

Summaries

Aram Ziai

Global structure policy or sustainable neoliberalism? A comment on the development discourse of the BMZ

The concept of „globale Strukturpolitik“ was introduced 1998 by the new federal government as an innovation in development policy. Many critics acknowledge that the concept is a step in the right direction but bemoan its insufficient implementation due to the negligible influence of the BMZ. An analysis of BMZ discourse, however, leads to the conclusion that the concept itself – although presenting itself as opposed to market fundamentalism – remains within a neoliberal framework, so that „sustainable neoliberalism“ appears to be an adequate term. It describes a kind of neoliberalism that includes certain ecological and participatory elements and tries to help the poor by better integrating them into the world market and thus letting them share the benefits of economic globalisation. The concept of „globale strukturpolitik“ can therefore be seen as an instance of the transformation of the classical paradigm of development in an era of globalisation.

Elmar Altvater

What Happens, when Public Goods are Privatised?

The privatisation of public goods is a dominant strategy all across the world, pushed by international institutions, backed by neo-liberal political concepts and propagated by economic actors, such as transnational corporations or institutional investors. Privatisation is the other side of the globalisation and liberalisation of markets, facilitated by the regulation of property rights (TRIPS and GATS) and new technologies. The question, however, is whether the privatisation of public goods is economically efficient, socially just and politically fostering the participation of peoples and the democratisation of societies, and above all how the human security of peoples is affected. Primarily, questions the concept of human (versus commercial) security has to be discussed, i.e. the norm defining whether a public good really is „good“. In many cases it is not good for all, but only for a few peoples. Thus public goods, especially the commons, do not only involve dilemmas (such as the „tragedy of the commons“), but also social contradictions. A good for some people can be „a bad“ for others. The distinction between local, regional, and global public goods only makes sense on the „demand“ or consumption-side of public goods, i.e. for users. With respect to their provision even local public goods, such as communal infrastructures, are the target of globally operating investors, e.g. via cross border leasing of local infrastructures. There is not only one form of privatisation, but there are many (from the privatisation of public firms to the „femini-

sation“ of social services and the commercialisation of public security), and for that reason it is difficult to get a comprehensive overview on the privatisation of public goods in different parts of the world.

Sonja Bartsch & Wolfgang Hein

TRIPS and Global Partnerships. Conflicts About Access to Medical Drugs in the Context of Global Health Governance

This article focuses on the interaction between the TRIPS agreement and Global Public-Private Partnerships (GPPPs) with regard to access to drugs for the poor. It is argued that TRIPS creates three types of problems for developing countries: a barrier for the development of their own technological capacities, a lack of incentive for the development of drugs for diseases of the poor, and a high price level for highly effective drugs. The possible exceptions from TRIPS like legally produced generics, parallel importing and compulsory licensing are not sufficient to cope with these problems. GPPPs in health – which can mainly be found in the areas of R&D and Access – can be regarded as an attempt to integrate public and private actors in global health governance and to reach a compromise between their respective interests. The neoliberal globalization process, so the main thesis of this article, led to the emergence of a global polity, in which dominant actors managed to establish their rules mainly through the WTO agreements, but in which the self-interest of these groups (legitimacy of this order, political stability, expansion of their basis of accumulation) also forces them to enter into compromises. In this context institutional forms like GPPPs have the chance to reach improvements for the poor. The respective policies and politics are not only contested but might also stimulate activities for wider reaching changes of the core structures of the „global polity“.

Robert Kappel

Cherries and cherry stones. Losers and winners in the world market

There are losers and winners in globalization. In this paper it will be argued that those developing countries which enable structural change might benefit, but this does not apply to those developing countries, which have fallen into a structural instability trap. Especially those countries suffering from asymmetric integration in world markets (resource abundant states) face external shocks with. Countries integrating in global value chains are in a far better situation but there is growing inequality. The minority of successful catching up countries have done better, because these economies started earlier, had a developmental state, established linkage structures thus boosting productivity, industrialization and agrarian change. The Washington Consensus fails to realize that liberalization and export orientation without structural

change, endogenous development via a developmental state will not be able to reduce inequality and poverty.

Bernhard Walpen

„Army is merely a plural of soldier“ or: The Methodology of Robinson Crusoe's Experiences. On neoliberalism and methodological individualism

The author examines the relationship between neoliberalism and methodological individualism. The historical development of both terms is shown. The article concentrates more strongly on methodological individualism. Also the relationship from this to marxism is examined.

As a result it can be held that neoliberalism and methodological individualism overlap, but one cannot reduce one on the other. Even if methodological individualism forms a scientific program, it is nevertheless ideologically over-determined in its most variants.

Huang Ping

After September 11th: A Challenge to whom?

One main purpose of this contribution is to convey central aspects of current intellectual debate in China. Starting from an understanding of the September 11th attacks as an outflow of frustration and crisis mainly in the Middle East, the article focuses on the crisis of the modern nation state as a container of violence and on the critical effects of modernisation, drawing mainly on the experience of China. Here, as in other large developing countries, future social disruption, e.g. by rural-urban migration coupled by failing employment opportunities, might produce considerable risks, even if fairly small minorities are driven into extremist reactions. The author sketches concrete policy outlines that might serve to avoid concomitant disasters.

Ingo Malcher

Continuity and rupture within neoliberal hegemony in Latin America

During the 1990ies Latin America was ruled by a neoliberal hegemony which on the turn to the 21st century came to an end due to several financial crisis and poor results in income distribution. But although neoliberal politics at the moment cannot count on a wide public consensus anymore there are still strong power structures, (i. g. financial market institutions like Rating Agencies and Country Risk Ranking, negotiations of the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA)) which make neoliberal politics work by forcing market friendly policy reforms. These power structures limit the possibility of social reforms of governments which tend to be progressive like in Brazil or Argentina.

Integration projects within Latina America, such as Mercosur, could strengthen the countries on the continent and open alternative development possibilities.

Gilberto Calcagnotto

The Lula Government between neoliberal Heritage and social Mandate

After the election of former union leader Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva as Brazilian President in October 2002 people expected that economic stabilization policies might lose some weight in favor of policies to improve social justice. The deterioration of Brazil's country risk indices during the election campaign forced all four main candidates to strongly reaffirm their commitment to orthodox economic policy. Lula was no exception, and the first six months of his government demonstrate his ability in transforming stabilization policy into an instrument of a socially oriented sustainable economic recovery. Just at the end of this period, most indicators show that time has come for an expansionary policy and a greater inclusion of the poor into economic and social cycles. This seems to reconfirm the correctness of his decision to pursue simultaneously stabilization, growth and distribution policies. And this can aid to improve the performance of Lula's party *vis-à-vis* its dissidents.

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| INKOTA - Brief | |
| Die Nord-Süd-Zeitschrift aus Berlin | |
| HANDEL – DIE WELT ALS WARE | Nr. 122 (Dezember 2002) |
| WTO – Welthandel und die Perspektiven / Bildung als Ware / Mercosur / GATS und die Folgen / Emissionshandel / Tauschringe in Argentinien / und vieles mehr | |
| SOZIALE BEWEGUNGEN | Nr. 123 (März 2003) |
| Aufschwung der sozialen Bewegungen / Das Phänomen ATTAC / Das Europäische Sozialforum / Theorie der sozialen Bewegungen / 3. Weltsozialforum in Porto Alegre / Friedensbewegung im Aufwind / und vieles mehr | |
| ÖKUMENE UND GLOBALISIERUNG | Nr. 124 (Juni 2003) |
| Kirchliche Globalisierungskritik / US-Hegemonialpolitik und Ökumene / Die Kirchen und der Irak-Krieg / Wie weiter mit der Ökumene? / und vieles mehr | |
| ARGENTINIEN UND BRASILIEN | Nr. 125 (September 2003) |
| Die ungleichen Nachbarn / Verschuldungskrise / Die MST und Lula / Hunger in Argentinien / Wie weiter mit den sozialen Bewegungen? / und vieles mehr | |
| Einzelheft (40-48 Seiten): 3,- Euro + Porto, im Abo (4x pro Jahr): 11,- Euro | |
| Greifswalder Str. 33a • 10405 Berlin | |
| Tel: 030 / 4289-111 • Fax: 030 / 4289-112 | |
| e-mail: inkota-brief@inkota.de • www.inkota.de | |

