

## REVUE DE PRESSE / PRESS REVIEWS

*En finir avec la dépendance à l'aide*, Yash Tandon. Préfaces de Samir Amin et de Benjamin W. Mkapa, coédition CETIM/Pambazuka Press/South Centre, PubliCetim N°34, 224 pages, 2009.  
*Ending Aid Dependence*, Pambazuka News, 2008.

[Reviews in English Below]

\* \* \* \* \*

Le CETIM vient de publier deux petits ouvrages sur l'aide publique au développement (APD) dont nous avons fait la promotion dans un précédent numéro. La qualité de ces publications nous amène à y revenir.

«Le pouvoir du marché et le pouvoir de l'aide partagent la même adresse (...) l'argent de l'aide et la plupart de ses destinations sont d'une importance mineure comparés aux grands enjeux de la balance commerciale militaire, mais l'aide est d'une importance majeure pour les élites mondiales». Cette assertion de David Sogge (2002) résume assez bien la ligne directrice qui guide les auteurs de ces ouvrages. C'est essentiellement à la Banque mondiale, à l'OCDE et au sein de l'Union Européenne que sont définis la destination, les montants et les conditionnalités de l'APD dans le cadre d'une vision héritée de la colonisation. La Déclaration de Paris, adoptée en 2005 lors d'un Sommet mondial organisé par l'OCDE, est le dernier né des textes d'orientation de l'APD. Il constitue une régression par rapport aux pratiques des «décennies du développement» (1960–1970) ou même de celles qui, en 1986, permettaient aux non-alignés d'imposer leur point de vue lors de l'adoption de la Déclaration sur le droit du développement. Quels sont les principes normatifs de l'APD? quels sont les liens entre le niveau bilatéral et le niveau multilatéral? à quels pays est-elle destinée? quels types de programmes sont financés par l'APD? qui en profite et de quelle façon? Quelles en sont les conséquences économiques et sociales pour les pays qui la reçoivent? quelle est la politique suivie par la Suisse en la matière? Les deux ouvrages publiés par le CETIM y répondent de façon critique et détaillée.

### ***Des «peanuts» au service de l'impérialisme***

Ce qui est nommé de façon perverse «aide» publique au développement, n'est que peanuts en regard des montants en jeu dans les flux financiers et commerciaux internationaux. Ces quatre dernières années, les échanges avec les économies émergentes, Chine et Inde, ont rapporté aux pays pauvres bien plus que toute l'APD des pays occidentaux en 25 ans. En 2007, les pays donateurs utilisent à peine, en moyenne, 0.28% de leur revenu national brut à l'APD contre les 0.7% prônés par l'ONU il y a trente ans. En outre ils gonflent artificiellement ces chiffres puisque 17% des montants totaux comprennent des annulations ou remises de dettes, les frais d'éducation des étudiants étrangers ou encore l'accueil des réfugiés. Cependant cet instrument a une importance qualitative pour les élites mondiales et des conséquences dramatiques pour les populations du sud. Il a permis d'encourager le mode de développement des puissances occidentales pendant la guerre froide et par là de contenir l'influence de la Chine et de l'URSS. Après la chute du mur de Berlin, l'aide internationale a été utilisée afin de «pénétrer» les marchés en favorisant la libre circulation des capitaux et les flottements des monnaies par les conditionnalités imposées à l'octroi de l'aide. L'évolution des dix dernières années montre que la part de l'APD visant à renforcer le développement du secteur financier et du commerce s'est stabilisée alors que la part de celle axée sur la «gouvernance du secteur public et état de droit» a augmenté de 10 à 45%.

Yash Tandon parle ici d'une nouvelle étape placée sous le signe de l'«aide idéologique», la plus dommageable puisqu'elle renforce de façon considérable la dépendance des pays qui la reçoivent. Elle prend essentiellement la forme d'un transfert de connaissances et d'assistance technique qui permet aux pays donateurs d'interférer directement «dans le cœur et l'esprit» des élites politiques ainsi que sur leurs institutions. Les exemples des conséquences néfastes de l'APD sont nombreux :

le gouvernement de Zambie a dû couper dans ses dépenses de santé et d'éducation, dévaluer sa monnaie et vendre ses entreprises étatiques à de grandes sociétés étrangères; l'APD constitue 49,5 % du PIB du Burundi et 120% de celui du Libéria en 2007; la dette extérieure publique des 145 pays dits «en développement» qui s'élevait à 1350 milliards de dollars en 2007 accapare en moyenne 20 à 30% de leurs budgets.

### ***Pour une réforme urgente de l'APD***

La question d'une réforme radicale de l'APD est urgente, compte tenu des conséquences attendues de la crise financière internationale sur les pays du sud (explosion de leur dette extérieure et 53 millions de personnes supplémentaires vivant dans la grande pauvreté). Les auteurs plaident pour une APD au service de projet socio-économique et non gonflée artificiellement par des dettes annulées ou autres frais qui n'ont rien à voir avec le développement. Une APD dont seule l'ONU, dans un cadre contraignant, aurait pour responsabilité d'élaborer une vision globale. Cependant, cela n'est pas suffisant. Il est urgent que les pays du sud mettent sur pied des institutions et un mode de développement alternatifs fondés sur des formes de coopération régionale afin de rétablir les termes de l'échange.

Isabelle Lucas, SolidaritéS, n°160 (17/12/2009), p. 18.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***La coopération au développement en question***

Les ouvrages critiquant la coopération au développement sont de plus en plus nombreux. Mais rares restent ceux qui passent de la critique à une approche constructive. Car quoiqu'on pense de la coopération actuelle, une solidarité structurelle reste nécessaire si nous voulons survivre en tant qu'humanité.

Le CETIM (Centre Europe-Tiers Monde) vient de publier deux ouvrages qui méritent d'être lus et étudiés. Car non seulement ils soulignent la pertinence des critiques, ils font aussi des propositions concrètes et très intéressantes pour l'avenir.

Le premier ouvrage 'Efficace, neutre, désintéressée ? Points de vue critiques du Nord sur la coopération européenne' est une collection d'articles de différents auteurs qui réagissent à des textes de référence. Il s'agit des Objectifs du Millénaire, de la Déclaration de Paris et d'un article écrit par le nouveau directeur de l'AFD, la coopération française. Y sont soulignés tous les facteurs qui rendent la coopération relativement 'inutile' : le manque de l'appropriation par les bénéficiaires, les effets négatifs du 'libre-échange', l'impact pervers des paradis fiscaux et des crises financières. Les auteurs mettent l'accent sur le besoin d'impliquer l'ONU, de regarder les biens publics mondiaux, de mettre fin à l'exportation des armes. L'écologie et la santé devraient occuper une place plus importante dans tous les efforts des pays riches.

Les auteurs soulignent également une des caractéristiques importantes et une des causes majeures de l'échec de beaucoup de projets. En effet, l'aide a trop souvent été un élément de géopolitique, tandis que les populations – 'bénéficiaires' – étaient perçues comme des non-acteurs du développement, des porteurs de valeurs traditionnelles qui sont des obstacles à la modernité.

Le deuxième ouvrage, 'En finir avec la dépendance à l'aide' est de Yash Tandon, ancien directeur du South Center à Genève. Des préfaces sont écrites par Samir Amin et Benjamin W. Mkapa. Il contient une critique approfondie de l'aide que l'auteur divise en 5 couleurs : une aide rouge qui est idéologique, une aide orange qui n'est pas de l'aide à proprement parler mais concerne le commerce (si chaque partie est gagnante comme disent les donateurs, qui aide qui ?), une aide jaune qui est militaire et qui n'est actuellement pas comptabilisée comme 'aide' (à tort, prétend l'auteur car ainsi elle échappe au débat), une aide bleu-vert qui concerne les biens publics mondiaux (dont les pays riches tirent aussi un profit), et une aide violette qui respecte la solidarité et qui permet de s'affranchir de la domination des Etats Unis, de la Banque mondiale et du FMI.

Selon l'auteur, l'aide renforce le pouvoir des donateurs. Il n'y a que la vraie solidarité qui peut renforcer le pouvoir des destinataires. C'est pourquoi il propose sept étapes pour sortir de la

dépendance et pour renouer avec les objectifs de la décolonisation, c.-à-d. une indépendance face à la domination étrangère. Les nations doivent prendre dans leurs propres mains leur destin. L'autodétermination sera au centre des efforts de développement. Il a également des propositions pour l'architecture internationale de l'aide. Il souligne que les pays en développement ne manquent pas de ressources mais qu'il leur faut une opportunité de les développer. Car le point de départ ne doit pas être l'aide, mais le développement.

Ces deux ouvrages montrent clairement qu'une critique sérieuse de la coopération est possible sans entamer la solidarité. Les Moyo et Easterly qui essaient de nous démotiver et de nous décourager en prônant des solutions de marché ne peuvent apporter des réponses valables. Avec le Consensus de Washington que les pays pauvres ont dû respecter pendant près de trois décennies, les marchés ne leur ont apporté rien de positif.

Le Cetim doit être félicité de la publication de ces deux ouvrages qui ouvrent des portes nouvelles, qui donnent de l'espoir à ceux qui souffrent et à ceux qui croient en la solidarité.

Francine Mestrum, Dr en sciences sociales, Chargée de conférences Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgique), Février 2010

\* \* \* \* \*

Il ne s'agit certainement pas d'un énième livre sur l'aide au développement. L'originalité de ce livre, sa force et sa radicalité sont résumées dans son titre : mettre fin à la dépendance de l'aide (sous-entendue au développement). Yash Tandon, ancien directeur du South Centre à Genève, une organisation intergouvernementale des pays en développement, nous propose une réflexion passionnante et salvatrice (au sens où elle incite à l'optimisme), un point de vue du Sud pour changer, destinés pour toutes celles et ceux qui s'intéressent aux questions du mal développement. Yash Tandon s'inspire de Julius Nyerere, premier président de la Tanzanie, pour proposer une autre définition du développement, résumée par la formule mathématique suivante : développement = FS + FD – FI ; où FS représente le facteur social (le bien-être essentiel des personnes), FD le facteur démocratique (le droit des personnes à participer dans les prises de décisions qui les concernent), et FI le facteur impérial (le droit des nations à disposer d'elles-mêmes et à être libres de toute domination impériale). Cette formule s'oppose donc à celle habituellement admise (y compris par des agences de l'ONU) : développement = croissance + accumulation des richesses. Il explique pourquoi l'aide au développement, telle qu'elle est pratiquée et instrumentalisée depuis quatre décennies – à un point tel qu'on parle de l'industrie de l'aide –, a plus aggravé la pauvreté et les inégalités sociales qu'elle ne les a réduits. Il dénonce les double discours des pays donateurs (occidentaux) et démontre ainsi la déliquescence du processus démocratique et social et la dépossession des peuples des pays africains (en prenant pour exemple les cas de la Zambie et du Zimbabwe), causée par l'application des programmes d'ajustement structurels des institutions financières internationales. « Si le développement endogène, l'autodétermination des nations sont compromis par l'aide, alors ce type d'aide va à l'encontre du développement » (If self-development, self-determination of nations is compromised by aid, then that kind of aid is counter-developmental), résume-t-il.

Yash Tandon écrit sans jamais tomber dans la démagogie ou l'utopie « gauchiste »... Loin de condamner tout type d'aide extérieure et utilisant toutes les nuances nécessaires – qui prouvent l'expérience manifeste de l'auteur et ses nombreuses réflexions occasionnées – il propose, pour voir plus clair dans l'industrie de l'aide, une classification des aides suivant cinq couleurs (comme un clin d'oeil aux classifications des subventions autorisées ou pas par l'OMC), qui vont du mauve (l'aide basée sur les principes de solidarité entre les peuples) au rouge (l'aide idéologique, celle qu'il faut absolument interdire).

Enfin Yash Tandon consacre tout un chapitre sur une stratégie réaliste et réalisable pour mettre fin à la dépendance de l'aide en sept étapes, qui relèvent du bon sens, dont les plus importantes consistent dans le changement radical des mentalités (au Sud et au Nord) et la revitalisation du projet national (terme trop galvaudé à tort de nos jours). Yash Tandon montre également l'urgence de redéfinir l'architecture de l'aide pour qu'elle ne soit plus arquées sur les asymétries de pouvoir existantes.

En somme, un livre pratique, écrit simplement, sans langue de bois, qui a l'avantage de proposer des solutions concrètes pour sortir du mal développement, allant complètement à l'encontre des mesures pseudo techniques et cosmétiques adoptées par les signataires de la Déclaration de Paris sur l'efficacité de l'aide (qui accroît la dépendance). Un livre qui doit faire date.

Bulletin d'information du Cetim, No 35, septembre 2009.

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***L'«aide internationale», la corde qui soutient le pendu?***

CONFÉRENCE - Présentant à Genève son dernier ouvrage, Yash Tandon démonte les mécanismes d'une «aide» plus bénéfique pour le donateur que pour le bénéficiaire.

Le constat se fait jour avec de plus en plus d'acuité: un demi-siècle de coopération internationale a échoué à sortir le Sud du mal-développement. Au point que les pays donateurs s'émeuvent et cherchent les causes. «Mais au lieu d'interroger l'architecture de cette aide, de pointer le doigt sur ceux qui la prodiguent, ils rejettent la faute sur ceux qui la reçoivent», s'étonne à moitié Yash Tandon. De ce triangle bien peu vertueux, où le lobby des riches, l'Organisation pour la coopération et le développement économique (OCDE), est juge et partie, l'intellectuel ougandais a tiré un petit livre dérangeant: En finir avec la dépendance à l'aide<sup>1</sup>. L'ancien directeur du South Center, le think tank intergouvernemental des pays du Sud, n'épargne ni les donateurs, le plus souvent mus par des intérêts propres, ni les élites du Sud, jugées économiquement et psychologiquement dépendantes à l'aide. Même la société civile du Nord, reléguée au rôle de comptable des flux financiers, est invitée à l'introspection.

### ***Aider le Sud, l'affaire du Nord***

Moins d'un an après avoir quitté le South Center, Yash Tandon était de retour fin janvier à Genève avec une drôle de mission: promouvoir l'édition francophone d'un ouvrage qui jamais n'aurait dû paraître. Ce réputé analyste des rapports Nord-Sud, consulté par plusieurs gouvernements africains, pensait faire entendre sa voix alternative lors du Forum de haut niveau d'Accra, en septembre 2008. «Plus grand rassemblement de tous les temps de l'industrie de l'aide», dixit M. Tandon, cette rencontre avait été pensée par la Banque mondiale et l'OCDE pour y «faire entériner par les Africains» la Déclaration de Paris de 2005 sur l'efficacité de l'aide. Un document conçu par le Nord, hors de tout cadre participatif onusien, et déconnecté du contexte économique international, accuse le professeur Tandon.

Ces critiques, l'OCDE ne daignera pas les intégrer au programme des 1200 assistants annoncés. Exclu des panels au début de l'été, l'économiste ougandais formalisera et éditera ses thèses en un temps record. Puis passera le forum ghanéen à promouvoir son ouvrage sur les marches du Palais des congrès d'Accra...

Dans une préface à l'édition francophone, Samir Amin revient sur cette péripétie. «Si, comme on le prétend, il y a dans l'aide deux «partenaires» – en principe égaux – le pays donateur et le pays bénéficiaire, l'architecture du système aurait dû être négociée entre ces deux ensembles d'Etats. Il n'en est rien. Le débat sur l'aide a été enfermé dans un corset serré», écrit le directeur du Forum tiers monde.

### ***Qui finance qui?***

Trop radicale la pensée de Yash Tandon? Oui, mais dans le sens qu'elle renvoie à la racine des maux. Ou du mot: aide. «Une aide qui serait motivée par d'autres soucis que le bien de son bénéficiaire ou le sentiment de responsabilité globale n'est tout simplement pas une aide», résume-t-il. Avant de vouloir en mesurer l'efficacité, encore faut-il déterminer ce qui se cache derrière le concept fourre-tout de l'aide, estime M. Tandon.

D'autant que, selon ses recherches, la solidarité réelle ou la cogestion des défis communs (par exemple l'environnement) ne constituent qu'une minorité des flux comptabilisés par l'OCDE. En face pullulent toute une série de politiques qui, sous couvert de coopération, distillent dépendance financière, politique et idéologique.

L'auteur cite évidemment les fameux plans d'ajustement structurels (lire ci-dessous), imposés par le FMI et la Banque mondiale, mais aussi ces «aides liées» impliquant une contrepartie commerciale, qui brouillent définitivement la frontière entre bénéficiaire et donateur. Du pays recevant un prêt préférentiel pour bâtir une infrastructure ou de celui exportant capitaux et technologie, qui profite le plus de l'«aide»? «Les statistiques de l'OCDE ne recensent que les flux de fonds du Nord vers le Sud (...), il n'existe pas de modèle conceptuel et de calcul analogue pour mesurer les flux inverses», remarque Yash Tandon.

### ***Objectif 0%?***

Au-delà de l'aspect comptable, l'auteur met en exergue les «effets pervers» induits par l'aide. Non sans cruauté, il accuse le Nord – si fier de ses acquis démocratiques – de saboter les institutions du Sud. En effet, que reste-t-il de la souveraineté nationale quand le pouvoir d'un l'Etat dépend d'abord des apports extérieurs? Pis, ces contributions détournent ces pays des mesures nécessaires à mobiliser leurs ressources domestiques. Pourquoi, en effet, se créer des «ennemis internes», «quand il y a toujours des donateurs alentour»? Provocateur, M. Tandon va jusqu'à affirmer que la société civile du Nord ferait mieux de passer du combat pour le 0,7% du PIB en faveur de l'aide internationale à «l'objectif 0%»!

Prenant l'affaire par l'autre bout, l'ex-directeur du South Center préfère toutefois s'adresser aux siens. L'auteur, qui rappelle au passage que le donateur actuel se confond souvent avec le colonisateur d'hier, exhorte les pays en développement à «briser les chaînes mentales du passé», premier pas indispensable pour sortir de la dépendance.

### ***Pas de salut sans démocratie***

Sans renoncer à l'idéal de la coopération, Yash Tandon plaide pour qu'elle soit soumise à une «stratégie nationale de développement endogène». Ce qui ne signifie pas, prévient le chercheur, que cet Etat doit devenir «autarcique, ni forcément protectionniste», mais qu'il définisse son projet dans un «processus démocratique», puisant «sa source à l'intérieur du pays», «où les gens prennent part aux décisions qui affectent leur vie sans interférence impérialiste de l'étranger».

L'«autodétermination» n'est pas davantage synonyme d'isolement, puisque ce projet de développement peut être mené soit de façon globale – au sein d'une institution onusienne renouvelée – soit de façon concomitante. Et Yash Tandon de souligner, non sans satisfaction, le retour en force de la coopération Sud-Sud, notamment sous l'impulsion du Brésil, du Venezuela et de l'Afrique du Sud.

Benito Perez, Le Courrier, 17 février 2010.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **La pauvreté a un avenir en Afrique**

Cinq auteurs africains dénoncent la dépendance envers l'aide au développement apportée par le Nord. Les Rencontres internationales de Genève ouvrent la discussion, sans tabou ni préjugé.

La pauvreté est-elle endémique en Afrique? Le continent a-t-il appris à s'accommoder avec la misère? Les Africains ont-ils le goût du sadomasochisme et du désespoir permanent? Pourquoi le nombre d'Africains vivant avec moins d'un dollar par jour croît-il année après année?

Ces questions taraudent les esprits dans les pays riches. Elles sont au cœur des débats qu'organisent les Rencontres internationales de Genève, du 20 au 23 octobre, sur le thème «L'avenir de la pauvreté». Des questions qui sont légitimes. Depuis une cinquantaine d'années, les Etats-Unis, l'Europe et le Japon ont dépensé 2300 milliards de dollars pour l'aide au développement. Le bilan laisse à désirer.

**Que pensent les Africains eux-mêmes de leur destin?** Ils sont cinq à avoir pris la parole ces derniers temps. Leur constat est implacable.

Selon **Hilary U. Nwokeabia**, économiste auprès de la Conférence des Nations unies pour le

commerce et le développement (Cnuced) à Genève, l'Afrique a raté le train de la connaissance qui est à la base de tout progrès humain. «Nous avons construit les pyramides, mais nous n'avons pas d'ingénieurs; nous soignons nos malades à base de remèdes traditionnels, mais les principes actifs de nos plantes sont aujourd'hui exploités par la pharma du Nord (...) Dans **Why Industrial Revolution By-Passes Africa**, le Nigérian appelle à une réappropriation des connaissances africaines et à investir dans l'innovation. «Les autres nations sont passées par cette voie et l'Afrique ne fera pas exception», dit-il.

L'Ougandais **Yash Tandon**, auteur de "**Ending Aid Dependence**", explique que les racines de la pauvreté en Afrique se trouvent dans la dépendance de l'aide internationale. L'ancien directeur de Centre Sud, (...) affirme que l'aide étrangère a rendu les classes dirigeantes irresponsables. (...) «Il y a une mentalité à briser, poursuit Yash Tandon. Les Etats du Sud doivent se défaire psychologiquement de l'idée selon laquelle rien ne se fera sans les donateurs.» Il affirme aussi que la dépendance envers l'aide internationale sert les intérêts politiques et économiques des pays donateurs. (...)

«Pour réduire la pauvreté en Afrique, il faut mettre fin à l'aide au développement.» La Zambienne **Dambisa Moyo** (auteur de "**L'Aide fatale**") va dans le même sens que Yash Tandon, mais elle va plus loin en attaquant frontalement la lourde bureaucratie de l'aide internationale. (...) elle préfère que le continent finance son développement par ses propres moyens, c'est-à-dire par les exportations de ses ressources naturelles, mais aussi par l'émission des obligations sur le marché international. Dambisa Moyo fait remarquer que l'Asie s'en sort par le commerce plutôt que par l'aide. (...)

Cadre à la Banque mondiale, le Camerounais **Célestin Monga** pose les questions les plus provocatrices sur l'incapacité des Africains de se sortir de l'ornière et sur des donateurs qui, malgré leurs milliards, n'ont pas réussi à faire décoller le continent. C'est lui qui, dans "**Nihilisme et négritude**", se demande si les Africains ne se complaisent pas dans le statu quo. Il n'épargne pas non plus l'aide liée à l'agenda des donateurs.

**William Easterly**, auteur de "**Le fardeau de l'homme blanc**", n'est pas Africain, mais Américain. Pour avoir travaillé à la Banque mondiale et surtout pour avoir vu l'échec de la coopération, il demande de mettre fin aux bonnes intentions paternalistes qui finissent par faire plus de mal que de bien. (...) «La grande poussée des pays du Sud ne viendra pas non plus d'une thérapie du Fonds monétaire international, mais par l'injection de capitaux et le développement des marchés», écrit-il.

Ram Etwareea. Le Temps, Genève, 20 octobre 2009 (Extraits)  
Source : <http://www.letemps.ch/Page/Uuid/dd749ddc-bceb-11de-8f5f-5ccc917fd0a6%7C0>

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***Développement : En finir avec la dépendance à l'aide***

Yash Tandon, auteur de ce livre au titre-choc, a donné récemment une conférence à Genève à l'initiative du CETIM qui a assuré la traduction française de l'ouvrage et en assume la parution. Echos de la rencontre et substance de l'essai.

Acteur majeur de l'éveil du Sud, l'intellectuel ougandais Yash Tandon s'est illustré par son opposition à «son» dictateur, Idi Amin Dada, ce qui l'a contraint à l'exil au Zimbabwe et en Tanzanie. Il a été directeur du South Center de Genève et est actuellement professeur dans une université norvégienne.

### ***Un constat d'échec***

Utilisant des mots forts et sans détours qui, provocateurs, forcent à la réflexion, l'essayiste constate que la colonisation n'est terminée que par la lettre: les pays qui en sont sortis sont passés d'un régime dictatorial à un gouvernement démocratique, même si celui-ci est parfois très fragile. Mais dans l'esprit, rien n'a changé. Un nouveau colonialisme succède à l'ancien, il agit sous couvert

d'aide et tient en otage l'économie.

«L'aide est un instrument de la stratégie de domination de l'impérialisme, conçu pour affaiblir les pays les plus vulnérables», affirme l'auteur de la préface, «En effet, si, comme on le prétend, il y a dans l'aide deux «partenaires» –en principe égaux– le pays donateur et le pays bénéficiaire, l'architecture du système aurait dû être négociée entre ces deux ensembles d'Etats. Il n'en est rien.» Et de citer les fondements intellectuels de l'aide, débattus au sein de l'OCDE. «Dès le départ, la procédure est donc illégitime.» Poursuivant prioritairement des objectifs géopolitiques, alignée sur les principes de la «mondialisation libérale», l'aide apportée depuis une quarantaine d'années a un effet dévastateur puisqu'elle corrompt les classes dirigeantes et impose des règles structurelles impossibles à suivre. Elle s'est implantée dans les mentalités des populations et a créé un état de dépendance. L'aide se fait dans l'illusion, calculée ou involontaire, que la croissance économique est synonyme de développement.

### ***Une question de responsabilité***

«Un gouvernement dépendant de l'aide est-il responsable envers son peuple ou envers les donateurs qui le financent?», questionne Tandon. Et d'affirmer qu'en invoquant le besoin d'aide, un pays sous-estime la valeur de son propre peuple, de son intelligence et de son ingéniosité, la valeur du travail de ses ouvriers et paysans, de celle de sa jeunesse, comme celle de ses ressources naturelles. S'émanciper de cette dépendance est un exercice d'économie politique basée sur la confiance en la capacité du peuple d'un pays à parvenir par lui-même au développement. Comme nous l'enseigne, par exemple, la lutte pour l'égalité entre les genres, le développement est un long processus de lutte pour se libérer des structures de domination et de contrôle, y compris au plan des représentations mentales et des habitudes de langage.

### ***En finir avec la dépendance***

L'auteur voit la libération possible en 7 étapes:

1. Rectifier la façon de penser. C'est à l'esprit de dépendance qu'il faut s'attaquer en premier.
2. Budgétiser pour les pauvres. Définir les priorités nationales.
3. Mettre au premier plan l'emploi et les salaires. Considérer la force de travail comme l'une des plus importantes ressources productives.
4. Créer un marché intérieur et avoir en mains les ressources du pays. Primauté des échanges intérieurs sur les exportations, sauvegarde de la propriété du sol et des ressources naturelles, et souveraineté alimentaire pour les aliments de base.
5. Combler le manque de ressources. Bloquer ou réduire une partie des dépenses externes au lieu de rechercher de l'aide ou des capitaux venant de l'étranger.
6. Créer des institutions pour investir l'épargne nationale. L'Etat doit investir dans la construction d'infrastructures sociales à la fois dans les zones urbaines et rurales.
7. Limiter l'aide à des priorités nationales démocratiquement définies. Le peuple prend enfin les commandes de son propre développement.

Yash Tandon invite les pays dépendants de l'aide à entamer «ce long processus démocratique qui commence de l'intérieur, dans lequel les populations participent aux prises de décisions qui concernent leur vie.» Quant aux pays donateurs, il les invite à participer à la construction de cette société mondiale hétérogène et pluraliste, qui se base sur les valeurs communes de notre civilisation, ainsi que sur les fruits partagés du développement historique des forces productives de la science, de la technologie et de l'ingéniosité humaine. Ainsi l'objectif du 0,7% sera dépassé et nous pourrions nous en fixer un nouveau: le 0%!•

Roland Pasquier, Cotmec Info n°317, avril 2010, Genève Dossier / 4

\* \* \* \* \*

The Aid Critic: Yash Tandon

In this final review of aid critics for GEG's blog series The (Dead) Aid Debate, Lindsay

Whitfield examines the contributions of Ugandan international political economist Yash Tandon in *Ending Aid Dependence* (2008).

Yash Tandon gets us on the right track by arguing that the conceptual starting point is not aid but development. However, he also brings us back to two polarized debates that have been ongoing since the 1980s which trap us in a cul-de-sac mindset. The first is the definition of development. He argues that growth is not the same thing as development, although growth is important. True, but then he focuses on attacking the neo-liberal formula where growth comes from open markets, foreign direct investment, plus good governance. He argues instead, that development should be defined in terms of human well-being, plus democracy, minus imperialism. He sees the international aid system as pursuing an imperial project which impedes the pursuit of national projects by reducing policy space.

These are all old arguments and, while they contain elements of truth, they do not highlight and describe adequately the real issues regarding both the economics and the politics of aid to Africa. On the economics side, there is the need for economic transformation and the need to address the structural constraints in achieving such transformation. It is important for African countries to learn lessons from South and East Asia and to apply them within an understanding of the different global economic conditions that they face today. On the politics side, we need to understand how the foreign aid system interacts with domestic politics in African countries. It is no longer accurate, if it ever was, to see it as the national project versus the imperial project.

But Tandon does make an important contribution to the debate. He argues for distinguishing between different types of aid. His rainbow categorization of aid into a spectrum of Red, Orange, Yellow, Blue/Green and Purple has inspired me to think about the usefulness of breaking down what we call 'aid' into categories which actually indicate what is being provided. Do we even need to talk about 'aid' at all, or can we just call a spade as a spade? Different forms of aid are problematic in different ways. Instead of talking about 'aid', let's be specific:

- Political and military support
- Commercial transactions and foreign investments
- Charity and NGOs providing money, goods and services
- Humanitarian and emergency aid (which is not a pristine form of 'giving' but can be extremely political, as the case of Sudan makes clear)
- Balance of payments support (traditional IMF territory)
- Concessional loans, particularly for infrastructure and provision of large public goods (traditional World Bank territory)
- Policy prescriptions (which became attached to balance of payments and sector loans)
- Individual projects (often designed by aid agencies)
- Technical assistance

Of course, these various forms of aid can be, and often are, bundled together in one package from aid agencies. But once we break it down like this, we can be clear on what we are talking about and more specific about changing the aid system and how aid is provided.

Lindsay Whitfield, 17 Feb. 2010, GEG's Blog

Lindsay Whitfield is Project Senior Researcher at the Danish Institute for International Studies and editor of *The Politics of Aid: African Strategies for Dealing with Donors* (2009). This blog was published as a Danish Institute for International Studies working paper. For more on the (dead) aid debate, visit GEG's resource page.

\* \* \* \* \*

Some estimates put the "aid received by poor countries at over half a trillion dollars in the past 30 years. Yet the history of development over that period shows that poor countries have got poorer,

especially in Africa. What explains this apparent paradox where such "generosity" has worked in reverse?

Analysis of the phenomenon reveals that "aid" contributes little to wealth creation and in many cases leads to impoverishment. "Aid" often takes the form of goods which the donor cannot use or sell; drug companies give expired medicines to countries in need; much "aid" is tied to goods and services from the donor and never leaves that country; consultants are paid at exorbitant rates. The structure of the present global system means that many experts in poor countries, trained at great expense, leave for the rich countries in a "brain drain" because their home nations cannot employ them. In the "aid" industry rich countries send their unemployed and unemployable "experts" to poor countries to show them how to become "modern" and "civilised". "Aid" may also be a form of dumping in which goods are exported below cost to undermine local industries.

In political terms "aid" is tied to certain "conditionalities" as defined by the IMF, World Bank and other agencies controlled by the USA and Western Europe. In the Cold War period receivers of western "aid" could not have relations with countries from the socialist bloc: now they have lists of undesirable countries such as Cuba, Iran, North Korea and in Bush's "axis of evil". As part of the "aid" package, the Fund and Bank send "experts" to the Ministry of Finance and the Central Bank to ensure that policies favourable to the dominant powers are implemented.

By coincidence, these are the former colonial powers such as England and France and the "victor" of the Cold War, the United States of America. Leaders of the poor countries forget the independence struggles of their countries in which many took the extreme resort of wars of national liberation, and cannot see that "aid" now performs the same functions once achieved by tanks, aircraft and machine guns.

Ending Aid Dependence by Yash Tandon takes a critical look at the "aid" industry with a view of freeing poor countries from addiction to it. Although Tandon is from the left, the recognition of the ideological nature of the concept is not a left-wing position.

When asked by a supporter why America was wasting its "aid" on poor countries which did not support his country, the very right-wing Nixon explained that "aid" was not for the benefit of the poor but for a very rich America which used it to keep the poor in line.

Tandon starts by defining "aid" so it could be analysed in a scientific manner. He follows this with a classification of different forms of "aid" so that scholars and policymakers could determine which "aid" was beneficial and which was harmful. While snow shoes and overcoats were of no use in tropical countries in crisis, food aid for starving people was okay as long as it did not undermine local food production as surplus grain and meat - from western subsidised production - did in many African and Caribbean countries.

"Aid" which was tied to advice was pernicious. Whenever poor countries experienced financial crises, the IMF and World Bank offered "assistance" on condition that they raised interest rates, devalued their currencies and deregulated their financial systems. The result was increased poverty and the purchase of their companies by western corporations at giveaway prices. Under no circumstances should governments assist their companies to stay afloat.

In the current "financial crunch" in the west, the advice is the exact opposite: the dollar has risen against most other currencies, interest rates have been dramatically reduced, and trillions have been given to prop up banks, mortgage and insurance companies. Regulation has been increased and the nationalisation prohibited in the poor countries resorted to with a vengeance. China and India which resisted western advice because they did not need "aid" emerged relatively strong compared to the USA and Europe.

Countries in Africa and the Caribbean which have gone backwards because of addiction to "aid" should consider the harm the users of heroin and cocaine experience because of their "need".

To wean themselves of their "need", drugs addicts must cut themselves off and build up their mental and physical resistance. For Tandon the cure for "aid" is the cultivation of reliance on the people, democratic politics which is of the people, by the people, and for the people. Leaders of poor countries who tell their people to accept subsistence wages to attract "investments", need to ask these people if such "investments" are worthwhile.

Patrick Wilmot writes from London. A Jamaican, he's a visiting professor at Ahmadu Bello and Jos universities in Nigeria and the author of Seeing Double.

\* \* \* \* \*

Millions of dollars in aid money is sent to developing nations each year, but poverty remains a major issue. This is the alleged dilemma being studied at an international conference that got underway yesterday in Ghana. Ministers from over a hundred countries are meeting with the heads of bilateral and multilateral agencies and representatives from a handful of non-governmental organisations to debate how best to channel funds intended to pay for development work. The High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness is a significant event for the aid industry, but it looks as though it will deliver very little in the way of positive change.

Aid is a decidedly suspicious word. It implies that whatever comes under such a name is inherently helpful, and that problems can only arise in situations in which there is not enough of it to go around.

Rich countries have long encouraged this kind of assumption. Discussions about how much they should give to their less fortunate counterparts are incredibly popular, and hardly a summit goes by without promises of more aid. But it is largely bluster. Forty years ago, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and its member states undertook to earmark at least 0.7% of their Gross National Income. They haven't done it yet, and an awful lot of time and energy is wasted in reminding them of their pledge and working out how far they still have to go. People are thereby distracted from questioning both the choice of this arbitrary figure and the content of what is supposed to be development assistance.

Excuses abound for this seeming inability to deliver. Questions are often met by expressions of concern over the ability of developing countries to use any extra finance, worries about corruption, fears that additional money will place too great a strain on bureaucracies, and talk of developing countries having institutions plagued by inefficiency and wastage.

The High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness is designed to address such hesitations. Donors and recipients are now contemplating ways of ensuring that funds set aside for development actually end up reducing poverty. Buzzwords are everywhere. Ownership, alignment, results-oriented management, mutual accountability and harmonisation are the key principles said to be the answer. They have been subject to discussion before, and still more assurances of progress were elicited at the time. Ghana is hosting the third of a series, following a similar assembly in Italy in February 2003 and another gathering in France in March 2005. Participants will once again evaluate how little they have managed to achieve since their last discussion and solemnly vow to improve matters within another couple of years.

An interesting book to be launched this week suggests that the whole process is merely a tactic to assist in maintaining the supremacy of rich nations. The South Centre, an inter-governmental organisation of developing countries, puts forward this idea in a volume by its Executive Director, Yash Tandon, entitled 'Ending aid dependence'. It argues that what is really needed is a strategy for giving up on aid.

Mindset is apparently the principal barrier. Governments and public opinion in their respective constituencies often believe that they simply cannot manage without development assistance. The South Centre proposes a fresh approach that starts from a new definition of what constitutes aid. The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and its member states currently decide for themselves what is meant by the term. Aid therefore now encompasses any money from official sources given on a concessional or even slightly less than market basis to developing nations.

It is important to be clear about what is on offer. Rich countries provide a good deal of funds that have to be used on products and services from their own corporations, which often ends up being more expensive for recipients than commercial borrowing. Donors also count money spent on refugees and funds given to non-governmental organisations for educational work on relevant topics at home as part of their development assistance. Administration costs are included too. Debt relief

on loans made to illegitimate regimes is another example of aid that isn't really useful. Rich nations also direct considerable amounts of money to trying to persuade recipients to change their policies on everything from governance of the financial sector to university curricula and staffing policies, and ideology doesn't often transfer into results in eradicating poverty. Technical assistance makes up almost half of all flows from donors, and payments to expensive consultants for advice of dubious quality on subjects of questionable utility are rife in the aid industry.

The South Centre wisely discounts all of this out of hand. It is the first stage in understanding that there are other ways of moving forward.

Developing countries must then accept that there is still work to be done on their national projects. Political independence from colonial powers was only the initial step, and further struggle is also needed to get out of the resulting asymmetrical economic, power and knowledge relationships.

The South Centre points out that there are other ways of closing the resource gap between income and expenditure. Aid is not the most important financing stream to developing countries.

Remittances play a big role in many places. It is also well known that considerably greater sums of money flow back the other way in illegal private transfers, in profits from multinational companies and in legal theft of various other kinds. Leaks should be plugged before turning to aid. Budgets are often drawn up while craving plenty of things other than what is necessary for development. Plans have to focus on creating decent employment and promoting the domestic market before anything else. The South Centre elaborates on these issues to set out a number of actions to be taken in a process of weaning a country off aid.

Rich nations will undoubtedly be worried by this prospect. Brazil has recently escaped from the aid system, having adopted strongly nationally-oriented policies in the trade, investment and monetary areas. India and China never became addicted in the first place, and they made sure that their agricultural and manufacturing sectors were in a position to compete before exposing them to the international market. Look at where these states are now.

It obviously isn't that easy. India, China and Brazil all have large populations to depend upon, so their use of specific policy measures cannot necessarily be replicated elsewhere. But other countries who are taking slightly different routes are on the verge of success too.

The High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness is about finding a way of keeping developing countries hooked on the aid drug and therefore also under the spell of rich nations for as long as possible.

Imperial projects haven't been forgotten yet either.

Buzzwords might sound hollow, but they do have meanings as well. Harmonisation is about donors coming together to jointly support budgets rather than each funding a selection of individual projects, which only increases their collective power. Mutual accountability is a cunning way of adding to demands on recipients, for sanctions never affect the other side. Results-oriented management sounds like an administrative detail, and indeed it is hard to know what might ensue. Alignment is supposed to imply using the existing systems of organisation, procurement and so on, but it can just as easily give donors an excuse to insist that these are changed to meet their particular standards. Ownership is the gloss that is applied to make everything seem alright, as donors pretend that none of it was their idea.

Poverty doesn't seem to come into the equation. The answer to the riddle being discussed this week starts to look a bit clearer when one remembers that all of the money spent on the conference is likely to come from budgets for development assistance. Maybe it will help in convincing a few people that their nation had better start planning a future without aid.

*Tandon* offers a seven-step programme:

1. Adjusting the mindset (psychologically liberating countries from aid dependence);
2. Budgeting for the poor and not for the donors;
3. Focusing on employment and decent wages;
4. Creating a domestic market and owning domestic resources;
5. Plugging the resource gap;
6. Creating institutions for investing national savings; and
7. Limiting aid to national democratic priorities.

One of the shortcomings in Tandon's book is that it does not show how countries such as Malaysia, Singapore and Brazil weaned themselves off aid or what policies or strategies they employed to dramatically boost living standards and reduce poverty levels.

In many of these countries, committed leadership made all the difference, not democratic institutions. Often, it is not "people-centred democracy" that delivers high per capita incomes and reduced poverty levels, but visionary dictatorship as the Singaporeans and Chinese will attest. The vision should ensure that economic growth does not increase levels of inequality (which can be politically and socially destabilising and which can adversely impact growth in the long term). The vision must also focus on developing people's skills and strengthening institutions that enhance productivity.

In addition, it should focus on eliminating corruption in order to gain citizens' trust. Without these, it is unlikely that governments will be in a position to say no to aid.

Rasna Warah, Daily Nation

\* \* \* \* \*

This week, Ministers from over 100 countries, heads of donor agencies and representatives of civil society organisations are gathering in Accra, Ghana, for a meeting to discuss ways in which rich nations can help "developing countries and marginalised people in their fight against poverty by making aid more transparent, accountable and results-oriented".

"Aid Effectiveness", the main theme of this meeting, has, however, come under severe criticism from the most unlikely quarters — the recipients themselves.

A leading voice is Mr Benjamin Mkapa, former president of Tanzania, who in a foreword in the just released book, *Ending Aid Dependence*, by Yash Tandon, urges developing countries to formulate strategies to exit from the aid dependence bandwagon.

Mr Mkapa argues that aid subjects recipient countries to "a discipline of collective control by donors right down to the village level", and that some of the most successful emerging economies, such as China, India, Brazil and Malaysia, developed, not through aid, but through strong nationally-oriented investment and trade policies.

The idea that aid is bad has been around at least since the 1980s when academics and activists began questioning the effectiveness of World Bank-IMF prescriptions, such as Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), which increased poverty levels in almost every country where they were implemented.

In his book, Tandon, the executive director of the South Centre in Geneva, argues that there needs to be a "radical restructuring of the institutional aid architecture" but falls short of calling for a total ban on aid.

Aid that imposes ideological positions on countries, for instance, should be shunned completely, according to Tandon, but aid that supports struggles for social justice is acceptable as long as it is people-centred.

Tandon's views are not as radical as those of "post-development" advocates such as Susan George and Arturo Escobar, among others, who argue that aid is just another form of colonialism and should be done away with completely.

These views have been articulated by various East Africans in the recently-published anthology (edited by yours truly) called *Missionaries, Mercenaries and Misfits*.

In this book, prominent writers, academics and activists, including Issa G. Shivji, Bantu Mwaura, Onyango Oloo, Firoze Manji and Sunny Bindra, present an African perspective on the aid industry and why it has failed to lift millions of people out of poverty.

Bindra argues that "far from being productive or necessary, the donor-dependent relationship most often ends in mutual hatred" and that by and large, countries that have ignored donor prescriptions have prospered.

Shivji, a leftist Tanzania scholar, says that aid wrenches policy-making out of the hands of African

countries and into the hand of donors, which in effect makes these countries impotent bystanders, rather than active participants, in nation-building.

Shivji even goes so far as to claim that the rapid rise of NGOs in Africa “is part of the neoliberal organisational and ideological offensive” that began in the 1980s with the adoption of SAPs.

Manji argues that current models of development assistance breed and sustain inequalities in Africa because they are framed, not in the language of rights or justice, but “with the vocabulary of charity, technical expertise, neutrality and a deep paternalism”.

So what can African governments do to get out of the aid trap? *Tandon* offers a seven-step programme:

1. Adjusting the mindset (psychologically liberating countries from aid dependence);
2. Budgeting for the poor and not for the donors;
3. Focusing on employment and decent wages;
4. Creating a domestic market and owning domestic resources;
5. Plugging the resource gap;
6. Creating institutions for investing national savings; and
7. Limiting aid to national democratic priorities.

One of the shortcomings in Tandon’s book is that it does not show how countries such as Malaysia, Singapore and Brazil weaned themselves off aid or what policies or strategies they employed to dramatically boost living standards and reduce poverty levels.

In many of these countries, committed leadership made all the difference, not democratic institutions. Often, it is not “people-centred democracy” that delivers high per capita incomes and reduced poverty levels, but visionary dictatorship as the Singaporeans and Chinese will attest.

The vision should ensure that economic growth does not increase levels of inequality (which can be politically and socially destabilising and which can adversely impact growth in the long term).

The vision must also focus on developing people’s skills and strengthening institutions that enhance productivity.

In addition, it should focus on eliminating corruption in order to gain citizens’ trust. Without these, it is unlikely that governments will be in a position to say no to aid.

Ms Warah is an editor with the UN. The views expressed here are her own and do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations. ([grasp@nbi.ispkenya.com](mailto:grasp@nbi.ispkenya.com)), Daily Nation  
Posted Sunday, August 31 2008 at 19:24

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***It is time to wean ourselves away from the aid bandwagon***

The idea that aid is a bad idea has been around at least since the 1980s, when academics and activists began questioning the effectiveness of World Bank-IMF prescriptions, such as Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs), which increased poverty levels in almost every country where they were implemented.

In his book, Tandon, the executive director of the South Centre in Geneva, argues that there needs to be a “radical restructuring of the institutional aid architecture” but falls short of calling for a total ban on aid. Aid that imposes ideological positions on countries, for instance, should be shunned completely, according to Tandon, but aid that supports struggles for social justice in the international community is acceptable as long as it is people-centred.

Tandon's views are not as radical as those of “post-development” advocates such as Susan George and Arturo Escobar, among others, who argue that aid is just another form of colonialism and should be done away with completely. These views have been articulated by various East Africans in the recently-published anthology (edited by yours truly) called *Missionaries, Mercenaries and Misfits*. In this book, prominent writers, academics and activists, including Issa G. Shivji, Bantu Mwaura, Onyango Oloo, Firoze Manji and Sunny Bindra, present an African perspective on the aid industry and why it has failed to lift millions of people out of poverty.

Rasna Warah, an editor with the UN.

See from: <http://www.nation.co.ke/oped/Opinion/-/440808/466194/-/3la41r/-/index.html>

\* \* \* \* \*

Whilst aid experts from all around the world prepare to go to Accra to discuss how aid can be made more effective, three writers (Tandon, Glennie and Warah) are preparing to launch/ have just launched new books, all of which argue that poor countries need to become less dependent on aid. Yash Tandon from the South Centre has written a book entitled "Ending aid dependence". Benjamin W. Mkapa (President of Tanzania 1995-2005) in his forward to the book says that "The primary and long-term objective of this monograph is to initiate a debate on development aid, and to lay out a doable strategy for ending aid dependence."

Tandon argues that "Developing countries reliant on aid want to escape from this dependence, and yet they appear unable to do so. This book shows how the developing countries can liberate themselves from the aid that pretends to be developmental but is not. Exiting aid dependence should be at the top of the political agenda of all countries." Tandon plans to launch his book at a side event at the High Level Forum in Accra which seems somehow a bit late given that one of his recommendations is that of the South beware against endorsing the Accra Action Agenda (AAA) offered by the OECD which he says "if adopted, it would subject the recipients to a discipline of collective control by the donors right down to the village level."

Jonathan Glennie's new book "The Trouble with Aid" also calls on poor countries to reduce aid dependency. Less damning about the effects of aid than Tandon, Glennie nonetheless is concerned that we are missing the real issues by investing so much energy into campaigns to "double aid to Africa".

I am looking forwards to more more spare time after Accra to be able to read these two new books. And whilst I am adding to the Accra hangover, I may also try and read "Missionaries, mercenaries and misfits: an anthology" by Kenyan columnist Rasna Warah. Pambuzaka describes it as "an anthology that brings together some of the region's best and best-loved writers, whose individual essays enable a kaleidoscopic view of developmentalism in East Africa, its discontents, its hubris, its smugness, its ability to kill through often genuine and well-meant kindness."

At least if donors refuse to agree to anything at all tangible in Accra, I can then at least make myself feel better by letting myself be convinced that it was never going to do any good anyway.

Lucy Hayes, BetterAid.org, Aug 19, 2008

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***Demolishing the myth of aid***

I urge my fellow Africans to read this little book.

Yash Tandon questions every assumption made about aid. Aid turns out not to be what the average person thinks it is.

Tandon classifies aid into 5 categories. Only one category can legitimately claim the status of aid. The author shows how aid is used as a tool by the donors ( who happen to be former imperial powers ) to control the recipients ( most of whom are former colonial subjects ). Every policy space of the recipients is controlled by the donors. As a result, the recipients are answerable not to their own people, but to the donors. World Bank officials sit in the central banks and ministries of finance of recipient countries.

Two visions of development emerge from this analysis. One is that of the donors. The other is that of poor countries of the South. The two are diametrically opposed to each other.

A number of case histories are described to illustrate the effect of conditionalities on the economies of the recipient countries. The case of Zimbabwe is fascinating. Tandon, who was personally involved in the events, describes chronologically the role that aid and donors played in bringing the Zimbabwe economy to its knees.

Recipient countries were forced to open their fragile economies to the full force of global competition by donor conditionalities. As a result their fledgling industries were swept away. Their

agriculture was destroyed.

Tandon proposes seven steps to ending aid dependence. Unless Africa comes off aid, she has no hope of achieving development. The present aid architecture is an obstacle to Africa achieving economic independence.

Dr M.S. Nkolokosa, May 27, 2009, Related News

\* \* \* \* \*

### ***Keeping Developing Countries hooked on the aid drug***

An interesting book to be launched this week suggests that the whole process is merely a tactic to assist in maintaining the supremacy of rich nations. The South Centre, an inter-governmental organisation of developing countries, puts forward this idea in a volume by its Executive Director, Yash Tandon, entitled 'Ending aid dependence'. It argues that what is really needed is a strategy for giving up on aid.

Mindset is apparently the principal barrier. Governments and public opinion in their respective constituencies often believe that they simply cannot manage without development assistance. The South Centre proposes a fresh approach that starts from a new definition of what constitutes aid. The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development and its member states currently decide for themselves what is meant by the term. Aid therefore now encompasses any money from official sources given on a concessional or even slightly less than market basis to developing nations.

It is important to be clear about what is on offer. Rich countries provide a good deal of funds that have to be used on products and services from their own corporations, which often ends up being more expensive for recipients than commercial borrowing. Donors also count money spent on refugees and funds given to non-governmental organisations for educational work on relevant topics at home as part of their development assistance. Administration costs are included too. Debt relief on loans made to illegitimate regimes is another example of aid that isn't really useful. Rich nations also direct considerable amounts of money to trying to persuade recipients to change their policies on everything from governance of the financial sector to university curricula and staffing policies, and ideology doesn't often transfer into results in eradicating poverty. Technical assistance makes up almost half of all flows from donors, and payments to expensive consultants for advice of dubious quality on subjects of questionable utility are rife in the aid industry.

Kath Noble, September 1, 2008. The Island Mid Week Review (Sri Lanka), Available at:  
<http://www.island.lk/2008/09/03/midweek1.html> and  
[http://www.news.lk/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=6870&Itemid=52](http://www.news.lk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6870&Itemid=52)

\* \* \* \* \*

A reappraisal of so-called development aid is long overdue, and Professor Tandon is to be congratulated for initiating this debate in such an incisive manner. This very readable book does not merely ask what 'aid' is and what role it plays, but places it in the context of a wider question, 'What is development?' That also needs to be urgently reconsidered in the rapidly changing circumstances of our time.

Writing in an influential country in the North, I am encouraged to see that global poverty and development are more prominent in my nation's media and politics than they were five or ten years ago. NGOs have galvanised people to raise development issues with our politicians. However, all too often the political answer to their questions is simply 'aid'. The deficiencies of the global economy and international relations, which inhibit development as this book rightly points out, are scarcely considered. The development debate receives more attention in the North than it did, but its content has taken a few steps backwards. The dogmatic slogans of the 1980s, 'The market is always right' and 'There is no alternative', still frame the discussion.

Meanwhile a 'development industry' has mushroomed, but too many of its practitioners are beholden to aid donors. The NGOs retain some autonomy where they are funded by public

donations. But outside of them, nearly all 'development' people in the North derive some if not all of their income from donor aid. As a result, there has been no serious debate about the nature of aid, as Professor Tandon calls for.

I too have worked in that capacity. How many complaints did I hear from other consultants and consultancy firms about the absurdities of the aid system! Yet almost no one would voice open criticism, however mild, for fear of losing the next contract: a pernicious consequence of the commercialisation of aid projects. Even monitoring and evaluation, as I experienced them, were rendered incapable of taking deficient aid programmes seriously to task. Having witnessed countless technical assistance projects and read their terms of reference while working in programme management and M&E, I find it hard to recall even one which actually achieved what it was designed to do. What a waste of the North's public money; what a deception played on the people of developing and transition countries alike.

Thomas Lines, a development consultant and the author of *Making Poverty: A History*.  
See from: *South Bulletin* (September 1 2008), Issue 22, pp.10.

\* \* \* \* \*

### Yash Tandon versus Danbisa Moyo

(*Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa*, Dambisa Moyo, Allen Lane, 2009. *L'aide fatale : Les ravages d'une aide inutile et de nouvelles solutions pour l'Afrique*, éditions JC Lattès, 2009)

What these two books have in common is firstly that they have exceptionally compelling titles for those interested in their subject matter. Secondly, is the obvious fact that they are concerned with aid and Africa. Thirdly, these books will interest those students, policymakers and government officials who ostensibly claim to be interested in eradicating aid. However, this is where their similarities end. The two authors have sharply contrasting ideological visions for Africa's disengagement from aid dependency. This is indisputably on account of their backgrounds. Moyo has worked at the World Bank and Goldman Sachs, studied at Harvard and Oxford universities, whereas Tandon is a radical scholar, public intellectual and former director of the South Centre (an intergovernmental think tank of the developing countries). In other words, their different experiences not only inform their analysis of aid, but their wholly differing prescriptive solutions to Africa's myriad problems, which they agree are rooted in aid dependency.

Both authors eloquently illustrate how aid has failed to deliver the promise of economic growth and poverty alleviation in Africa. Moyo's caustic attack is greater than Tandon's. She forcefully argues that not only has aid often been stolen by corrupt governments, it has often been unproductive; it has led to indebtedness and as President Paul Kagame of Rwanda poignantly states, since 1970, much of the US\$300 billion allocated to Africa was spent on creating and sustaining client regimes of one type or another, with minimal regard to developmental outcomes on the continent (p. 27). Moyo claims that aid 'is the silent killer of growth' (p. 48). In chapter four she gives a cogent critique of the damaging effects of aid in that it reduces savings and investment as a result of the 'crowding-out effect' of aid; it discourages private finance capital; causes inflation; stifles the export sector and inculcates an aid dependent psychology in African people (pp.61-66).

On the other hand, Tandon's 'aid taxonomy' is a far greater analytical breakdown of the five different types of aid, compared to Moyo's simplistic three forms (humanitarian or emergency aid, charity aid and bilateral/multilateral forms of aid). Using a colour classification Tandon identifies purple aid as based on the principle of solidarity; green/blue aid encompasses humanitarian aid and transfer of technical assistance; yellow aid is given on the principle of geo-strategic and security interests; orange aid are concessionary grants given for commercial gain – and in Tandon's opinion should not be considered as aid – and lastly red aid is given on the basis of ideological principle to influence countries to implement the policies of the Washington Consensus (pp. 18-22). Tandon

contends that it is this latter aid that permeates and dominates the kinds of aid given by the DCD-DAC.

Central to both books are their strategies for extricating African countries from their addiction to aid and setting them on paths of economic development. Moyo argues that 'the cornerstone of development is an economically responsible and accountable government' (p. 57). Yet Moyo fails to define what she means by development. However, implicit in her overall arguments and vision is a model of development that imitates the West. In contrast, central to Tandon's arguments is that one must be clear on clarifying what development means for the discourse on development has been considerably enmeshed in 'conceptual traps' (p. 128) that engender false questions and false solutions.

For Tandon, development is essentially 'self-defined; it cannot be defined by outsiders' and 'is a process of self-empowerment' (p. 12). For Tandon development is a process that needs to be in the hands of Africans rather than imposed and directed by policy makers in the North. Therefore, in his seven steps to ending aid dependence the first and major step of 'adjusting the mindset' places the emphasis not only on African leaders, development experts and officials but African people to make this psychological shift. Such a change in mentality, which is essentially 'an act of political will' (p.77), cannot be achieved immediately. The subsequent steps are: 'budgeting for the poor and not the donors', followed by 'putting employment and decent wages upfront.'

Step four involves 'creating the domestic market and owning domestic resources' such as water, land and all natural resources. 'Plugging the resource gap' is step five and step six involves 'creating institutions for investing national savings.' Whilst Moyo recognises national savings as important, she focuses on the role of the private sector in doing this, whilst Tandon focuses on the state and the community sector, which have been relatively neglected in the literature.

The last step in Tandon's proposals involves 'limiting aid to democratic priorities'. He contends that 'before we decide what role aid plays in the development process, we have to understand what development means and what constitutes aid.' (p.78) Like Moyo Tandon sees a positive yet very limited role for certain kinds of aid.

Moyo's exit strategy is clearly wedded to the neoliberal paradigm reflected in the title of chapter 6: 'A Capital Solution.' For her, African countries need to issue bonds, increase trade with the Chinese and other partners such as India, Russia and Turkey; engage in greater micro-financing, and increase domestic savings. Whilst Tandon is of the view that 'the role of foreign investment should be treated just as carefully as aid' (p. 79) Moyo sees it as a critical plank in her proposals for Africa. She considers wooing potential investors is fundamental and though she accepts that 'in order for borrowers (countries or companies) to access bond investors, they need a credit rating,' (p. 83) such a hurdle is often determined by the same 'white blue-eyed bankers' that President Lula of Brazil characterised as causing the current financial implosion of the West. Moyo appears to accept the dictum that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

It appears Tandon's emphasis is on Africa seeking to forge new ways to engage and simultaneously change the global economy with an agenda focused on the 'national project' and with greater South to South cooperation. Moyo's prescriptions seek to integrate Africa into a system that is weighted against Africa's interests. To illustrate this, Moyo argues: 'But, most of all, acquiring credit ratings and experience in the capital markets is the passport for Africa's participation in the broader world architecture. It is incumbent on African governments to play ball.' (p.88)

Perhaps the Achilles heel of Moyo's thesis is that her exit strategy from aid dependency for Africa may be unlikely or very difficult in the current global economic recession. For in the present economic crisis in which capitalism is being discredited, it raises questions as to what kind of economic system is desirable to provide the maximum benefit to the majority of African people? Another weakness and disturbing observation is that Moyo is cited in the Foreword by Niall Ferguson, as calling for 'a decisive benevolent dictator to push through the reforms required to get the economy moving.' (p. xi) It is necessary to ask, has Africa not had too many 'benevolent dictators' since independence, who have promised economic betterment when in reality standards of living have worsened catastrophically for Africa's poor?

Furthermore, whilst Moyo hails the Chinese as Africa's new friends, she fails to examine the example of the pink revolution that has recently swept Latin America by leaders such as Evo Morales of Bolivia, Rafael Correa of Ecuador, and Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. The rejection of the neoliberal paradigm in this corner of the globe has practical relevance for Africa where similarities of a colonial past and continued economic exploitation remain. There is also greater scope for not only trade but equally an ideological vision of ways in which wealth can be redistributed more fairly which can be learned by African countries from these pink countries.

Moyo's peripheralising of African people is demonstrated in the following point she makes: 'Ordinary people across Africa, the millions who bear the brunt of the economic catastrophe, have an incentive to change the aid regime of course. They would, if they could – who wouldn't? But they eke out their existence under a veiled (and often not so veiled) threat of intimidation, punishment and even death. In order to overturn the state of aid-dependency, Africans need the gritty defiance of the unknown man who stood against the Chinese tanks in Tiananmen Square in June 1989. But such a rebellion carried enormous risk, and when pitted against the omnipotent state, more likely than not, will fail. This leaves it to Western citizens. They have power, and could hold the key to reform. It was, after all, thanks to the 60,000 ordinary Americans who wrote to the US Congress laying out their desire for freer trade access for African countries that the AGOA was born. It is this type of activism that is needed to help jump-start Africa's development agenda, and set it on the right track.' (p. 149).

There is certainly a role for Western citizens to play in holding their governments, banks and multi-national companies accountable for the unfair trading rules of an unjust economic system that also includes the WTO. Such Western citizens must also encourage the loot that resides in Western bank accounts as a result of African dictators safeguarding money that belongs to African people, to be returned to the African majority.

Yet, to argue that challenging aid-dependency lies with Western citizens to 'jump-start Africa's development' is to make African people passive subjects in a process of economic transformation that African people should ultimately be in control of. In addition, Africa has many unknown men and women who have stood against the crushing forces of the state, in a similar way to the unknown Chinese man. The deaths of hundreds of Ethiopians in 2005, Kenyans in 2006 and Zimbabweans in 2008 are testimony to African people's active desire for reform of their societies.

Moyo claims to outline 'another way for Africa' yet her proposals will continue to perpetuate the neo-colonial system many African countries continue to be entrapped by. The challenge for any African leadership with the political will and courage to embrace Tandon's seven steps is to do so within a Pan-Africanist vision and in collaboration with other African countries within a medium to long-term timescale.

Ama Biney