

**Imagining cultures of cooperation:
universities networking to face the new development challenges**
III Congress of the Italian Universities Network for Development Cooperation(CUCS)
Torino, 19-21 September 2013

Cooperare nei nuovi orizzonti dello sviluppo

Gianni Vaggi
University of Pavia

1. Preambolo

Il coordinamento universitario preso la DGCS

Il CUCS

Esempi unici in Europa e non solo di collaborazione anche interistituzionale

2.1 L'evoluzione del concetto di sviluppo ovvero: c'era una volta la crescita economica

30 anni fa la crescita del PIL era tutto.

1987 il rapporto *Our common future* delle Nazioni Unite, meglio noto come **rapporto Brundtland**, presenta l'idea di **sviluppo sostenibile**: quello che lascia alle **generazioni** future un patrimonio di risorse naturali almeno invariato rispetto a quello della generazione presente. Più che l'aspetto relativo all'ambiente vorrei qui sottolineare la dimensione temporale, quel fare riferimento al passare del tempo come 'generazione', convenzionalmente 25 anni.

1990 UNDP pubblica il primo **Rapporto sullo Sviluppo Umano** e presenta l'**Indice di Sviluppo Umano**, che oltre alla dimensione economica include anche educazione e salute.

2000 l'ONU, con Banca Mondiale, Fondo Monetario e OCSE lanciano gli obiettivi del millennio, **Millennium Development Goals**- MDGs, che spaziano da povertà ad educazione, da salute ad ambiente a genere; la definizione di sviluppo si allarga ulteriormente. Obiettivi come miglioramenti da raggiungere nel 2015 rispetto ai dati del 1990; 25 anni, ancora una volta una generazione.

SDGS 2012 Rio + 20

Il 2015 è dietro l'angolo: Maggio 2013 A new Global Partnership: eradicate poverty and transform economies through sustainable development, The Report of the High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post-2015 Development Agenda.

12 goals, 5 transformative shifts, jobs, distribution, peace, sustainability, orizzonte al 2030.

C'è anche altro nell'idea di sviluppo ma lo lascio per la parte finale

2.2 Le politiche

1. *The Washington Consensus*. The economic reforms program associated with a term coined to John Williamson (see Williamson 1990).
2. *The post-Washington Consensus*, Stiglitz 1998, institution second generation reform.
3. *The Comprehensive Development Framework*, 1999. to James Wolfenshon then president of the World Bank.

1996 HIPC 1999 Cologne G7 cancellazione del debito, nasce in Banca Mondiale ma diventa altra cosa, con tantissimi attori, società civile, chiese Nord e Sud **Massimo Pallottino e Riccardo Moro** conversione debito CEI.

Legge italiana del 2000 number 209, sul debt swap e cancellazione bilaterale Kenia dal 2006 con un meccanismo partecipativo molto articolato ed interessante.

Questo per dire che le circostanze esterne fanno anche l'agenda, anche la nostra agenda di ricerca e che c'è di fatto stato un fermento negli anni 90 che abbiamo forse un poco scordato. Advocacy!!

2.3 La cooperazione

2002 si tiene a Monterrey Mexico la conferenza su *Finance for development*, in cui fra l'altro si impone il tema dei **global public goods** e da cui è emerso il cosiddetto *Monterrey consensus*.

2003 Roma primo High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness.

2005 c'è la *Paris declaration* del Secondo High Level Forum on *Aid Effectiveness* La Paris declaration raccomanda ai donatori di avere programmi più *accountable*, di adottare politiche più coerenti fra di loro e di coordinarsi maggiormente e di condividere con i paesi che ricevono l'aiuto gli strumenti di analisi e di valutazione.

2008 AAA *Accra Agenda for Action* segue il Terzo High Level Forum nel Settembre 2008 che aggiunge nuovi elementi al dibattito, in sintesi: si rafforza l'idea di *ownership*, l'importanza della divisione del lavoro fra i donatori e della stabilità negli aiuti.

A Novembre e Dicembre 2008 a Doha si tiene una conferenza per verificare gli sviluppi dell'agenda di Monterrey.

2011 Nel Novembre-Dicembre Busan quarto High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, *Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation*, che rinforza gli aspetti di trasparenza e sottolinea la Development effectiveness. Viene ribadita la necessità di utilizzare **strumenti di valutazione condivisi** fra paesi che ricevono aiuti e paesi donatori, l'importanza del coinvolgimento della **società civile** e il badare ai risultati più che agli indicatori di input.

Si tratta di passi importanti che vanno apprezzati, come sono fondamentali le operazioni di *peer review* dentro al **OCSE-DAC** e la richiesta per ogni Paese donatore di darsi politiche e linee guida chiare. Italia **memorandum** inviato da pochi giorni.

Another important field in awareness raising is the cooperation with Academia, one of the most defining asset for building a true culture of development cooperation in Italy. DGCS supports many University courses on development cooperation and is working at an agreement with the Ministry of Education to promote the dissemination of Development Cooperation values at school possibly in connection with the World Development Information Day (24th of October) and with an active involvement of Local Authorities.

Nel disastro quantitative, lo 0.7% ce lo scordiamo, dal punto di vista qualitativo le ultime per review non sono andate male.

2.4 I rapporti internazionali su sviluppo e povertà

- 2008 First European Report on Development, fragile states.
- 2009 Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress , Fitoussi, Stiglitz Sen Sarkozy Report.
- 2010 Acute **Multidimensional poverty**: A new Index for Developing Countries, OPHI Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative.
- Dal 2012 **World Happiness Report** è appena uscito quello del 2013 Jeffrey Sachs.
- Dal 2013 **BES** Benessere Equo e Sostenibile ISTAT.

Negli anni 80 avevamo il WDR.

Summing up:

Visione olistica dello sviluppo e dinamica:

molti aspetti,

fra di loro collegati, non sempre sappiamo bene come regressione ma qual è l'ordine causale processo in divenire che trasforma: campagna città, demografia, tipo di lavoro

sviluppo come **empowerment** e come **well being**.

Povertà come **deprivation, esclusione**

Cooperazione: Efficacia dell'aiuto, coordinamento, coerenza delle politiche (Europa)condivisione, co.co.co. Ownership

3. La rivincita dell'economia; the economy strikes back

Soprattutto **dal 2000** in poi, quale è il contesto in cui si opera, che lo si voglia o no.

3.1 **Obiettivo 1** raggiunto grazie alla crescita economica della **Cina**.

3.2 Paradosso la **maggior parte dei poveri** non sta nei paesi Low Income Sumner ma in quelli Middle Income India, ma anche quali politiche per questi poveri, soprattutto nazionali?

3.3 Dopo due decenni di stagnazione anche **l'Africa Sub sahariana dal 2000 al 2011** è cresciuta in media del 4.7%, non è un gran che si era sempre pensato ad un 7%.

3.4 E per la cooperazione, anche la nostra in che scenari ci poniamo Dal **G7 si è passati al G20. New Donors**, non DAC nuovi attori. Anche la cooperazione **ODA o APS dovrà capire che fare con questi nuovi attori**, quali strategie per ingaggiarli.

Non è qui il caso di discutere il modo in cui la **Cina in Africa**.

Brasile potenza regionale, Sud Africa, quando andiamo in Malawi certo US, EU e Cina ma le Banche sono Sud Africane, India.

In **Asia meridionale**, e sud est dove abbiamo paesi least developed e fragile è in atto un confronto economico e forse no solo.

3.5 Dal 1998 ad oggi i **flussi di finanziamento privato** verso i PVS sono aumentati di oltre tre volte e sono ormai di quasi dieci volte più grandi degli Aiuti Pubblici allo Sviluppo. In particolare gli Investimenti Diretti Esteri e le rimesse degli emigranti superano rispettivamente i 600 e 400 miliardi di dollari mentre l'aiuto si attesta attorno ai 130 miliardi di dollari.

Profit repatriation e rimesse

3.6 Pil pro capite è fortemente correlato con molti degli indicatori di well being etc.

Si diceva **Trade not aid**: ecco qua.

Due fenomeni epocali

3.7 **Cina**, seconda economia del mondo **saggi di investimento del 35% accumulazione** di capitale fisico + politiche industriali.

Crisi sarà lunga e prolungata e vedrà un'accelerazione del processo di spostamento di potere economico verso l'Asia; questo sarà il **secolo dell'Asia**.

3.8 **Finanza e Crisi del 2007-2008** nel 2007 derivati /PIL Mondo 10 volte oggi poco diverso i grandi operatori finanziari internazionali sono una decina. Rischio sistemico e shortsightedness.

Peggiora la **distribuzione del reddito** già dagli anni '90, per entrambi i fenomeni.

Crisi da **sovra produzione** o eccesso di accumulazione che determina:

- tensioni fra sistemi ed aree economiche
- anche all'interno, UE
- saturazione di mercati
- concentrazioni oligopolistiche se non addirittura monopolistiche reggono solo i più grandi che si mangiano i più piccoli; Torino automobile

Non sottovalutiamo la forza dei cambiamenti economici; la crescita economica è spesso assai rude e cambia gli scenari.

Il mondo di domani è determinato soprattutto dai processi di investimento soprattutto in tecnologia: cosa, dove e come produrre, il motivo del profitto. Ricordiamocene quando parleremo della nostra cooperazione quella universitaria.

4. E allora? Well being tutte belle parole?! ci scordiamo tutto quello che abbiamo visto al punto precedente. Che fare? C'è una **dialettica** anche se la forza sta spesso dalla parte del potere economico, ma questo non significa che ci sia una specie di **materialismo dialettico** per cui il destino della storia è completamente segnato, nel senso dell'inevitabilità del capitalismo nel senso della rivoluzione.

Andiamo avanti con tutto ciò che abbiamo detto al punto 2, ma con consapevolezza.

Benissimo il rapporto **pubblico privato**, ingaggiare i **private donors** etc. Io sono felicissimo della collaborazione fra IUSS UNIPV e tre ONG COOPI, CISP e VIS dal 1996 al master di Pavia, andiamo avanti dal 1997 e abbiamo aperto 4 master analoghi in giro per il mondo
Questi sono not for profit.

Prima di venire alla cooperazione universitaria

4.A Cosa altro c'è ancora nell'idea di sviluppo?

Amartya Sen. La povertà è l'impossibilità di sviluppare le proprie capacità, *capabilities*, i propri diritti, l'impossibilità di crescere come individui, come esseri umani, di prendere il futuro nelle proprie mani. Sviluppo è rimuovere qualche ostacolo alle forme di esclusione.

Lo sviluppo è libertà, dal titolo del libro di Sen del 1999; forse il titolo originale inglese *Development as freedom* si potrebbe rendere meglio con ***Lo sviluppo come liberazione***.

Empowerment: la possibilità per ogni essere umano di dispiegare i suoi diritti e le sue capacità.

Ownership: partecipazione ma anche il far proprio, l'interiorizzare **il processo di allargamento delle capacità**.

Empowerment e ownership da anni li proclamiamo e anche su questi termini c'è ormai ampio consenso. Fatto davvero importante e ora anche i popoli del Sud del Mondo ne sono convinti e li reclamano. **Lo sviluppo come liberazione implica che essi vogliono prendere in mano il loro destino, vogliono, decidere, contare sempre di più il che ci porta a...**

4.b Dal lavorare per al lavorare con. La cooperazione come dialogo... e conoscenza

Nelle famiglie c'è spesso una fase in cui i figli sono grandi e quindi non li puoi più trattare come bambini, però non sono ancora economicamente indipendenti. Non è una fase semplice, perché tenere le chiavi della borsa ti dà comunque un potere differente, stabilisce una distanza di fatto fra le due parti.

Non mi faccio illusioni, manca ancora molto affinché i 'poveri' riescano a 'fare bene' i pozzi, le scuole e gli ospedali, a tirare su i muri diritti, se mi passate l'immagine. Certo spesso i poveri fanno le cose malamente, almeno secondo gli standards prevalenti. Errori

C'è un'identità nazionale e anche orgoglio, **corruzione** certo, ma si sta formando una classe media, c'è più istruzione. Il **problema del ricambio politico**, insomma del come si passa da un presidente all'altro è enorme, eppure insieme a molte situazioni difficili ci sono anche qui segnali positivi.

4 c. Alterità e distanza

La **distanza come occasione di conoscenza**. La *percezione della distanza* è oggettiva e soggettiva al tempo stesso; qualcuno misura che sei più povero, ma in realtà sei solo tu che senti e verifichi dentro di te, e con la comunità attorno a te, quanto questa povertà conti davvero.

La cooperazione ovviamente vuole colmare il *gap*, ma per farlo bisogna prendere atto che la distanza esiste e che deve essere capita e tenuta in conto. E' attraverso l'accettazione della distanza che la nostra conoscenza dell'altro si affina; la distanza è occasione e strumento di conoscenza; un'opportunità per imparare.

Dove la distanza è poca, comunque essa sia valutata, le cose sono più facili e ci si può aiutare di più ad andare verso una cooperazione come dialogo e collaborazione. Dove la distanza è maggiore allora le cose sono più complesse.

Formulazione dei giudizi. Gli esseri umani continuamente esprimono opinioni su ciò che è *giusto o sbagliato*, su ciò che è bene o male. Ma anche circostanze relativamente più semplici: il giudizio sul velo per le donne. Come si intende la vita politica e la democrazia, che rapporto lega i diritti della persona alle tradizioni culturali di un popolo.

Oltre a lavorare insieme per ridurre le differenze di reddito dovremo anche operarci per ridurre la distanza nei nostri giudizi. Sì, ma come?

Ci aiutano ancora due libri di Amartya Sen, *Identità e violenza* del 2006 e *L'idea di giustizia* del 2009. *monoculturalismo plurale da non confondere con il pluralismo*. Ogni comunità mantiene le sue posizioni ed i suoi giudizi, ben venga la tolleranza, ma non ci sono incontro, comunicazione, dialogo e contaminazione. *Non c'è conoscenza diretta dell'altro*.

Sen ci ricorda che *ognuno di noi ha in sé diverse identità*, io sono bianco ma anche padre, e cristiano, e insegnante, e mi occupo di cooperazione e così via. Sembra un ragionamento astratto ma è molto semplice: quanto tempo dedico alla famiglia rispetto al lavoro? Quanto importante per me è l'essere italiano rispetto ad essere europeo, e così via? In questo 'minestrone' di identità l'aspetto decisivo è la mia **libertà e la consapevolezza del poterle combinare** in varia misura.

Il ragionamento prosegue in *L'idea di giustizia* che arricchisce l'opera *Una teoria della giustizia* del 1971 di John Rawls.,

perche negli ultimi 40 anni si parla così tanto di giustizia globale, diritti?

l'imparzialità chiusa, che si basa sull'idea di Rawls che all'interno di ogni comunità - sia essa, politica, etnica, religiosa - esista una specie di *contratto originario*, un nucleo di valori fortemente condivisi, ma validi per i membri di quella comunità e non al suo esterno, dove i valori potrebbero essere diversi. Sen contrappone l'idea di *imparzialità aperta*, che si fonda su un libro di **Adam Smith del 1759**, *La Teoria dei Sentimenti Morali*. Smith teorizza la figura dello *spettatore imparziale*: la capacità che ognuno di noi ha di vedere le persone ed i fatti togliendosi dal suo punto di vista, ma diventando quasi un terzo estraneo, un giudice non coinvolto nella disputa. Ma anche la capacità di mettersi al posto dell'altro, di vedere i fatti *con gli occhi degli altri*.

L'identità aperta

5. Come fare **cooperazione universitaria**, che tanto spesso si accompagna a **ricerca e sviluppo, trasferimento tecnologico**(sic), per cortesia cerchiamo un'altra parola vedere perché siamo privilegiati, che vuol dire avere delle possibilità che non tutti hanno dei doni.

- Lavoriamo con i giovani
- future classi dirigenti
- ricerca con situazioni potenzialmente distanti e quindi più intriganti per la conoscenza

La cooperazione universitaria è facile perché la distanza è breve. Il linguaggio utilizzato è comune nel senso che ha grandissime aree di sovrapposizione: si usa l'inglese o comunque altra lingua franca, si usano gli strumenti della moderna tecnologia e poi c'è il linguaggio specifico del gruppo di riferimento.

Se dobbiamo scrivere un progetto in comune non è difficile, se dobbiamo valutare le priorità nei bisogni formativo anche. Eppure è ovvio che anche in questi casi bisogna imparare a lavorare insieme, a condividere le scelte ed i giudizi.

Un programma sanitario di puro aiuto e sostegno alimentare nelle campagne. La donna malata di AIDS con il bambino messo malissimo a Balaka in Malawi la donna parla *chichewa*, Giamba swahili.

Fra questi due esempi ci sono tante esperienze intermedie

Certamente anche nella cooperazione si tratta sempre e comunque di rapporti dialogici in cui vanno accettati punti di vista differenti, nel bene e nel male.

Progetto Palestina sostenuto dalla DGCS e nato dal Coordinamento con 9 università italiane e 7 poi 10 palestinesi Gaza. Quindi abbia insegnato a 6 studenti che non erano previsti *Piombo fuso*. E' uno dei più bei ricordi della mia esperienza di cooperazione.

Selezione con tabella dei candidati con tutti i dati e anche una **colonna con 1 2** religione compromesso, Ho fatto bene o male non lo so.

Ma se non colgo le distanze posso anche **non approfittare dell'occasione** di conoscenza: Vado in un laboratori porta la mia tecnologia, opero 100 bambini in una settimana e torno, faccio il mio MBA 'chiavi in mano' e me ne vado. La poca distanza mi frega mi limita, mi illude.

Certo far convivere la **professionalità specifica con la condivisione della situazione locale** non è semplice, però è la sfida ed è anche il bello del nostro mestiere. In fondo non dovremmo fare questo anche con gli studenti: **stimolare la loro curiosità non solo passare informazioni.**

Aiutiamoci ad imparare il dialogo è un processo Socratico

Nella processo di ricerca di conoscenza e dialogo abbiamo molte possibilità, molti strumenti; ne indico tre, potentissimi.

Il primo è la **transitività** o se volete il **lavoro in rete**. Certamente nessuno può sapere/fare tutto, nessuno può conoscere i popoli del mondo, ma abbiamo tante possibilità di conoscere e anche tante opportunità di aiutare a conoscere, cioè di informarci. E poi c'è la **proprietà transitiva**: non sono mai stato in Casamance in Senegal. **Avere una comunità di riferimento aiuta tantissimo: fiducia.**

Far incontrare i giovani. La **prossimità**. La prossimità è lo scopo del **Fondo Cooperazione e Conoscenza** che l'Università di Pavia si è inventata nel 2009 con il primo congresso CUCS So che altre università fanno interventi simili.

CICOPS Scholarships

Abbiamo enormi possibilità e strumenti e opportunità formidabili per favorire il dialogo e accorciare le distanze sui giudizi. **Se non favoriamo noi la transitività e la prossimità chi altro?**

Adapted from: Vaggi G. The learning and practice of development cooperation, in L'università e i giovani per la cooperazione e la pace, edited by G. Vaggi, E. Colombo and F. Miglietta, Milano 2010.

Foreword

The following notes have a twofold purpose.

First, inside CUCS we are exploring the possibility of a teaching module on development and cooperation to be adopted by some of our universities.

In sections I-III below there is an attempt to introduce some of the issues and topics which could be part of this module. Of course there is no presumption of full coverage of all the elements which might be included in the present debates on the notions of development and cooperation. This is just a first sketch for discussion and I will concentrate only on those notions and policies which either have re-

ceived in the past or do receive now a generalised support, or what is called a *consensus*. Thus these notes will be expanded.

Second, in section IV and in the conclusions I draw on some well-known debates on the concept of development and on the policies of international cooperation to put forward some considerations on the meaning and practice of university cooperation.

I. Notions and theories of development

I.1 Only income per capita matters

Once upon a time there was economic growth, development was mainly defined in terms of increases in income per capita and it was by and large regarded as *a one dimensional* notion. This was the case in the fifties and sixties and even into the nineteen-eighties.

There was and still is a theory explaining why low income, poor, countries will converge with the income per capita of the high income ones. Since Harrod's paper of 1939 physical capital has been regarded as the main element in the explanation of economic growth and since Solow's, an early Nobel prize laureate in economics, contribution in 1956 we have a model that predicts that capital will flow to low income economies where it is scarce and thus it yields higher returns. Technical progress will also flow freely across countries and provided that the markets are competitive and given enough time all countries will tend to have similar income per capita.

Clearly if this views were correct there would be no need for specific developmental theories and policies nor for cooperation activities, but rather the practice of cooperation should be confined to mitigating the unwelcome and harsh phenomena which might appear in the short run during the long run process of economic growth.

I. 2 Towards a broader definition of development

In practice we have not seen a convergence of most low income countries towards the living standards of high income economies. Moreover years of study and experience have shown that economic growth alone does not guarantee participatory and sustainable development. There are rapidly growing countries where social hardships are multiplying and new forms of poverty are being created. There are other countries where despite slow growth considerable improvements have been made in terms human development and quality of life. The Indian state of Kerala is a has a low income per head, but excellent human development and quality of life indicators.

Nowadays development is no longer defined in terms of income per capita only, this view may seem absurd and even crazy, but we should consider the fact that the evolution of the notion of development is quite young; as a matter of fact this process is only one generation old, about 25 years.

For sure the transformation of the notion of development is due to the debates which started in the sixties and in the seventies, but it was only in the nineteen-eighties which a general consensus began to emerge on a broader definition of development. Three significant steps can be identified.

1987, the Bruntland Report. The report refers to sustainable development as the process which can satisfy the needs of present generations without compromising the possibilities of future generations(see United Nations 1987). Since this report, environment and climate have been included into the definition

of development. Development now incorporates a time dimension, and one must notice the importance of including the generation as a measure of time, which is common in some disciplines, like demography, but not in many others.

1990, the first Human Development report by UNDP gives an official status to the notion of human development, which now includes not only income but also education and health. The Human Development Index is made up of indicators which relate to the three aspects and the education index includes tertiary education too. The evolution of the notion of development and the emergence of that of human development owes a lot to the work of Amartya Sen during the seventies and eighties.

2000 the UN, OECD, World Bank and IMF present the Millenium Declaration which includes the Millenium Development Goals, eight goals which provide the now most widely accepted definition of development, including health, education, environment and gender. The eight goals are subdivided into eighteen targets and almost fifty different indicators. The goals are expressed in terms of achievements to be measured by the different indicators between the period 2000 and 2015, even if the improvements have to be measured *vis à vis* the value of the indicators in 1990, one generation before.

In 2008 as part of the first European Report on Development which will appear later this year the EU has provided a study on the progress towards the various goals(see European Union 2008).

The notion of development has broadened enormously between 1987 and 2000. We may believe that some aspects are still missing and we might like to include more facets, as a matter of fact the debate is open, some authors included more dimensions even before 2000(see Sachs 1999). Nevertheless, the MDGs represent a sound basis for a modern view of development, an achieved *pro tempore* consensus.

II. Development policies

Different views of development have been accompanied by different ideas about how to achieve it.

II. 1 The Washington Consensus.

The economic focused definition has largely been associated with to the so called Washington Consensus, a term coined to John Williamson (see Williamson 1990), to indicate a set of economic reforms meant to speed up economic growth. They included and still include: privatizations, liberalizations plus macroeconomic stability, that is to say low inflation and small state budget. The general rule being more market and less state. These policies have been the key elements of the *Structural Adjustment Programs* of the IMF, and partly of the World Bank in the eighties and nineties. Of course these policies were also considered to be necessary, and even sufficient, to trigger economic growth in very different countries; it was a sort of one model one recipe.

II.2 The post-Washington Consensus, 1998.

The structural adjustment policies received strong criticism, both because of their inefficacy due to various types of market failures, but also because of the human suffering that in many cases they were also causing. An early criticism was made in an important book *Adjustment with a human face* published by UNICEF in 1987(see Cornia et al. 1987), which also helped in moving rapidly towards the notion of human development. But it is in the second half of the eighties that an alternative to the Washington Consensus emerges.

The idea of a post-Washington Consensus derives from a famous paper by Joseph Stiglitz in 1998 (see Stiglitz 1998), when he was not yet a Nobel prize laureate but already Senior Vice-president of the World Bank. In the paper Stiglitz advocates the need for more articulated and less economic focused policies but also highlights the fact that development has to be interpreted in terms of broader goals, not just income. This was not the reason why he received the Nobel prize but it certainly helped a lot to open the way to the so called second generation reforms -the first one being the purely economical ones typical of the Structural Adjustment Programs- which give much more attention to the institutional and social conditions of the country. These reforms can be quickly synthesized with the term of good governance. In any case the economic reforms were no longer considered to automatically lead to economic growth.

II.3. The Comprehensive Development Framework, 1999.

A further step in the modification of the views about development policies is due to James Wolfensohn then president of the World Bank who in 1999 launched the Comprehensive Development Framework(see Wolfensohn 1999). This is a very ambitious document because it proposes a new methodology to approach development and the related policies. Not only is development is defined in terms of many aspects but the analysis also includes many different actors: the nation states, international organizations, civil society, the profit sector, both as potential donors but also as possible implementers of developmental actions. In a two dimensional table, a matrix, there is also an attempt to identify for each development aspect the actors which are likely to be more efficient and useful.

As Wolfensohn writes this is an holistic approach in which complexity is accepted as being the major feature of development. The document offers a rich taxonomy which covers all aspects of the development processes, from the strictly economic ones to those of a human, political and social nature. Efficient policies can only be achieved by taking into account the interrelations of the different aspects of development. In a sense no goal or target can really proceed in isolation from the others. There is no longer the belief that there is only one development model that is the same for every country.

III. Cooperation and aid - Official Development Assistance

Aid is an essential component of development policies and since 1960 at the OECD operates the DAC Development Assistance Committee has been operating, in charge of coordinating aid policies among the OECD donors. Following the presentation of the MDGs the UN, DAC and the various G7-G8 meetings have been producing an incredible amount of initiatives and documents on the role of aid and aid effectiveness in particular.

Among the different MDGs there is *goal number eight: Develop a global partnership for development*, which is particularly intriguing in the sense that it has important implications for development policies and in particular for aid.

III.1 The Monterrey Consensus and various aid commitments

In march 2002 in Monterrey Mexico a conference was held on Finance for development, from which emerged the so called Monterrey consensus. If developing countries have to meet the MDGs by 2015 they must implement the appropriate policies and reforms, above all good governance, but the rich countries must concretely help to achieve the MDGs, mainly committing more and more predictable and stable resources, aid. As we know only five of countries reaches the *0.7 percent of GDP* which is

the target set by the UN since the seventies. But it was in Monterrey that all the donor countries, including the G7, promised to increase aid and to approach, if not to achieve that target. A recent document by the European Commission identifies the delays and fallacies of the promises made (see European Commission 2009a).

From November 29 to December 2, 2008 a conference was held in Doha to review the implementation of the Monterrey consensus, and was meant to be the follow up of Monterrey but not much progress has been made.

The Paris declaration of 2005 at the Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (the first was in Rome in 2003) includes several indicators of aid effectiveness and more commitments to increase aid by donor countries. The Paris declaration recommends the donor to have more accountable programs, to adopt coherent aid policies and to coordinate among themselves.

The AAA Accra Agenda for Action following the Third High Level Forum in Accra in September 2008 adds new commitments by the donor countries and emphasises new elements. Here there is no space to enter into the details of the two documents but I want to mention three elements which will be briefly examined below: *country ownership, division of labour and predictability of aid*.

The EU has also produced many documents, the most noticeable being the European Consensus on Development of December 2005 and the EU Agenda for Action on the MDGs adopted by the European Council in June 2008.

III.2 The value of aid

Overall ODA was almost 120 billion US\$ in 2008 recovering from 2006 and 2007, equivalent to 0.30% of GDP of DAC donors, therefore still far away from the 0.7% but also off track with respect to the previous commitments, particularly those of the G7 summit at Gleneagles in 2005; at current prices there are around 20 billion US\$ lacking to meet those commitments.

The EU as a whole provides around 50 billion US\$ of ODA and the final aim should be that of reaching the 0.7% of GDP in 2015, with an intermediate step at 0.56% in 2010. Notice that in the European Consensus there was already a 0.33% target for 2006.

Unfortunately the various commitments to increase aid are not being met. It must be emphasised that here the problem is not only the lack of funds, but the failed promises.

International cooperation is a tricky game in which trust is often more important than money for the obvious reason that development is about long-run improvements and co-operation requires long-term commitments, much beyond the three-year life of most projects.

We all have had this experience in our development collaboration at our micro level. You can only build together when you know each other and trust each other and this needs time and keeping promises on both sides, including those who provide the funds and those who receive them; trust is by definition a two-party relationship and it must work on both sides. This is also true for co-operation among countries and it would be much better and more efficient to promise less but to deliver what is being promised, than to make impressive statements which will not then be fulfilled. In this lat-

ter case we might have a kind of bargaining between donors and beneficiaries which would make it very difficult to achieve good development results.

IV. International and university cooperation

International cooperation, and particularly the Italian Cooperation, has always operated in many different areas: health, education, water, natural resources, cultural heritage, without waiting for economists to recognize the multi-faceted nature of development, clearly practice has anticipated the theory. The same is true our universities, for NGOs and for many other non-state actors. CUAMM of Padua did not wait for health to enter the notion of human development to begin operating in Africa. After all, even our CICOPS- the University of Pavia's Cooperation Centre- was founded in 1987. Not to mention the various religious congregations and orders, of which our Italian experience is so rich, which have been 'on the field' for more than a century.

So why bother broadening the view of development and the variety of different consensuses which seem to mushroom every year among some sort of self-defined development professionals? Would not it be better to concentrate on doing things in favour of low income countries and their people?

I do not think so. The fact that so many new ideas have emerged in a very short period of time implies that there is a process of search going on, a process of re-research. Why not participate in it? Also through the concrete experiences of our university cooperation.

IV.1 Development as a process of change through time and space.

Let me start by recalling three features of development: complexity, time and space; each dimension has either two or three sub- divisions.

Complexity

Development has many faces, a multi-disciplinary approach is quite often needed in order to understand it.

Development is a complex phenomenon, the links among the different aspects are not immediately obvious, they are difficult to identify.

Time

Development has a time dimension, it is a continuous process, and it is not a static equilibrium condition, nor is it the enlargement of the economy in a homothetic way, like an ever-enlarging pie.

Development is about transformation and change in the history of a country, and it is in continuous evolution.

Space

Development has also a spatial dimension, for instance in the case of the so called global public goods, such as the environment, international security and so on; these are elements which literally cross borders

Development implies the comparison of different countries and realities across space.

Development implies a judgement about certain conditions or standards, for instance the MDGs, which have to apply to all people; either these standards are universal development standards, accepted by all people, or it is difficult to include them into the concept of development.

The spatial dimension is probably the most intriguing one and the last sub-division above is perhaps the most difficult one. It is clear that awareness of these six elements could be of great stimulus to research activities and in particular to university co-operation. Let me give three examples by using some popular jargon in development debates.

IV.2 “Think globally, act locally”

This is a well-known expression which was made popular by Stiglitz, even if of course this is not the reason he received the Nobel prize. In development we need to have a broad view of the general issues and challenges, for instance: the working of international markets and finance can hardly be ignored. Therefore, development analysis and policies cannot avoid a large and possibly well informed knowledge of world phenomena, the macro level. All the more so for development projects and programs, even at the micro level, which is what we really practice in the case of university cooperation. Three considerations:

To help universities of LICs to improve the standard of their graduates and to establish new graduate programs is always a good thing but does solve the question about local and regional labour markets and job opportunities for new graduates.

Some cooperation projects modify local conditions much beyond the initial scope of the project itself. In Gulu the St. Mary Lacor Hospital is an essential component of health care for the whole of Northern Uganda, but it is also the second largest employer in the Acholi region, and a new city has developed outside the hospital's walls.

In section *III.5* above, we have briefly discussed two European policies: CAP and EPAs. We just had European elections, but neither CAP nor EPAs have appeared in the political debate and or in the media. This is a cultural defeat for all of us working in the field of university co-operation, but it also indicates the type of work we have to do with our students, and more in general with young people. It is important to involve our students in projects in developing countries, perhaps funded by the EU, but we must also give them the possibility to learn more about EU co-operation and other policies.

On the other hand, each country and region has a specificity, the local knowledge, which must be part of the prerequisites of any action which aims to be efficient and this requires strong collaboration with our partners in developing countries and leads me to the next section.

IV.3 Ownership

Another important element of the new development consensus is the need for country ownership in the development process; again borrowing from Stiglitz, one could say that developing countries must be “in the driving seat”.

Here in Pavia we have just started an EDULINK project on the EU-African economic partnership with five universities in Africa and my colleague and friend Gianbattista Parigi is carrying on a very demanding training program with five hospitals in Africa. One of these is Lacor Hospital in Northern Uganda. The hospital was started in 1961 thanks to the efforts of Piero and Lucille Corti, but now the handing over of all the responsibilities to local people, both in the medical and in the managerial aspects is almost complete. This is a successful example of development cooperation, but I think it will have to be the same for university cooperation projects.

In university cooperation we are particularly lucky because education and training directly benefit the students, by becoming part of their knowledge; at the very micro level, the personal level, ownership can be guaranteed.

Cooperation is a dialogue,

and obviously a dialogue is needed to carry on projects in a successful way, during three, six, twenty years. However the responsibilities for setting the themes of the discussion will have to gradually move to the colleagues and friends of the South.

At some stage of a successful cooperation program we will have to disappear.

However, in university cooperation we have an enormous benefit: the possibility of joint research, the dialogue does not have to stop but simply is transformed precisely because the boundaries of our curiosities can be moved forward. A project or even a program might end, but that will not put an end to the problems and questions that need to be answered. Thus

the dialogue will continue.

Some of us have already had the privilege to experience this feeling: cooperation help to establish long term bonds and commitments. Not always, only with some colleagues and in some cases, but in terms of new research and never-ending curiosities, the door is clearly open to all of us.

The more complicated the notion of development is, the more it is challenging and requires a continuous investigative effort. It is time to conclude and we are back to where we started: the multiform concept of development.

Conclusions

Indeed, the notion of development is even wider than the MDGs. Amartya Sen Nobel prize laureate of 1998, in 2005 in this very same hall he received an Honorary Degree in Political Economy and International Institutions. Studies on the capability approach continue with Professor Enrica Chiappero who directs the Human Development and Poverty International Research Center established at IUSS. I will conclude with a few considerations derived from two of his books.

C.1 Development as freedom

In 1999 he published a book by the title *Development as freedom*, thus one more dimension and a very difficult one indeed; not only because freedom is difficult to measure, but even more because it is difficult to define.

So here we are with a very articulated notion of development, made up of many different aspects. How is it possible to describe a development process? Wasn't it better when we had a one dimensional definition and a single development model, in terms of capital accumulation and economic growth? However, we can derive some useful lessons from the way in which Sen proceed in his book.

First of all, and this is fundamental, now each individual, each person, is the centre of the development process.

Second, instead of looking for a universal definition of freedom and for a single set of policies for development, Sen concentrates on the impediments to freedom, those features and elements which prevent the individual from using some opportunities and which deny him some choices. These can be personal impediments, lack of education, but also political and economic impediments.

It is a different methodological attitude with respect to that of having a single model, which describes the ideal situation and then development implies the reduction of the distance between the ideal model and the 'backward' situation. To Sen development consists in the reduction of the non-liberties of people, the elimination of those elements which prevent people from the possibility of having a larger set of choices in front of them.

We can now see why quite often Sen also turns the problem of development upside down, it is not by chance that he has dedicated some so much effort to the notion which appears to be opposed to that of development: poverty. Of course not only income poverty, poverty as exclusion, poverty as deprivation, as a lack of possibilities and opportunities for individuals and sometimes for societies.

This method of looking at development from the point of view of removing the impediments instead of that of a single set of policies has also been adopted by another Harvard economist Dany Rodrik of the Kennedy School of Government. Rodrik highlights the role of institutions in the process of development and the fact that there is no single recipe which fits the many different economic and social conditions. In 2004 he proposed a methodology known as growth diagnostic to identify the elements which prevent an economy from growing, and these elements can be economic, social, political or institutional.

It is a similar attitude to Sen's: first examine the major impediments and then see what the evolution of the process will be.

Notice: this is not an a-theoretical approach, quite simply is not deterministic, and in sense, it is more pragmatic.

C.2 Identity and Violence–The Illusion of Destiny

However Sen's view has a great advantage: the explicit acknowledgement of each individual's rights and dignity, this is the benchmark to appraise development and progress away from poverty as deprivation. It is the language of the Enlightenment and of a certain Western tradition which calls human dignity-citizenship- now universal citizenship.

Sen is not a believer but his approach echoes some passages of two famous encyclicals, *Pacem in Terris* and *Populorum Progressio*. The latter encyclical says that "in order to be true, development must aim at the improvement of each man, of all the man in his entirety"; and the "conclusion" has a famous title: "development is the new name of peace".

Identity and Violence was published in 2006 and it invites each of us to consider how many different aspects we are made up of.

Personally I draw two lessons from Sen's book.

First, not only is development a multi-faceted phenomenon, but above all, each man is a complex mixture of different ideas, views and roles, which derive from the many different relations which link each of us to the others and thus define our space inside society.

Therefore, development is about the enlargement of this space, not about restricting ourselves to a few, maybe even one single definition, this is the illusion of identity: one dimension explaining all.

Different identities do co-exist. Development as freedom is about the possibility for each human being to enlarge her/his range of choices about different identities.

Second, in chapter eight Sen distinguishes multiculturalism from what he calls plural monoculturalism. In plural monoculturalism different cultures, traditions, visions, to live side by side but without meeting. Of course, to have a tolerant and decent world is of vital importance, but it must not be confused with a multiculturalism in which cultures and traditions do meet and can also cross-fertilize one another. Multiculturalism is about the mixing up of the different experiences and here we return to cooperation as dialogue.

A few weeks ago I was in Vietnam in a Parish church of Ho Chi Minh City visiting a hospital which is intended to provide even the poorest part of the population with modern diagnostic tools and treatments. In the same place there is also a section dedicated to traditional herbal treatments. *Per se* this would be plural monoculturalism, but in the hospital there are doctors who know how to use the two medical traditions and this is what makes the difference.

The decisive element in overcoming plural monoculturalism is the possibility for human beings to decide and to choose which tradition, political beliefs and culture they want to emphasise in their own identity; it is a problem of widening the range of individual and collective choices. This enlargement of opportunities requires the knowledge of traditions, cultures, even techniques with which we are not familiar. In its turn, this expansion of knowledge requires true dialogue and university cooperation is part of this process.

C.3 The privileges of university cooperation

The rapid evolution in the notion and in the policies of development gives us more reasons to re-discover the privileges of university cooperation, which go much beyond the help and support that we can offer to colleagues and young people of LICs.

We work

- in research, trying to improve human knowledge;
- with young people, as possibly educators, but our mission is not only that of transferring knowledge, but that of raising their curiosity, of helping them to ask themselves relevant questions;
- with colleagues from different countries and who work in conditions which pose different challenges, and differences and unusual conditions are the bread for new knowledge.

Aren't we in an ideal position to improve human understanding? Research is our mandate; young people are working with us for change; we collaborate with realities and situations which are not the familiar ones in our countries.

These are three big assets of university cooperation for development.

References

Sen A. 1999, *Development as Freedom*, Anchor Books, New York.

Sen A. 2006, *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*, W.W. Norton, USA.

Stiglitz J. 1998, *More instruments and broader goals: Moving toward the post-Washington consensus*.
The Wider annual lecture, Helsinki.

United Nations 1987, World Commission on Environment and Development (Bruntland Report), *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

UNDP 2003, *Human Development Report 2003, Millenium Development Goals: A compact among nations to end human poverty*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Williamson J, 1990, *What Washington means by policy reform*. In J.Williamson, *Latin American adjustment: how much has happened*, Institute of International Economics, Washington.

Wolfensohn J.D. 1999, *A proposal for a Comprehensive Development Framework*, mimeo, Washington.

World Bank, 2003, *World Development Report 2003, Sustainable Development in a Dynamic World*

– *Transforming Institutions, Growth and Quality of Life*, Oxford University Press, New York.