

Projekte häufig erfolgreicher wären, wenn Möglichkeiten und Grenzen im Vorfeld sowie begleitend kompetenter eruiert würden.

Jörg Menzel, Pnom Penh

David Simon (Ed.)

Fifty Key Thinkers on Development

London, Routledge, 2006, 301 pp., \$ 26,95 (paperback); ISBN-10: 0415337909

With *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development* Routledge has added another volume to its *Key Guides* series which has been steadily growing since the 1980s. Other topics of the series range from art history to twentieth century British politics. The success of these works mainly depends on the publisher's choice of an editor who is able to manage a difficult double task: Selecting an appropriate, representative line of "key thinkers", and finding authors who are able to portray these figures in an appropriate manner. The concept of the "biography of ideas" makes this task even more challenging. The contributors – mainly from the British scientific community – had to summarise the lives and ideas of the thinkers on four pages at most. The result at hand is remarkable. One reason for its outstanding quality may be the fact that the editor David Simon, a Professor in Development Geography and Director of the Centre for Developing Areas Research (CEDAR) at Royal Holloway, University of London, has personally collected lots of field experience. He confesses that "Rewarding as I find theoretical debate, I attach fundamental importance to 'grounding' it in real-world conditions, and to seeking to apply the insights thereby gained to improving policies and practices."¹

The attempt to bridge the gap between theory and practice is visible in Simon's selection of key thinkers. Few of them spent their all academic lives in the ivory tower. The majority had a considerable practical impact on development, from to the oldest key thinker, Thomas Malthus whose position as professor at the British East India Company training college gave his theories considerable influence over Britain's administration of India through most of the 19th century, to the youngest, Vandana Shiva, an ecofeminist assisting grass root organisations until today. At the same time the editor avoided the inclusion of mere activists who did not substantially add to the theory of development. For instance, Simon rightly did not include Chico Mendes, adding that that the Brazilian environmentalist was included in *Fifty Key Thinkers of the Environment* (p. viii). However, duplications between the different *Key Guides* are unavoidable. Karl Marx can be found in not less than five volumes.² He also plays a central role in the *Fifty Key Thinkers on*

¹ Prof. Simon's website at <http://www.gg.rhul.ac.uk/simon>, last visit on March 28th, 2008.

² Marx is portrayed in *Fifty Major Political Thinkers* (2nd ed. 2007), *Fifty Major Philosophers* (2nd ed. 2006), *Fifty Major Economists* (2nd ed. 2006), *Cultural Theory: The Key Thinkers*

Development. No theorist has been referred to more extensively in development studies at least until the second half of the 20th century. Accordingly the keywords “Marx” and “Marxist” in the book’s index lead the reader to more references than any other name or notion. Many later development thinkers started from, and amended Marx’ theory; others offered alternative drafts; but for a century or more, none of them could bypass his ideas. This persistent power of the German philosopher must have been excruciating for a diametrically opposed theorist like Walt Whitman Rostow who tellingly subtitled his main work *A Non-Communist Manifesto*.³ The author of Rostow’s portrait, Ulrich Menzel even diagnoses that “his work revealed many parallels with that of Marx, against whom he fought so bitterly. These related not only to his claim to have formulated a universally valid counter-concept to the Communist Manifesto, but also to his derivation from it of his demand for political action” (p. 213).

Fifty Key Thinkers on Development covers all major areas of development thought. Besides the Marxists and their antagonists, structuralists like Gunnar Myrdal (p. 181), modernists like Charles P. Kindleberger and non-dogmatic progressives like Albert O. Hirschman are paid attention to. In the 1950s new macroeconomic hypotheses came up – and they collided soon: Was there a need for balanced growth, i.e. rapid industrialisation and synchronous rural development (W. Arthur Lewis, p. 146), or should economists advocate unbalanced growth concentrating on key industries and locations (Hirschman, p. 126)? At the same time more and more scholars began to realize the cultural limits and time-bound content of their theories. Alexander Gerschenkron criticized the generalisation that the history of advanced industrial economies traced out the pave way to development for more backward countries (p. 116). Raúl Prebisch and Hans Wolfgang Singer analysed the terms of international trade between the industrialised countries of the North (“centre”) and those of the South (“periphery”) and proved that the world economic cycle permanently led to disadvantages of the latter (p. 202, 244). Their successors drew diverse consequences from the interdependencies within the international economy. Some Latin American *dependencistas* like by the later President of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso rejected the assertion that dependency produced underdevelopment (p. 62). More radical thinkers demanded the delinking of the national economies, e.g. Andre Gunder Frank and Samir Amin, a call which has not fallen silent to this day.

As recently as in the 1970s the almost exclusive focus on macroeconomic models of development was complemented with fresh perspectives from a new generation of scholars and, more importantly, voices from the developing countries. The portraits of these scholars and politicians enunciating alternative visions of development belong to the most exciting sections of the book. Kwame Francis Nkrumah from Ghana and Julius Kambaragwe Nyerere from Tanzania pointed out that the essence and purposes of capitalism were contrary to

(2001), *Fifty Key Thinkers of the Environment* (2000), and *Fifty Key Thinkers on History* (2nd ed. 2007).

³ W.W. Rostow, *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*, 2nd ed. 1971.

the African culture (p. 189) and tried to adapt Marxist concepts to the realities of the societies in their countries. Both were elected presidents of their countries and strove to implement their visions of an African socialism. The economic success of their policies may have been modest; however, some achievements in social welfare, health and education are noteworthy. Moreover, they gave self-confidence and optimism to a whole generation of post-colonial African politicians of their time.

The problems in South Asia were similar at that time but the consequences drawn were quite different. Many thinkers and activists from this region were influenced by the principles of non-violence, rural development and self-sacrifice as exemplified by Mohandas Gandhi who is himself aptly portrayed by Rana Singh. In contrast to his contemporaries in Africa and Latin America, Ahangamage Tudor Ariyaratne from Sri Lanka did not believe that economic development and the fair distribution of wealth was an effective means to eradicate poverty. Instead of macro-economical programs he taught that structural change in society had to begin with personal change. Ariyaratne founded and shaped the Sarvodaya Movement in ways that forged a significant link between secular principles of development and Buddhist ideals of selflessness and compassion (p. 27).

Prominent topics which came up after the era of the all-explaining economic theories – which lasted until the 1960s – were education, the environment, gender equality, and good governance. From diametrically opposed points of view, Jagdish Bhagwati and Paolo Freire stressed the importance of education for development in the 1970s. Bhagwati, an Indian-American economist noted for his defence of free trade, pointed at the negative effects of the brain drain for national economies and stood for a special tax upon skilled migrants leaving their countries. Meanwhile the Brazilian educator Freire campaigned for literacy and education as instruments for the empowerment of the poor and voiceless.

A decade later, the Indian environmentalist Anil Agarwal fought to increase the representation of poor people in both the definition and the solution of development problems. His strategy was to expose the politics underlying each scientific statement, thus expose how allegedly “neutral” science legitimised or de-legitimised different policies (p. 9). At the same time the German political scientist Elmar Altvater began to warn that nature was reaching the limits of encumbrance and that it was time for a transition from fossil to solar sources of energy. His transfer of theories and categories from thermodynamic physics to environmental studies and economics is astounding (p. 17).

The 1980s also brought gender issues on the agenda. Professors like Diane Elson began to analyse and criticise the lack of attention paid to the role of women in development. However, it took another decade until institutions like the World Bank understood, e.g., the effects of women’s education on poverty and birth rates, and augmented their macro-economic models and top-down approaches with cooperation with local groups and non-governmental organisations.⁴

⁴ E. Kuiper and D.K. Barker, *Feminist Economics and the World Bank: History, Theory and Policy*. 2nd ed., London/New York 2006, p. 1.

Unfortunately, *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development* skips the Law and Development movement of the 1960s/1970s with key figures like Robert Seidman and David M. Trubek. The debates on Good Governance in development since the early 1990s when issues like political accountability, administrative reform and the rule of law gained importance, are also neglected. The index of the book does not even denote the notions “law” and “rule of law”. “Governance” is mentioned only once in the article on Cardoso. This blind spot is deplorable not only from a lawyer’s perspective since the rule of law has become a central element of development strategies since the 1990s. The more the conviction that crisis-ridden countries would recover if only the market forces were released and the state be restrained – the core idea of the “Washington consensus” – proved to be erroneous, the more researchers and policy makers like World Bank governance expert Daniel Kaufmann became sensitive to the importance of functioning state institutions. The majority of those doing research on the interrelation between the rule of law on the one hand, and economic and social performance on the other, are economists.⁵ In part their ideas trace back to the studies of the political economist and sociologist Max Weber.⁶ Many aspects of modern public administration have been derived from Weber’s ideas. In *Economy and Society* (1922) he outlined a description of rationalization – of which bureaucratization is a part – as an evolution from traditional and charismatic authority to legal-rational authority, and from value-oriented to goal-oriented organization and action. Practitioners later coined the notion of “Weberian administration” for a specific Continental type of hierarchical bureaucracies, ignoring the petty fact that this was actually not Weber’s preferred choice. This influential theorist and at least one or two other thinkers on the role of law and state institutions for development should have been included into the book.

The oblivion of the governance branch of development theory is the only severe weakness of *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development*. As a biographical reference work it stands all alone in the libraries. The only comparable book, Gerald M. Meier’s and Dudley Seers’ *Pioneers in Development*⁷ comprises only scholars from the North and may therefore be seen as incomplete, if not outdated. The selection of key thinkers in the Routledge’s new book is convincing. Only few could have been added, for example Hernando de Soto whose works on the informal economy and on the importance of property rights have influenced the respective policies of many countries.

However, one could counter that considerable impact is not enough to make a key thinker. The book promises to portray “50 key thinkers” but not “*the* 50 key thinkers on development”. Readers should therefore refrain from reproaching the editor of neglecting their preferred theorist. Simon’s frankness in the explanation of his approach to, and diffi-

⁵ See, e.g., Order in the Jungle, *The Economist*, 13 March 2008.

⁶ *Alvaro Santos*, The World Bank’s Uses of the “Rule of Law” Promise, in: David M. Trubek and A. Santos (eds.), *The New Law and Economic Development*, p. 26 seq. (reviewed in this issue by *Markus Kaltenborn*)

⁷ Oxford UP, 1984. The book is available as PDF at <http://www-wds.worldbank.org>.

culties in the selection of thinkers actually engages the reader's sympathy for the editor's sincere commitment. His choice of contributors can also be called felicitous. The contributors summarise lives and ideas on four pages at most. The quality of content and style is consistently good. Personal perceptions only sometimes shine through the lines. For example, Rana Singh asks the reader, "Should we not all follow the path of Gandhi?" (p. 110), and Reginald Cline-Cole expresses hope that Adebayo Adedeji's struggle to "indigenise" the paradigms, strategies and agendas of development in Africa "will, hopefully, continue to wage for a while yet" (p. 7). Ben Fine admits not to be terribly impressed by Joseph Stiglitz when he describes him as a mainstream economist whose "command of ... methodology, history of economic thought, and the other social sciences is limited" (p. 251). Such remarks do not diminish the joy of reading as they are always transparent as what they are: personal opinions.

Many of the portraits reveal haunting details from the lives of the thinkers. Almost one out of five was badly affected by the Nazi regime: Frank, Friedmann, Gerschenkron, Helleiner, Hirschman, Schumacher, Singer, Streeten and Wolf fled from the European continent in order to save their lives. Many of them were still children or students. Not one of them went back. Albert O. Hirschman's struggle before his leave is especially impressive. Born in Berlin in 1915, he fled from Germany in 1933 and continued his studies of economy at the Sorbonne and at the London School of Economics. In the mid-1930s he joined the underground opposition to Mussolini and fought with the Spanish Republican Army against Franco. In 1938 Hirschman obtained his PhD at the University of Trieste. Immediately afterwards he turned back to the struggle against Mussolini but had to leave Italy soon as the situation became too dangerous for a Jew. Hirschman spent another two years fighting with the French Army until its defeat in 1940, then supported refugees in Marseille together with Varian Fry and fled from the continent in the very last moment in 1941 (p. 127). The reader is tempted to speculate about the influence of these experiences on Hirschman's further life and works but the author of his portrait, John Brohman, wisely remains silent.

Other key thinkers suffered under the political or racial persecution under different circumstances. Marx' life as a political refugee in London was the life of a poor, stateless family father who only survived with the help of some friends and his pragmatic wife Jenny. Of W. Arthur Lewis we learn that the gifted young scholar "had hoped to be an engineer but the realities of the colonial West Indies meant that there was no employment for a black engineer" (p. 144). Instead, he studied economics, to be knighted in 1963 and win the Nobel Prize for his pioneering research on developing nations in 1979. There are also fruitful interrelationships between the thinkers to be detected, such as the surprising friendship between Mahbub ul-Haq and Amartya Sen. While the former engaged with the Pakistani military dictatorship as a Minister of Finance, Planning and Commerce (1982-1988) the latter served the United Nations, arguing that development and freedom are intrinsically tied together, each being critical for the achievement and success of the other. Nevertheless, ul-Haq and Sen together pioneered in human development theory and pro-

posed of the Human Development Index (HDI) which is today the central tool for the understanding and statistical accounting of development (p. 267).

The question remains open of what ties together all these scholars, policy makers and activists. They are labelled “key thinkers on development”; but, what on earth is development? The book does not give an answer, and it is wise to resist this temptation. Instead, the editor carefully notes that „(...) development studies still has a remarkably underdeveloped centre or core. Consequently, there is less sense of shared heritage or a widely agreed set of leading figures and personalities than in longer-established fields” (p. vii). Societal development could certainly be analysed and described with, e.g., the tools of systems theory but the value of such an abstract glass bead game is doubtful. The thinkers portrayed in this volume were interested in the practical applicability of their concepts and accepted a lack of theoretical coherence of this multi-disciplinary field as a whole. Enough to do for future generations of development thinkers.

Tilman Röder, Heidelberg

Naseef Naeem

Die neue bundesstaatliche Ordnung des Irak

Eine rechtsvergleichende Untersuchung

Leipziger Beiträge zur Orientforschung, Band 22

Frankfurt a.M., Peter Lang Verlag, 2008, 317 S., 51,50 €; ISBN 978-3-631-57628-1

Die vorliegende Arbeit, eine von Peter Nahamowitz betreute Dissertation, stellt die erste ausführliche Untersuchung staatsorganisationsrechtlicher Aspekte in den islamischen Staaten dar und verdient schon deshalb besondere Beachtung. Die Untersuchung hat zudem die neueste verfassungsrechtliche Entwicklung im Irak zum Gegenstand und ist daher auch von hoher Aktualität. Darüber hinaus enthält sie einen rechtsvergleichenden Teil zum Staatsaufbau in den arabischen Staaten, der sie von allgemeinem Interesse auch unter entwicklungspraktischem Aspekt sein lässt.

Die Untersuchung beginnt mit einer kurzen und prägnanten Darstellung des verfassungsrechtlichen Prozesses im Irak nach dem Sturz Saddam Husseins im Jahre 2003 bis zur Entstehung der ständigen Regierung im Jahre 2006. Dem Autor gelingt es, anschaulich zu verdeutlichen, dass die Geburt der irakischen Verfassung von 2005 kein Selbstgänger, sondern das Ergebnis eines äußerst instabilen politischen Prozesses gewesen ist, der durch Uneinigkeit und Misstrauen unter den handelnden politischen Gruppierungen und Institutionen geprägt war.

Bevor der föderale Gedanke in der irakischen Verfassungsdiskussion und in der Verfassung selbst einer näheren Analyse unterzogen wird, folgen – und das gibt der Arbeit besonderen Wert – allgemeine und rechtsvergleichende Ausführungen zum Aufbau der arabischen Staaten. Überzeugend identifiziert der Autor den Zentralismus als staatsorganisatori-