Chapter 1: Key concepts and analytical approach

What is immediately clear in beginning to research the LDC category within UN development discourse is the glaring absence of academic literature on the subject of the LDC category. In the years since this project commenced in 1999, the situation hasn't changed. While there is material produced about the category by governments[5] and UN agencies, and there are no analytic studies describing the evolution and changes in the development of this category, there are no analytic works exploring the linkages between shifts in policy emphasis of the LDC category with the wider debates within development discourse, or indeed international relations. Mawdsley and Rigg (2002) observed a similar absence of discourse analysis in their survey of the World Bank's World Development Reports 1978 to 2002.

This absence of academic work on this rich source of material about development continues to be a source of curiosity. Why is it that the UN's international LDC policy focusing on alleviating poverty in a group of countries defined and categorized as the poorest of the poor has not attracted academic researchers? Why is it that the disjunction between the continued international LDC policy efforts by the UN and the development trajectory of these LDC countries towards an increasing and entrenched socioeconomic poverty over the last 30 years has not caught the attention of development research specialists and analysts to examine the LDC category? Particularly as there are now extensive bodies of research into poverty alleviation strategies and efforts by international institutions such as the World Bank (Ferguson 1990; Mawdsley and Rigg 2002; Shepherd 2001) and the United Nations Agencies (Hyndman 1998; Wolfe 1996) and those of bilateral donors (Edwards and Hulme 1998; Lensink and White 1999) and non-government organisations (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Fernando 1997). These questions are not ones for me to answer, but they are a driver behind the longevity of my personal interest in this particular project. They have also defined the research approach required, and its difficulties.

This chapter begins with an outline of the research methodology, focusing on the primary texts and archival material located and examined in undertaking this thesis research. This discussion on research methodology outlines the primary document research and the key sources used. The chapter then locates this archival material as a product of development discourse, by moving through an outline of the postmodern-influenced readings of development as discourse and gender and development that have influenced the thesis. I then introduce the concept of the technologies of knowledge that will be drawn upon in the ensuring three chapters. This is located explicitly within Foucauldian theory, and linked with Escobar's use

[5] See Productivity Commission (2002) for an example of national government study. This is an assessment of the impact on the Australian economy and businesses of removing tariffs on LDC exported goods to Australia.

of Foucauldian theory in his analyses of development as discourse. The chapter is then divided into two key sections, titled 'Analysing gender' and 'Analysing development'. The section' Analysing gender' locates the approach to gender analysis used in the thesis within the rich and diverse trajectory of feminist engagements with development. The discussion then links the three main approaches within development studies, Women in Development (WID), Women and Development (WAD), and Gender and Development (GAD), and the post-colonial critiques of these three approaches. This section then introduces the approach used to gender analysis in the thesis, before outlining a key premise of the approach, the feminisation of poverty. The section 'Analysing development' begins with various definitions of development, and then outlines key models of development theory: the modernisation and dependency schools. The section then moves into a discussion of post-development critiques of development, which link development discourse with Western European enlightenment metanarratives. It then moves through a discussion of three core elements of development discourse: with the concepts of poverty, planning and progress that are identifiable in the LDC development discourse. It concludes with a discussion of Shestra's tale of being introduced to development as discourse and praxis that demonstrates the discursive dependence of development on these three concepts and their transformative interaction with local cultures.

Accessing the archives

Given the absence of secondary literature on LDC category and policy, the dominant research methodology has been primary document research. This has led to a strong emphasis on identifying and recording debates and issues as outlined in these primary documents to establish the basis for analysis and discussion. The research for Chapter 2 involved locating and examining in detail the UN's three decade long policies for LDCs adopted in 1981, 1991 and 2001. I was able to attend the 2001 UN Conference on the Least Developed Countries as a representative of the World YWCA, an international women's organisation with consultative status at the United Nations and participated as a member of the NGO Gender Caucus. The experience of observing the dynamics in the UN production of a policy text, particularly seeing who is heard and when, led me to identify, analyse and question LDC development texts' discursive authority. In accordance with feminist research methodologies that use self-reflexivity to locate the researcher, I have considered my own position, as one with a physical voice present in the discussion where the text was negotiated. I have contrasted this with the position of those whom the text is about and for but who were not present. This disparity and power inequity this identified gives this process of questioning the authority of the LDC discourse even more urgency.

The research for Chapter 3 involved significant documentary research. The history of the development debates and changes within the LDC category are found in the minutes and reports of the United Nations Committee for Development Planning. Created in 1965, this Committee reports to the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and since the creation of the category of LDC in 1971, has been mandated by ECOSOC to monitor the international development socio-economic context of LDCs, and assess the composition and criterion used within

the LDC category. The research has involved sifting through years of musty yellowed UN documents. A number of early records of this Committee's operation have not been available to this research project, as they have been lost, misplaced or destroyed in Australian collections[6]. The assistance of librarians at the State Library of South Australia and the State Library of New South Wales has been invaluable in locating records of the meetings of this Committee in the 1980s and onwards, and the associated resolutions within the United Nations Economic and Social Council. This research project has used ECOSOC records as the primary material for the Committee's early work from 1965. I have undertaken a thorough reading of reports from the United Nations Committee for Development Planning (UNCDP), now known as the Committee for Development Policy, for the twenty-three year period 1981- 2004.

The main objective of this primary research for Chapters 2 and 3 has been to look at the ways in which the boundaries of the category LDC have changed, in terms of the criteria which define it, and in terms of the way in which it has been both a chart of the increased prevalence of poverty in the world, through the increase of countries within the category, and the way in which the pressures to shift the measurement of the category have been a result of individual countries seeking to join the grouping for the perceived benefits it can accrue to them. The primary source documents that are available have been able to illustrate this over the last two decades.

The research for Chapter 4 involved close examination of the two most recent Least Developed Country reports produced by United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) from 2002 and 2004. This has focused Chapter 4 on the most recent approaches and data available. I should note that these reports have no formal relationship informing the work of the UNCDP in administering the LDC category. The differences in the historical approach adopted to the examination of the UNCDP activities and the international policy documents and the shorter-term approach to the data analysis is a result of the research process itself. The initial focus of this thesis was the three ten-year international LDC programmes of action documents, which sparked an interest in the institutional practices and organisations that were associated with the LDC category, their origin and changes to the category over time. This institutional context for LDC category administration became a major focus of the research and analysis processes. The examination of data on LDCs began as a tool to gain a sense of current poverty levels in LDCs after more than thirty years of efforts to address this via the LDC category and the three ten-year programmes of action. This examination was driven by concern as all three UN LDC policy texts talk about how poverty in LDCs has increased and I wanted to get a sense of what these new levels of poverty were. However far from obtaining a clear sense of poverty levels, the process of examining these data reports in the context of the UNCDP records and the international policy texts made me realise the discursive authority of data and the limited picture it presents within LDC development discourse. This is particularly the case in the way that data structures what is known within LDC

---

[6] As this is a Masters research thesis, I have focused my research efforts on library collections that are accessible within the available travel and time restrictions of part time study.

category development discourse about poverty in LDCs. The contemporary focus of the chapter on data provides connections with the current UN LDC policy 2001-2011 and the more recent meetings with the UNCDP, creating a means to feature contemporary LDC development discursive practices within this historical survey. This contemporary emphasis highlights that the issues of gender blind policy and practice, and discursive limitations to LDC analysis identified throughout this thesis, are not things of the past, but are very much of the here and now.

Approaching analysis

In this analysis, I have drawn insights from the work of others, but have not sought to re-apply in this case study of LDC category and policy an approach established and applied in other analyses of UN development discourses. Clearly a critical text is Ferguson's (1990) seminal analysis of World Bank policy and practice in Lesotho. Using the stark disjunction of established facts about Lesotho between academic historical discourse and a 1975 World Bank country report, Ferguson draws on Foucault to analyse the production of development knowledge. In this work Ferguson charts the making of Lesotho into a 'Less Developed Country', with specific attributes requiring specific forms of development assistance from the World Bank, and then maps the effects of this through the design assumptions and implementation effects of a five year joint World Bank–Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) development project.

This is a different LDC category to the category LDC that I am examining in this thesis. It is not simply a matter of different nomenclature in the acronym, 'Less' versus 'Least'. Lesotho is both a 'Less Developed Country' in the World Bank report analysed by Ferguson, and a 'Least Developed Country' according to the United Nations Committee for Development Planning (UNCDP). These two categories LDC are different in several ways. Firstly, there is the different institutional home, the World Bank and the UNCDP within the UN. Secondly, there is the role of these different institutions within development praxis, the World Bank as an implementing agency of development assistance, and the UNCDP as an observer, documenter and measurer of development trends. The effects of these differences are that the terms are used in different ways. The LDC characteristics identified by the World Bank form the basis of a poverty problem analysis that has direct links to a development fix or 'cure'. The UNCDP, without such a direct link to funded development activities, seeks to ensure that its recommendations and analysis have authority and credibility so they can exercise influence over development activities supported by national governments and development agencies. As a result the UNCDP attempts to increase the rigour of the criteria that determine category LDC and processes by which the criteria are applied.

These differences aside, Ferguson's analysis identifies some critical characteristics 'development' and of category LDC produced in the development discourse on Lesotho, which also appear in the discourse of this category LDC. Notably, Ferguson argues that the development discourse produces knowledge about Lesotho that means it is defined as a LDC, requiring "the technical, apolitical, 'development' intervention" (Ferguson 1990:28). The nature of the 'development' intervention is defined by Ferguson as the conflation of two distinct meanings: a

progression over time of a national economy to modern industrial capitalism and the alleviation or eradication of poverty amongst the population of a given nation state. Ferguson argues that the characteristics of Lesotho becoming a LDC requiring development assistance are that it has an 'aboriginal economy', is predominantly 'agricultural', has a 'national economy' and is subject to the principle of 'governmentality'. Another important linkage between the operations of the two categories LDC is the use of statistics to develop analysis that supports the argument that Lesotho is a LDC, which is explored in Chapter 3.

A critical point where my analysis departs from Ferguson's is the absence of gender analysis within his work. This thesis identifies a critical role for gender analysis. Asking the questions 'where are the women?' and 'who are the women?' exposes key constructs within development discourse, making an important entry point into analysis that does not repeat the assumed gender neutrality that development discourse frequently implicitly claims. Ferguson's work does not use any gender analysis in examining the effects of World Bank LDC policy and project effects in Lesotho. In this he continues the gender-blind traits of the World Bank's policy and project documents that are the subject of his study. This lack of attention to gender effects is interesting to note in itself, as by 1990 the prominence of gender analysis had been well established within development studies and praxis, but it also leads to some key questions about the World Bank work that are ignored in Ferguson's study. For example, Ferguson notes the history of predominantly male labour migration for wages, and contrasts this to the World Bank construction of the Lesotho population as farmers, but fails to note that this construction is gender blind. Critical questions about the gendered assumptions and effects within the World Bank policy paper and project are not raised or explored. Who are the farmers if 60% of the adult male labour force in Lesotho is waged labour in South Africa? What are the assumptions about who owns land, livestock and can get access to credit that are operating in project design and implementation? What are the impacts of these assumptions on the status of women?

Cooks and Isgro (2005) provide a useful example of analysis on UN policy that unlike Ferguson's work on LDCs, attempts to integrate gender analysis and development discourse analysis. This is outlined in their essay on the UN's 'Cyber Summit', the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). The texts analysed by Cooks and Isgro are those that were produced at the December 2003 WSIS, and the Preparatory Committee meetings in advance. Cooks and Isgro identify the assumptions about gender and development and Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) within these texts and to assess the policy biases that will influence funding decisions for future UN 'women and ICT' projects. This reading adapts a 'technology–context scheme' developed by Houston and Jackson (2003, cited in Cooks and Isgro 2005:4-5) to analyse the relationship between the use of ICTs in different contexts. This scheme identifies four different approaches and puts these forward as four quadrants of a methodological schema that can be applied to assess issues, projects and policies. Cooks and Isgro adapt this schema and include an explicit gender analysis, proposing four new quadrants of questions to apply in analysis: technological determinism; technology as change agent; context as a filter; and integration.

While ICT specific, this analysis provides a useful example of a method to analyse UN policy texts that seeks to link gender analysis and post-development recognition of the importance of culture. However it is it too mechanistic as a methodology to be useful in this exercise examining LDC category. Firstly, the neatness of the dividing lines between the four areas doesn't recognise the fluidity required of recognition of multiplicity, and the interaction between different factors. Secondly, there is little room to recognise the inherent fallibility of the analytic exercise: to paraphrase Lorde (1981), the master's tools are still being used to break down the master's house. The lack of recognition of the power/knowledge dynamic in discourse production in the Cooks and Isgro analysis means that the dominant discourse dynamics are unidentified and unexplored. The presented common-sense objectivity of UN policy is unquestioned (master's house), and a scientifically objective methodology applied (master's tools).

The analysis I am undertaking and this work by Cooks and Isgro share a commitment to question and analyse constructions of gender and development discourse in UN policy, recognising the influence policy has in fund allocation and development practice, but their reductionist approach is too confining. I prefer to think of the analysis in this thesis as raising questions and exploring issues rather than reducing analysis to an authoritative schema that defines the questions and responses in advance. This is precisely an example of how knowledge is produced, setting up limitations on what is seen as knowledge, what is valid, with the potential to exclude information that crosses borders between quadrants, or sits outside the boxes, and produces an analysis that conforms to the approach.

Drawing explicitly on Foucault, Apthorpe (1996) proposes a methodology for reading development policy using discourse analysis. Termed an 'emancipatory reading,' this methodology focuses on development policy and examines in particular the mechanisms of 'framing', 'naming', 'numbering' and 'coding' that operate within development policy, particularly within the writing of policy texts:

> This study views policy as being analysis as well as policy, and analysis as being policy as well as analysis. Deeply to read policy and analysis of policy is to find devices of framing, naming and numbering, the sense-making codes of composition, and the ways in which analysis and policy are driven as well as served by them. These devices and codes operate within and beyond the writing immediately in view. So a closer reading requires a total picture of reason, rules, responsibility, authority and community as well as just text, subtext and context. (Apthorpe 1996: 16-17)

It is the both the spirit and some elements of the proposed praxis of this 'emancipatory reading' that I will draw upon in the discussions of the processes of categorising and classifying; data analysis and policy texts as technologies of knowledge within LDC discourse.

Technologies of Knowledge

The phrase 'technologies of knowledge' is inspired by the work of Michel Foucault, and seeks to indicate the way regimes of knowledge are also bound up with material practices and physical structures in a nexus of power/knowledge, such that they can be accurately called 'technologies'. The development of Foucault's work involves an increasing recognition that the knowledges of the human sciences are not simply intellectual practices, but material practices with

outcomes in the real world, just as a theoretical knowledge of explosives has a 'technological' outcome in the production of weapons.

In *The Order of Things* ([1966] 1973), Foucault was concerned with "the two great discontinuities in the 'episteme' of Western culture" (Foucault 1973: xxii), the beginning of the Classical age in the mid-seventeenth century, and the beginning of the modern age at the start of the nineteenth century. His analysis focuses on the sciences of philology, biology and political economy, and is primarily concerned with the external boundaries and internal structures of these disciplines as systems of thought, with the limitations of what it is possible to think in a given episteme.

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* ([1966] 2004), Foucault laid out a methodological treatise for analysing the "rules of formation" of discourses of knowledge, and in particular, how discursive formations define their objects of study; produce authoritative speaking positions for their practitioners; lay out rules for the production of concepts; and produce strategies for the creation and expansion of knowledge (see *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Part 2, "The Discursive Regularities" (Foucault 2004: 21-85)). Here again, Foucault's primary focus is with the "conceptual foundation" of discourses, knowledge as an intellectual construct rather than as a form of material practice. It is not until *Discipline and Punish* ([1975] 1991), that Foucault begins to outline how systems of thought are also integrated with physical structures and material practices to produce a "technology of knowledge".

Michel Foucault's work is concerned to show that the rise of the so-called human sciences is inseparable from the rise of a new form of 'disciplinary' power used in the administration of individuals and populations through a range of discourses, from medicine and psychiatry, education and criminology. For Foucault, in an extension of the concept of 'panopticism' used in the model prisons of the nineteenth century, the techniques for the construction of knowledge about human populations – identification, classification, separation, measurement, surveillance and punishment or discipline – are also techniques in the exercise of disciplinary power to produce docile subjects, self-governing individuals and manageable populations:

> 'Discipline' may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus; it is a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology. (Foucault 1991: 215)

For Foucault, this inter-penetration of power and knowledge involves not just new modes of thinking but also a range of physical structures and material practices and therefore should be thought of as a technology of power/knowledge.

> The formation of knowledge and the increase of power regularly reinforce one another in a circular process. At this point, the disciplines [cross] the 'technological' threshold. (Foucault 1991: 224)

In using the model of the panopticon, Foucault is concerned to show that the modern disciplinary modality of power/knowledge involves not just new modes of thought, but is also embedded in physical structures and material practices and activities which mean it is more properly considered as a technology for the management of human populations rather than simply a philosophy or a paradigm.

It is also in these intersections between modes of thought and praxis Foucault highlights the ways in which power is not simply exercised through coercive acts by a singular authority but has productive effects and impacts throughout society.

Escobar was an early proponent of the importance of Foucauldian discourse analysis in development studies. In an early article (1984-85), Escobar identifies 'development' as a grand narrative supporting inequitable political and economic relations between developed and 'developing countries':

> [The first one is] the discourse on the underdevelopment of the Third World constructed by the developed countries. This discourse is associated with the whole apparatus of development (from international organisations, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, to local-level development agencies) as well as the large number of theories of development produced especially by international organisations and by scholars at North American and European campuses. (Escobar 1984-85: 383)[7]

In this article Escobar argues that Foucauldian discourse analysis is critical:

> …without examining development as discourse we cannot understand the systematic ways in which the Western developed countries have been able to manage and control and, in many ways, even create the Third World politically, economically, sociologically and culturally; and that, although underdevelopment is a very real historical formation, it has given rise to a series of practices (promoted by discourses of the West) which constitute one of the most powerful mechanisms for insuring domination over the Third World today. (Escobar 1984-5: 384)

Escobar refers specifically to the elements that constitute development discourse and their modes of interaction as 'technologies':

> In this way, development will be seen, not as a matter of scientific knowledge, a body of theories and programs concerned with the achievement of true progress, but rather as a series of political technologies intended to manage and give shape to the reality of the Third World. (Escobar 1984-85: 384)

The phrase 'technologies of knowledge' fits well with this Foucauldian reading of development discourse. Escobar uses the term 'technologies' to describe both the structure of development discourse and the interactions between power and knowledge that make and are created by development praxis. This praxis, or 'deployment of development' as Escobar terms it, occurs in three major strategies: the identification and incorporation of problems into the sphere of relevance to development discourse; the creation of new specialist 'scientific and technical'

---

[7] Escobar's work has provoked debate from a variety of perspectives. Grillo (1997) provides analysis of the use of discourse analysis and Foucauldian and post-structuralist readings of development. His reading of work by Escobar, as well as Ferguson and Hobart provides a cautionary tale to simplistic readings of their analyses that could see the complexity of these works reduced to simplistic arguments that 'development is bad'. Grillo's call to recognise multiplicity within analysis of development discourses is particularly useful for this analysis where essential and universalizing statements about women are the focus. Escobar's has not been the sole focus of these criticisms. Cecile Jackson's 1997 essay is an example of the criticism of postmodern influenced readings of gender and development debates and praxis.

areas of expertise required to address these problems; and the formation of new institutions to implement and oversight development practices. These are particularly relevant to this study of the creation of category LDC within development discourse and praxis, which involves institutional oversight, regular administration of membership and the creation of specific policy texts.

The phrase technologies of knowledge also locate the emphasis of this study of LDC category as a discourse analysis, where I identify key elements within the discourse, how they operate and some of the discursive effects. This work does not argue that these discursive operations effects are the expression of a particular ideology (Van Dijk 1995) as that would be a different thesis.

Following Foucault, and post-modern development theorists, I use the phrase 'technologies of knowledge' to suggest this inter-relationship of three aspects of development discourse: systems of thought (theories of economic development, inequality, etc); material practices (institutions such as the World Bank & IMF; loan and investment practices; bureaucratic procedures such as planning, statistical measurement and reporting against projected outcomes); and physical structures (where, on the model of the panopticon, typical development infrastructure – such as roads, schools, hospitals, communication systems – should be seen, not just as enabling economic development, but also as enabling the exercise of disciplinary power through the management and control of individuals and populations). The focus of this study is not on the discursive effects in terms of material practices and produced behaviours of populations, but on the internal mechanics of the produced knowledge about the LDCs and their populations within development discourse. A precise definition of the phrase 'technologies of knowledge' then is as a group of discursive devices, which function in a range of ways within the LDC discourse to produce knowledge and have material effects due to both their subject matter and modes of interaction within the discourse.

In examining gender and the operation of LDC development discourse through technologies of knowledge the discussion in this thesis is linked, as the discipline of development studies itself is linked, to a wide variety of fields: for example, international relations, economics, anthropology, geography, political science, sociology, philosophy, women's studies, gender studies and cultural studies. Before outlining the approach to gender analysis, I will locate this thesis and approach within the field of writing on women, gender and development.

Analysing Gender

This thesis is positioned within the terrain of post-modern and post-colonial influenced readings and critiques of the relationships between women, gender, culture and development. In undertaking this analysis and reading of LDC development discourse the thesis draws on rich and diverse traditions of feminist scholarship within both development and women's studies that has sought to describe and theorise women's experiences and lives in society. The following discussion will outline aspects of this tradition of feminist scholarship, and introduce key terms, assumptions and approaches I draw upon in undertaking a gender analysis of the technologies of knowledge of LDC category's operation.

In *The Second Sex* Simone de Beauvoir (1961) explored the historical and contemporary social experiences and status of women, concluding that the men viewed themselves as fundamentally different and superior to women and that the status of women is as 'the other'. This argument has been developed and extended in multiple and various ways by rich and diverse groupings of feminist theorists and researchers who have documented and theorized women's lives and status. Feminist approaches are themselves subject to considerable debate within feminist research and praxis, and have been broadly characterised into several streams with divergent views and perspectives on the position and status of women in society and contest terminology and definitions, for example:

> Gender is a contested term that has been analysed from different perspectives and with differing assumptions. It covers conceptions of sexuality and reproduction; sexual difference, embodiment, the social constitution of male, female, intersex, other masculinity, femininity; ideas, discourses, practices, subjectivities and social relationships. (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002: 172)

The main strands of contemporary Western feminist thought can be identified as liberal, Marxist, radical, psychoanalytic and postmodern (Eisenstein 1984; Grieve and Burns 1986; Tong 1989). These Western feminist approaches have been challenged in multiple ways through interventions by women of colour who have argued the importance of recognizing the dynamics of racism in feminist analysis and in placing the stories and experiences of women of colour in the forefront of analysis (hooks 1981; James 1985; Moragan and Anzaldua 1981; Morrison 1993; Prescod-Roberts and Steele 1980; Purcell 2002; Williams, 1991). Throughout this debate and exchange, and despite this contestation of terminology, a fundamental characteristic of feminist readings of women's lives is the distinction between biological sex and gender roles (Oakley 1972). This is conceptualized as the ways in which the physical characteristics of women, particularly in relation to reproduction, are distinct from what has been identified as the tropes of women's socially ascribed roles, identified as gender characteristics. The former is constant, while the latter tropes are permeable and transitory, changing with historical and contemporary context, socio-economic position, culture, geography, and age.

This theoretical insight is a core element of contemporary feminist debate, and a central conceptual underpinning of the various ways in which feminist scholars have written and theorized about women and development. The three well acknowledged approaches are women in development (WID), women and development (WAD), and gender and development (GAD) theory and praxis (Marchand and Parpart 1995; Moser 1995; Parpart, Connelly and Barriteau 2000; Rathgeber 1995; Schech and Haggis 2000; Visvanathan 1997). Each of these major areas of feminist approach to development criticism, theory, advocacy and practice has a relationship with the major Western feminist approaches and theories of development.

The WID approach is aligned with liberal feminism and the modernisation model of development (Chowdhry 1995; Rathgeber 1995; Visvanathan 1997):

> Liberal-feminist analysis makes distinct the public-private dichotomy at the heart of modernization theorizing and policy development. It is easy to ignore women's contribution in the public domain because it is assumed

that women work, and should work, within households. (Barriteau 2000: 168)

WID is closely associated with the early and critically influential contributions of Boserup (1970) about women in agriculture and Rogers' (1980) study of male bias in the development process, which influenced the emergence of the WID approach and its adoption by institutions (Koczberski 1998). In essence these arguments are that women have important contributions to make to development and need to be integrated into it, from the perspective of equitable rights to access the benefits of development. WID scholars, practioners and advocates challenged gendered assumptions about women's roles in developing societies that were influencing the implementation of development initiatives:

> The assumptions development planners make about women in society are almost never stated, but are all the more powerful for that reason. It is thought 'natural' that a woman's place is in the home and that she has a very specific set of tasks which are thought to be universal because they are based on the biological imperatives of sex. The most important role for women, defining their entire life, is portrayed as the bearing and bringing up of children. A man, on the other hand, is seen as the 'natural' head of the family, its representative in the outside world, and therefore the person with home planners will deal. (Rogers 1980:11)

Recent threads of this WID approach, known as the 'anti-poverty approach,' have argued that integrating women in development is an effective approach to alleviating poverty given their roles in supporting households. There is also the 'efficiency approach', which argued that integrating women in development is efficient as women have significant untapped labour which could be used productively in the formal economy and promote national economic growth (Moser 1995; Schech and Haggis 2000). The focus of the WID approach is on women, separated from a focus on their social roles. The core argument is that in not integrating women into these efforts the impacts of development on women are negative and there are missed opportunities for the greater success of development efforts. The WID approach still has significant influence within the contemporary practice of development institutions (Koczberski 1998).

The WAD approach developed as a feminist reaction and response to the WID approach, and argues from Marxist, socialist-feminist and dependency theorist perspectives that there is critical need to examine the dynamics of capitalism with women's experiences of development (Visvanathan 1997). In their preface to *The Women, Gender and Development Reader* (1997), editors Visvanathan, Duggan, Nisonoff and Wiegersma outline the emergence of WAD networks in North American universities in the 1970s and 1980s as researchers expressed concern about the lack of analysis of capitalism in WID and sought to share and promote research that linked studies of women's status and experiences of exploitation and subordination with explorations of international political economy and class differences. WAD also formed as a distinct approach in response to the perceived inadequacies of traditional Marxist and socialist theorizing that subordinated 'the woman question' to the class struggle (Pearson, Whitehead and Young [1981] 1984). The emergence of the WAD approach has been associated with the influential studies of Maria Mies (1982, 1986). In *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale*, Mies argues that there is a fundamental relationship between capitalism and patriarchy:

> …it became clear to me that the confusions in the feminist movement worldwide will continue unless we understand that 'the woman question' in the context of all social relations that constitute our reality today, that means in the context of a global division of labour under the dictates of capital accumulation. The subordination and exploitation of women, nature and colonies are the precondition for the continuation of this model. (Mies 1986:2)

Mies' study *The Lace Makers of Narsapur* (1982) identified relationships between the exploited labour of third world women, whose products were purchased by women in developed countries. It outlined her thesis that capitalism was reinforcing patriarchal subordination of women, and challenged simplistic notions of a universal sisterhood where all women were the same, as clearly in this study, capitalism advantaged some women over others.

The WAD approach is also associated with studies of Trans National Corporations and the reliance of some forms of national economic development, particularly the development of new export-oriented industries, on women's labour in textile, garment, food processing and electronics Export Processing Zones (Iremonger and Hill 1998; Pettman 1996; Sasabe 1994; Sobieralski 2003; Valadez 1999).

> Socialist-feminist theories have contributed to the extensive examination of the ways women's labour is exploited in factories and export-processing zones. They have also documented how women receive lower wages for comparable work. They reveal the feminisation of certain occupations that occurred as women entered the labour force in increasing numbers. As the men moved out of certain occupations, these because "ghettoized" as women's work, with an accompanying decrease in status and wages. (Barriteau 2000: 168)

A central argument of the WAD approach in examining international divisions of labour is that the issue is not that women aren't integrated into development, but that women are in ways that are exploitative (Visvanathan 1997). More recent work from the WAD approach has linked the capitalist exploitation of women with the exploitation of the environment associated with international capitalism (Visvanathan 1997). This includes feminist theoretical debates and interventions charting the global nature of women's subjugation and the relationships between capitalist and military activity and women's exploitation, particularly through international divisions of labour (Enloe 1990; Enloe and Cohn 2003; Heyzer, Lycklama a Nieholt and Weerakoon 1994; Mies 1986; Pettman 1996; Thomas 2001; Valadez 1996). The WAD approach has been criticized for essentialist representations of women as victims of both capitalism and patriarchy (Schech and Haggis 2000).

The GAD approach emerged in the 1980s and seeks to take a broader perspective on cultural differences, recognizing that there were inherent assumptions about women's roles in society in both the WID and WAD approaches that could not readily apply in the diverse cultural settings that are the developing world. It sought to build on the WAD focus on political economy and to shift the focus from universalist representations of women to gender relations:

> We wanted to develop a theory of gender which was integrated into and informed by the general analysis of the changing world economy. Our aim was to develop analytical and conceptual tools to encompass not only

economic relations but also what have been termed the relations of everyday life. In our discussions we found unhelpful many standard terms current in discussions of women's position in society – such as exploitation, oppression or patriarchy. (Pearson, Whitehead and Young 1984)

The GAD approach sought to recognise that relations between women and men were not static and fixed, but changed as society and culture itself changed. It recognised that development is not a singular act or linear path, but a complex process of change (Visvanathan 1997: 23). A key aspect was identifying a key role for the state in improving the status of women (Young 1997). GAD is also linked with a heightened emphasis on the importance of the involvement of women drawing on local knowledge themselves in determining appropriate development activities, to promote women's empowerment (Schech and Haggis 2000).

The GAD approach sought to influence the practice of development agencies and institutions, through gender planning, gender training, development project implementation, evaluation and review (Ostergaard 1992). Feminist interventions within development praxis have advocated for an increased focus on women and gender considerations at the level of 'doing development', in project design, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and now in the field of 'gender mainstreaming' and analysing the achievements of these efforts (Moser 1995; Williams Seed and Mwau 1994; Woodford-Berger 2004; Koczberski 1998). A contemporary approach used in development policy and practice is promoting gender mainstreaming, which has sought to ensure that the marginality that has been associated with separate women-oriented initiatives is usurped by the incorporation of gender analysis and the implementation of gender specific strategies that improve the status of women in all development initiatives (Reeves and Baden 2000:12). This has been allied with an increased focus on the description of the experiences of individual women, women's groups, and women as a population group outlining gender-based differences and inequalities in societies, countries, and regions. The gender mainstreaming approach has been challenged in recent times as leading to a total loss of emphasis on issues affecting women (Woodford-Berger 2004; Eyben 2004; Standing 2004; Subramanium 2004; Mukhopadhyay 2004).

The WID, WAD and GAD approaches and associated development praxis have been challenged by the perspectives of women from developing countries and from post-colonial feminist theorists (Bhavnani, Foran and Kurian 2003; Mohanty and Alexander 1997; Mohanty, Russo and Torres 1991; Minh-ha 1989; Narayan 1997; Rajan 1993; Sittirak 1998; Spivak 1996), who have highlighted the politics of the representation of women in developing countries:

> Feminist theories and critiques of development are instrumental in revealing that the countries of the South are not culturally, politically or economically homogenous. Nor are gender relations experienced in the same manner by all Third World women. Black feminist Audre Lorde has warned of the danger of implying that all women suffer the same oppression because they are women…black feminists have argued that this ignores the varieties and degrees of women's subordination. It also ignores how these experiences change with a woman's race, class, and cultural setting. There is more variation among countries in the South than among industrialised societies of the North. … The tendency to homogenize the

concept of The Third World woman and assume the universal applicability of these approaches to development creates specific problems for women in the South. (Parpart, Connelly and Barriteau 2000: 168-168)

These arguments highlight the ways in which WID/WAD/GAD approaches have claims to knowledge that locate expertise in the West. There has been a response to the charge that white Western women have imposed western feminist values and approaches with the emergence of broad, sweeping analyses of 'women in Africa', 'women in Asia', 'women in Latin America', 'women in the Pacific' and 'women in the Middle-east' by western women positioned as experts of an exotic other[8]. A criticism of these analyses is that they over simplify and homogenise and in the very desire to 'let women's voices be heard' have silenced diversity, experience and culture. A response to this concern has been an emergence of third world feminist scholars recording and promoting the perspectives and experiences of women in developing countries themselves to ensure these views were visible and in a stronger position to influence broader debates (Nnaemeka 1998).

In analysing WID/WAD/GAD as discourses, Sylvester (1996) argues that recognizing gender as a social construct challenges the ability of discourses to impose perspectives about the characteristics of 'women':

We can only assume that gender is a historically contingent set of local social assignments that we must discern and query, just as many of us routinely query terms like "development" or "progress". It seems obvious to say that people are not necessarily what they are called. Yet to query "women" can seem unnecessary and strange because women is so often a given. Surely all of us know women when we see them! But do we? Whose notions of "women" guide our vision and potentially freeze people in relation to their bodies and usual social assignments? What do people called women call themselves? Are there gaps between the usual self-confident understanding of women we speak about and the self-understandings that people negotiate for themselves in local contexts? (Sylvester 1996:184)

Sylvester argues that in accepting that gender is a social construction, one has to accept that as such gender identities change, shift and alter over time, through and in status, socio-economic and cultural position and circumstance. As a consequence the process of 'identifying women' is not simple or straightforward or value-free. The process of identifying women is complex, involves multiples perspectives and positions. The 'woman' and 'women' identified during the 'identification' and 'knowing' processes may experience themselves and their lives in different ways.

These post-colonial challenges to ways of knowing identify that classic WID and WAD approaches can treat women in developing countries as homogenous with the same views, perspectives and experiences; as powerless victims of patriarchy and/or colonialism and capitalism; and with set current and future social roles and interactions with development and social change (Goetz 1991). These challenges to universal concepts of womanhood require new approaches:

As a result of taking difference into account, feminist theorists are moving away from characterizing women as whole and alike toward distinguishing personal and separable identities for individual women and groups of

---

[8] See de Ishtar 1994 and Brooks 1995 for examples of these analyses. They focus on 'women in the Pacific' and 'women in the Middle East' respectively.

> women. In place of figuring out what one particular "thing" makes women women, most feminists are now differentiating women. (Moss and Matwychuk 2000: 82-83)

Narayan (1988) argues that in challenging discursive gender essentialism, a cultural essentialism also needs to be challenged:

> While gender essentialism often equates the problems, interests and locations of some dominant groups of men and women with those of "all men" and "all women," cultural essentialism often equates the values, worldviews and practices of some socially dominant groups with those of "all members of the culture." (Narayan 1998: 88)

This discursive reliance on gender and cultural essentialisms is also apparent within third world feminist challenges against local fundamentalisms that find themselves positioned as "cultural traitors corrupted by the seduction of Western values" against a localised cultural essentialism (Narayan 1988:96). Narayan calls for the development of feminist approaches that challenge metanarratives of cultural and gender essentialism as an urgent task. There are some criticisms of these arguments. Including a concern that concepts of sisterhood for collective organising and agency are made problematic and that these critiques do not provide space to alleviate or ameliorate poverty (Jackson 1997). Responses to this concern have highlighted the ways that critiques of the politics of representation that draw on postcolonialism lead to new ways of theorizing and praxis, as McEwan (2001) argues:

> Postcolonial feminisms therefore have the potential to contribute to the critical exploration of relationships between cultural power and global economic power. Moreover they point towards a radical reclaiming of the political that is occurring in the field of development and in the broader field of transformation. (McEwan 2001:107)

Bhavnani, Foran and Kurian (2003) propose new visions of theoretical ways forward that link women, culture and development, placing women at the centre of analysis away from discursive margins and placing culture on a par with political economy, recognising both the social construction of gender relations and the diversity of cultural positions. Postcolonial critiques of feminist theories of development are useful in linking the authority of Western dominated discourses with the exercise of Western power The analysis of discourses, including WID/WAD/GAD identifies important insights into the historical antecedents of discourse and praxis, but also identifies new connections and principles for further analysis.

Gender analysis

Gender analysis within development studies has developed in various ways over the years and different trajectories of WID/WAD/GAD theorist and practioner writings. A definition of gender analysis is:

> The systematic gathering and examination of information on gender differences and social relations in order to identify, understand and redress inequities based on gender. (Reeves and Baden 2000: 6)

Reeves and Baden (2000) describe gender analysis as a tool for development planning and practioners the components and approach of which is influenced by the particular institution involved. In this is it is linked to the programmes of gender training and policies of gender mainstreaming that have been adopted by development institutions such as bilateral donors, NGOs and multilateral agencies.

The work of Caroline Moser (1995) has been influential in establishing approaches to gender analysis in her work on gender planning. She articulated an approach that identified gender roles, and differentiated between meeting basic gender needs that supported women fulfilling social roles and responsibilities and strategic gender needs, which supported women's empowerment. In so doing she sought to develop a new approach to gender planning which integrated gender analysis within development institution training and project planning practices. This approach is reliant on homogenous notions of gender roles and has a strong emphasis on women's roles in the household. Reeves and Baden describe a newer social relations approach that has a broader focus and looks at gendered power relations in the community, the private and public sectors as well as the household:

> The aim is to understand the dynamics of gender relations in different institutional contexts and thereby to identify women's bargaining position and formulate strategies to improve this. (Reeves and Baden 2000: 6)

Reeves and Baden note that this approach has not been widely adopted by development institutions.

A commonality between these different approaches is that they all sit within realist epistemologies that assume that 'reality' can be understood and described by an objective researcher. Foucauldian theory provides feminist researchers with new freedom to explore what knowledge has been presented to be common sense, identifying and analysing the ways of knowing within different discourses:

> [Foucauldian theory] unsettles what is taken for granted in existing ways of thinking so that people are free or at least freer to recognise how authoritative knowledge is socially constituted …it shifts the focus of empirical investigation onto how discourses are constituted, the varying ways in which texts/evidence can be read, and what effects particular forms of knowledge have. (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002:88)

In their survey of feminist research methodologies Ramazanoglu and Holland (2002) describe feminist approaches to gender analysis as fundamentally based on a theory of gender and power. They identify three critical components to contemporary feminist analyses of gender relations. The first component is a commitment to exploring relations between knowledge and power, "assuming the inseparability of politics, theory and epistemology" (Ramazanoglu and Holland 2002: 65). This involves challenging and opposing enlightenment traditions that depend on gendered hierarchical dualisms between the public and private, which locates women in subordinate discursive positions aligned with nature and lack of reason. It also involves challenging the enlightenment tradition of a scientific research method assuming that a singular approach to knowledge can create a full and total representation of reality. The second component Ramazanoglu and Holland identify is the importance placed on locating the researcher, and making the researcher and reader visible within the analytic approach. The third component is a commitment to take into account the full diversity of women's lives and experiences and the complexity of power relationships between women. This component challenges assumptions that women and men operate as universal categories.

In linking an exploration of technologies of knowledge with gender analysis in this thesis I am drawing most closely on these feminist approaches to gender analysis and the rich tradition of feminist engagements with development discourse and

praxis. Throughout the analysis of primary material on LDCs I draw on this approach outlined by Ramazanoglu and Holland to unsettle discursive assumptions, identify and disturb a discursive reliance on the universal and identify discursive dynamics of the politics of representing women in the third world. The precise definition of gender analysis in this thesis is the process of identifying the gendered differences and inequalities between the social, economic and cultural experiences of diverse women and men, recognizing that the inequitable positions of researcher and 'knowledge object' mean that all attempts to represent reality can only ever provide a partial picture.

Feminisation of poverty

A foundation of this thesis is the premise that women, particularly women in LDC countries, are disproportionately represented amongst the poorest of the poor. By using gender analysis as the starting point I have sought to shift third world women from the marginal place LDC category discourse has allocated them, to the centre of the analytic stage. The feminisation of poverty and the overrepresentation of women amongst the poor are facts that have been adopted by international development organisations such as Oxfam International, multilateral bodies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Fund for Women, and academic researchers. This is based on a conception of poverty as multidimensional; that understands poverty as a material fact with material effects and also as the result of the interconnections between institutions and ideologies that are gendered (Beneria and Bisnath 1996; Narayan et al 2000). It is also based on an acceptance of the existence and perpetuation of gender inequalities that discriminate against women (King and Mason 2001: 4). As Schech argues:

> After all, systematic and widespread gender inequality in opportunity, representation and decision-making in the household and in society has long been recognised to exacerbate women's poverty, and was highlighted in the World Bank's consultations with the poor as a formidable barrier to poverty reduction (Narayan et al 2000). (Schech 2006: 1)

However, while there are studies on the gendered impacts of globalisation and structural adjustment, there is rarely substantive quantitative data to substantiate this. A rare example of data that does demonstrate an increase in poverty amongst women over time is cited by Baden et al, which is based on aggregations of household survey data disaggregated by sex. There is no such data available within official LDC texts, either in considerations by the UNCDP, the reports by UNCTAD or the UN policies.

Table 2: Total number of rural people living below the poverty line by sex, 1965-70 and 1988 (in millions).

	1965-1970	1988	% change
Women	383,673	564,000	47.0
Men	288,832	375,481	30.0
Total	672,505	939,481	39.7

Source: IFAD cited by Buvinic in 1993, cited by Baden et al 1998:17

This lack of internationally comparable longitudinal quantitative data is concerning (Elson 2001). In part as a response to this lack of specificity to the assertion of

women as the poorest of the poor, the growth of female-headed households is frequently used as a proxy measure for the feminisation of poverty (Chant 2004). This has been challenged as a measure for its inherent homogenizing assumptions which do not take account of the diversity of women's lives and the circumstances in which they may be heading a household, particularly if female –headed households become a disproportionately dominant 'target' of development assistance efforts in a particular community (Chant 2004: 19-22). Similarly, the prevalence of women in the unstable informal labour market is identified as a reason why there is a disproportionate representation of women in poverty and vulnerable to poverty (UNIFEM 2005). However concerns about the lack of 'hard data' replicates a discursive priority placed on the numeric, measured and quantified. It should not obviate the significance of my imperative to focus on the discursive constructions of the diverse lives and experiences of women living in LDCs. Data disaggregated by sex may be marginal to the data collectors, but I will not use this as an excuse to repeat and continue this discursive marginality in my thesis.

Analysing Development

As a discipline and praxis development studies is relatively young, emerging only in the 1950s out of the Truman Doctrine in the US (Escobar 1995) and in the discursive relationships between colonial and newly independent states (Cooper 1997). However, it has only been relatively recently that the discipline itself has emerged as a key area of focus (Cowan and Shenton 1996; Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1990; Munck and O'Hearn 1999; Pieterse 1991; Rahnema and Bawtree 1997; Sachs 1992; Sittirak 1998; Spivak 1999), as postmodern and postcolonial theoretical interventions in related fields and disciplines within the humanities and the social sciences have begun to influence an increasing number of researchers, practitioners and theoreticians. Foucauldian readings of discourse and institutional practices have played a significant role in this area of study (Apthorpe 1996, 1997; Briggs 2002; Escobar 1984-85).

It has been observed that defining development is difficult, as there are many different meanings (Cowan and Shenton 1996: 3) and definitions. Ferguson (1990) argues that development has two particular meanings which, despite their differences, are linked. The first meaning or definition of development is the notion of a movement of a national economy towards modern industrial capitalism. The second meaning or definition of development is an altruistic one, promoting improved quality of life and the alleviation or eradication of poverty.

> It should be clear upon inspection that the development of capitalism and the elimination of poverty are, if not positively antithetic (as many neo-Marxists argue), at any rate not identical. But it seems to be a theoretical necessity in 'development' discourse … for the two notions of 'development' to be co-present and even conflated. This is nowhere more apparent that in the definition of countries full of poor people as 'less developed countries'.   The implicit argument is of the sort known to logicians as a fallacy of equivocation, of the form: (1) all banks have money; (2) every river has two banks; therefore (3) all rivers have money. The fallacy, of course, consists in changing the meaning of one of the terms

of the syllogisms in the middle of the implication. The 'development' version goes as follows: (1) poor countries are (by definition) 'less developed'; (2) less developed countries are (by another definition) those which have not yet been fully brought into the modern economy; therefore, (3) poor countries are those which have not yet been fully brought into the modern economy. (Ferguson 1990:55-6)

The conflation of these two definitions, particularly the assumption within the second definition that all functions are good as they are provided with goodwill to alleviate poverty and suffering, has the function of de-politicizing actions proposed and undertaken in the name of 'development'. This turns development discourse into an 'anti-politics machine', by which actions as fundamental as changing land tenure systems are seen in discursive terms as merely technical acts, neutralized by their technical nature and the good outcomes that are assumed to be the result.

Models of development

In terms of models of development, Hart (2001) has a useful description of models belonging to either capital 'D' or small 'd' development:

'big D' development defined as the post-second world war project of intervention in the 'third world' that emerged in the context of decolonisation and the cold war, and 'little d' development or the development of capitalism as a geographically uneven, profoundly contradictory set of historical processes. (Hart 2001: 650)

In making this distinction Hart draws on the changes and challenges to the World Bank's market based approach to promoting national growth and development, termed the Washington Consensus. She highlights challenges to this approach from both the recognition of the role of the state in the East Asian economic miracle of the early 1990s, and the response by the IMF and World Bank to the Asian financial crisis of the late 1990s, which she argues exacerbated the crisis. Hart argues that despite these challenges to the Washington Consensus, there has been little fundamental change to the development model. Hart also draws on post-development critiques that have analysed the ahistorical notion of development as an immanent process by locating its dependence on culturally specific Western European enlightenment notions of progress and trusteeship. Hart argues that as the dynamics of globalisation are intersecting with post-development analyses there is an increasing discursive focus on the local, which is represented as passive recipient of global forces. Hart calls for development studies to engage with 'big D' development by confronting its relationships with the dynamics of 'little d' development, namely capitalist growth.

Ferguson (1990) has a different distinction: he argues that development studies as a discipline has been characterised by two major strands. One strand within the discipline of development studies concerns the business of 'doing development'. The other strand identifies universal/global theories of development and/or describes the historical and contemporary dynamics and relations of and between nations or institutions (i.e. national histories and descriptors of roots of poverty, colonial and neo-colonial impacts, and international financial institutions). The strand concerning the business of 'doing development' or development praxis incorporates a strong focus on debates about appropriate methodologies, projects and approaches. This strand within development studies can be dominated by publications by organisations and institutions engaged in development, such as the

United Nations Development Program (UNDP), The World Bank, bilateral development agencies such as the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), and international Non-Government Organisations, such as Oxfam International. Work within the other major strand observes the international context of development policy and praxis and has identified its historical antecedents in colonialism and the notion of trusteeship (Cowan and Shenton 1996). This strand of development studies has theorized the two major theoretical approaches to development – modernisation and dependency (Cooks and Isgro 2005).

Both Hart (2001) and Ferguson (1990) acknowledge the dominance in development studies of the critical and ideological differences between modernisation and dependency approaches. The modernisation theory is based on adapting principles of capitalism to developed country settings focusing on increasing national growth in anticipation of the trickle down effect to benefit the poor as economic growth takes off (Rostow 1963). This approach is still enshrined in the Washington Consensus of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund institutions as described by Hart (2001), and in the approaches of bilateral donor agencies that focus on promoting growth through liberalising the market and free trade (AusAID 2006). The modernisation approach has argued that there are paths to achieve development through economic growth that are linear, ahistorical and universally applicable regardless of national history, culture, and the dynamics of the international economy. It is based on a fundamental "us and them" distinction between the 'West', developed and modern societies which are then positioned as the aspiration for all, and the 'rest', countries who are defined as undeveloped, traditional and backward (Hall 1992). Modernisation theory has been criticized for its ethnocentrism, eurocentrism, inability to predict effects and outcomes, and simplification of the social and political change that accompanies the development process (Scott 1996: 23). As Hart (2002) argues, despite these challenges it is remains a critical force in neoliberal economics based approaches in critical development institutions.

The theory of dependency and underdevelopment (Frank 1966) criticizes modernisation development practices and their effects. It argues that despite the fact that this is a post-colonial era for most developing countries, the imperialist global economy continues to function and international economic inequalities are persisting or being exacerbated. There is a new form of economic colonialism where, for example, raw materials and light manufactures are produced in the developing world and profits sent to corporate headquarters in the developed world. It criticizes the universalism inherent in the modernisation model, which assumes what has worked for the developed countries is the correct path for the undeveloped (Cowan and Shenton 1996: 9):

> If the now under-developed were really to follow the stages of growth of the now developed ones, they would have to find still other peoples to exploit into underdevelopment, as the now developed countries did before them. (Frank [1969: 46] cited in Pieterse 1991: 14)

Underdevelopment, the exacerbation of poverty and international economic disparities, is seen as a result of capitalist development.   The problem of increasing poverty is too much development rather than too little.   Currently there are calls to

re-visit the insights of dependency theory in light of globalisation and the cultural focus of post-development critiques of development (Kapoor 2002).

Over time there has been a series of changes in development practice, as practioners and theorists identified difficulties and failures associated with different approaches over time, ranging from human capital development, technological development, basic needs, women in development, structural adjustment and sustainable development (Rathberger 1996). Eva Rathberger argues, "...in each case, the failures of earlier strategies have led to the establishment of new approaches." (Rathgeber 1996:204-5). These different approaches are allied on the whole as variations on a theme of the modernisation approach, promoting capitalism with various different human faces. Despite the ideological differences between modernisation and dependency schools, there are discursive similarities and there has been little change in the core assumptions within the business of 'doing development' over time (Pieterse 1991; Rathberger 1996).

Post-development critiques

As noted previously, it has only been in the last ten years or so that the basic question 'what is development?' has been raised within the field of development studies. Until this questioning, development itself had been universally unquestioned as a concept, and had been understood as a process, a set of actions, and an outcome:

> It may be worthwhile to focus in future on what constitutes agreed-upon approaches in the field of development studies and practice and on the language used to justify and popularize different perspectives. As we have seen, development discourse is largely based on assumptions that have not changed substantially during the past thirty years and that never have been questioned very closely. Development practice has generally involved a heavy infusion of resources from outside with a predilection towards the "technological fix" (Stamp 1989). Development theorists and practioners have learned little from past mistakes, nor have they fundamentally changed their way of thinking or their mode of operation. As a result, isolated knowledge in the form of case studies or academic papers generated in either the North or the South has had relatively little impact on most development practice. (Rathgeber 1996:219)

While debates may have occurred about the appropriate processes by which development should or did occur development had been understood and unquestioned as a goal that was beneficial and desirable that alleviated poverty and improved living standards (Rapley 2004). Development as a concept was not historicised, and its reliance on discursive assumptions about progress, poverty and planning were unexplored.

In the opening chapter of *The Critique of Postcolonial Reason* (1999), Spivak analyses the trajectories of Hegel, Marx and Kant to determine the positioning and location of postcolonial studies. Spivak argues that that without deconstructive rigour, studies of development in former colonial countries can unwittingly be aligned with and within the position of the 'native informant', the colonial object

that made violent suppression of the colonial encounter, indeed terra nullius, possible[9]. This position of the native informant is diverse, varied and complex:

> Even if history is a grand narrative, my point is that the subject-position of the native-informant, crucial yet foreclosed, is also historically and therefore geopolitically inscribed[10]. (Spivak 1999:344)

In this discussion of Hegel, Marx and Kant, whose work has exercised a major influence over contemporary thought and society, Spivak traces their relationships with the cultural contexts that produced imperialism. A brief summary of an aspect of her argument is that the enlightenment tradition which produced imperialism, and the racist pseudo-sciences such as craniometry[11] which legitimised it, formed a set of cultural justifications that have now produced the discourses of 'development' and 'aid':

> These moves, in various guises, still inhabit and inhibit our attempts to overcome the limitations imposed on us by the newest division of the world, to the extent that, as the North continues ostensibly to "aid" the South – as formerly imperialism "civilised" the New World – the South's crucial assistance to the North in keeping up its resource hungry lifestyle is forever foreclosed. (Spivak 1999: 344)

Recent writing has drawn on these analyses of the colonial roots of development praxis and policy to challenge the absence of any discussion of race within development discourse, arguing that dominant development is 'colour-blind', and the impact of discursive continuities with the colonial era is visible in outcomes, techniques and modes of knowing[12] (Kothari 2006; White 2002). Cowan and Shenton's influential text *Doctrines of Development* (1996) locates Western European philosophical notions of progress, trusteeship and order with the origin of the concept and process of development in both the pre and post Second World War era. Drawing on the work of Malthus, Comte and Mill, Cowan and Shenton locate what they term the 'invention of development' with the work of these

---

[9] "I think of the "native informant" as a name for that mark of expulsion from the name of Man – a mark crossing out the impossibility of the ethical relation" (Spivak 1999:6).

[10] Spivak's use of the concept of 'foreclosure' is borrowed from Lacanian psychoanalysis. Loosely, Spivak argues that it refers to a kind of self-repression that rejects the accompanying emotional result, the 'affect'. In using this concept to refer to the praxis of imperialism, Spivak argues that 'foreclosing' occurred when the violent consequences of this 'civilising mission' not only were repressed as a memory and event, but the emotional 'affect' was rejected as well (Spivak 1999:4-5).

[11] Craniometry was one of the forms of scientific racism that had widespread currency in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Developed by the American Samuel George Morton, it was a theory that differentiated intelligence through the ranking of brain sizes of different races, by measuring skull capacity. Morton's experiments consisted of the filling of the cranial cavity with mustard seeds in his early experiments, and later with lead shot, then recording the cubic inch size. His belief in racial superiority guided his statistical calculations, juggling groupings of measurements in order to reach the results that validated his conviction that the racial intelligence rankings placed blacks at the bottom, Indians in the middle and whites at the top (Carrigan 1988:9).

[12] See the recent special issue of *Progress in Development Studies* vol. 6, no, 1 edited by Uma Kothari for a series of interesting and challenging articles about the importance of defining 'race' as a concept to apply to analyses of development discourse and praxis.

philosophers, and the processes of dramatic social change that accompanied industrialisation in Western Europe. Pieterse (1991) also explores these historical antecedents, locating modernisation theory and developmentalism with the Western European tradition of enlightenment thinking and the pre-eminence of nineteenth century economics, both Marxist and liberal which is borne out in discursive continuities:

> [...what these traditions] have in common is economism, centrism and teleology: economism because economic growth is the centrepiece of social change, teleology in that the common assumption is goal-oriented development, centrism because development (or underdevelopment, according to the dependency view) is led from where it is furthest advanced – the metropolitan world. (Pieterse 1991: 15)

Spivak's work argues that the deconstructive act is defined as simultaneously an undoing and embracing. It identifies and locates deconstruction as a praxis for that which one "cannot not desire, cannot not wish to inhabit however much I (we) wish also to change it" (Spivak 1996:7). Deconstruction recognises its own risk as an analytic approach, as it has an inherent fallibility:

> Operating necessarily from the inside, borrowing all the strategic and economic resources of subversion from the old structure, borrowing them structurally, that is to say, without being able to isolate their elements and atoms, the enterprise of deconstruction always falls prey to its own work. (Derrida 1976:24)

Spivak locates her deconstructive approach as based on Derrida's notion of the experience of the impossible, which she describes as a blurred and vulnerable state. This is identified as different from the earlier Derridean concept of the necessary yet impossible, that

> ...insisted that all institutions of origin concealed the splitting off from something other than the origin in order for the origin to be instituted. This was a making indeterminate of any answer to questions of origin, as to what it was from which the supposedly original thing or thought, in description or definition, was being differentiated. It is this question, instituted at the origin, that had to be guarded or kept as a task in the first phase of deconstruction. (Spivak 1999: 426)

It is this concept of the experience of the impossible that Spivak uses to analyse the experience of gift, ethics and justice within the world. She argues that this experience is impossible as it exists within global and local contexts of violence and inequality. The act of deconstruction traces the relationship between what she identifies as pairs, the act and the method through which the act could be possible but isn't: gift and responsibility, justice and the law, ethics and politics. In this argument that deconstructs development discourse as a universalising grand narrative, Spivak is positing a call for applying the analytic approach in an act of "deconstruction without reserve" (Spivak 1999: 430).

Spivak's and Escobar's work sits within the literature that is loosely termed 'post-development' (Brigg 2002; Ferguson 1990; Rahnema and Bawtree 1997; Rapley 2004; Sachs 1992) as it has been influenced by post-modern theories and approaches and aligns itself with studies of the dynamics of the post-colonial era

that question dominance of eurocentric metanarratives[13]. In drawing on Foucault, and this body of literature, this thesis is positioned within post-development influenced debates which acknowledge and explore the relationships between discourse and power that determine what is known and how. Feminist work within development studies has made important contributions to post-development critiques of development praxis and discourse (Bhavnani, Foran and Kurian 2003; Mohanty 1991, 1997; Schech and Haggis 2000; Wood 2001). In drawing explicitly on feminist post-modern influenced critiques of development discourse and praxis, this thesis explores the position and representation of women in development discourse.

Thus discourse analysis is a critical tool in understanding the underlying assumptions inherent within development discourse and praxis, particularly in identifying the discursive position allocated to women. Discourse analysis provides important tools to explore the productive discursive relationships involved in the appearance and adoption of development as concept and as aspiration, for as Cooper argues "the meanings of development reflected the engagement of local mobilization with global discourses, and of local discourses with global structures of power" (Cooper 1997:83). The concepts of poverty, planning and progress are inherent in these functions of development as a discourse over time and throughout the various changes in aspects of development practice. Within these concepts, development discourse defines and locates agency and power. Spivak explores this dynamic linkage between identity, the politics of voice and representation and agency, and the enlightenment imperial origins of the theory and praxis of development. This is a critique that is part of the development theories over the years that have linked aid and trade engagement with a new form of relationship between former colonies and colonizers.

> For the great narrative of Development is not dead…My generation in India, born before Independence, realises only too well that many of the functionaries of the civilising mission of imperialism were well meaning. The point here is not personal accusations. And in fact what these functionaries gave was often what I call an enabling violation – a rape that produces a healthy child, whose existence cannot be advanced as a justification for the rape. Imperialism cannot be justified by the fact that India has railways and I speak English well. Many of the functionaries of the civilising mission were well meaning; but alas, you can do good with contempt or paternal-maternal-sororal benevolence in your heart. And today, you can knife the poor nation in the back and offer band-aids for a photo-opportunity. Scapegoating colonialism in the direst possible way shields the new imperialism of exploitation in development. (Spivak 1999: 371)

The multiple aspects of the development endeavour that are characterised by failure have driven this analysis. In recent years this has emerged as the debate on the effectiveness of aid and development assistance[14] (Thomas 2004). This failure

---

[13] This questioning of development as discourse is associated with the emergence of critiques of associated disciplines, such as anthropology, which have become inextricably linked with development praxis (Ferguson 1997).

[14] However there is a tendency for this debate to operate within a framework that doesn't question the overall project, and focuses instead on the mechanics of 'doing development'.

is understood as the negative social and economic impacts of the innumerable development initiatives that have caused harm, as well as in terms of what could be termed as a fundamental fallacy of the endeavour – addressing the inequitable distribution of global wealth and poverty[15].

Poverty

Esteva argues the term 'development' is linked to 'growth, evolution and maturation' (Esteva 1992: 10). Its origins as a biological term and use in the context of 'development discourse' means it comes as a concept and a term with implied meanings such as natural, evolution, progress, growth, movement for the bigger and better. The consequence is that the converse also applies: the current state is at best a state of potential, an inferior state, lacking, undeveloped. Esteva argues that the use of the term 'development' in the Truman doctrine defined the majority of the world's population as 'under-developed' and poor[16]. This was a description of a difference in monetary wealth and modern social structures and services. It was also an immediate assertion of Western cultural values and assumptions. Poverty is identified, created, made. It can be identified by others, and imposed.

In his 1972 work *Stone Age Economics* Marshall Sahlins argued for a rethinking of anthropological and economic definitions of affluence, need and necessity and poverty through recognising the inherent values within these disciplinary based readings and interpretations of subsistence economies and hunter gatherer communities. This discussion is based on Aboriginal society compared to other contemporary social situations:

> Poverty is not a small amount of goods, nor is it just a relation between means and ends; above all, it is a relation between people. Poverty is a social status. As such it is the invention of civilisation. It has grown with civilisation, at once as an invidious distinction between classes and more importantly as a tributary relation- that can render agrarian peasants more susceptible to natural catastrophes than any winter camp of Alaskan Eskimo. (Sahlins [1972] 1997:19)

This outlines an understanding of poverty as a cultural construct, which can change dependent on the perspective and vantage point held.

This is an analysis that has been echoed in Indigenous peoples' histories of colonization. It includes changes to perceptions of poverty comparing pre-colonial and colonial interactions and exposures:

This tendency attributes problems about the effectiveness of development and the expenditure of the aid dollar to poor monitoring and evaluation, poor design, poor implementation, poor ownership or poor participation of recipients in all the above. An interesting collection of recent Australian articles that demonstrates precisely this point is in Thomas, Pam (ed.) 2004, *International Perspectives on Aid Effectiveness.* Development Studies Bulletin No. 65, The Development Studies Network, The Australian National University: Canberra.

[15] This inequality is stark. Sachs states 'in 1960, the Northern countries were 20 times riches than the Southern, in 1980 46 times' (Sachs 1992:3).

[16] Truman's speech is deconstructed and analysed powerfully in Escobar's 1995 text *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.*

'Poverty' has only recently been introduced to Native Communities...for thousands of years people subsisted from the land and ocean along the west coast of Alaska. It is a hard life, but it had none of the frustrations and stigmas of poverty, for the people were not poor. Living from the land sustained life and evolved the Yupik culture, a culture in which wealth was the common wealth of the people as provided by the earth, whether food was plentiful or scarce among the people. This sharing created a bond between people that helped ensure survival. Life was hard then, but people found life satisfying. Today life is getting easier, but it is no longer satisfying. ...With the first Russian traders came the idea of wealth and poverty. These new people added to the process of living the purpose of accumulation. ... The new economic system... began replacing food and furs with cash, cooperation with competition, sharing with accumulating... Fortunately a cure has been found for measles. A cure has not been found for our 'poverty'. (Davidson and the Association of Village Council Presidents [1974] cited in Clarkson, Morrissette and Regallet 1997: 45)

In working to alleviate/eradicate poverty, the way 'development' functions as a discourse is premised on an imposed definition of poverty.

The way the concept of poverty functions in development discourse is frequently as an objective, quantifiable fact. The way in which this can operate is used in a discussion of the dynamics of poverty described in Chapter 4. As the dynamics of development approaches have changed over time, poverty has assumed a stronger emphasis and role in development assistance. This has been linked to an agenda of focusing on the participation by 'the poor' in development initiatives and planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation[17]. The growth of techniques to increase community participation in development assistance, via conducting Participatory Poverty Assessments and Participatory Rural Appraisals is evidence of this interest in 'putting the last first' (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Chambers 1983, 2004), as is the increased interest effective strategies for civil society engagement and strengthening (Low and Davenport 2002). Major international development institutions have adopted this language and approaches. The World Bank undertook major consultations with 'the poor' in preparing its 2000 World Development Report, titled 'Attacking Poverty' (Narayan et al 2000; Williams and McIlwaine 2003). Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers have become a major tool for national level development planning and assistance by the International Financial Institutions and multilateral development agencies (World Bank 2006; UNDP 2001; Verheul and Rowson 2001). The Asian Development Bank has pioneered the use of participatory poverty analysis in the pacific region (Abbott and Pollard 2004). What is clear is that the cultural and historical aspects of poverty cannot be excised from the way in which poverty functions within development discourse.

Planning

The concept of planning has a pivotal position within development discourse as a theoretical approach and a tool of development assistance. Within development

---

[17] For example, see this study by Tinker (1993) 'Evaluation of the organisation for development and support of street food vendors in the city of Mina: Model for empowering the working poor'.

discourse planning is promoted both as a response to poverty at the village level and a requirement for improved functioning of the state and national economic development. A feature of the way the concept of planning works is a reliance on defining a 'problem', to which some form of planning is inevitably the appropriate response. The concept has been and continues to be used within development discourse as a neutral term, without reference to its historical social, cultural and economic origins and as such without understanding of the significant social change it requires and creates.

Escobar (1992) traces the history of the term to a specific series of responses in Western Europe to the social and economic change that occurred with the advent of the industrial era, namely town planning and social services planning to address population pressures in cities that had occurred with mass urbanization and at the national level, economic planning. Drawing on Foucauldian insights of the relationship between knowledge disciplines and practices, Escobar outlines the ways in which those new responses of planning created specific roles for the state in daily life. Planning required changes that were both ideological and physical: its effects produced or created ordered governable subjects. These disciplines of planning "have shaped not only social structures and institutions, but also the way in which people experience life and construct themselves as subjects" (Escobar 1992:133). This production of governable subjects requires a produced and accepted conformity. The removal of difference in this process has major effects and impacts. For example, the creation of the concept of the modern economy separated the economic from the social spheres as forms of capitalism strengthened, and other forms of social and economic organisation, such as subsistence activities, were marginalized. The origins of the concept of planning in this specific context of industrializing Western Europe mean:

> In short, planning redefines social and economic life in accordance with the criteria of rationality, efficiency and morality, which are consonant with the history and needs of capitalist, industrial society, but not short of the Third World. (Escobar 1992: 134-5)

Escobar's essay highlights the ways in which planning is a central concept within development discourse and praxis. In the immediate post Second World War period which saw the creation of critical development institutions such as the World Bank, and the creation of the modern United Nations, planning plays a critical role. Planning was the neutral science required by developing countries to develop. Within this aspect of development discourse, the introduction of planning is required to address national social and economic ills, which are identified as a result of the absence of effective planning from the state. Thus not only is a lack of planning is a problem that requires rectification by planning, the histories of colonial exploitation and the dynamics of the international political economy are also and simultaneously ignored. Escobar highlights the significance of planning as a method and a concept within development discourse with the following quote from the first UN Development Decade:

> The ground has been cleared for a non-doctrinaire consideration of the real problems of development, namely saving, training and planning, and for action on them. In particular, the advantages in dealing with the various problems not piecemeal, but by a comprehensive approach through sound development planning, became more fully apparent…Careful development

> planning can be a potent means of mobilising…latent resources for a rational solution of the problems involved. (United Nations 1962 cited in Escobar 1992: 136)

Escobar's essay charts the ways in which planning has not stayed still as a concept within development discourse and praxis. It has changed over time as new approaches and emphases have evolved in development praxis, providing mandates for involvement in the most intimate aspects of people's lives[18]:

> From the emphasis on growth and national planning in the 1950s, to the Green Revolution and sectoral and regional planning of the 1960s and '70s, including 'Basic Needs' and local level planning in the '70s and '80s, to environmental planning for 'sustainable development' and planning to 'incorporate' women, or the grassroots into development in the '80s, the scope and vaulting ambitions of planning have not ceased to grow. (Escobar 1992: 137)

In shifting his discussion explicitly into the Foucauldian territory of the relationships between knowledge and power, Escobar explores the way in which planning within development has been used as a conceptual neutral science, utterly rational and logical, devoid of the contaminating influence of cultural specificity and the overt understanding of the way in which planning is both a tool of domination and a productive force. Escobar highlights the ways in which planning as a discipline shifts culture, social and economic organisation and is a mode of exercising power:

> Planning relies upon, and proceeds through, various practices regarded as rational or objective, but which are in fact highly ideological and political. First of all as with other development domains, knowledge produced in the First World about the Third World gives a certain visibility to specific realities in the latter, thus making them targets of power. (Escobar 1992: 140)

Planning, in this reading, is a way within development praxis to focus on the most intimate aspects of people's lives, such as planning for reproductive health or nutrition, and separate them from other aspects of life, society, economy and culture. The rationality and neutrality ascribed to planning hides the way in which planning is the modality of reconciling complex competing concerns and issues – planning of some sort or another is the fail-safe development solution to whatever problems or needs are identified, be it poverty, population growth rates, public health, transport or lack of international capital for economic investment. Escobar is blunt about the detrimental effects of planning within development. He argues that the planning approach within the green revolution and integrated rural development projects has:

> …in general contributed not only to the growing pauperisation of rural people, but also to aggravated problems of malnutrition and higher…the impact of many development programmes has been particularly negative on

---

[18] The United Nations Programme of Action for Population and Development 1994 and its reviews in 1999 and 2004 make recommendations on reproductive health and access to contraception, and is a demonstration of the way in which planning as a concept within development is now engaged in the most intimate aspects of people's daily lives.

women and indigenous peoples, as development projects appropriate or destroy their basis for survival. (Escobar 1992:141)

The forms of planning described by Escobar are all gender-blind, and in so doing perpetuate the Western European enlightenment tradition of a gendered separation between the public and private spheres. As such, the planning concept in various guises has been unable within development to recognise the roles of women and their importance in social and economic life in developing country settings. A key example is the role of women in many developing countries as the primary producers of subsistence agriculture, yet development plans for agricultural improvement have frequently targeted men as smallholder farmers (Boserup 1970; Ukeje 2006).

This Foucauldian reading of planning as a concept highlights the cultural specificity of the term's genealogy, and identifies the ways in which the unquestioning use of the concept within development praxis has seen it play a critical and influential role. I would argue that the specific impacts of planning as a concept and discipline within development praxis cannot be separated from the overall development enterprise and the inequity of international political economy. In this essay Escobar gives a little too much credit to planning as a discipline in identifying the negative and productive impacts of the term within development. The concept of planning is further explored in *Encountering Development* (1995) where it is placed in a broader context of development discourse and praxis. Planning is a critical term within development praxis and discourse, but it sits alongside the invention of poverty, the assumed concept of progress, the idea of modernity, and the concept of helping as pivotal concepts that form the complex discursive world in which development occurs.

Progress

The idea of progress is a core assumption within development discourse. It is the concept of an inevitable path that can be followed, into a modernised and industrialised future. The concept of progress became dominant, promoted in the eighteenth and nineteenth century with the industrial revolution, increasing dominance of science and technology, and forms of national political structures – parliament, democracy and the nation-state. It inevitably leads to divisions: those supporting the aspirations of progress, those who are engaged in progress, those who have achieved a state of progress and those who have not. Progress was a core concept in the colonial endeavour, and as such became incorporated into the structural and conceptual legacies upon independence. The phrase fell into disfavour after the Second World War, which was seen as a climax of the achievement of modern progress. However the associated set of interpretations and associations of the term 'progress' found a new life within development discourse (Sbert 1992; Schech and Haggis 2000:15). This legacy of the term progress within development praxis has been explored by a number of theorists, including the influential sociologist Teodor Shanin (1997) who drew on his work analysing the survival strategies amongst informal peasant economies to map the historical and philosophical antecedents of the concept:

> The idea of progress is the major philosophical legacy left by the
> seventeenth to nineteenth centuries to the contemporary social sciences.

> The idea was secular, departing from the mediaeval mind set where everything could be explained by God's will, and it offered a powerful and pervasive supra-theory that ordered and interpreted everything within the life of humanity – past, present and future. The core of the concept, and its derivations and the images attached to it have been overwhelmingly simple and straightforward. With a few temporary deviations, all societies are advancing naturally and consistently 'up', on a route from poverty and barbarism, despotism and ignorance to riches, civilisation, democracy and rationality, the highest expression of which is science. This is also an irreversible movement from an endless diversity of particularities, wasteful of human energies and economic resources, to a world unified and simplified into the most rational arrangement. It is therefore a movement from badness to goodness and from mindlessness to knowledge, which gave this message its ethical promise, its optimism and its reformist 'punch'. (Shanin 1997:65)

These functions of the term 'progress' within colonial, industrial and economic discourse emerge time and time again within development discourse. Escobar gives an example of the re-emergence of progress as a core assumption, unquestioningly, by the dominant development literature promoting the 'green revolution' (Escobar 1995: 159-160).

This is not to mean that these discursive associations with the term 'development' are not contested on many different levels in many different spaces and places:

> People in rural Africa, Asia and Latin America experience 'development' in several ways. They experience in practice processes that are described to them as development, in terms of official discourse inspired by or dressed up in an idiom of Western origin. They can evaluate these processes for themselves in terms of material loss and gain, as well as set them in relation to the values they themselves have for what is a good life. But they also get the ideological message itself. They scrutinise it for its validity in relation to local ideas and also for its consistency with the practical process they have seen. Do the ideal claims of development agree with the praxis? Much of this evaluation is a collective process, interwoven with the routines of daily life. (Gudrun Dahl and Gemetchu Megeressa [1992] 1997: 52)

The personal experience of and resistance to the productive nature of the grand narrative of development discourse is highlighted in Nadnra Shestra's powerful tale of growing up in Nepal. The intersections between poverty, identified by others and then self-identified, planning and the notion of progress where all that had occurred before was singularly characterised as backward and anti-development are all explored in this personal account of the seductive and productive power of development discourse within developing country social networks and cultural paradigms:

> This personal narrative reveals how and why the discourse of development, with the help of foreign aid, solidifies the colonial mindset in the post-imperial world, crafting cultural values, thinking, behaviour and actions. (Shestra 1995: 266)

The emergence of development as a concept and praxis in Nepal occurred in the 1950s, and as a concept and praxis it became known by a Nepali word *bikas,* and its opposite was *abikas*. The associations of *bikas* were with educated elites, large

capital projects such as roads, hospitals and dams, and with a working life not involved with manual labour. The opposite of *bikas,* the people labelled *abikasi* were the poor, the uneducated, those involved with agricultural subsistence and manual labour. *Bikas* was progress, modernity, science, technology and all that was required to achieve it. *Abikas* was poverty, the poor, the uneducated, cultural beliefs and aspirations that were incompatible with *bikas.* In Shestra's article about his personal experience growing up in Nepal, the grand narrative of development is exposed as a tool of social, cultural and economic change on such a massive scale that it separated parents from their children:

> Many students felt ashamed to be seen in public with their parents. The new education gave us the impression that our parent's manual labour was antithetical to *bikas*. So we sneered at manual work, thinking that it was something only an *abikiasi* or intellectually underdeveloped' mind would do. It was not for the high-minded *bikasis*. The new educational system was producing a whole new way of thinking about the value of labour. (Shestra 1995: 268-9)

Shestra's personal account of the impact of *bikas* showcases the cultural impact of development discourse, and the way in which it has a negatively impacted on people's self-reliance and experience of poverty. Shestra's article provides insight into how key concepts within development discourse and praxis – poverty, planning and progress – are productive concepts in this significant social, cultural and economic change. Shestra is associated with the self-reflexivity in development studies influenced by Foucault, Said and postmodern or 'post-development' theorists. What is clear is that in challenging the grand narrative of development, theorists such as Shestra, Escobar, Sachs, Esteva and Ferguson question, deconstruct and explore development as discourse without any gender analysis. In asking the questions 'where are the women?' and 'who are the women?' in this thesis the gendered nature of the grand metanarrative of development is revealed, and with it the conceptual seams of LDC development discourse are readied for some analytic unpicking.

Conclusion

This chapter began by describing the research approach and source material. In summarising the thesis's emphasis on primary source material, I outlined the lack of secondary literature that had analysed the existence and operation of the LDC category itself. The main focus of the chapter is outlining and identifying approaches I have drawn upon in undertaking this analysis of the LDC category. I began by detailing the distinction between category 'LDC' and Ferguson's influential post-modern influenced critique of development policy and practice of the World Bank's Less Developed Country category and its operations in Lesotho. The discussion then outlined aspects of Foucauldian analysis that have been drawn upon by theorists and analysts, (including Apthorpe and Cooper) of development discourse and function and introduced the key analytic concepts used in assessing the operations of LDC category discourse, technologies of knowledge. In introducing this concept I demonstrate how it is grounded in Foucauldian theory and linked to Escobar's analysis of development as discourse.

The chapter then locates the approach to gender analysis in the thesis's postmodern and postcolonial influenced critiques of development discourse. It begins this discussion by locating these critiques within the trajectory of feminist engagements with development. This includes tracing the WID, WAD and GAD debates linking them with theories of feminism and models of development. The postmodern and postcolonial influenced have challenged the essentialised notions of gender and culture in these approaches. The chapter then outlines a core premise of the thesis, the feminisation of poverty. The chapter then proceeds with an analysis of development, outlining the distinctions between the two main models of development theory, the modernisation and dependency approaches. It then locates this thesis's research approach with post-development critiques that criticize enlightenment metanarratives and situates core concepts within development discourse – poverty, planning and progress – with their historical philosophical roots, and their interaction with culture.

This thesis explicitly draws on Foucauldian discourse analysis and gender analysis to examine the ways in which LDC category operates within development discourse. This analysis recognises that readings of gender and development discourse are complex, associated with multiple interpretations, analyses and theories. Neither term exists in an environment where it can operate as an objective descriptor, excised from socio-economic, cultural and historical uses and associations. The interactions and intersections between gender analysis and development theory, policy and practice are complex and have changed over time. Despite taking place at the same time as the growth of critical analyses of development practice, and the emergence of gender and development debates and theories, United Nations policy and analysis of the Least Developed Countries is characterised by the absence of an acknowledgement of this complexity, and frequently of any recognition that there is an interaction between gender and development at all. The technologies of knowledge – policy, categorization and data – are ways in which category LDC operates within development discourse. Gender analysis is an important starting point, to interpreting the ways in which these technologies function, and provides important insights into category LDC and development discourse.