

This PDF is auto-generated for reference only. As such, it may contain some conversion errors and/or missing information. For all formal use please refer to the official version on the website, as linked below.

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests Are Being Met?

<https://www.e-ir.info/2009/08/15/a-liberal-structure-for-realist-uses-international-development-and-the-question-of-whose-interests-are-being-met/>

ANDREW BLENCOWE, AUG 15 2009

The relations of states are marred by divisions between its primary units, states. It is rare to find states that are more than just superficially similar. These differences, though, do not mean that any group of people are more or less important than another, simply they reflect the diversity that exists in the world. Many of these differences are self-imposed or in other words, created by the social distinctions that we place on ourselves. One such example is the apparent distinction between developed and underdeveloped states. Currently there is a massive divide between rich and powerful states and those that make up the remainder, who have weak economies and little influence globally. At the same time, this divide can be traced to the regional and historical differences amongst states. The global North is home to a disproportionate number of “developed” states, while in the South, underdevelopment is a common occurrence. This reality can be traced through history following the search for new worlds and resources. Many of the states in the North were colonial powers in the past, searching out riches from the South. A pattern of exploitation developed that continues to exist today. Following the end of colonialism, it was commonly believed that the states of the South would be able to “catch up” to their Northern counterparts. Certainly, many Southern states were able to develop quickly and establish independent and strong socio-economic structures. However, many did not and are still struggling to do so today.

International development assistance has established itself as the common answer to this problem. States are recognizing the importance of the growing inter-connections between them and working to promote growth in underdeveloped states. Constructs of international development are increasingly being included in the foreign policies of states and other international bodies. Underdeveloped states have become the battlegrounds for issues like conflict and climate change and as such, global actors are recognizing the importance that promoting development and growth in these states has on the preservation of international order and to the success of all. This paper will examine the currently accepted liberal concept of international development assistance, assessing what development is, who is involved and how it has developed into its current form. This examination will then critique this mainstream perception through the lens of realist political thought, making conclusions as to an alternative understanding of international development assistance and its role in the study of international political economy.

What is International Development?

The creation of a comprehensive definition of development is a contested issue in current dialogue on the subject. What actually is development and how can it be defined? It is difficult to create a single statement that can encompass the multitude of factors and instances in which development is said to occur. Development processes vary as much as the societies that partake in them. Development can however be understood as a set of principles that drive the many different components it can entail.

It is foremost important to understand what international development is not. Development “is not just a question of a one-off process of change to something better, but implies a process which builds on itself, where change is

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests

Written by Andrew Blencowe

continuous and where improvements build on previous improvements" (Thomas 24). This continuous process is neither limited by calculations of time or place nor is it relegated to being a solely economic or political process. International development is very much a process within international political economy for "it is concerned, first of all, with the relationships between the economic and political domains across territorial boundaries. Second, attention should be paid to the role of the state as the focus of decision-making in a system of competitive states that is, in turn, interdependent within a transnational market economy" (Underhill 7). This economic focus is the result of international development's origin.

Development can be said to be as old as history, but for the purposes of this paper, international development can be traced to the aftermath of the Second World War. Europe, post-1945, was in shambles following six years of wanton death and destruction. The United States emerged from the war as the new hegemon in world affairs and sought to ensure its favour amongst the tattered remains of Western Europe. This manifested itself in the form of the Marshall Plan whose

primary goal was spurring economic growth. But over the years, our conception of development has changed. While growth is still viewed as essential to the development process, 'development' has become more focused over the years on poverty alleviation, and its definition has widened to include criteria such as 'basic human needs' (such as food, health, and education) and 'capabilities' (such as the ability to partake in the life of one's community) (Kanbur et al. 9).

International development has become a process of improving the aspects of a person or society's existence.

But how can development be quantified or analyzed? Those who are the subject of development know what they need and those providing the development assistance have their own concept of what the assistance or goals should entail. The common link is that they both possess a sense of meliorism. Ronald Scott, jr., of the Leading-Edge Research Institute, defines this "as the innate desire of a society to improve its conditions; and if help is needed, it must also be wanted. This particular definition is important because meliorism has been defined by others as the innate desire of a society to improve another society's conditions based on the former's set of values" (Scott Jr. 341). It can, however, be generally accepted amongst all parties that, "over the long term it implies increased living standards, improved health and well-being for all, and the achievements of whatever is regarded as a general good for society at large" (Thomas 23).

International development is very much a product of liberal theory; "the underlying assumption of political liberalism is the intrinsic value of individuals as the primary actors in the international system. Liberalism is thus permeated with a concern for enhancing the freedom and welfare of individuals" (Underhill 13). Development can be viewed then, in this context, as the process in which people are able to improve their freedom and welfare, both personally and through society. As stated previously, economics plays an influential role in the ability to increase one's freedoms and welfare. It is of no coincidence that those states that are deemed to be "developed" are also the ones that tend to be richer and have strong economies. One can even go as far as saying that "the decisive role in defining development practice are the norms of a liberal international economic order (LIEO). In most general terms, these norms involve a commitment to free markets, private property and individual incentive, and a circumscribed role for government" (Gore 792).

Development then refers to processes that create the environments for people to prosper and acquire the ability to provide for themselves. "Mahubal Haq, founder of UNDP's *Human Development Report*, a series issued annually since 1990, explains: 'the basic purpose of development is to enlarge peoples' choices' " *Creating Value for All: Strategies for Doing Business with the Poor* 20). According to the most recent report, "development is about people. It is about expanding peoples' real choices and the substantive freedoms – the capabilities – that enable them to lead lives they value" (*Human Development Report 2007/2008* 24).

In terms of international development's foundation in liberal thought, it can be assigned to the subsection known as social welfare liberalism, which "maintains that the basic necessities of life should be provided for those who are truly in need, for those who are unable to provide for themselves through no fault of their own" (Smith 44).

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests?

Written by Andrew Blencowe

In the current climate of world affairs, international development has become more important than ever. Poverty has become rampant across much of the globe and more than ever the difference between being developed and developing is staggering. There

are more hungry people in the world than ever before, and their numbers are increasing. So are the numbers who cannot read or write, the numbers without safe water or safe and sound homes, and the numbers short of wood fuel with which to cook and warm themselves. The gap between rich and poor nations is widening – not shrinking – and there is little prospect, given present trends and institutional arrangements, that this process will be reversed (World Commission on Environment and Development 260).

Thus, international development can be understood as a process, both economic and political, influenced by liberal theory whereby actors participate in order to create the conditions for the gap between developed and underdeveloped societies to be lessened.

Who is Involved?

It is suitable, considering the complexity of defining international development, that the actors that participate in this process are just as varied as the definitions. Furthermore, the roles that these actors play can differ depending on the situation and who exactly is involved.

The public sector is the predominant party involved in the pursuit of development both home and abroad. Actors within the public sector include international organizations, governments, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). One major source of international development assistance is international organizations. These include organizations like the United Nations or the European Union and international financial institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In terms of their assistance “multilateral development banks mainly provide loans. The UN, European Union, and bilateral donors, however, primarily supply grants. Around three-quarters of the total concessional assistance of bilateral donors is in the form of grants. These grants support a broad range of activities, including sustainable development projects, education programs, technology transfers, food relief, and emerging assistance” (Clapp & Dauvergne 210-11). These bodies are important to international development because of their ability to generate support beyond that which individual actors can.

Non-governmental actors have begun to play an increasingly important role in international development thanks to growth in telecommunication communications technologies. These technologies have increased global awareness of international issues and created an environment where people can mobilize large grass-roots efforts to address these issues. They “are transnational bodies exercising a special type of authority called rational voluntarism. They employ limited resources to make rules, set standards, propagate principles, and broadly represent ‘humanity’ vis-à-vis states and other actors. Unlike states NGOs lack the rational-legal authority to make or enforce law [and] unlike global corporations, they have few economic resources” (Boli & Thomas 14). These organizations, because they are not as financially able as states or the private sector are to promote development, have focused the majority of their efforts on specializing in specific issues or ideals and working at the grass-roots level. The presence of NGOs does not present itself as a challenge the sovereignty of recipient nations for NGOs are more actively engaged in incorporating the local societies in the efforts rather than the traditional top down engagement pursued through state actors.

Then there are the traditional actors in international development, the state. Governments play an important role in promoting international development, both as donors and recipients. Donor governments promote international development abroad through the granting of foreign aid. This can be defined as support given to developing countries to promote economic, social and political growth. Aid could take the form of debt forgiveness, humanitarian aid, multilateral ODA or bilateral development projects. The developed nations of the world, who compose the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), provide much of this aid through the provision of Official Development Assistance (ODA). The nations of the OECD have committed to provide ODA in amounts of at least 0.7% of their GDP. Sadly, in 2007, only 5 of the 22 member states fulfilled this commitment (OECD 6). This threshold, while generally acknowledged as being important, has seen only limited engagement, which in turn is likely

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests

Written by Andrew Blencowe

to have had a negative impact on prospects for development. In domestic politics, governments routinely act as a buffer between the interests of the private sphere and the interests of all its citizens. The aim is to promote economic growth while ensuring the welfare of the citizenry. The same applies in international development; “the rationale for involving government in social protection, rather than leaving action to the private sector, relates to the inability of the private sector, unaided, to solve two problems: firstly the low level of income (and hence high poverty) of some individuals or groups, and secondly the vulnerability of others to transient poverty due to high variability of incomes and lack of effective consumption smoothing strategies” (Norton et al 25). This does not, however, mean that the public sector does not have a role in international development.

The private sector’s involvement in international development is to promote economic growth with the intention that human development will emerge from this growth. This has largely taken the form of public-private relationships, which are agreements between the traditional bodies (states and international organizations) and corporations in the private sector. These partnerships have grown as a result of the increasing “disillusionment with the UN and its agencies. Concerns about the effectiveness of the UN, including increasing evidence of overlapping mandates and interagency competition, led directly towards the establishment of partnerships to deal with specific and limited issues” (Buse and Walt). These partnerships allow for the strategic combining of the economic assets of private corporations with the legitimacy and access that the public sector can provide, which theoretically should have a positive effect on the advancement of the development process. Despite the differences that exist between the parties, the end goal is relatively the same for all those involved. “Most donor agencies see their role as supporting long-term reductions in poverty, which offers an eventual reduction in the need for aid, rather than providing protection of livelihoods, especially where such assistance has characteristics of a recurrent service with no clear exit” (Norton et al 36).

A common trend that has emerged is that the majority of the parties that provide assistance for development come from a select group. It is “the rich and powerful who are in the position to be able to promote development. [Unfortunately,] they are likely to do so in ways which benefit themselves” (Thomas 4). Each of these types of actors may have the same goal in mind but their motivations are quite different. “Why should the world’s richest countries support the efforts of its poorest countries to adapt to [development issues]? The human development case for urgent international action is rooted in the ethical, social and economic implications” that are inherent in the problems that development attempts to address (*Human Development Report 2007/2008* 185). But why then would the private sector be interested in promoting international development. Simply put, “the private sector is central to the lives of the poor because all poor people are consumers, and because most earn income in the private sector, whether by working for a business or by running one” (*Creating Value for All: Strategies for Doing Business with the Poor* 16). Corporations can build favour and customer bases by ensuring that people in developing societies have the ability to acquire the goods and services they need to survive, including those that the involved corporations may sell.

Given the recent global economic problems, “governments, academics and multilateral institutions are now debating the proposition that new global institutional arrangements are needed in a world of increased economic volatility (seen in both commodity relations and capital flows), and are examining the implications of such change for economic and social policy” (Norton et al 26). This type of collaboration is essential to ensure that the international development agenda is not threatened by economic problems emanating from the developed world.

The Growth of International Development

International development has not always been in the form it takes today. As previously mentioned, development began in the aftermath of the Second World War out of the need to rebuild Western Europe. In an attempt to challenge the spread of communism in the post-war period, the United States and its allies began efforts to rebuild the economies of Western Europe. “Development was now a ‘euphemism’ used to refer to United States hegemony, and it was ideals and ‘programs’ from the United States and its (Western) European allies which would form the basis of development everywhere” (Thomas 5). At this point development’s nature was international in that the actors were trying to develop states other than their own but it did not reflect the level of globalization that it has become. “Mainstream explanations of the development process and evaluative judgments of the goals of development were both conducted within a national frame of reference” (Gore 791). Promoting international trade was not as important

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests?

Written by Andrew Blencowe

as building stable, national economies. These rebuilt economies would reflect liberal qualities to combat against the spread of communist ideals.

As the Cold War waned and the threat of communism lessened, a new trend in international development arose, based on the growing popularity of neo-liberal economic theory, called the Washington Consensus. Much like the initial stages of development, this practice was rooted in the political and economic aims of US policymakers in Washington, D.C.; hence the name. "Rather than combining normative economic nationalism with a methodological internationalism, the Washington Consensus was its mirror image. It combined normative economic internationalism with a methodologically nationalist form of explanation which attributed what was happening within countries mainly to national factors and policies" (Gore 792). The idea behind this policy agenda was to promote development through the economic side of development. "The main types of policy changes called for were those that opened up developing-country economies to the world economy. The purpose was to facilitate trade and investment and ultimately economic growth" (Clapp & Dauvergne 203-4). The Consensus prescribed that developing countries cut government spending through the privatization of state-run corporations and attract foreign investment through the removal of protectionist barriers (e.g. taxes, tariffs, legislation, etc) in the attempt to create a positive trade balance. This was done to promote international investment and trade; the reason being that this would help to build strong economies by attracting investment, pumping financial assets into the developing economies. The Washington Consensus policies became popular amongst actors in international development for two reasons: 1) the policies were adopted by major international financial institutions and, 2) these policies produced favourable outcomes for donor countries. The World Bank and the IMF, being the two predominant sources of multilateral development aid, adopted the policies of the Consensus. This was largely influenced by the power that the United States wields within these bodies. The US favoured these policies and used its influence to guide the World Bank and IMF to follow suit. This was manifested in the form of Structural Adjustment Programs instituted by these bodies and meant to help address the international debt crisis and promote economic development through the granting of loans. "These structural adjustment loans have enabled the IMF and World Bank to wield considerable influence over economic policies and outcomes in poor regions of the world. Not only are these agencies themselves a significant source of funds to developing countries, but their policy advice also influences other development banks as well as donor states" (Clapp & Dauvergne 203). Other sources of development aid began to require that applicant states adopt these policies and receive approval from the IMF and World Bank before they could qualify for any assistance programs.

Unfortunately, these policies subjected the fate of citizens in developing nations to the exploitive nature of the private sphere. Developing countries "argued that exploitation by global capitalists was a core reason for their high levels of poverty in the first place. Global economic institutions were singled out for pushing them to export raw materials on declining terms of trade. [This led] many developing countries to call for global economic reforms as part of efforts to solve" international development and environmental issues" (Clapp & Dauvergne 56).

Current realities have forced concepts of development to evolve to account for new challenges and problems. International development practice can no longer allow for the exploitation of developing countries and their resources because its long-term effects are not sustainable.

Noting that a large proportion of the world's population still lived in poverty, that there were grave disparities in patterns of resource use between rich and poor countries, and that global ecosystems were already suffering acute stress, [the development community has] called for an international consensus to re-orient economic activity in order to privilege the urgent development needs of the poor and to prevent irreversible damage to the environment (Meadowcroft 267).

This has led to the evolution of "sustainable development" or development that promotes growth while accommodating for long-term realities including environmental impact and patterns of poverty. This means "the current view of the developmental state can be encapsulated in the concept of good governance, in which the state connects to citizens, civil society, and the private sector in ways that enable socio-economic progress but also are characterized by accountability, transparency, responsiveness, participation, and equity" (Brinkerhoff 987).

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests

Written by Andrew Blencowe

This shift away from the neo-liberal policies and towards the ideals of sustainable development can largely be attributed to the outcomes of the Millennium Conference. “In 2001, the UN-sponsored summit set forth eight goals known as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These goals are designed to reduced poverty and promote sustainable human development in direct response to globalization. For each substantive goal (poverty reduction, better education, improved health, environmental sustainability, and global partnerships), there are specific targets, time frames and performance indicators with an implementation plan” (Mingst 271-2) — see Appendix A. This concept of development has been accepted by the United Nations and much of the international and academic community as the next step towards ending poverty and under-development. International development actors have begun to work towards a widespread adoption of these ideals. However, some powerful actors, like the World Bank and the IMF, are clinging to their Washington Consensus perspectives and this is an influential reason why evidence of sustainable development practices is not presenting itself as quickly as many desire. It is important to note, though, that “the MDGs are not a complete human development agenda, they reflect a sense of urgency and define a set of shared priorities” that hopefully establish itself as being the common understanding in international development” (*Human Development Report 2007/2008*, 185). These priorities, though, should not be confused with the motives of participatory states.

Realism in International Development

This paper, so far, has established what international development is, who is involved, and how development is pursued. But why is development such an important issue? What makes it so important that it has become an integral component of the relations of nations? This section will show how international development can be attributed to understandings in realist political thought. A pioneer in realist political thought, Hans J. Morgenthau, believed that “international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever the ultimate aims of international politics, power is the immediate aim” (Morgenthau 27). Power can mean many things in terms of this reference; it can mean political influence, wealth, manpower and/or military strength. For Morgenthau, “the main signpost that helps political realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest in terms of power” (Morgenthau 5). This means that actors’ decisions are driven by the calculation of whether they have the ability to use their power to achieve their interests. The actors that realism refers to are states and states alone. States are the only actors deemed reliable by realism due to the inherent nature of the relations of nations. Realists “recognize that communal bonds are fragile and easily undermined by the unrestrained pursuit of unilateral advantage by individuals, factions, and states. When this happens, time-honoured mechanisms of conflict management like alliances and the balance of power may not only fail to preserve the peace but may make domestic and international violence more likely” (Lebow 257). The international community is anything but civil; it is anarchic and driven by self-interest. However, this does not mean that states won’t interact with each other, just that they only do so when they feel it benefits them the most. “For realists, coalitions are useful for improving one’s chances for favourably influencing the future distribution of national capabilities” (Mowle 569). When the power a state has is not enough, it is perfectly acceptable to align with other states in order to increase the chances of securing one’s interests.

International development assistance “has, through its history, been driven by more than a concern for development and development strategy. It has also been driven by the political, economic, and institutional circumstances of both donors and recipients, which have led them to engage in development assistance” (Kanbur et al. 16). For the purposes of this analysis, the array of international development actors described previously (states, international organizations and non-governmental actors) will be considered legitimate actors in international politics. This may contradict the fact that political realism considers states to be the only legitimate actor but this paper’s conception of actors will reflect current realities in the relations of nations. Development assistance, from the perspective of realism, is an excellent way to acquire the power and influence necessary to pursue one’s interests. Development practices can achieve this by building goodwill, influencing domestic policies both home and abroad and, in building communities of nations with favourable policies towards donors.

International development assistance is an excellent way to build the diplomatic credit or “soft power” that has become a necessity for achieving one’s interests in today’s international community.

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests

Written by Andrew Blencowe

In March 2008, retired Marine Corps General Anthony Zinni and Navy Admiral Leighton Smith testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of a budget increase for the State Department and USAID. Zinni and Smith said, 'we know that the 'enemies' in the world today are actually conditions – poverty, infectious disease, political turmoil and corruption, environmental and energy challenges' (Atwood et al 2).

Rather than continue the past trend of using military means to battle the world's current problems, developmental assistance is becoming more and more relevant to achieving peace. The use of "hard power" or gun barrel diplomacy has developed a negative reputation in international politics. States are favouring it less and less as an effective means to ensure one's interests. It does not make sense to pursue peace and security by waging war, especially when the causes of violence are, more and more, reflecting the observations of Zinni and Smith. International development can address the grievances of those disaffected peoples that conflict surrounds. "Doing business with poor people empowers them demonstrably both as individuals and communities. By raising awareness, by providing basic education, by including groups that have been discriminated against and by conferring new hope and pride, inclusive [development] models can give people the confidence and strength to escape poverty" (*Creating Value for All: Strategies for Doing Business with the Poor* 23). Helping these peoples is not only beneficial to the international security interests of a state but also the reputation of states that is essential for developing effective diplomatic ties.

Having a strong reputation as a proponent of development gives the impression of benevolent intentions, whether or not the true intentions are such. Noted scholar in conflict and international relations, UBC professor Michael Byers, argues "if developed countries were to redirect just a portion of their currently military budgets to overseas development assistance (ODA), the number of armed conflicts and humanitarian crises would almost certainly decrease" (Byers 121). This is very much an issue of public image. Being especially active in providing international development assistance looks well on states and this image is important to building credibility and influence in diplomatic circles. This is why the concept of providing 0.7% of GDP in foreign aid is given so much attention. Those states that do not reach this threshold, which is most of the OECD countries, suffer blemishes on their records of involvement that are routinely used against them in policy discussions. Realists "posit that all states should seek opportunities to improve their relative positions and that states should strive for power even if their goal is merely to preserve their own independence" (Mingst 66). International development assistance is a means to this end; Byers contends, "overseas development assistance is not charity. It is the price we pay for 'soft power,' the ability to persuade rather than coerce. Soft power is the principle currency of diplomacy" (Byers 123). Therefore, it is in the best interests of states to actively engage in international development assistance because of its ability to build soft power diplomacy, which in turn increases the amount of power a state may use to achieve its interests.

International Development can also be used by actors to achieve domestic conditions, both home and abroad, which are in their best interests. It is a common practice in international development for states to "use economic statecraft – both positive and negative sanctions – to try to influence other states. Positive sanctions involve offering a 'carrot', enticing the target state to act in a desired way by rewarding moves made in the desired direction. The assumption is that positive incentives will lead the target it to change its behaviour" to follow the policies of the donor state (Mingst 114). This has traditionally been found in the private sector's development activities. This takes the form of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), which is investment by foreign entities into the domestic economies of states. This can have an immense impact on developing economies because of the desire by the developing states to attract foreign investors. The prominence of FDI has followed the growth of multinational corporations (MNCs) in the international market. These sources of investment bring large quantities of wealth, both in material resources and in employment, to developing nations. This wealth is important to the stability and prospective growth in developing markets. Because of this, investors and their governments are able to influence the economic and political policies of the recipient states. They can ensure that these policies are favourable to them by using the threat of pulling out their investments to influence policymakers. Usually divestment like this would have a crippling effect on the domestic economy and threaten any existing or prospective development.

The provision of tied-aid can be used, as well, to achieve its interests. Tied-aid refers to the provision of foreign aid to developing states with the condition that it is used to purchase goods or services from the donor country. This effectively limits the ability of the recipient to utilize the aid while ensuring profitable outcomes for firms in the donor

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests

Written by Andrew Blencowe

country. By tying the aid that states give, they are able to build domestic support from within their own country. Realism, “domestically, demands that the state meet and overcome challenges from, and maintain the support of, societal groups and coalitions” (Mastanduno et al 459). It is much easier to gain popular support for the granting of aid when tangible economic returns are apparent. Greater support means that more aid can be given more often, which can then help to build the soft power that states use to build the influence that states use to achieve their interests.

Lastly, the provision of international development assistance can help to build policy communities that are favourable to a state's interests. A perfect example of this is development of the Washington Consensus and neo-liberal economic policies. These concepts in international development assistance arose out of the pursuit of national interests by the United States. The bodies largely responsible for the mobilization of the Washington Consensus, the IMF and World Bank, became tools for the United States to pursue their interests. By donating large amounts of money for development to these bodies, the United States was able to establish their policies as the dominant policies in international development. This effectively meant that major international development institutions were acting in the political and economic interests of the United States; an unheard of reality in international politics.

Thus, international development assistance is an excellent way to follow realist political theory and base international political decisions on the pursuit of national interests and the power necessary to achieve them. By providing assistance for development, states can build their international influence, achieve favourable policies at home and abroad and build an international community that allows them to succeed in achieving their political and economic ends.

Conclusion

International development has become the favoured path to addressing the glaring differences between underdeveloped states and the rest of the world. It has replaced colonialism and military intervention as the most conducive way to transformational change within foreign communities. Initially state-oriented, international development has grown to reflect the current realities in international political economy, including new concepts and actors into its mainstream conceptions. While difficult to define, international development has embraced the liberal concepts popular at its inception and endeavoured to create a better, more just international community.

However, it is critical to understand that while international development may be structured upon liberal concepts, the motivation to use it is directly influenced by realist thought. Those who understand this, realize that international development is merely another tool in the proverbial toolbox of statesmen and global actors. It is an effective way to create the conditions necessary to best secure one's interests. Therefore, international development should be understood, in the long tradition of Hans J. Morgenthau, as the future means to the development of power necessary to acquire one's interests in international affairs.

Appendix A

Millennium Development Goals

Goal 1 Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

Target 1. Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day

Target 2. Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

Goal 2 Achieve universal primary education

Target 3. Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

Goal 3 Promote gender equality and empower women

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests?

Written by Andrew Blencowe

Target 4. Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015

Goal 4 Reduce child mortality

Target 5. Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate

Goal 5 Improve maternal health

Target 6. Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio

Goal 6 Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases

Target 7. Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS

Target 8. Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

Goal 7 Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 9. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources

Target 10. Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation

Target 11. Have achieved by 2020 a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

Goal 8 Develop a global partnership for development

Target 12. Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system (includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction (both nationally and internationally))

Target 13. Address the special needs of the Least Developed Countries (includes tariff- and quota-free access for Least Developed Countries' exports, enhanced program of debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries [HIPC] and cancellation of official bilateral debt, and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction)

Target 14. Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing states (through the Program of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and 22nd General Assembly provisions)

Target 15. Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term

Some of the indicators listed below are monitored separately for the least developed countries, Africa, landlocked developing countries, and small island developing states

Target 16. In cooperation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth

Target 17. In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries

Target 18. In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications technologies

[Source: UN Millennium Project]

Works Cited

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests?

Written by Andrew Blencowe

"Goals and Targets," *Millennium Development Goals 2006*. UN Millennium Project. Accessed 20 Nov 2008
http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/reports/goals_targets.htm.

Atwood, J Brian, M Peter McPherson and Andrew Natsios. "Arrested Development." *Foreign Affairs*. 87,6(2008): 123-132.

Boli, John and George M. Thomas. *Constructing World Culture*. 1st ed. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. "The State and International Development Management: Shifting Tides, Changing Boundaries, and Future Directions." *Public Administration Review*. 68,6(2008): 985-1001.

Buse, K. and G. Walt. "Global Public-private partnerships: part I – a new development in health." *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 78,4(2000):
http://www.scielo.org/scielo.php?pid=S0042-9686200000400019&script=sci_arttext&lng=en.

Byers, Michael. *Intent for a Nation: What is Canada For?* 1st ed. Vancouver: Douglas & MacIntyre Ltd, 2007.

Clapp, Jennifer, and Peter Dauvergne. *Paths to a Green World: The Political Economy of the Global Environment*. 1st ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.

Gore, Charles. "The Rise and Fall of the Washington Consensus as a Paradigm for Developing Countries." *World Development*. 28,5(2000): 789-804.

Kanbur, Ravi, Todd Sandler and Kevin W. Morrison. *The Future of Development Assistance: Common Pools and International Public Goods*. ODC Policy Essay No. 25. 1999.

Lebow, Richard Ned. *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders*. 1st ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Mastanduno, Michael, David A. Lake and G. John Ikenberry. "Toward a Realist Theory of State Action." *International Studies Quarterly* 33(1989): 457-474.

Meadowcroft, James. "Sustainable Development: A New(ish) Idea for a New Century?" *Debating the Earth: The Environmental Politics Reader*. Ed. John S. Dryzek and David Schlosberg. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Mingst, Karen A. *Essentials of International Relations*. 4th ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 3rd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Mowle, Thomas S. "Worldviews in Foreign Policy: Realism, Liberalism, and External Conflict." *Political Psychology*. 24,3(2003): 561-592.

Norton, Andy, Tim Conway and Mick Foster. Overseas Development Institute. Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure. *Social Protection Concepts and Approaches: Implications for Policy and Practice in International Development*. London: 2001.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Development Co-operation Directorate. *Aid Targets Slipping Out of Reach?* Paris: 2008.

Scott, Jr., Ronald J. "International Development in a Complex Adaptive System." *Public Affairs Quarterly*. Fall(2008): 339-366.

A Liberal Structure for Realist Uses: International Development and the Question of Whose Interests?

Written by Andrew Blencowe

Smith, Peter J. "Modern Political Ideologies." *Critical Concepts: an introduction to politics*. Ed. Janine Brodie. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 2002.

Thomas, Alan. "Poverty and the 'End of Development'." *Poverty and Development into the 21st Century*. Ed. Tim Allen and Alan Thomas. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Underhill, Geoffrey R.D.. "Conceptualizing the Changing Global Order." *Political Economy and the Changing Global Economy*. Ed. Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2006.

United Nations. United Nations Development Programme. *Creating Value for All: Strategies for Doing Business with the Poor*. New York: 2008.

United Nations. United Nations Development Programme. *Human Development Report 2007/2008*. New York: 2007.

World Commission on Environment and Development. "From One Earth to One World." *Debating the Earth: The Environmental Politics Reader*. Ed. John S. Dryzek and David Schlosberg. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2006.

—

Written By: Andrew Blencowe
Written For: Dr. G. Martin
Written at: Mount Allison University
Date Written: Dec. 1, 2008

About the author:

Andrew Blencowe completed his Bachelor's degree at Mount Allison University and his MA in Political Science at the University of Waterloo, both of which are in Canada. Andrew has been a Contributing Editor of e-International Relations since September 2009