

Globalisation and the Dynamics of Impoverishment –

The IMF and the World Bank*

Michael F. Keating

Politics and International Studies
University of Warwick

Prepared for the Development Studies Association (DSA) and Political Economy Research Centre (PERC) Policy Workshop, “Poverty and Social Exclusion in North and South”. University of Sheffield, 9 April 2001.

Abstract

This paper analyses the relation between globalisation and the dynamics of impoverishment through consideration of global attempts to promote development. The IMF and the World Bank are key international institutions in this regard, so analysis focuses on how they conceptualise globalisation, how this impacts on their development strategies, and the implications of this for impoverishment. The central argument of this paper is that the IMF and the World Bank’s conception of globalisation has, over the last decade, legitimated these institutions’ preferred, neo-liberal development strategy, with significant negative implications for impoverishment. Alternative strategies for conceptualising the globalisation-development nexus in the context of developmental efforts that reduce, rather than exacerbate impoverishment, are then considered.

Introduction

This paper elucidates the link between globalisation and impoverishment through analysis of the role of international financial institutions (IFIs) in promoting development. The two institutions that are focused upon are the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Particular emphasis is placed on how these IFIs conceptualise globalisation, and how this impacts upon their development strategies. The central argument of this paper is that the IMF and the World Bank use globalisation to legitimate neo-liberal development policies. This has significant implications for impoverishment.

The IMF and the World Bank – Globalisation and Development

The IMF and the World Bank play a crucial role in international efforts to promote development. They have considerable financial capacity, which endows them with significant structural power relative to developing countries. This enables these IFIs to attach policy conditions to loans – conditions which accord with their preferred development strategies – in what are usually referred to as structural adjustment programs (SAPs). The importance of these institutions to development is such that their preferred development strategies, and the particular policies they promote, have implications for what is legitimated in economic and political development more widely (Keating 1999: 429).

Many different development strategies have been advocated by the IMF and the World Bank since their inception, each with different implications for impoverishment. The IFIs development strategies are to some extent variable because development itself is a problematic concept. A universally acceptable framework for understanding and promoting development does not exist. Rather, development is complex and controversial, the subject of a wide-ranging debate within which exists diverse and competing viewpoints regarding social, political, economic, cultural, and (more recently) environmental factors.

However, development has important implications for impoverishment, as is evident in examples of developmental successes and failures since World War II. The World Bank, for example, engaged in extensive lending to developing countries in the 1970s in the name of poverty-alleviation, but a global commodity price slump and high interest rates ensured that a debt crisis was the result. It is estimated that half a million children in Africa die each year from debt-crisis caused impoverishment (Thomson 2000: 173). Failed developmental efforts are in fact widespread, but the clearest examples are in sub-Saharan Africa, despite decades of developmental aid and support by the IFIs.¹ Indeed, between 1965 and 1995 many countries, but particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa, had negative rates of economic growth (Leftwich 2000: 1).

‘In many of these societies, despite voluble developmental rhetoric, large numbers of people remain sunk in absolute poverty and many more hover close to it, while inequality, as measured by the distribution of income or (in some countries) land, has become grotesque. Moreover, such poverty and inequality are commonly expressed in tragically high levels of infant mortality, maternal mortality during pregnancy or childbirth and infant malnutrition’ (Leftwich 2000: 1).

A clear contrast can be made between these states and those, although few in number, which have experienced rapid economic growth and development, such as the Southeast Asian Newly Industrialised Countries (NICs). Crucially, the attainment of sustained high levels of economic growth allowed these countries ‘to lift many if not most of their people clear of the misery which so many others still experience’ (Leftwich 2000: 2). This achievement is crucially important because of the possibility that the policies leading to the Asian NICs developmental success might be transferred to other developing countries. The IMF and the World Bank, in fact, as this paper shows, linked the successful development policies of the Asian NICs to globalisation.

Globalisation, however, has been described as ‘the most over used and under specified term in the international policy sciences since the end of the cold war’ (Devetak and Higgott 1999: 483). Indeed, much like development, there exists ‘little

consensus' on 'definitions, evidence, explanations, implications, value judgements and prescriptions' regarding globalisation (Scholte 2000: 2). Despite, or, perhaps, because of this, the concept of globalisation has become crucially important to development studies, as it has to social science in general.

One thing that is clear about globalisation is that since the 1960s, in what might be considered the accelerated period of globalisation, levels of impoverishment – as sub-Saharan Africa shows – have often been exacerbated rather than reduced (Scholte 2000: 214). It is important therefore to understand the link between globalisation and impoverishment, and globalisation and development, which requires particular conceptions of globalisation to be explicated. There is a danger that without specification, analysis of globalisation might deteriorate into meaningless generalisations. This paper, therefore, given the importance of the IMF and the World Bank to development, seeks to explicate these institutions' conception of globalisation in the context of their development strategies, and to establish the consequences of this for impoverishment.

Globalisation and IMF and the World Bank Development Strategies

The central argument of this paper is that the IMF and the World Bank's conceptions of globalisation legitimate a neo-liberal development strategy.² Indeed, since the late 1970s and early 1980s, these IFIs have sought to promote development by increasing levels of economic growth through neo-liberal policies.³ The general thrust of the development strategy of the IMF and the World Bank in the 1990s was in fact for developing countries to take advantage of the rapidly expanding global market economy through neo-liberal policies.

Michel Camdessus, then Managing Director of the IMF, summed up the position of both institutions when he argued that 'globalisation offers considerable opportunities to accelerate trade and economic progress throughout the world' (1996). In fact, these IFIs' development strategies were explicit in promoting economic growth by

encouraging developing countries to rapidly adjust to changing competitive conditions in dynamic global markets⁴ (World Bank 1989: 10; IMF 1990: 13). Structural adjustment programs (SAPs) were used to encourage this development strategy, with clearly neo-liberal policy conditions attached (IMF 1990: 13; World Bank 1988: 59).

The most crucial policies were trade and financial liberalisation, which were aimed at promoting foreign investment and an export-oriented economy as the IMF and the World Bank considered an open economy to be essential to any development strategy (World Bank 1991: 7-8; IMF 1990: 6). An open economy was open to global competition, and to foreign goods, firms and capital. Indeed, the IMF and the World Bank explicitly argued that under conditions of globalisation, financial liberalisation would massively increase the opportunities for developing states to attract foreign investment capital, thereby increasing their levels of economic growth (World Bank 1993: 25; IMF 1992: 16). Indeed, globalisation was portrayed as a development opportunity, which developing states could take advantage of by engaging in financial liberalisation.

Globalisation is with us: the availability of massive amounts of private capital has opened new opportunities for investment and growth to an even larger number of developing countries, allowing many to develop more rapidly than would otherwise be possible (Camdessus 1997a).

The Southeast Asian Newly Industrialised Countries (NICs) were extremely important to the IMF and the World Bank in this regard because they are the only recent example of extremely successful development (Stiglitz 1998; Camdessus 1997). It was crucial that the Asian NICs rapid economic growth and development could be explained through neo-liberal policies. Indeed, the IMF and the World Bank attempted to do exactly this, in order to make their neo-liberal development strategy more attractive to other developing countries (Lim 1998: 26; World Bank 1993: 5; IMF 1997: 59). According to these institutions, the two main factors in the Asian NICs economic success were trade liberalisation, which encouraged an export-oriented development strategy, and financial liberalisation, which encouraged foreign capital inflows (IMF 1997: 57-9; World Bank 1991: 7-8).

In fact, the IFIs directly linked the success of neo-liberal policies in the Asian NICs to globalisation, which was held to have created the conditions that made rapid economic growth possible (World Bank 1993: 24-5). Furthermore, the World Bank argued that these policies were transferable to other developing countries, as 'despite changes in the global economic environment, these policies remain viable options for developing economies today' (1993: 347). Indeed, financial liberalisation was held to be the only policy option available under conditions of globalisation (1993: 25). However, by linking financial liberalisation to the Asian NICs, this policy appeared also to be the most likely way to generate rapid economic growth.

In today's increasingly global economic environment, few governments have the ability or the desire to close their financial markets. Indeed, many East Asian governments are in the process of liberalizing restrictions on capital flows (World Bank 1993: 25).

The IFIs argued that under conditions of globalisation it was in fact no longer possible for developing states to pursue interventionist or state-led development strategies (IMF 1997: 86; World Bank 1993: 24-5). Reasons given included that powerful global financial markets could greatly amplify the effects of policy mistakes, and that under the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) such policies might be deemed unfair by other countries (World Bank 1993: 25; Camdessus 1996). Consequently, policies such as export subsidies or export-linked directed-credit programs, were, under conditions of globalisation, deemed unsuitable for promoting development (World Bank 1993: 25). However, neo-liberal policies, such as trade liberalisation and encouraging export-oriented foreign direct investment and infrastructure projects remained viable (World Bank 1993: 25). These policies were linked with the success of the more recent Asian NICs, Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, and developing countries were encouraged to emulate them (World Bank 1993: 25).

The IMF argued that neo-liberal policies would resolve problems associated with rapid, large, volatile and destabilising capital flows, thereby laying the foundation for a fast-growing and stable global economy (1997: 80). However, the Asian NICs

experienced a severe economic crisis in the late 1990s which the IFIs recognised as raising fundamental questions about globalisation, about neo-liberal development strategies, and about financial liberalisation in particular (IMF 1999: 26; Sandström 1998). Financial liberalisation brought large capital inflows into the Asian NICs, but these were poorly allocated, with investors severely underestimating risk and overestimating returns, then engaging in ‘herd’ behaviour in the form of mass capital flight when this became apparent (IMF 1999: 34-6; World Bank 1998: xiii).

The IFIs argued however that the irrational behaviour of investors reflected inappropriate domestic policies which did not conform to neo-liberal policy recommendations, and which had caused the ‘risks of globalisation’ to manifest (World Bank 1999: 82; IMF 1999: 6-7; Berger and Beeson 1998: 500; Lim 1998: 31-2). Not only did the IMF argue that financial liberalisation was not responsible for the crisis, it advocated further liberalisation as a solution to the crisis (1999: 37). Liberalisation would for example, by enabling foreign ownership of the Asian NICs’ financial sectors, businesses, and assets, substitute for domestic financial reform by bringing in international financial companies, expertise, and standards, thereby helping to mitigate the ‘risks of globalisation’ (Camdessus 1998; IMF 1998: 31-2). The IMF argued that developing countries must ‘continue to liberalise international capital flows’, as with appropriate domestic policies they might benefit for globalisation and ‘reap the rewards of global competition’ (Camdessus 1998; IMF 1999: 6).

It is important to note, however, that the World Bank was not in accordance with the IMF. Apparently as a direct consequence of the Asian economic crisis, the World Bank argued that the supposed developmental benefits of financial market liberalisation were not supported by either empirical evidence or recent economic theory, whereas ‘economic instability’ and ‘financial market vulnerability’ were significantly increased (World Bank 1999: 97; Stiglitz 1998a). The period immediately following financial liberalisation, furthermore, was associated with a significantly higher probability of financial crises, especially where regulatory capacity is weak (World Bank 1999: 97). Consequently, the World Bank advocated

forms of capital controls such as taxes, regulations or restraints, especially for small, open or developing economies (Stiglitz 1998a).

Neo-liberal Development Strategies and Impoverishment

The IMF and the World Bank's structural adjustment programs (SAPs), complete with neo-liberal policy conditions, provide clear evidence that the IMF and the World Bank's globalisation legitimated development strategies generate impoverishment. It is important to note in this regard that the success of SAPs in promoting development is questionable. The United Nations Economic Commission on Africa argued that it is doubtful that SAPs have had a positive impact in Africa, where countries without SAPs have performed just as well, if not better, than those with SAPs (1989: 9-10).⁵ The World Bank admits that of 26 sub-Saharan African countries with SAPs, six have improved, nine improved marginally and eleven deteriorated (1994: 3).⁶

‘After a decade and a half of structural adjustment, there is no sign of the transformation in Africa's economic fortunes that it had been expected to bring about by its proponents; on the World Bank's most recent figures, per capita GNP continues to shrink, and most of the higher growth rates, as in Uganda and Mozambique, are the result more of rehabilitation than development’ (Clapham 1998: 266).⁷

In terms of the implications of these SAPs for impoverishment, one basic requirement of neo-liberal policy conditions was a reduction in state provision of social services, from which many citizens benefited, with, consequently, differential socio-economic effects (Schuurman 1993: 11-12; Leftwich 1994: 367). These effects were often to impoverish low-income groups that depended to a greater extent on state provision of employment, housing, health care, and education (Schuurman 1993: 11-12; Leftwich 1994: 367). One analyst estimated that 80% of people in developing countries would lose from IMF and World Bank SAPs with neo-liberal policy conditions (Taylor 1997: 50). Indeed, the Department of Social Medicine at Harvard Medical School recently published a study titled *Dying for Growth* that specifically focused on the devastating impact on the world's poor of the promotion of neo-liberal globalisation by the IMF and the World Bank (Kim et al 2000).⁸

‘Some analysts argue that the most powerful of the public institutions of global governance – the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and even the World Bank – through their promotion of unregulated economic globalization, have contributed to the growing numbers of the destitute as well as to the growing privilege of the world’s rich’ (Murphy 2000: 791).

SAPs have in fact been widely criticised for exacerbating impoverishment. According to several analysts, IMF SAPs in India, for example, promoted neo-liberal policies that resulted in an immediate increase in impoverishment (Hill 1999: 306; Chandresekhar and Sen 1999; Chaubey 1999). Policies aimed at removing subsidies, for example, included the abolition of a subsidy on basic food items administered through the Public Distribution Scheme (PDS) (Hill 1999: 306). The abolition of subsidies on basic food items, as well as on crucial medicines, also occurred in Africa, again resulting in increased impoverishment (Thomson 2000: 177).

The IMF in fact admitted that although SAPs do not necessarily increase impoverishment, and that the sustained growth that resulted could benefit all socio-economic groups, impoverished groups could be disadvantaged in the short run by increases in the price of necessities, reductions in employment, and public service cutbacks (1989: 37). The World Bank, furthermore, admitted that SAPs were ‘often associated with a domestic recession characterised by rising unemployment, sharply contracting imports, and falling real wages and living standards’ (1988: 60). The World Bank also conceded that more ‘could have been done, should have been done, to reduce poverty in the context of structural adjustment programs’ (1994: 14).⁹ Indeed, as the extent of the impoverishment that SAPs generated became evident, the IFIs introduced ‘poverty-alleviation programmes’ into their SAPs (Thomson 2000: 177-8).

By this time, however, it was too late for many. Millions of Africans had experienced hardship. Consequently, the social impact of structural adjustment had already begun to have major repercussions on Africa’s political process (Thomson 2000: 177).

Analysts have also highlighted the negative impact on impoverishment of the SAPs designed for crisis-afflicted Asian NICs (Wade 1998: 1547; Lim 1998: 32-3; Lal

1999: 6-7; Akyüz 1998: 37; Bullard 1998: 112-20; Higgott 2000: 274-7). Indeed, while the World Bank's SAPs clearly aimed to strengthen social safety nets, the high levels of welfare expenditure being funded were mainly used to mitigate the impact of IMF's SAPs (Bullard 1998: 114; World Bank 1999a; 1998: xiv). However, while the IMF's SAPs did include the usual array of neo-liberal policies¹⁰, they also emphasised social welfare expenditure, in order to cushion the adverse impact of both the crisis, and the IMF's neo-liberal policy conditions, on impoverishment (IMF 1999: 6-7; IMF 1998: 27-32).

The IMF argued however that the social welfare measures included in its SAPs would 'complement the neo-liberal globalisation' project by facilitating flexible responses to the global market economy, thereby maximising the benefits of globalisation (IMF 1999: 43; Camdessus 1999). The IMF's stated aim in this regard was to ensure 'sustainable' growth (IMF 1999: 8; 1998: 25). Effectively, this meant sustaining its preferred neo-liberal development strategy by enabling states to mitigate the impoverishment that the globalisation legitimated, neo-liberal policy conditions attached to structural adjustment loans were causing.

Rethinking the Globalisation-Development Nexus

With the apparent exception of the World Bank after the Asian economic crisis, the IFIs clearly used globalisation in the 1990s to legitimate a neo-liberal development strategy. The IMF and the World Bank consistently presented globalisation as a structural constraint upon some development policies, and a structural imperative for others. The approach of these institutions to globalisation, then, is that of 'methodological structuralism', wherein developing countries have no autonomous choice in relation to the structural forces of globalisation, but can only respond to them according to the neo-liberal policies outlined by the IFIs (Scholte 2000: 91).

However, another approach to globalisation is possible, one which Scholte terms the 'structuration postulate' (2000: 91). In this view, globalisation is the result of

mutually constituting agent choices and structural dispositions, with structure largely establishing the range of options to actors, and encouraging certain choices over others (2000: 91). However, as these structures were created and are perpetuated by the decisions of actors, then under certain conditions the decisions of actors such as the IMF and the World Bank become crucial to structuring globalisation (2000: 91). In this conception of globalisation, the IMF and the World Bank become a crucial link between the structural forces of globalisation and developing countries.

In fact, the neo-liberal development strategies that the IMF and the World Bank pursue through structural adjustment programs (SAPs) do structure the way in which developing countries integrate into the global political economy. However, the nature of this integration is such that the IMF and the World Bank have become a crucial link between developing states and the dynamics of impoverishment, as the evidence on SAPs indicates. The neo-liberal policies that are legitimated by the IFIs approach to globalisation in fact serve to generate dynamics of impoverishment in the development process. The IFIs neo-liberal approach to globalisation and development, as they admit, exacerbates impoverishment in the short term at least.

This approach to globalisation furthermore results in neo-liberal policy prescriptions that are essentially apolitical, in that they do not reflect interests and needs located in the domestic political economy. Analysts argue that the IMF and the World Bank in fact see development, and the neo-liberal policies attached to SAPs from which development should follow, as essentially non-political (Gills and Philip 1996: 588; Berger and Beeson 1997: 497). This might be because the IMF and the World Bank are not bound by the kinds of political restraints which restrict governments, such as having to face an impoverished electorate (Woods 2001: 84). However the globalisation legitimated SAPs of the IMF and the World Bank clearly have a profound impact upon impoverishment, and, therefore, upon the domestic political economy of the recipient country in both the present and the future (Leftwich 1994: 364).

Taking the domestic political economy into account explains why many countries abandon SAP policy conditions, and also suggests the manner in which the IFIs development strategies might be sustained. According to Devetak and Higgott, ‘securing domestic political support for the continued liberalization of the global economy requires more than just the assertion of its economic virtue. It also requires political legitimation’ (1999: 489). Serious attempts to reduce or eradicate impoverishment – as opposed to using the concept of globalisation to legitimate further impoverishment – might help to provide this legitimacy. As Devetak and Higgott argue, ‘while some objections to liberalization are indeed ‘protectionism’ by another name, not all objections can be categorized in this manner’ (1999: 489).

Such a poverty-reduction oriented development strategy might vary significantly between countries, but must be conceived of not as undermining globalisation, but as laying the foundations for a politically acceptable and stable global political economy. Indeed, a politicised developmental understanding of globalisation is clearly needed. Leftwich’s argument for the ‘primacy of politics in development’, therefore, needs to be applied also to the globalisation-development nexus (2000). The IMF and the World Bank must acknowledge their own role in structuring globalisation as it is experienced by developing countries, and then begin to structure this development-globalisation nexus in such a way as to reduce, not exacerbate impoverishment. As Scholte argues:

‘To build a more humane globalisation at the start of the twenty-first century we do best to concentrate on well-designed public policies that alleviate sufferings and increase opportunities’ (2000: 289-90).

This approach would be possible for the IFIs either within their neo-liberal development strategy, or through a different strategy, one of global ‘public management’, which uses ‘state, substate and suprastate laws and institutions’ to democratically manage globalisation, with the eradication of impoverishment as an immediate policy objective (Scholte 2000: 290-1). Global governance mechanisms such as the Tobin tax, which the World Bank has recently come to favour, would be a part of this more ambitious approach to reform (Scholte 2000: 291; Stiglitz 1998a).

From the normative perspective of promoting democratic and equitable global development, this more ambitious approach is preferable.

Indeed, as Sen argues, all development strategies, including those pursued by the IMF and the World Bank, must be linked to ‘the ends of economic and social development’ (1996: 2). Perhaps the World Bank’s recent approach in questioning financial liberalisation and neo-liberal globalisation, and in arguing that without ‘quality’ growth featuring ‘human development’ – including the reduction of impoverishment – then even rapid economic growth will be short term, is an important step in the right direction (Thomas et al 2000). So, also, might be the poverty-reduction aspects of both IFIs recent structural adjustment programs (SAPs). The World Bank and the IMF, however, must seriously come to terms with Sen’s argument in the context of the links between impoverishment, and the globalisation-development nexus as they conceive it, or risk going down in history with the institutional epitaph written for the IMF by Oxfam. This epitaph is placed above a picture of a bottle of white pills:

IMF: To be taken seriously. Do not expose to reality. Bitter economic medicine for the Third World. Hard to swallow. Tested on people. Side effects include empty schools, increased poverty and blighted futures. IMF. Created 1945. Never seriously questioned.¹¹

Endnotes

* Research for this paper was undertaken as part of an M.A. Thesis completed at the University of Western Australia, in September 2000. The author would like to thank staff in the Department of Political Science at UWA, particularly Jeremy Moon, as well as staff at Murdoch University’s Asia Research Centre (ARC), and the Department of Politics and International Studies (PAIS) at the University of Warwick. The author can be reached via e-mail at: keatinm@richmond.ac.uk

- ¹ See the World Bank's *Sub-Saharan Africa* (1989).
- ² Many analysts have argued that globalisation functions to legitimate neo-liberal development strategies. Susan Strange for example argues that globalisation depicts neo-liberal development policies as being better able to promote economic growth than interventionist alternatives, which have become antiquated and obsolete (1995: 299).
- ³ As elucidated in Friedman (1962) and Hayek (1944).
- ⁴ Cerny in fact terms this development strategy the 'neo-liberal competition state' (1997: 263).
- ⁵ Cited in Thomson 2000: 175
- ⁶ Cited in Thomson 2000: 175.
- ⁷ Citing the World Bank, *World Development Report 1997* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), table I.
- ⁸ Cited in Murphy 2000: 791.
- ⁹ Cited in Thomson 2000: 177-8.
- ¹⁰ Wade argues further to this that the IMF SAPs were linked to pressure on the Asian NICs to sign a World Trade Organisation (WTO) agreement (the MAI or Multilateral Agreement on Investment) which would further liberalise global finance and capital flows (1998: 1546).
- ¹¹ Cited in Gray (1999).

References

- Akyüz, Yilmaz (1998) 'The East Asian Financial Crisis: Back to the Future', in K.S. Jomo (ed.), *Tigers in Trouble: Financial Governance, Liberalisation and Crises in East Asia*, London: Zed Books.
- Berger, M. and M. Beeson (1998) 'Lineages of Liberalism and Miracles of Modernisation: The World Bank, the East Asian Trajectory and the International Development Debate', *Third World Quarterly* 19(3): 487-504.
- Bullard, Nicola with Waldon Bello and Kamal Malhotra (1998) 'Taming the Tigers: The IMF and the Asian Crisis', in K.S. Jomo (ed.), *Tigers in Trouble: Financial Governance, Liberalisation and Crises in East Asia*, London: Zed Books.
- Camdessus, Michel (1996) 'Is the New Bretton Woods Conceivable', Address to the Société d'Economie Politique, Paris, 19 January.
(<http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/mds/1996/MDS9601.htm>).
- Camdessus, Michel (1997) 'The Agenda for Global Financial Cooperation', Address to the Association of Japanese Business Studies, Washington, DC, 13 June.
(<http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/1997/MDS9708.htm>).
- Camdessus, Michel (1997a) 'Fostering an Enabling Environment for Development', Address at the High-Level Meeting of the UN Economic and Social Council, Geneva, 2 July.
(<http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/1997/MDS9710.htm>).
- Camdessus, Michel (1998) 'From the Asian Crisis Toward a New Global Architecture', Address to the Parliamentary Assembly of the International Monetary Fund, Strasbourg, 23 June.
(<http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/1998/062398.htm>).
- Camdessus, Michel (1999) 'Governments and Economic Development in a Globalized World', Remarks at the 32nd International General Meeting of the Pacific Basin Economic Council, Hong Kong, 17 May.
(<http://www.imf.org/external/np/speeches/1999/051799.htm>).
- Cerny, P. G. (1997) 'Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization', *Government and Opposition* 32(1): 251-74.

- Chandrasekhar, C.P., and A. Sen (1999) 'Statistical Truths: Economic Reform and Poverty', *Frontline*, February 23: 100-2.
- Chaubey, P.K. (1999) 'Poverty' in Alternative Survey Group (eds) *Alternative Economic Survey 1991-1998: Seven Years of Structural Adjustment*, Rainbow Publishers, Delhi: 139-46.
- Clapham, Christopher (1998) 'Discerning the New Africa', *International Affairs* 74(2): 263-70.
- Devetak, Richard and Richard Higgott (1999) 'Justice unbound? Globalization, states and the transformation of the social bond', *International Affairs* 75(3): 483-98.
- Friedman, M. (1962) *Capitalism and Freedom*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gills, Barry and George Philip (1996) 'Towards Convergence in Development Policy?: Challenging the 'Washington Consensus' and Restoring the Historicity of Divergent Development Trajectories', *Third World Quarterly* 17(4): 585-91.
- Gray, Joanne (1999) 'IMF suddenly hears the poor' in *The Australian Financial Review*, Monday, October 4: 14.
- Hayek, F. A. (1944) *The Road to Serfdom*, Sydney: New Century Press.
- Higgott, Richard (2000) 'The International Relations of the Asian Economic Crisis: a Study in the Politics of Resentment', in Richard Robison *et al* (eds.), *Politics and Markets in the Wake of the Asian Crisis*, London: Routledge.
- Hill, D. (1999) 'The Promise(s) of Globalisation and the Visible Hand of Transnational Coercion: the Limits of Empowerment and the Politics of Poverty Alleviation in Rural Northern India', in *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference of the Australasian Political Studies Association*, Volume II Refereed Papers, Department of Government, University of Sydney/APSA: 301-11.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1989) *Annual Report 1989*, Washington, DC.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1990) *Annual Report 1990*, Washington, DC.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1992) *Annual Report 1992*, Washington, DC.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1997) *Annual Report 1997*, Washington, DC.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1998) *Annual Report 1998*, Washington, DC.
- International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1999) *Annual Report 1999*, Washington, DC.
- Keating, Michael F. (1999) 'Divergence and Convergence between the IMF and the World Bank's Conceptions of Development during the 1990s', in *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference of the Australasian Political Studies Association*, Volume II Refereed Papers, Department of Government, University of Sydney/APSA: 429-37.
- Kim, J. Y. and J. V. Millen, A. Irwin, and J. Gresham (eds) (2000) *Dying for Growth: global inequality and the health of the poor*, Department of Social Medicine at the Harvard Medical School, Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Lal, Deepak (1999) *Renewing the Miracle: Economic Development and Asia*, Melbourne, Victoria: Institute of Public Affairs.
- Leftwich, A. (1994) 'Governance, the State and the Politics of Development', *Development and Change* 25: 363-86.
- Leftwich, A. (2000) *States of Development: On the Primacy of Politics in Development*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lim, L. Y. C. (1998) 'Whose 'Model' Failed? Implications of the Asian Economic Crisis', *The Washington Quarterly* 21(3): 25-36.
- Murphy, Craig N. (2000) 'Global governance: poorly done and poorly understood', *International Affairs* 76(4): 789-803.
- Sandström, Sven (1998) 'The East Asia Crisis and the Role of the World Bank', Statement to the Bretton Woods Committee, Washington, DC, 13 February.
(<http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/extme/ss3speech.htm>).

- Sen, A. K. (1996) 'Radical Needs and Moderate Reforms' in Dreze, J. and A. K. Sen (eds) *Indian Development: Selected Regional Perspectives*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi: 1-27.
- Scholte, Jan Aart (2000) *Globalization: a critical introduction*, London: MacMillan Press.
- Schuurman, Frans J. (1993) 'Development Theory in the 1990s', in Frans J. Schuurman (ed.), *Beyond the Impasse: New Directions in Development Theory*, London: Zed Books.
- Stiglitz, Joseph (1998) 'More Instruments and Broader Goals: Moving Toward the Post-Washington Consensus', The 1998 WIDER Annual Lecture, Helsinki, 7 January. (<http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/extme/js-010798/wider.htm>).
- Stiglitz, Joseph (1998a) 'The Role of International Financial Institutions in the Current Global Economy', Address to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, Chicago, 27 February. (<http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/extme/jssp022798.htm>).
- Strange, S. (1995) 'The Limits of Politics', *Government and Opposition* 30: 291-311.
- Taylor, Lance (1997) 'The Revival of the Liberal Creed -- the IMF and the World Bank in a Globalized Economy', *World Development* 25(2): 145:52.
- Thomson, Alex (2000) *An Introduction to African Politics*, London: Routledge.
- Thomas, Vinod et al (2000) *The Quality of Growth*, The World Bank/Oxford University Press.
- United Nations, Economic Commission on Africa (1989) *African alternative framework to structural adjustment programmes for socio-economic recovery and transformation*, Addis Ababa: UNCEA.
- Wade, Robert (1998) 'The Asian Debt-and-Development Crisis of 1997-?: Causes and Consequences', *World Development* 26(8): 1535-53.
- Woods, Ngaire (2001) 'Making the IMF and the World Bank more accountable', *International Affairs* 77(1): 83-100.
- World Bank (1988) *World Development Report 1988*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1989) *World Development Report 1989*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1989a) *Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (1991) *World Development Report 1991: The Challenge of Development*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1993) *The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1994) *Adjustment in Africa: Reforms, results and the road ahead*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1997) *World Development Report 1997: The State in a Changing World*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1998) *East Asia: The Road to Recovery*, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (1999) *World Development Report 1998-9: Knowledge for Development*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank (1999a) 'World Bank Financial Support to East Asia Since July 1997'. (http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/asian_crisis/facts.htm).