Critical perspectives on International Development: New geographies of inequality and the reconfiguration of the 'Global South' and the 'Global North'

Fabian Frenzel[1], University of Leicester

Peter Case, James Cook University and the University of the West of England

Arun Kumar, University of York

Mitchell W Sedgwick, London School of Economics and Political Science

Profiles of panel convenors:

Fabian Frenzel co-organized a stream on Critical Development Studies at CMS in 2013, and convened a number of conferences and workshops. He was part of the organizing team at CMS 2015 in Leicester where he also delivered two papers and a workshop on the future of critical management education.

Peter Case co-organized a stream on Critical Development Studies at CMS 2013 and has co-convened two other CMS streams (2011, 2009). He is an experienced conference and stream organizer having been directly involved in convening/organizing over 20 events for such international groups as EGOS, SCOS, ERUAM and APROS.

---

[1] Lead Convenor, email: ff48@leicester.ac.uk

Arun Kumar has presented a number of papers at CMS in 2013 and 2015 and the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management's CMS Division (2013, 2016) one of which was awarded the Best Critical Management Education Paper (2016).

Mitch Sedgwick co-organized a stream on Critical Development Studies at CMS 2013, has presented papers in multiple and diverse venues, including at SCOS, CMS and EGOS, and has long experience organising panels and paper streams at the AAA, ASA, AAS, JAWS, EAJS, etc. He has organised conferences, regular seminar programmes and overseen the work of researchers as Executive Director and Director, respectively, of a think tank at Harvard and a research centre at Oxford Brookes.

Proposal

In this stream we seek to build on Critical Management Studies' (CMS) engagement with and criticisms of international development (ID). In particular, we are interested in challenging, indeed re-thinking, the geographical schism on which international development is predicated. Of crucial importance here are constellations of meanings and practices that revolve around the structural division between the so-called 'Global North' and 'Global South'. The 'Global South' has long been used as a shorthand term to describe 'under-developed countries';[2] that is, a geography where those in need of development resided. The 'Global North', on the other hand, is used to designate the developed nations or liberal capitalist democracies. It has the knowledge, history, resources, and readily available templates on which the 'Global South' is expected to model its 'development'.

In the period after World War II, when the postcolonial push for 'development' became more concentrated, the 'North' and the 'South' were intended less as geographic specificities than as relative signifiers for designating nations with a diminished socio-economic status within the world order. Indeed, the introduction of the 'South' acquired in its propagation a mythical status that, in juxtaposition with the North, served an essentially

---

[2] The convenors reject the implicit ideologies and agendas connoted by the terms 'developed' and 'developing' as they reproduce a 'civilized/uncivilized', 'advanced/backward', 'modern/non-modern' dualities which this stream is eager to challenge. Nonetheless, these concepts do form part of common parlance and it is important to acknowledge how, at a minimum, they align with the *economics*-language driven, neo-liberal discourse that drives international development in the contemporary world.

ideological purpose. Empirically, while neither of these terms is accurate, the division of 'North' and 'South' has been sustained not only in international development, but also in the discourses of global politics and international relations. The use of concepts such as 'North' and 'South' extends to accounts critical of the status quo and indeed to the language of practitioners and activists challenging global inequality (Frenzel et al. 2011), indicating the persuasiveness of the ideological sway of the divide. In struggling against colonial and post-colonial impositions, activists' claims to be from the 'Global South' can also be understood in relation to what Spivak (1996) has described as 'strategic essentialism'; for example, to enable powerful alliances among very different actors. Thus the concepts of 'Global North' and 'Global South' seem to frame both the management of global economic relations and postcolonial dominance, but equally configure the myriad utterances of resistance against these impositions.

CMS scholars have for some time provided an outline for interrogating management of ID, or development management, from a range of historical, theoretical and geographical positions (Cooke, 2004, 2010; Dar and Cooke, 2008; Murphy, 2008). CMS scholars have studied the political economy of global capitalism in its imposition of managerial blueprints (Misoczky & Böhm, 2013) the power of international institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF in this process (Federici & Caffentzis, 2004) as well as resistance movements that challenge the dominant managerial development paradigms (Spicer & Boehm, 2007). This builds, significantly, on previously existing critique of ID from Anthropology and Development Studies, particularly Post-development Studies (Escobar, 1995, 1996). Within this work deconstructive criticisms of ID have revealed the discursive power of such terms in making mythical geographies - such as 'Third World', 'Latin America' and 'Global South' - *real* in the sense of having real-world effects. Likewise, postcolonial studies of development have drawn attention to and challenged the dichotomies of North/South, traditional/modern, under/developed, on which international development is premised (Gupta, 1998). That is, the extensive use of such spatial signifiers generate ideational openings for intervention that legitimise the organizational and managerial assemblages of international development.

This field, however, is far from static, and extant criticisms may be seen as a starting point for the furthering of Critical Management Studies engagement with ID that we propose in this stream. Profound changes in conceptions and practices of ID, and the geographies in which international development takes place, warrant renewed attention from CMS. This stream aims, then, at (re)invigorating critical research on ID and geography by inviting contributions that offer fresh theoretical, empirical and methodological insight to the field.

Today such renewed attentions seem particularly urgent as the 'Global South' and 'Global North', we argue, are being reconfigured today in a process that is underpinned by material transformations and new complex geographies of inequality. With continuous and rising poverty in so-called developed countries - the US, UK and, most notably of late, in southern European nations (Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal) - alongside the rise of new emerging powers, geographical and developmental divisions are being, variously, redrawn, blurred, or rendered irrelevant. For example, the 'local' rise (in the 'North') of childhood poverty, 'rough sleepers' existing cheek and jowl with City bankers, the on-going diminishing of public services, including the reduction in global aid owing to the recession, has collapsed the seeming distance between the 'North' and the 'South'. On the *erstwhile* 'other side of the globe', the rise of the 'South' through collaborations such as the New Development Bank[3] is challenging, if not reversing, prior global hierarchies.

Current demands from certain political quarters to redirect and redeploy development aid in the service of 'local causes and needs' are perhaps indicative of a sense that the South/North divide is no longer a sustainable or salient socio-economic division (if, indeed, it ever was). This is, in no small part, the result of challenges to the prior (post/colonial) boundaries that demarcated the countries from the 'North' from those in the 'South'. From grassroots globalisations between and within the global 'South', we see increasingly global patterns of migration that defy the easy separation of the world and the hierarchies of the global geopolitical order. The global refugee crisis, for example, has brought large-scale camps and urban 'slums' to the 'North' (at Calais for example). As such, the United Nations has had to refocus its rescue and relief operations to the 'developed' 'North' and the

---

[3] Formerly known as the BRICS Development Bank, where BRICS is an acronym standing for an association of so called 'emerging economies': Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa.

boundaries (land or maritime) that segregated the two. Relatedly, the legitimacy of INGOs' interventions in the global 'South' are now under challenge. Variously under the rhetoric of national sovereignty, security and interest, 'Southern' nations are challenging the involvement of 'Northern' liberal developmentalism in their sovereign geographies. This is extremely problematic in that it stifles democratic dissent. In India, for example, protestors against the Kudankulam nuclear power plant, and their 'Northern' supporters have been facing sustained backlash from the nation-state.

 Seen as a whole, we suggest that current understandings of the 'South' belie new socio-economic global realities; and to this extent its juxtaposition with the 'North' continues to serve essentialist ideological purposes. Where might we re-locate the 'South' within blurred lines and complex geographies of inequality? Does the appearance of the South in the North reconfigure the logic of intervention and postcolonial politics?

We invite critical perspectives (historical and contemporary) on global inequalities and the implications of, and challenges to, the discursive and geographical divisions between the Global North and South. We are also interested in geographically informed criticisms of International Development, more generally. Indicative topics might include:

- Deconstructing the South/North divide
- Poverty eradication and its discourses; and their differences in the North/South
- Development and sustainability: conflicts and convergence
- International Development Policy and Global Governance
- Relevance of Global Governance Institutions (G8, G20, UN, IMF, World Bank)
- Emergent International Development Institutions and their roles
- Geographies of 'Corruption'
- Critical analyses of international development discourse(s)
- International development and critical project management studies
- Subaltern studies and postcolonial criticisms of international development
  Global, regional, and national inequalities.

The convenors would also welcome creative interpretations which challenge the boundaries set by this call for papers.

References

Cooke, B. (2004) 'Managing the (Third) World', *Organization* 11(5): 603-629.

Cooke, B. (2010) 'Managerialism as Knowing and Making in Latin America: International Development Management and World Bank Interventions', in A. Guedes, and A. Faria (eds) *International Management and International Relations: A Critical Perspective from Latin America*, pp. 161-184. New York: Routledge.

Dar, S. and Cooke, B. eds (2008) *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed.

Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Chichester, NY: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. (1996) 'Imagining a Post-development Era', in J. Crush (ed.) *The* Power *of Development*, pp. 211-227. London: Routledge.

Federici, S. & Caffentzis, C.G. (2004) Globalization and Professionalization in Africa. *Social Text*, 22(2), pp.81–99.

Frenzel, F.; Boehm, S.; Quniton, P.; Spicer, A; Sullivan, S.; Zoe, Y. (2011) Comparing alternative media in North and South: The cases of IFIWatchnet and Indymedia in Africa. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(5), pp.1173–1189.

Gupta, A. (1998) Postcolonial Developments: Agriculture in the Making of Modern India, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Misoczky, M.C. & Böhm, S. (2013) Resisting neocolonial development: Andalgalá's people struggle against mega-mining projects. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, 11(2), pp.311–339.

Murphy, J. (2008) *The World Bank and Global Managerialism*. London: Routledge.

Spicer, A. & Boehm, S. (2007) Moving Management: Theorizing Struggles against the Hegemony of Management. *Organization Studies*, 28(11), pp.1667–1698.

Spivak, G.C. (1996) *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak* D. Landry & G. M. MacLean, eds., Psychology Press.