Disaster Mitigation.** Measures, which lessen the impact of a disaster phenomenon by improving a community's ability to absorb the impact with minimum damage or disruptive effect. The measures include both preparedness (see above) and protection of physical infrastructure and economic assets.

---

12 It may take generations to consolidate a democracy. Regime consolidation (which is beyond the scope of this study) can only be said to have occurred after significant threats of regime reversal have been effectively eliminated or contained.

13 These include regular elections with universal adult suffrage, partisan competition and a secret ballot, as well as procedures for ensuring popular participation and executive accountability between election.
♦ **Disaster Preparedness**: Administrative, individual and community action to minimise loss of life and damage, and facilitate effective rescue, relief and rehabilitation: forecasting and disseminating warnings of imminent potentially damaging phenomena, developing and testing plans for responding to both warning/impact of such phenomena, and assuring the rapid availability of appropriate material resources, transport and other equipment, and funds when and where needed. (UN-DMTP)

♦ **Disaster Prevention**: "An aspect of development\(^{14}\) that is implemented in communities where objective conditions have deteriorated below the levels of sustainable subsistence, underscoring the need for structural and organisational change to ensure even the most basic needs. The enhancement of people's capacities within a constantly changing environment, coupled with the more visible short term increase in productivity. The emphasis is stability, the reduction of variability of production in all forms both in time and space. The demands of equity, popular support and participation impose a further condition ... the foundation of democratic management systems internalised by rural people themselves, assuming a high degree of devolution of decision-making to beneficiaries\(^{15}\).

♦ **Disaster**: The occurrence of a sudden unexpected event or major misfortune, which disrupts the basic fabric and normal functioning of a society or community. An event or series of events, which gives rise to casualties and/or damage or loss of property, infrastructure, essential services or means of livelihood (deprivation of basic necessities) on a scale, which is beyond the normal capacity of the affected community's ability to cope with unaided. (Sources: NPDPM and UN-DMTP)

♦ **Effectiveness**: The capacity to realise organisational or individual purposes. It entails competence; sensitivity and responsiveness to specific, concrete, human concerns; the ability to articulate these concerns, to formulate goals to address them, and to develop and implement strategies for the realisation of these goals. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Effects**: Assessed during the project's lifetime because they relate directly to the function of interventions and their justification as a resource for defined development purposes. If the intended effects are not being achieved, and/or if the unintended effects cannot be avoided or minimised, the hoped-for end result or impact of the justification of the project may have to be re-examined. The project may have to be postponed and redesigned. Further investment of scarce resource inputs may no longer be justified since the project may not make sense under existing circumstances unless remedial action can be identified and implemented.\(^{16}\)

\(^{14}\) In this context disaster prevention can also be defined as a form of development - the essential, required motion, change in time. Transference in space is development as it retains change in time in a transformed shape; like motion [it] is infinite insofar as it is material; at the same time, development exists as a separate finite process. The development of inorganic systems, the living world and human society, more specifically is governed by the general laws of dialectics. (It) occurs in the form of a spiral, in the unity and conflict of opposites, as transition of quantity into quality and the vice versa. Each separate process of development has stages ... external motion, emergence [transition to internal motion] and formation [the transformation ... of the conditions it has emerged from].


\(^{16}\) Ibid.
♦ **Election:** A popular means of expression conducted for the formation of the Constituent Assembly or of central or regional organs of state power and their corresponding substitutes;

♦ **Empowerment:** The expansion of people's capacities and choices; the ability to exercise choice based on the freedom from hunger, want and deprivation; and the opportunity to participate in, or endorse, decision-making affecting their lives. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Enabling environment:** Surrounding conditions for an activity or system that facilitate the fulfilment of that activity's or system's potential. This paper is concerned with the pre-conditions for sustainable human development. These include supportive laws and regulations, adequate resources and skills, broad understanding and acceptance of the differing roles of the state, private sector and civil society in SHD, a common purpose, and trust. The relationship to the global environment is also an important consideration. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Equity:** Even-handed treatment or just dealing. Equity requires that relevantly similar cases be treated in similar ways. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Governance:** Governance is the conscious management of regimes with the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of political authority. Governance can be thought of as the applied realm of politics, in, which political actors seek mechanisms to convert political preferences into concrete outcomes. Good governance involves improvements in the technical competence and efficiency of the public sector as well as measures to make public policy more accountable, transparent and predictable to society at large. The UNDP defines governance is the exercise of authority, control, management, and power over the actions of members, citizens or inhabitants of organisations, communities, societies and states. It is a neutral concept. It is the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions, through, which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations, and mediate their differences. Sound governance addresses itself to the allocation and management of resources to address collective problems, and is characterised by, inter alia, participation, transparency, accountability, the rule of law, effectiveness, and equity. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Hazard:** The probability that in a given period in a given area, an extreme and potentially damaging natural phenomenon occurs that induces air, earth or water movements,, which affect a given zone. The magnitude of the phenomenon, the probability of its occurrence and the extent of its impact can vary and, in some cases, be determined. [UNCHS]

♦ **Impact:** Change that is brought about as a result of programme component intervention. It is an expression of the actual results obtained and can be broadly categorised as follows: Economic resources generated for self-reliance, promotion of people's participation in public debate, development planning, decision-making and qualitative change in social, economic, political and cultural relationships of individuals in a community.17

---

♦ **Input:** Social, material, technology, management, policy and attitudinal resources that are applied with careful co-ordination and balance to fulfil objectives leading to certain activities. (FAO)

♦ **Institution, institution-building:** An institution is an organisation or a group of related organisations created to serve a specific purpose. Institution-building, is the creation, development and relationships of certain functions to accomplish specific tasks within institutions. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Institutional Development:** A planned, systematic process designed to change increased system-wide organisational effectiveness by integrating the desires of individuals for growth and development with organisational goals. The purpose of Institutional Development is to increase the effectiveness of the system and to develop the potential of all individual members; find improved ways of working together toward individual and organisational goals. Institutional Development focused on the macro goal of developing an organisation wide improvement in managerial style, using differing techniques such as sensitivity training and transactional analysis. It is based on systematic appraisal and diagnosis of problems, [often using the Log-Frame] leading to specific types of change efforts and aimed at overall organisational health and effectiveness. These tools must be used to assess and produce with an identification of indigenous women's organisational capabilities.

♦ **Legitimacy:** The property that a regime's procedures for making and enforcing laws are acceptable to its subjects. A legitimate system is legal, but more importantly, citizens believe in its appropriateness and adhere to its rules. Legitimacy is closely tied to governance: voluntary compliance with laws and regulations makes for greater effectiveness than reliance on coercion and personal loyalties. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Micro-environment:** Is a distinct small scale environment, which differs from its surroundings presenting sharp gradients or contrasts in physical conditions internally and/or externally; can be isolated, or contiguous and repetitive, and natural or made by people or domestic animals.

♦ **Minority nationality:** A community determined to be a comparatively smaller size of population than that of other nations/nationalities;18

♦ **Nation or nationality:** A people living in the same geographical area and having a common language and a common psychological make up of identity.

♦ **National execution:** National execution is defined as the overall management, by national government authorities, of UNDP-funded development programmes and projects, along with assumption of responsibility and accountability for: (1) the production of outputs and the achievement of programme/project objectives and (2) the use of UNDP resources. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Self-government:** Self-Governmental established by any action, nationality or people for the purpose of administering its own affairs within its geographical area.

---

18 means a nationality or people, which cannot establish its own Wereda Self-Government because of the small number of its population.
♦ **Organisation**: A social group having some kind of structure designed to achieve collective goals. Organisations provide the basis for purposeful collective activity. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Participation**: Literally, taking part. The question for those concerned with governance issues is whether participation is effective. Effective participation occurs when group members have adequate and equal opportunity to place questions on the agenda and to express their preferences as to the final outcome during the decision-making process. Participation can occur directly or through legitimate representatives. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Political liberalisation**: occurs when a governing elite grants or extends civil and political rights that had previously been denied. These rights may benefit individuals (such as rights of privacy, speech of movement) or social groups (such as freedom important of association or assembly). Liberalisation is often deemed a political "opening", since it marks an important departure from the usual practices of an authoritarian government to liberalise the rules of the political game marks the onset of a political transition.

♦ **Political organisations**: Groupings legally promoting their respective political programme. In this sense political parties represent social groups formed in accordance with national systems of governance and laws by specified persons within the society having a programme of its own reflecting its political belief and objective and, which participates in country-wide or regional political activities for the purpose of achieving political power through the democratic process.

♦ **Private sector**: In a mixed economy, that part of the economy not under government control and functioning within the market; private enterprise. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Process consultancy**: Process consultancy is a distinctive form of management consultation in, which the consultant assists the client management group to initiate and sustain a process of change and continuous learning for systemic improvement. The role of the consultant is not that of a typical technical expert, who analyses the client's situation and prescribes his or her recommended course of action. Rather, process consultancy engages the inclusive participation of the client management group to clarify the purpose of the change process, to redefine their roles and responsibilities, and to redesign the procedures through, which their respective functions will be integrated to sustain improved results system-wide. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Programme approach**: The programme approach is a methodology, which can be used by Governments and their partners to address in a coherent and integrated manner, a set of development problems, which in turn coalesce as a major national objective or set of objectives. The articulation of these problems, the strategies for their resolution and the resulting national goals and targets are contained in a national programme framework document. (Source, UNDP, 1996)

♦ **Risk**: Can be related directly to the concept of disaster, given that it includes the total losses and damages that can be suffered after a natural hazard: dead and injured people, damage to property and interruption of activities. Risk implies a future potential condition, a function of the magnitude of the natural hazard and of the vulnerability of all the exposed elements in a determined moment.
♦ **Self-government**: National entity vested with legislative, executive and judicial power.

♦ **Sustainable Development**: The Brundtland Commission was a political turning-point, making the concept one of geopolitical significance and the catch-phrase it has become today. Since 1987 some 70 definitions are in circulation. The basic implication of the concept of sustainable development, as embraced by the Brundtland Commission and others, is that this generation should leave to the next a stock of 'quality of life' assets no less than those, which it has inherited. It is a political goal. The first interpretation stresses all capital assets, man-made and 'natural'. The second emphasises 'natural capital' only. The third includes cultural and other human inheritances. The condition of 'human capital' - that is, society and its cultural inheritance - is at risk and must be built into any desirable concept of development.

♦ **Sustainable Livelihoods**: The integration of population, resources, environment and development in four aspects: stabilising population; reducing migration; fending off core exploitation; and supporting long term sustainable resource management. The Brundtland Commission developed it as an integrating concept - livelihood meaning adequate stock and flows of food and cash to meet basic needs; security refers to secure ownership of, or access to, resources to meet contingencies; and sustainable refers to the maintenance or enhancement of resource productivity in the long term. Sustainable livelihoods concern people’s adaptive strategies and capacities to generate and maintain their means of living and enhance their well-being and that of future generations. The following characterise sustainable livelihoods. The concept refers to the institutional arrangements and procedures that govern political life. These are often called "the rules of the political game". the formal and informal rules of the political game specify the ways on, which state and society are linked together and, especially, who may participate in politics and how. the most basic distinction in the literature is between authoritarian or democratic regimes, though finer distinctions can be drown within each category. These capacities are contingent upon **autonomy**, **sustainability**, **productivity**, **availability**, **stability** and **accessibility** of options, which are ecological, socio-cultural, economic and political. These invariably lead to sustainable livelihoods that are concerned with **people's capacities to generate and maintain their means of living**, enhance their well-being and that of future generations. They are predicated on equity, ownership of resources and participatory and wise decision making – notions of **sustainable human development** and **sustainable livelihoods** that incorporate the idea of change and uncertainty. They constitute a permanent change in the mix of productive activities and require modification of community rules and institutions to meet livelihood needs.

♦ **Transition**: A political transition is the interval between one regime and another. During a transition, political actors struggle to establish political rules that will provide advantage, not only in the immediate contest over state power, but over any future redistribution of public resource. Due to vigorous contestation, theses rules of the political game are in constant flux during a transition and any number of unpredictable alternative outcomes are possible. As well as leading to democracy, political transitions can result in liberalised or re-invigorated forms of autocracy, or in anarchy.

---

Vulnerability: Any physical, structural or socio-economic element to hazard is its probability of being damaged, destroyed or lost; a dynamic process, integrating changes and developments that alter and affect the probability of loss and damage of all the exposed elements. A community is physiologically or motivationally vulnerable when people feel victimised, fatalistic or dependent. Sometimes vulnerability in the motivational realm varies with context and culture.
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