What development for a society founded on the principles of economic and social solidarity ? Proposals for discussion

Translated by : Alexandre Papadopoulos, Michele Richman et Robert Corner, Coorditrad

A workgroup set up by ATTAC's Scientific Council has been working for a year and half on the question of development.In its plenary sessions the Council has on several occasions examined the progres of ideas on this subject and provided the modifications it juge necessary. The totality of this work will appear in a book to be published within the next few weeks. Given the magnitude of the subject it nonetheless seemed useful to provide members with a brief report as soon as feasible. The Council has therefore prepared the following eight pages of summary. In no way does this document propose any fixed positions on the part of ATTAC, assuming such a possibility would even be desirable. It is more an attempt to contribute to an ongoing debate within the association.

. . .

At the dawn of the twentieth century, humanity was drawn into theparlous spiral of capitalist globalisation and the increasingly liberal policies it entails. The manifold forms of social decline now affecting entire populations first and foremost the poor but also those with hard-won and significant systems of social welfare - are the hallmarks of lethal deregulation. Environmental degradation, including high levels of pollution and global warming, the exploitation and depletion of our natural resources, and the loss of biodiversity, are now undermining the bases of the planet's future and bringing us face to face with our responsibilities vis-ˆ-vis future generations. Social and ecological issues have to be taken together - capitalism, in its thirst for gain, is attempting to extend the notion of private property to domains which so far have remained beyond its reach: from the natural resources such as clean water and the air we breathe, for example, through to the manipulation of patents, or the production of foodstuffs through bioengineering, ...

It is no false catastrophism to denounce an economic system careering at breakneck speed in its insatiable desire to convert all capital into profit; inevitably it can only aggravate the social and ecological contradictions already existing. Nor is it anexaggeration to challenge the model of development imposed and underlying its predatory systems a model of wasteful production and consumption proposed to all peoples of the planet, despite being well-beyond the reach of most of them. Indeed, given the environmental limitations, it remains virtually impossible to replicate in most areas of the world; its application in development programmes across the East and the West throughout the twentieth century has demonstrated its unsustainability.

ATTAC is hoping to make contributions to the debate on the construction of an alternative world based on solidarity and respect for basic human rights and limited environmental resources. The exchange of ideas on an alternative development model is, therefore, essential, particularly given that a variety of different views and opinions have already been expressed within the "alter"-globalisation movement. Whilst this diversity is part of our strength, it also points to the need to clarify our ideas and, most especially, the priority objectives around which convergences can be constructed.

This document provides a summary of the analyses presented in the book to appear under the title, « Le Développement a-t-il un avenir ? Pour une société solidaire et économe » [1], As such it offers a rapid survey of the planet and an inventory of those policies which have either attempted to promote development or succeeded in blocking it by imposing the liberal paradigm. It then sets out the terms of the polemic between advocates of a « sustainable

development » model, the adversaries of all forms of development and partisans of a human project for development reconstructed around basic needs and human rights. Finally, it proposes areas of activity in favour of the latter.

1. A disastrous record

Since the second half of the XXth century economic development has rhymed with progress, and has been accepted as an almost universal goal. All human beings, sooner or later, were to enjoy higher standards of living, facilitated by economic growth, and, especially, an improvement in well-being; this thanks to extended life expectancy and the spread of education and culture.

Development = growth in per capita GDP + improved well-being. This simple equation, generally accepted, summarised the readily accessible path to be followed towards progress. The least one can say is that this promise has not been fulfilled: the ambitious development strategies have frequently proved illusory for a majority of peoples and have exacerbated planetary imbalance. In addition the term "development" has often been used as an alibi by international organisations; it has rendered acceptable what is nothing other than a quest for unlimited capital accumulation, in the service of a privileged social minority.

The persistence and extension of poverty

All the statistics concur: the number of poor and very poor across the world is not decreasing. Year after year reports by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) show that 1.2 billion people live on less than a dollar a day. Inequalities have exploded over the last half-century. At the beginning of the 1960s it was estimated that the gap between the poorest and the richest 20 of the planet was of 1 to 30. Today that gap is of 1 to 80.

The UNDP’s 2003 Report asserts that "some 54 countries are poorer today than in 1990. In 21 countries a higher percentage of the population suffers from hunger. In 14 countries there are more children dying before the age of five. In 12 countries elementary school enrolment has declined. In 34 life-expectancy is lower."

The UN Food and Agriculture Organisation emphasises in its 2003 report that the number of undernourished people was dropping in the first half of the 1990s (there being approximately 37 million fewer between 1990 and 1995), but that it had risen thereafter by 18 million. This can, for the most part, be explained by the deregulation of international trade in agricultural produce and by the influx of capital in agriculture. This has led to a lowering of farm prices, hitting peasant farmers hardest - whilst the gap in agricultural productivity has increased by a factor of 100 in 50 years.

The rise in poverty could be seen even in the richest countries, and most notably in the United States and the UK where economic disparities have been most glaring. According to the UNDP’s 2002 Report, between 1979 and 1997 rising incomes have benefited the rich: the earnings of the top 1% of families rose by 140% or three times the national average. The UNDP’s Human Development Index (HDI) is designed to measure progress other than that of the GDP per head it takes into account also increases in life-expectancy and educational parameters. Globally, these two indicators have improved. East Asia, the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean have literacy levels approaching 90%, whereas South-Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab nations are at only 60%. In countries with weak human development, according to the UNDP, the proportion of literate adults has doubled in the last 25 years, but it does not surpass 50%. Out of 21 Sub-Saharan countries, 14 are lagging or in

regression. Moreover, 39% of the global population are unrepresented, as the statistics in 93 countries are inadequate.

The tendency toward increased life expectancy is therefore overshadowed by considerable disparities, and by regression in some cases. 15 countries, for instance, representing 4% of the world population (10 of which are in Sub-Sahara Africa) show a rise in the mortality of children under 5 years of age, and 66 countries (57% of the world population) are behind in their so-called Millennium targets on poverty eradication. The decline in life expectancy, most notably in a large number of African countries, is largely due to the ravages of AIDS. Twenty-two million people have already died of AIDS, leaving 13 million children bereft of at least one of their parents. More than 40 million are HIV-positive, and 93% of these are in developing nations, with 75% of them in Sub-Sahara Africa.

The situation of women in a country is a strong indicator of social development. Gender disparities remain significant; they have even increased in terms of womenÕs income-earning potential, their access to training or participation in social and political life. Two-thirds of illiterate adults are women, and three-fifths of the 115 million children who do not go to school are female. To this, one must add their high mortality: 514 000 women die each year during pregnancy or delivery one per minute.

One cannot now maintain what has so often been claimed in the past, that the principal cause of poverty is population growth: the birth rate has in fact slowed down across the world. The planet now supports 6 billion inhabitants. According to an (average) projection this will rise to approximately 9 billion in 2050, and then remain stable.

Clearly such a large and youthful population will require resourcesand facilities. But rates of reproduction respond to levels of poverty and access to education, and not vice versa. Policies that confuse cause and effect can lead to social disaster.

Ecological disaster

The very conditions of life on planet Earth may very well be undermined. The current ecological crisis presents three mutually-reinforcing phenomena: the generalisation of pollution and resource depletion; the impact of human ecological demands exceeding the planetÕs capabilities; the fact that the poor bear the brunt of environmental degradation.

We must first note that environmental degradation and the depletion of natural resources are now phenomena universally acknowledged. Our fossil fuel resources will disappear in a matter of decades, with no serious alternative programmes other than nuclear being envisaged for renewable energies. Our fish supplies are also threatened by over-fishing. Water is becoming a scarce commodity in those zones where irrigation diverts it for over-demanding crops. The tropical forests are shrinking, as is biodiversity (one mammal in four and one in eight bird species are threatened in the short term).

Secondly, the ever-growing sources of pollution are rendering the air in many cities impossible to breathe, and the water in areas of intensive agricultural production unfit for human consumption. Tankers continue to spill their cargoes of oil with no measures being taken to prevent them.

Thirdly, global warming associated with an aggravation of the greenhouse effect (itself caused by agricultural, industrial and vehicular emissions) is an indisputable reality. Approximately 8 billion tons of carbon dioxide are dumped into the atmosphere per year. By the close of the twenty-first century this will result in a rise in sea levels, the flooding of coastal areas, disturbed rainfall patterns and ocean currents, desertification and drought on the one hand and flooding on the other. There is a real fear that the first effects will be the literal

sacrifice of entire swathes of the poorest of the earthÕs populations, before reaching the point where the survival of humanity as a whole will be at stake.

Scientists consider the critical threshold for carbon-equivalent emissions to be 500 kg per person per year. All the developed nations are well above this maximum, with the United States taking the lead with 5500 kg per person per year; the Europeans stand at around 3000 kg.

The challenge of global warming and the progressive exhaustion of fossil fuels compels us to envisage alternative energy scenarios, especially given the need to prioritise the development of the poorer nations. During the first half of the twentieth century, world consumption of "primary" energy resources quadrupled, reaching the equivalent of 10 billion tons of oil equivalent. At the same time the world population increased by 2.4 from 2.5 to 6 billion; this has resulted in an increase of two-thirds in the average energy consumption per person. Energy consumption, however, varies widely, since 60% of the energy produced is consumed by only 20% of the world population. The poorest 2 billion living on less than $1000 per year consume less than 0.2 tons of oil equivalent per head per annum, whereas the richest 1.2 billion living on an annual $22000 per head account for 5 tons of oil equivalent per year; this gives a disparity of 1 to 25.

The organisation Redefining Progress has devised the "ecological footprint" index, defined as the area required to accommodate human activities. Since 1960 to 1999 the ecological footprint left by mankind on the planet has increased from 70% to 120% of its surface area. Humanity has thus, according to this calculation, exhausted the planetÕs capacity for absorption. Let us not forget the enormous inequalities: a North American will leave a footprint of 9.6 hectares or 7 times that of an African or Asian. According to this analysis, four or five planets would be required if the entire world population was to consume at the rate of an inhabitant of the United States.

Poverty and ecological degradation are both mutually reinforced by the phenomena of desertification, soil degradation, water shortage, drought and /or flooding. The impact on agricultural production is dramatic. In the long run the World Bank foresees a third of BangladeshÕs rice paddies flooded by rising sea levels. The 2002 rice harvest was reduced by 10% in Cambodia and subsequent crops were seriously threatened. Following two years of poor harvests, serious famine is now threatening southern Africa.

Strategies and policies reconsidered

The paradox - but is it really such? - is that, for the last two hundred years, capitalism has been engendering (and relying upon) social and ecological disruption, whilst promoting in parallel the growth of commercialised production, the alleged source of all well-being.

But such growth is so iniquitous that the causes of inequality need to be questioned. The principal explanation for the disparity in living standards (which appeared and were amplified worldwide in the course of the 19th century, when they were at most 1 to 2 or 3) can be found in the dynamics of accumulation thriving on capitalism.

The regions that have experienced the fastest rates of growth werethose in which capitalism was born Western Europe, North America and then later Japan, those regions forming the center of Fernand Braudel’s capitalist "world-economy". The regions at the periphery, where economic growth and progress were slower in terms of life-expectancy and education, were those denied the opportunities for capital accumulation or, more often, exposed to colonial domination (Latin America and a large part of Asia and Africa, in particular).

In the 19th century the imperialist nations imposed free trade policies on their colonies whilst remaining protectionist themselves. This was the case of Great Britain, which blocked

the nascent industrialisation of textiles in India. The "the development of under-development" has been invoked to describe the fact that under-development and the exacerbation of inequalities were not caused by retarded development, but occurred as the direct result of social organisations dominated by the nations of the centre. The centre, with the assistance of local dictatorships, obliged the periphery to maintain a workforce drained from rural areas, devoid of rights, and to be mobilised whenever needed. The large capitalist corporations were the main beneficiaries. In the centre however, despite the pressure of social conflicts, social protection schemes and increased standards of living have sufficed up to now to contain the conflicts. In this way the gulf between centre and periphery - erroneously portrayed as a matter of retarded development - continues to widen in all crucial areas, including industrialisation, standards of living, social and political rights.

This is well illustrated by the change in the terms of trade (the purchasing power generated by a country's exports for importing foreign products) pertaining between the raw-material producing countries and those producing primary commodities. If we exclude the 1970s, and oil in particular, the terms of trade have deteriorated. Raw materials, and basic commodities in particular, (coffee and cocoa, for example) lost as much as 50% of their purchasing power between 1980 and 2000.

Since the Second World War, following decolonisation, the drive for development led to controversies within the nations concerned and amongst economists in the field. One of the most important points of contention is whether production should be oriented primarily toward the satisfaction of domestic needs or be determined by external demand, even if this means importing the products one no longer produces. The first option would at first sight seem to be preferable. But there are many cases where the strategy of substituting domestic production with imported goods and exporting industrial products instead of barely processed raw materials has not led to genuine independence. Nor has it brought about any significant improvement in living conditions for all levels of society. In Latin America in the early part of the XXth century, such strategies encouraged the emergence of an industrial base.

They did not however succeed in producing any significant transformation in those social structures marked by the concentration of wealth and the collusion of dominant elites with international capital.

When attempts were made to take advantage of the Cold War and introduce strategies of independence opposite the international market, or bring about socialist transformation, they found themselves rapidly confronted with their own particular difficulties, the failure of the Soviet model and, ultimately, accelerated globalisation.

The countries seeking to develop were confronted with the three inextricable strands of capitalist globalisation: rising levels of debt, structural adjustment, and falling levels of development aid. Given, in particular, the rise in interest rates across the world during the 1980s, the countries of the Third World have over twenty years accumulated staggering levels of debt, rising from barely 50 billion dollars to almost 2500 billion, of which two-thirds consist of public debt.

The IMF and the World Bank have taken advantage of the fragility thus caused to impose on debtor nations programmes of structural adjustment which were little more, in effect, than programmes of hyper-austerity. The restrictions on public expenditure introduced to balance the budget, the devaluations required to balance external trade, and the privatisations carried out to encourage foreign capital investment, have all resulted in the demise of any development objectives. The outcome was everywhere the same: an explosion in inequalities, the weakening of social security programmes, and, in some cases, reversals in terms of life expectancy and education. This occurred with no positive impact on the debt and

accompanied by periodic and brutal crises, such as the monetary crises in Asia in 1997 and Argentina in 2001.

At the same time, the liberalisation imposed on fragile economies was aggravated by a reduction in public aid, despite repeated resolutions in favour of its increase. The official targets of 1% of GDP (later reduced to 0.7%) were never attained. France, for example, only devotes 0.32% of its GDP to public development aid. These liberal policies have been tacitly promoted by the "Washington consensus", the worldÕs economic and political *lite; in the light of their patent failure they are now being served up as "good governance", without significant changes to their general orientation.

2.- A necessary debate

Faced with the failure of development policies (dictated by the interests of the dominant classes in even the poor countries and by the holders of international capital supported by the World Bank and the IMF) and the social and environmental impasse brought about by world capitalism, the very concept of development has become the focus of debate. Is there still a place for "sustainable development?" Or must we now abandon, once and for all, the development objective? Or, alternatively, can we resolve the dilemma by radically redefining the very content of development?

What is « sustainable development » ?

In 1987 the Brundtland report proposed the following definition : « Sustainable development is a mode of development that responds to current needs without compromising the ability of future generations to satisfy theirs. » Through this formulation, however, the subscribes to the idea that indefinite economic growth is possible without compromising social and natural equilibriums. Thanks to technical progress it will always be possible to produce more, using fewer resources and energy and with less pollution. However, whilst there has been a clear reduction in resource intensification, the benefits are more than offset by the general increase in productive activity, as was recognised in the UNDP’s 2002 Report: « For several years now production processes worldwide have become increasingly energy-efficient. However, given the increase in volume produced, this progress is far from sufficient to reduce global emissions of carbon dioxide. »

The virtues of sustainable development are now touted by those very international financial institutions and powerful financial groups who brought an end to development policies aimed at meeting the needs of the poorest of the poor; they include multinational corporations responsible for maritime transports and other sources of environmental pollution and for the promotion of genetically-modified organisms. Ringing declarations on sustainable development have been made by the governments of capitalist nations, without no noticeable consequences other than the reinforcement of existing destructive practice. In such a context there can be no possible exchange on sustainable development within a capitalist social framework completely indifferent to the global equilibrium and within a liberal philosophy subordinating all to the demands of indefinite economic growth. The lip-service paid to sustainable development is no more credible than acceptable; it makes the impossible wager that market forces will automatically impose acceptable social and environmental standards or will ensure their achievement through the automatic distribution of income and resources to

those best placed or offering the best price - witness the Kyoto protocol on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Out of the development ?

This explains the force behind the movement now campaigning for "an end to development" and in favour of "negative growth." We share many of its criticisms of capitalist development, but we feel that the call for negative growth is not only ill-founded but also impracticable. There are three reasons for this.

First, behind this thinking, there is often a refusal to acknowledge the idea of the progressive establishment of universel human rights, on the pretext that these are little more that a camouflage for western values. Evidently not all of those today questioning the concept of growth necessarily reject the principle of universal human rights; however, those who do contest the principle are those who advocate negative growth. Whilst we can criticize the West's pretension in imposing its culture and values, this should not undermine our acknowledgement of what is quintessentially human in every human being.

Secondly, to advocate negative growth as a value in itself is no more reasonable than to consider the growth so indispensable to capitalism (and so clearly an impasse) as a finality in itself. Whilst growth will tend to extend production indefinitely, its obverse, negative growth, can only extend it to zero. The two positions are absurd. Furthermore, if negative growth is taken within the capitalist framework, one can be sure that it would affect areas vital to the popular classes education, health and public services.

Thirdly, and most importantly, those populations endowed with all or nearly all resources must be clearly distinguished from those most deprived. The eradication of illiteracy presupposes the provision of schools; the delivery of drinking water implies the development of facilities; access to healthcare entails the development of health centres. And all of this means additional production, i.e. economic and developmental growth. The poorest nations therefore have a right to the growth necessary for the provision of goods and services not provided by their traditional economic structures and the market. Whether we call it « development » or otherwise, the universally accepted ambition for improved welfare via education or health services, should be sufficient to reconcile the diversity of viewpoints.

We must therefore avoid attributing to development, or indeed to any economic form, the damage which in reality is caused by the subordination of the economy, and society as a whole, to profit, following a rationale biased towards the interests of the dominant classes.

Rethinking the concept

Although the distinction between growth and development was made very early by development economists (making the former a necessary but not sufficient condition for the second), the definition has not stood the test of time: capitalism has so influenced attitudes that people now believe in the eternal need for growth, locked in the belief that improved standards of living depend on perpetual (and of market-oriented!) consumption. The distinction needs review.

We therefore suggest rethinking the concept of development, based on the prioritisation of basic needs, needs which are not minimalist but reasonable and defined by democratic political debate. This redefinition of development is quite distinct from the illusion of a clean and human « sustainable development » revolving within an economic system dominated by the profit motive. It is closer to the desire being expressed by social movements across the world for improved levels of justice and solidarity. Only this redefinition can create the conditions ensuring that the human impact on the biosphere does not threaten the future.

Whilst refusing the approach that rejects development, adopted by those favouring negative growth for all human beings and all types of production, we are well-aware that there are limits to growth. The extension and generalisation of the wasteful and extravagant lifestyle of the richest populations is neither possible nor desirable. Following the principle of responsibility formulated by philosopher Hans Jonas, it would appear reasonable to envisage negative growth for the richest countries, in order to reduce their use of natural resources and facilitate growth in poorer countries. Development becomes a strategic objective for all, if it is considered differently depending on the standard of living in question, and if priority is given to the production of quality under social and ecological conditions that are themselves of quality.

This change in perspective implies a radical transformation of our social aims and organisation. We cannot envisage an end to growth under the capitalist system; this would imply the growth also of poverty, unemployment and inequality. The debate on growth must therefore become part of the debate on going beyond profit. This implies an in-depth change in the notion of progress and well-being, and our collective understanding of these. Although it is easy to hypothesise on the deliberate deceleration of growth once it has attained a certain limit, its structural integration is quite another thing. A significant reduction in inequalities in even the richest countries, will doubtless be essential.

Society's breakneck economic expansion is mainly justified by capitalism's incapacity or refusal to temper these inequalities. Growth seems to be the only solution to flagrant injustice; in fact it is generally no more than a palliative. With technological conditions constant, high economic growth is not a necessary condition for counteracting unemployment, unless the distribution of income between work and capital and individual working time are taken as intangibles. The same logic applies when considering the level of social and ecological protection a society is able to (or chooses to) offer its members .

A society's capacity to reduce internal inequalities of all sorts will determine its ability to slow down material economic growth and encourage economy rather than waste. Economy in material growth and energy consumption is the sine que non for any progress towards the production of immaterial services and a real reduction in our exploitation of natural resources. Decelerated growth is therefore not an objective in itself, but a means of launching the transition which will render qualitative development independent of global economic growth (itself an illusion in the long-term). A conscious political decision to decelerate growth in the rich countries over the medium-term would have to precede any (conscious and political) decision to achieve negative growth; simultaneous negative growth is in any case not an option for all countries, nor for all types of production, considering the level of inequality pertaining, nor without consideration of production types. The aim is to bring economic activity back into the realm of social and ecological policy.

3.- Propositions for a united and energy-conscious society

This aim is to build a society in which solidarity with the majority takes precedence over profit for the few, and based on resource husbandry rather than waste. This will require a new conception of wealth, the redefinition of reasonable needs (human rights, for example), and action at both global and local level.

A new conception of wealth

Social wealth cannot be reduced to material accumulation, to the exchange of monetary values. Whole sections of life in society concern non-commercial relations, including the production of services socially funded (education, health, pensions), and non-monetary relations generating productivity and social relations (domestic duties, voluntary work and mutual help).

After decades of liberal insult we must rehabilitate non-commercial and non-monetary relations, which are the hub of authentic use values and essential elements of collective wealth. The battle for the recognition of voluntary service cannot be separated from that for reducing the working week as productivity rises - beyond the question of the production ethos, it is the final objectives of labour that is at issue.

Meeting basic needs : a right

There are certain basic rights: to food security and autonomy, to work and income under decent conditions, to political and union activity, equality for men and women, social security, education and culture, and to a healthy environment and the global commons such as water, air and technical knowledge.

The classification of such basic needs as rights positions them not as naturally inherent rights, but as the result of a social construction.

Such needs and rights set objectives for all humanity. strict controls over the movement of capital, global taxation, the abolition of tax havens and areas beyond the law, food sovereignty for all, guaranteed prices for primary commodities and natural resources, agrarian reform, ecological agriculture, protection for developing economies rather than their obligatory integration into the world market and the resulting international distribution of labour, democratic control over the central banks and international regulatory bodies, the development of management control for citizen-workers (particularly over mankindÕs natural heritage at all relevant levels, be they local or global), democracy in investment planning. In other words, the calling into question of the power wielded by capital.

Acting both globally and locally

Such prospects imply the uprooting of global capitalist logic, of the search for profit and global commoditisation. It is essentiel that these battles be globalised and coordinated at international level.

They will only succeed, however, if accompanied by daily action at local level across the world. The development of a society based on mutual solidarity will need more than a few islands of solidarity in an ocean of profit; the logic of profit would rapidly smother the rest. It is nevertheless important to encourage experiments demonstrating other modes of production, exchange and consumption other than those imposed by transnational corporations.

New production practices must be launched, which are managed by workers and users and supported by fair credit and trade, practices which reject the movement of capital, blind free trade, the liberalisation of community services and social security, the privatisation of essential services, patenting of living organisms, and refusal of labour rights. To make progress towards a more sustainable way of life there are battles to be fought by employees

standing up for their rights, by farmers seeking access to land or refusing GMOs, and by citizens struggling for empowerment.

What sustainability? What should be made to last?

The struggle to redefine and extend democracy, to have peace accepted as a fundamental value, or to make Man responsible for a healthy biosphere, cannot be dissociated from the emergence of a united and energy-conscious society. There is therefore no reason to drop the concept of development, as a project for the emancipation of all human beings. Nor is there any reason to abandon the hope of moving beyond social relations based on capitalist exploitation and alienation. The sustainability and viability we need are not those promised by the advocates of capitalist productivity. Our opting for a socially and ecologically sustainable way of life expresses our commitment to work on the sustainability of our living conditions rather on that of our commercial affairs.

Box 1

Measuring poverty

Population living with :

[-] less than 1$ per day: 1.2 billion

[-] less than 2$ per day: 2.8 billion

Population without access to:

[-] drinking water: 1.1 billion

[-] sanitary facilities: 2.4 billion

Population:

[-] suffering from malnutrition: 900 million

[-] illiterate: 900 million

The income of the richest 1% = income of 57% of the poorest.

Source: UNDP reports for 2002 and 2003.

Box 2

Average annual rise in GDP per inhabitant, 1820 -1998

	in percent	multiplied by
Western Europe	1.51	14.4
European immigration countries	1.75	21.9
Japan	1.93	30.0
Latin America	1.22	8.7
Eastern Europe and ex-USSR	1.06	6.5
Asia (without Japan)	0.92	5.1
Africa	0.67	3.3

Angus Maddison, L'Economie mondiale. Une perspective millénaire
OCDE, Paris, 2001

Box 3

Comparisons (annual figures)

Official development aid worldwide :	50 billion $
European and American agricultural subsidies :	350 billion $
Global expenditure on expectorer :	500 billion $
Global expenditure on arms and the military :	800 billion $

Box 4

A few definitions

Gross Domestic Product : the total monetary value of all the goods and services produced in a given year. Considers commodities and non-commodities, irrespective of their social cost.

Economic growth : increase in the GDP.

Development : growth and improved well-being. The question is whether it is actually possible to distinguish a rise in the GDP from a rise in well-being. Liberal economists, whatever they may actually say, think not. Opponents of the growth and development school think the same. We need to reconsider this distinction.

Use value : the utility of a commodity or service. An unmeasurable qualitative notion, which cannot be reduced to a unit of monetary exchange value.

Exchange value (often shortened to value): the rate used when exchanging two commodities, in a monetary transaction. In the capitalist system, this rate depends on the conditions of production (quantity of "living" or "dead" labour required), on the level of return required from oneÕs capital, and on fluctuations in the market .

Wealth : the totality of goods and services available with a certain use value, whether of natural or manufactured origin, monetarised or otherwise. Taken widely this can even include social solidarity.

Capitalism : social system based on the private ownership of productive resources, and on the obligation, for those not possessing capital, to sell their labour. As Karl Max observed, capitalists obtain value added from this labour; this allows them to accumulate capital, a resource whose sole raison dÕetre is to reproduce itself indefinitely.

Liberalism : the term refers to two different phenomena, clearly inter-related but not to be confused. Liberalism is both a political policy based on the freedom of the individual, and also an economic doctrine extolling private property as a so-called natural right. It rejects all state intervention in the provision of social welfare, arguing that the satisfaction of oneÕs personal interests is automatically in the public interest. The term liberal economics is used by extension to designate economic political programmes based on this philosophy.

Productivism : the endless search for growth in productivity, provided only that this lead to profit or favour a specific elite (the case in the USSR). Not to be confused with improvements in labour productivity (increase in the quantity produced per hour worked) which remain desirable, providing they are not achieved at the cost of labour intensification or irreversible damage to the environment.

Box 5

Further reading

[-] ATTAC, *Le développement a-t-il un avenir ? Pour une société solidaire et économe*, Editions 1001 Nuits, Paris, 2004.

[-] Gro-Harlem Brundtland, *Notre avenir à tous*, Editions du Fleuve, Montréal,1987.

[-] Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, *La Décroissance : Entropie-Ecologie-Economie*, Sang de la terre, Paris, 1995.

[-] Jean-Marie Harribey, *L'économie économe. Le développement soutenable par la réduction du temps de travail*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1997.

[-] Michel Husson, Six milliards sur la planète : sommes-nous trop ?, Textuel, Paris, 2000.

[-] Serge Latouche, « Les mirages de l'occidentalisation du monde : en finir, une fois pour toutes, avec le développement », *Le Monde diplomatique*, May 2001.

[-] Angus Maddison, LÕEconomie mondiale. Une perspective millénaire, OCDE, Paris, 2001.

[-] Damien Millet, Eric Toussaint, *50 questions, 50 réponses sur la dette, le FMI et la Banque mondiale*, Bruxelles, CADTM, Syllepse, Paris, 2002.

[-] René Passet, LÕEconomique et le Vivant, Economica, Paris, 1996.

[-] PNUD, *Human Development Report 2002* , Bruxelles, De Boeck, 2002 ; and *Human Development Report 2003*, Economica, Paris, 2003.

[-] Silence, Objectif décroissance. Vers une société harmonieuse, Ed. Parangon, Paris, 2003.

[-] Eric Toussaint, *La Finance contre les peuples, La Bourse ou la vie* , CADTM, Bruxelles, 2003.

[-] Stéphanie Treillet, LÕEconomie du développement, Nathan, Paris, 2002.

[-] Patrick Viveret, Reconsidérer la richesse, Editions de l'Aube, La Tour d'Aigues, 2003.

A more complete biography will soon be available on ATTAC France's website : www.france.attac.org.

Notes :
[1] NDT :ÓDevelopmentÕs Future? Towards an economy of solidarity and sustainabilityÓ)