

**Exploring development under the lenses of Foucault's
idea of power and Post-Structuralism: How do bilateral
donor – recipient dynamics reinforces asymmetric
relations of power.**

EDGAR MIGUEL PUGA AYALA

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment for the Degree of MA Human
Rights and International Relations**

Department of Social Sciences, Roehampton University

January 16th, 2017

ABSTRACT

The research consists on an exploration of how the dynamics of donor – recipient regarding international help can be part of an asymmetrical relation. In order deepen into that area tools such as concepts of power are required and used.

Due to the fact that power is a broad concept that has been taken by many authors and therefore can be found under different theories and approaches, the exploration choses a particular author that was one of the leaders of the movement that is based for the methodology taken for the research. In this sense, Foucault´s understanding of power and how it works, creates and affects within its system will go across the whole research.

Despite the fact that initially, the research was considering focus on a particular country and effect of the asymmetrical relation between donor an recipient, the idea of questioning from the beginning the simple fact of having two different roles in international help towards development fits better for the application of Post-structuralism, which cannot be diminished by only one or two variables since it was a view of the world that opposes to binary categories, challenging absolutely everything.

The dissertation takes the terminology `exploration´ because, under the chosen methodology, the possibilities are infinitive depending on subjectivity, use of language, etc. In fact, the exercise of exploring is the most suitable term for the topic that is pretended to be approached, not through quantitative analysis or high precision tools.

The questioning of language and power are the essential points that discuss development within the donor – recipient relations. In this sense, statistics do not have an important role in the research since the latter does not seek punctual effects but intents to open the door to challenge pre-established conceptions of development through international help as ODA.

I. INTRODUCTION

The current research is based on Post-structuralism and therefore will use the techniques of that kind of analysis, which does not mean that the exploration is merely a speculative exercise since it is based on concepts to be challenged.

The problem of asymmetrical relations of donor and recipients and the fact the development international help can reinforce that type of relation is the main object of analysis that can be seen over the research.

The use of the language of international help through ODA is the cornerstone to understand we are interested in deepen on development under the lenses of Post-Structuralism. Thus, theory of power is also a figure taken in order to identify why the relation between donor and recipient is asymmetrical and unfair with no hope to change. The latter situation is the one that can be linked to human rights and the controversy of how detrimental or beneficial its western view and understanding is.

There is more than meets the eye when it comes to challenge pre - established categories. In fact, development is one of those that during the exploration will be contested due to the power of its meaning (language wise) and also because of its strategic use to dominate or impose beliefs.

Development has become not only a desirable goal for countries but also the reason they gather and negotiate. But, what happen if that reason does not exist? Or if that reason is actually an excuse for powerful countries to dominate others and introduce them in a system where the latter cannot escape unless they cooperate with the donors.

In other words, development as international help (ODA) may be the reason why recipients stay on that status for years and use the donated resources only on purposes donors agree with.

Again, terminologies are stronger than simple language. In fact, the use of language is absolutely present in every single part of the exploration because roles are distributed by terminologies and all them depict power on them. In this sense, although it seems to be really abstract, the exploration, takes language and also knowledge (Foucault's views) as the lines that will help it discover what is hidden behind international help towards development.

II. METHODOLOGY

The exploration is guide by a Post-structuralist approach, which means that it will use the tools related to this philosophical movement.

In this sense, discourse analysis is the main methodology resource that consists in reading between lines. In other words, the exploration will focus on not necessarily written language or ideas that can be inferred due to the context that provides them with certain characteristics.

At the same time, discourse analysis is absolutely helpful because the exploration is based on an already asymmetrical relation of power where there only one of two voices can be hear (the one from the powerful, which in this case of analysis belongs to donors). In fact, that can be seen easily on the regulations of ODA since the prohibitions for labelling as so, depicts the voice of donors, despite the real needs of recipients.

Discourse analysis works better every time language is challenged in the way Post-Structuralism does. Foucault contributes to the methodology when he introduces the link between power and knowledge though the use of language. In this sense, the exploration follows Foucault steps in terms of how the topic of study is analysed. However, that situation can make the research look too ambitious and difficult to understand due to

its lack of concretion. However, the exercise of challenging a relation as the donor – recipient one under the dynamics of international help (ODA) cannot be only seen under quantitative tools since they can be related to exact sciences but cannot read beyond numbers.

The absence of quantitative analysis is justified on this exploration because it is not trying to find an absolutely truth. Let ´s remember that for post-structuralism there are not definitive answers and therefore, not absolute truths.

Although statistics can provide researches with credibility, they also represent a particular moment in time. The effect of them are very similar to a photograph since they prove that something happened but they cannot prove why or even if that cause is still there.

The chosen methodology for the exploration is based on challenging realities, not on discovering patrons of behaviour. In fact, the reason the dissertation is called exploration is due to its curiosity to disassemble pre conceptions questioning openly is the history we believe in are real or maybe we are following artificial beliefs.

The discourse analysis and the use of language provides the exploration with the chance to re-think relations of power under the frame of Foucault´s ideas, which, at the same time incorporate ideas such discipline, individualities and the power of language itself.

It is important to acknowledge that the discourse analysis is a branch of the qualitative analysis that is as, it was described, the cornerstone of the exploration and it is present at every step of the latter.

To sum up, the chosen methodology is a qualitative one based on the discourse analysis to challenge already established concepts that are part of the literature review. In addition, the Post-structuralist approach

triggers a more detailed analysis of language as well as the introduction of categories related to the power according to Foucault.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The exploration faces many problems since its purpose is challenging as much realities and concepts as possible. However, the asymmetrical nature of the roles of donor and recipient within international help (ODA) is the main issue that dissertation tries to explore.

Furthermore, development is per se a problematic terminology since it can be seen through different eyes and therefore responds to different needs. Western centrism is the main critique to development but it can be even more complicated when we realise that development is the reason why underdeveloped and developed countries are linked and work together. Do they really work together? Or is a powerful country imposing its western values?

The research challenges the use of power, language, knowledge and development itself but it is basically worried about the fact that development due to the asymmetrical relation of power reinforces the latter through international help.

The fact that development is a desired goal worldwide makes it specially dangerous since no one seems to analyse if the way of obtaining it is more detrimental than the fulfilling the needs without international help.

There is more than meets the eye when it comes to realise what it is behind development (international help wise) because it can undermine the sovereignty of the participants, especially of the recipients that does need to be part of that system to solve their internal problems.

In a nutshell, the main problem statement is the fact that bilateral donor – recipient dynamics reinforces asymmetrical relations of power.

As it was explained on the methodology section, the problem is analysed through the lenses – Post-structuralism and Foucault’s understanding of power.

IV. AIM – OBJECTIVES (RESEARCH QUESTIONS OR HYPOTHESIS)

Aim:

Explore the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development and how they reinforces asymmetrical relations of power or if they, actually, diminishes the gap between developed and developing countries.

Research questions:

- Do the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development reinforces asymmetrical relations of power?
- Is the dynamics of donor – recipient within the arena of development necessarily beneficial for developing countries?
- Does power play an important role in the arena of development?
- Can international help have a negative dimension towards recipients?

Hypothesis:

- Bilateral donor – recipient dynamics reinforces asymmetric relations of power.

V. LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to be able to explore the chosen subject properly, first many concepts and precisions about them must be written. In this sense, terminologies such as power, knowledge, Post-structuralism and development allows us to establish a theoretical frame to, in the second part of the literature review, explain the gap that the academia has regarding those concepts and the problem statement.

In this sense, there are conceptual tools that due to its absence in the arena of donor – recipient asymmetrical relations of power are explained and then justified according to the main goal of the exploration.

Power

Foucault understanding of power is the cornerstone to link development to the dynamics of donors and recipients since the latter is based on positions of power. In this sense, we frame Foucault understanding to the theory that he, as well Derrida and Deleuze, represents: post-structuralism.

It is important to acknowledge that Post-structuralism was born as an answer to a previous movement called Structuralism. For instance the use of the language as a tool regarding power is a clear and direct reply to the binary opposition theory from Saussure (La Saussure, 1986). In fact, what started as an attempt to challenge established approaches ended up opening new and diverse possibilities. Indeed, the understanding of realities through the discourse analysis, which is one of the most distinctive methods from Post-structuralism, not only questions pre-established categories but also broke the mould of how knowledge was conceived.

However before deepening into the idea of knowledge based on the concept of power, it is more than obvious that the first step to follow is exploring the main understanding of power according to Foucault.

In this sense, Foucault (Paras, 2006) provides the idea of power as a result of individuality instead of as an opposition to it. In fact, Paras (2006) literally cites a conference in 1974 where Foucault explains himself in this way:

'I think that individuality is today completely controlled by power, and that we are individualised, at bottom, by power itself. In other words, I do not believe in the least that individualisation is opposed to power, but on the contrary, I would say that our individuality- the obligatory identity of each of us- is the effect and instrument of power.'

In other words, understanding the context of Foucault's ideas, we must acknowledge that power does not necessarily presents itself in negative terms as a taming force that delimits behaviours or characteristics of individuals. In fact, power needs to be seen as a positive weapon capable of triggering and therefore producing individualities. The keyword is 'production' because it takes power to a different level which is not limited to worsen or improve already existent individuals, but, on the contrary, amplifies its spectrum to the extent of creating from scratch. Let's take note about this particular characteristic of power since it will be useful to understand more about Foucault and his idea of knowledge.

But there is more than meets the eye when it comes to power according to Foucault since it involves everything we can imagine. In other words, nothing can escape from power because it is practised and not held (Nealon, 2008). In this sense, there is no chance to be outside power as Nealon (2008) refers when he explains Foucault's ideas.

The consequence of approaching power as a system with no exit due to its complex and unavoidable relations is re-interpreting the whole world and actions based on the interests of the most powerful ones towards the less favoured ones. The latter may not be as independent as they wish since they cannot escape from the decisions, convenience or simple desires of the ones who lead the systems of power. Therefore ideas such as cooperation or

donations are impossible if are conceptualised ignoring the fact power is exercised even during those kinds of relations. As a matter of fact, power is the reason why countries are linked to each other since they seek an ability they do not have by themselves. For instance, countries with no enough technology to process commodities into final products turn to industrialised allies looking for do so under commercial treaties. According to Foucault's view of power, the fact of processing the commodities into final products for the benefit of a third country involves a relation of power since there is no purely innocent intention of helping. No one spends resources without expecting a result. In other words, there is always a reason that triggers socialisation between countries, people, etc. and there is no way to escape from that logic of power.

In addition, 'discipline' is a term that clarifies and complements the notion of power since, according to Foucault (Paras, 2006), can be described as *'the set of techniques in virtue of which systems of power have as their goal and result the singularisation of individuals.'*

On top of explaining the link between power and individualities, the presence of 'discipline' provides power with a methodology so as to obtain better results from individuals. Despite the fact that a first approximation to 'discipline' may mislead us to a contradiction within individuals due to the belief that discipline implies uniform behaviours with no differences at all, Foucault was able to apply the opposite idea to his understanding of power on Discipline and Punish (Foucault, 1995). The mentioned book introduces an idea of discipline as a provider of effectiveness that create differences (individualisation) in order to obtain the right number of population specialised on certain tasks so as to make the system work better. In plain English, discipline is the tool that shapes the particular characteristics of individuals, within the system of power. Again, this 'discipline' is related to the purpose of the most powerful.

Until now, we are briefly exploring Foucault's understanding of power and discipline that will be extremely useful to frame development and the dynamics of donor – recipient that are the main aim of the research.

Foucault had his own ideas regarding subjectivity (Strozier, 2002), which differs from individuality, however due to its purely philosophical nature it is not worthy to include it completely in the exploration. Be as it may, Foucault considers that the subject is different from its actions and that each subject is a result of historic events that does not mean the latter are the same as the subject. This idea is easier to understand when it is applied under the discourse analysis because the latter takes the history of the author of certain information as an element to re-interpret that information and even find a hidden message that cannot be deciphered unless the reading goes beyond the lines or the spoken words.

Knowledge

When it comes to break structuralism, Foucault (2002) uses his archaeology of knowledge and presents complex process of language, subjectivity and power. The French author introduces the discourse as a tool to uncover the structure of already established ideas. At the same time, history provides Foucault with the chance to criticise the present however he understood historic events as contingents and not necessary since, for him (Rawat, 2014) they are the result of chain of complex relations

In fact, as Kendall (1999) refers: *‘the point that Foucault regularly makes is that so often our much-cherished advances are the quite accidental result of some apparently unrelated changes.’* In other words, Foucault was trying to explain that there are no coincidences or senseless actions because each event has a purpose that, at the same time, triggers new events and so forth until the present arrives.

In addition to the idea of the inexistence of unrelated events with no consequences within the system of power, Foucault takes the analysis of the language as part of his understanding of knowledge. The main emphasis of the French author lies on the fact that language produces content since there is a difference between the objects that are referred by language and the reference itself. The latter is related to the text that works as the lenses we see the world

through. These lenses do not work equally for every individual due to the particularities of each one. In fact, those particularities are the culture that provides us with different ideas of the same object. For instance, whereas the object `gun´ is defined as a device able to shoot bullets, a weapon collector can, through his textuality - culture, understand its significance as a missing piece of a collection and a gang member, as a the perfect tool to kill rivals in the most violent possible way. So language and its cognitive process help us interpret the world, which gives us an idea of how detrimental or beneficial the use of language is when it comes to interfere and produce knowledge.

The use of language is not only based on Foucault´s view about knowledge and power but it is also part of the tools Post-structuralism provides us to challenge the binary categories of an structured world.

Post-Structuralism

As a philosophical movement that presents itself as the opposition to Structuralism, Post-Structuralism challenges its predecessor. The idea of a structured world is reduced to one full of infinite variables, where nothing is taken as granted.

In fact, scepticism plays a leading role in order to foster the questioning of already established forms of knowledge. Indeed, scepticism is a crucial element in any theory, methodology or research. Axioms do not contribute to the production of knowledge since they tend to discourage curiosity and therefore tries to impose a particular view with no confronting it to new realities.

Although the universal truth is something sought by most of theories or approaches of power or knowledge, Post-Structuralism does not focus on that type of goal. In fact, its aim is related to uncover new answers to old questions without any intention of imposing its discoveries. Let´s remember that the more we question the world we live in, the deeper the knowledge we can provide our peers with.

Furthermore, Post-Structuralism cannot seek an absolute truth since it contradicts the main essence of the repetitive exercise of questioning that supports this philosophical approach.

Even when it comes to the idea of a system of power with no exit at all, it has to be challenged in order to suggest alternatives to that statement. Post-structuralism would introduce as many variables as exits to a system of power however could find. However, challenging realities, axioms or established concepts requires enough criteria to accept plural answers that incorporates the context or culture of the ones who are ready to interpret them.

Besides the critiques that Post-Structuralism can trigger (due to its lack of conclusive answers), the fact that it depicts an effort to go beyond the until then limits is enough ground to believe that it can be apply to any circumstance, especially when it power is involved.

The context of the interlocutors, writers or authorities is as important as their message since they are mixed because the first shapes the latter. In other words, the relative nature of things is a result of the individuality, culture or context of each participant of certain situation or interpretation.

To summarise these part regarding power, knowledge and post-structuralism, we can point out the following:

Power needs to be seen as able to continuously produce content and not only as a limiting force.

Power implies a system of relations and events that always produce a consequence and have no exit.

Discipline is a tool of power that is responsible of the individualisation that, at the same time, implies the effectiveness of the resources of the most powerful within the unavoidable system of power.

Knowledge is produced due to the use of language and subjectivity by power.

The language is not neutral since it comes with all the interpretation of the one who uses it and that is why it differs from the original significance of the object it is referred to.

As for Post-structuralism, it can be compiled as a philosophical movement born as answer to structuralism challenging and the ideas of binary categories by questioning everything using the language and subjectivities to analyse contexts.

Development:

The Declaration on the Right to development literally recognises that

‘development is a comprehensive, economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at the constant improvement of well-being of the entire population and of all individuals on the basis of their active, free and meaningful participation in development and in the fair distribution of benefits (...)’ (United Nations, 1986).

Analysing the already mentioned Declaration we acknowledge that Development is understood as a right and therefore it can be claimed under that international regulation system. However, there is still a doubt regarding the *erga omnes* nature of the Declaration. In other words, the immediate fulfilment of the right to development is not clear due to soft law interpretations.

Despite the discussion of the real impact of the status or not of development (right to be fulfilled wise) there is another interesting idea to take from the Declaration that is the fact that development crosses over more than one process. In this sense, areas such as economy, culture and politics are involved in attainment of development, which provides it with a complex dimension that requires complex actions from governments to make it work.

Another note from the main Declaration text is the fact that the entire population and all individuals must be participants of their own development. It can be understood that the population has an active role regarding their own well-being. In fact, development crossing the arena of political rights reinforces democracy and therefore civil rights. In spite of economic or cultural growth, there is no real development unless political rights are guaranteed by governments. Likewise, the accomplishment of economical development does not authorise or validate abuses on the cultural dimension of development.

In this sense, the Declaration unifies the different dimensions of development so as to protect it completely and foster its integral promotion. In addition, the idea of development as a process involves long term goals but also immediate actions. It is clear that countries cannot change from one day to another but they can start showing aspirational regulations that implement a set of aims in terms of applicable rights to their citizens. For instance, poor countries can implement regulations towards social security even when they are not capable of responding to the needs of the whole population. However, having that situation regulated will allow that government, through other regulations (probably economy wise) slowly prioritise social security. As we can see, there is no excuse for governments to work for their own development despite the lack of resources that, for example, non-western countries may find.

Besides the Declaration, it is important to understand how the idea of development has changed according to certain events. In this sense, and following Castels (2001), we can identify models of development depending on the preference of capitalism or communism.

In this sense, the first one is oriented to *'state investment, urbanisation, cheap and abundant labour and free entrepreneur'* (Baeck, 1993). There is no doubt that this particular view of development responds to an absolute western cosmovision of the world and therefore only covers the needs they recognise as valid. In this sense, countries that are still in their way to become as industrialised as the western ones have the duty to follow the economic policies

of leaders of free market despite the fact that they may not be result of the same circumstances or realities.

On the other hand, and again, according to Baeck (1983) there is a notion of development based on the Five-Years plan from the Soviet Union. The mentioned plan considers the State as the commander of the economy and also every single act of the State is understood as 'in behalf of the people.' Thus, agricultural surpluses are extracted in order to economically support new capital accumulations and industrialisation as well. In a nutshell, the state is the main actor of the economy and therefore of this view of development.

The controversy regarding development was the fact of pretending to establish universal values, labelling them as desired ones. The consequence of doing so implies the movement of population from economically emerging countries to the dominant and prosperous western ones triggering demographic changes but, at the same time, ignoring, the needs of the a genuine and own understanding of development for emerging countries.

In fact, development cannot be only understood through the lenses of the economic growth and advanced well - being polices but also silenced voices must contribute from the corners of vulnerability, traditions and also non-western values.

In addition to the division of the view of development as a result of the western and the soviet model, the Dependency School (Cardoso and Faletto, 1979) indicated that developed countries introduced economically countries into a system where the latter are always exploited by the first ones. Furthermore trade and help did not guarantee better results for Third World countries. On the contrary, the effects of the relations between underdeveloped and developed nations were the perpetuation of the dominance of the most powerful over the emerging ones.

In other words, development was criticised due to the lack of results in terms of interchanging the positions of power, development wise. Furthermore, the fact

that there was not exit from conditions of underdevelopment despite the integration of weak economies to stronger and more income growth friendly markets generates doubts about the effectiveness of the idea of development. Be as it may, development cannot be understood without annexing it to the idea of Globalisation because, development is not an isolated concept. On the contrary, it makes sense once it is part of a system of countries or group of individuals. For instance, development can be measured regionally or worldwide. In fact, the comparison between well – being conditions here and there is an important tool in order to discover improvements or deteriorations regarding development. Indeed, development requires parameters to be compared to and globalisation provides it with them. Undoubtedly, there is more than meets the idea when it comes to globalisation since minimising it to a simple provider of measures, implies taking a little part of all the dimensions it could offer to the dynamics of development, especially towards the donor – recipient relation.

In this sense, and paraphrasing McLuhan (1995) and his ‘global village’ (that is considered an early approximation), Globalisation is based on the idea that individuals are interconnected to each other despite the geographical distance between them.

Official Development Assistance (ODA)

In order to achieve a better understanding of ODA, we must explain its roots and how it works since this framework is the basis for the main research.

ODA is a specific kind of international help labelled by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) that according to the OECD (2003), literally, consists in:

Flows of official financing administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective, and which are concessional in character with a grant element of at least 25 percent (using a fixed 10 percent rate of discount). By

convention, ODA flows comprise contributions of donor government agencies, at all levels, to developing countries (“bilateral ODA”) and to multilateral institutions. ODA receipts comprise disbursements by bilateral donors and multilateral institutions.

Now, this definition requires some considerations regarding how the aid is used or how the money is spent. In this sense, the OECD (2008) has forbidden certain activities and has clarified others.

Exclusion of military aid: There is no discussion that any aid related to military purposes cannot be considered as part of ODA since the OECD does not understand them as development-oriented. However, the cost of transporting the aid by military troops can be considered as ODA.

Peacekeeping: Despite the fact that peace is an irreplaceable factor that can trigger development, it is not eligible as ODA but, again, the criterion requires certain clarification. Operations under the umbrella of the UN towards human rights, election monitoring, rehabilitation or demobilised soldiers and on national infrastructure, monitoring and training of administrators, including customs and police officers, advice on economic stabilisation, repatriation, demobilisation of soldiers, weapons disposal and mine removal can be labelled as ODA because despite the use of troops (in certain cases) the goal is development. The counter-example (OECD, 2008) is the mine removal to clean the area to use it for military training. As we can see the OECD does not consider peacekeeping as ODA when its goal features a military final goal. However, when the military presence or operation is only a step in the development chain, the vision is absolutely different.

Civil police work: Police training can be labelled as ODA but counter-terrorist training does not qualify and neither does the control civil disobedience oriented one.

Social and cultural programmes: Social and cultural practices are part of the identity of each country and that is why any cultural event that promotes the

values of the donor country in the territory of a developing one is not considered as ODA. In fact, instead of triggering development, a cultural invasion is detrimental for developing countries. Any other social and cultural programme oriented aid is definitely counted as ODA.

Assistance to refugees: The help to refugees in developing countries' territories is labelled as ODA, including the temporary assistance for refugees fleeing from developing countries to donor countries during the first 12 months of stay.

Nuclear energy: There is not a ban for nuclear energy per se since it has two clear dimensions. On the one hand, if it is used on the construction of nuclear energy plants, nuclear safety and the medical use of radioisotopes can be reported as ODA. On the other hand, there are the military-oriented applications of nuclear energy. The latter completely differs to any understanding of development.

Research: there is no doubt that investigation drives development and must be considered a reliable source to it. However, the research can only be reported as ODA if it addresses a problem of the developing country. In fact, even if the research is done in the territory of the donor country, it still counts as ODA due to the benefit of the recipient country.

Anti-terrorism: No anti-terrorism operation can be labelled as ODA since this kind of operations usually take place in order to repel threats based on the donor understanding instead of using the aid on improve the economic and social situation of the recipient country.

As we can tell, the idea of setting limitations to the ODA responds to the need of preventing the abuse of donor countries over the developing ones, which implies the fact that the donor-recipient dynamic is per se asymmetrical. The fact that 'food' is considered as ODA aid by the main OECD (2016) depicts the existence of this anomalous relation between donor and recipient because food is a need and the donation implies the capacity of satisfy urgent requirement.

The absence of the described elements on the arena of donor – recipient

Power:

Even though the donor – recipient relations implies two different levels of power connected, the element power is usually forgotten in behalf of development and its effects. In fact, due to its self-described positive effects of development and international help, researchers forget that there is no relation with absence of the element power.

Thus, no matter how much the recipient celebrates the help of the donor, the exercise of power is still there. No analysing the dynamics of international help under the lenses of power diminishes the purposes of that help. For instance, the statement ‘the colonies were indoctrinated to help them discover god’ is a result of not considering power as an element of colonisation, that coincidentally has the form of donor-recipient. On one hand, a culture that provides another with certain help (in this case, the knowledge of god) and, on the other, a culture that receives the help and should use it under the parameters the donor rules. The Indians from South America could only take religion to practice it under the Spaniards criterion. It is exactly a donor – recipient relation where power plays a role despite the fact that evangelisation was told to be beneficial the Indians.

Be as it may, despite the fact that the recipient - donor dynamics cannot be equalised to charity, it does share the public recognition of the latter, which, again, can be seen as a point that is not taken seriously when it comes to deal with development in the arena of international help.

Knowledge

Due to its intimate relation to the Post-structuralism and Foucault approach, ‘knowledge’ has not been constantly participant of the studies about the donor – recipient dynamics however it can be used to understand more about how that relation affects both parties.

In fact, 'knowledge' is mentioned when it come analyse what the recipient can get from the donor. However, the way it is understood is extremely superficial to the extent that it is referred to 'know-how' regarding technologies or certain disciplines. The fact of limiting the importance of knowledge to know-how's wastes the whole dimension of knowledge related to imposing values.

Again, development explorations must consider the western roots of development and therefore the need to rethink all created knowledge by donors as a serious possibility of imposing western values. Yet, it is not part of the exploration to claim if there are imposing intentions however, it is relevant to be open to accept that option and that is why 'knowledge' should always be part of the studied elements when it comes to the donor – recipient relations.

Post-structuralism

Challenging already established structures is the main goal of Structuralism and a donor – recipient relation subsumes perfectly into an established structure. However, Post-structuralism and its methodology have not been applied to development through the donor – recipient asymmetrical relation yet.

Considering the fact that an asymmetrical relation confirms per se the presence of power, the tools of Foucault are undeniable perfect to drive an exploration.

Thus, asymmetrical relation implies a weak party in terms of power which requires the application of discourse analysis because the mentioned party is limited to directly express its complains by the dominant party.

In this sense, looking for concrete evidence is a mistake because it will be extremely difficult to find and its absence does not discard at all problems around the donor – recipient relation. In fact, the most suitable approach to such situation is opening all possibilities through the challenging nature of Post-Structuralism that allows an exploration that is the intention of the research.

Development itself

The only element that has no other choice than being part of the discussion of the donor – recipient asymmetrical relation is `development´ since that relation happens in order to obtain the latter. However, development in the international arena should be seen not only as part of human rights.

There is more than meets the eye when it comes to development because of the several dimensions of it. First of all, the roots of development are crucial to understand future problems. Is there a right to development? Is a will to development? And more important what is behind development? Those questions are not usually asked when it comes to analyse the asymmetrical relations between donor and recipient because they take the benefits of development for granted.

VI. MAIN ANALYSIS (and discussion of research questions)

In order to explore the asymmetrical donor - recipient relation of power, instead of taking a case of study, the research will apply certain elements to the mentioned relation and show the available variables after that.

Thus, considering each chosen element from Foucault view, each research question will be answer in order to do not lose the direction the exploration requires.

Through the lenses of Foucault´s view of power:

Foucault was definitely keen on analysing relations of power due to his particular understanding of the latter that provides us with enough tools to dismember the relation between donor and recipient regarding development.

The first step consists in evaluating the arena the relation is taking place in. As it was mentioned, the arena is basically 'development' in its international level, which can be summarised under the ODA.

The ODA (OECD, 2016) responds to international regulations and therefore counts with international subvention. Theoretically, OECD seems to be independent, however, the fact that its nature is international puts it into the international relations arena, which implies gathering small countries and powerful ones as well as surviving interests and geopolitical ones.

Applying Foucault's understanding of power, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development is part of the arena of international power where the countries that play the role of recipients are clearly weaker than the ones that play the role of donors.

Furthermore, the donors have the chance to impose their beliefs and, according to the arena where international development takes place, can even manipulate the goals.

Despite the initial superficial approximation of the ideas of Foucault on the OECD, it is absolutely possible to deepen on more detailed dimensions of power. The idea of power able to create from scratch can also be applied when donors provide recipients with resources to be used under the limitations of ODA. In other words, donor can produce a new behaviour on recipients. For instance, when a capitalist country help a communist poor one through ODA, it intensifies the chances that the latter opens to the free market using provided help.

Of course, the result is not immediately and cannot be guaranteed but it increases the possibilities that a desired action by the donor can become truth. A better example is the spread of transgenic products. When international help through ODA provides transgenic products to a country that suffers of shortage of food, the policy of use transgenic products will be imposed and imposing is

with no doubt a way of showing power and of reinforcing asymmetrical relations of the latter.

Now, Foucault takes discipline as one of his more interesting points regarding power. For him, discipline is able to produce individuality according to the needs of the powerful. So the question is, does bilateral donor – recipient relations be part of that practice? In fact, the presence of limiting regulations regarding the use ODA and the main negotiation of countries shape the behaviour of recipients. How does it happen? First, the main regulations of OECD close the door to the free disposition of the provided international help, which means that, no matter how urgent the recipient's needs are, they are always blocked if they are based on prohibited activities. Thus, the different resources provided to each recipient foster its ability to certain activities. Again, if a donor constantly provide seeds the recipient A with seeds and the recipient B with animals, that donor is deciding to make the first donor an agrarian country and the second a rancher one.

It is more than probably that there is a reason why the donor wants an agrarian and rancher country around. It may be because the donor requires extra supply of meat, vegetables, etc. It is important to point out that it is very difficult to the recipient to choose.

Foucault calls it the effectiveness of power and can be seen when the powerful shapes certain distinctive characteristics to different parties. The example of the aid to the new agrarian and rancher country fits perfectly. Therefore, the main status of recipient or donor provides us an idea of the level of power of each of them.

Believing that there are no more effects than the main benefit to the donor is a mistake and due to optimism blinds the real dimension of development.

However, we need to recognise that recipients can hold certain level of power but not enough to openly negotiate considering their position of recipients, which per se implies a passive role that is completely asymmetrical.

The fact of playing the role of recipient reinforces the asymmetrical relation. The only way this unbalanced situation can change is when parties switch roles. However, the country with a position of dominance (donor) would not easily allow becoming a recipient.

Exceptions can occur but they are outside the system of power regarding international development. An example is an economical crisis due to the decrease of the price of the product a country's economy is based on. Furthermore, if the resources of the donor decrease, it can decrease the help prioritising its own well being instead of others.

Under the Foucault's analysis, the bilateral donor-recipient asymmetrical relation regarding international help for development is a conflict of power where the recipient has a privilege position that reinforces the roles of donor and recipient do not switch.

In a nutshell,

- Do the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development reinforces asymmetrical relations of power?

According to the Foucault's view of power, besides other elements that he points out, the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of asymmetrical relations of power do reinforces that kind of relations since they per se depicts a conflict of power where the stronger party is the donor and the weakest, the recipient who suffers domination and manipulation to the extent of having its needs shaped by the donor.

- Is the dynamics of donor – recipient within the arena of development necessarily beneficial for developing countries?

According to the Foucault's view of power, besides other elements that he points out, the dynamics of donor – recipient within the arena of development are not necessarily beneficial for developing countries because they can respond to the interests of the donor. It is important to acknowledge that the donor can drive even the needs of the recipient, generating a false sense of fulfilment once the donor 'altruistically' saves the recipient.

In spite of the answer to the question, developing countries can benefit from their role of recipient however it is not necessarily truth in all cases.

- Does power play an important role in the arena of development?

According to the Foucault's view of power, besides other elements that he points out, there is no doubt that power plays a central role in the arena of development since power is the one who shapes development and therefore is the present all the time.

- Can international help have a negative dimension towards recipients?

According to the Foucault's view of power, besides other elements that he points out, international help can have a negative dimension towards recipients since they can be used by donor in order to perpetuate the position of dominance of the first ones.

Through the lenses of Foucault's understanding of knowledge:

When Foucault refers to power, he also introduces the idea of knowledge since for the French author, power produces knowledge and, at the same time, knowledge implies power.

Again, analysing the bilateral donor-recipient asymmetrical relation regarding international help for development through the lenses of 'knowledge' requires a first point that consists in the fact that the condition of donor implies that the latter know or owns something that the recipients lacks of.

In fact, the 'know-how' of certain activities are a popular aid under the ODA system and it is purely knowledge that goes from donor to recipient. However, under Foucault's view there is a process of imposing that consists in unifying knowledge but the chosen one by the donor.

For example, when a United States, as part of the bilateral donor-recipient regarding international help for development, sends books to Haiti, the American country is not only providing them with educational material but it is also imposing its more spoken official language and therefore it is trying to uniform the donors under the English language.

The same criterion works for any other educational help but there is one even more important related to the knowledge conception of Foucault which is the fact that the dominant role of power qualifies the donor as authorised to create valid content.

In other words, there is a huge risk of producing wrong or not accurate knowledge and be considered as appropriate despite the fact that it is incongruent, incomplete, etc. just because it comes from donor to recipient.

In fact, western-centric view of the world can be responsible for the spread of knowledge that is not ready to be taught and, at the same time, recipients are also responsible for accepting and not questioning the received information.

In a nutshell,

- Do the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development reinforces asymmetrical relations of power?

According to the Foucault's view of knowledge, besides other elements that he points out, the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development reinforces asymmetrical relations of power since the most powerful is able to create content (knowledge) and that content reinforces roles of power. In this sense, a donor constantly recreates its roles and reinforces the passive role of the recipient.

- Is the dynamics of donor – recipient within the arena of development necessarily beneficial for developing countries?

According to the Foucault's view of knowledge, besides other elements that he points out, there is no guarantee that the donor – recipient dynamics within the arena of development necessarily results in benefits for development countries. In fact, the chances are high that developing countries obtain benefits from the donor – recipient dynamics but it will also depend on the level of independence that the recipient can reach, which is not easy considering the passive role it plays.

- Does power play an important role in the arena of development?

According to the Foucault's view of knowledge, besides other elements that he points out, it is clear that power plays an important role in the arena of development to the extent that development and power increase together.

- Can international help have a negative dimension towards recipients?

According to the Foucault's view of knowledge, besides other elements that he points out, international help do have a negative

dimension towards recipients that happens when the recipients do not pretend to leave the passive role of the donor – recipient dynamics and completely depends on the help towards development.

Through the lenses of Post-Structuralism and Discourse analysis

Post-structuralism does not agree with binary categories and the bilateral donor – recipient dynamics is based on them. So, let's question the roles and the aims of both positions.

On one hand, donor responds to theoretically, the aim to help but Post-structuralism makes us ask ourselves about how genuine the intentions of the donor are. If it is not help, what are the other possibilities the donor is thinking of? There are infinite variables from, obtaining a future favour to make the recipient collapse so as to be invaded.

Now, the role of the recipient needs to be challenged as well and open to more possibilities than only reaching development and the well-being of its citizens. In this sense, Post-structuralism asks itself if the position of recipient is strategic, responds to save resources or it is result of the domination of the donor?

Applying the discourse analysis that is part of the post-structuralism approach, we can think about unwritten or unspoken reason why the donor plays that role and the recipient does the same regarding its position. Most of the answers are related to domination and development because, again, Post-structuralism and the discourse analysis questions even the nature of development.

What is development? Who indicates the values of development? When a country is underdeveloped? Who judges that? Why are there only two kinds of countries: developed and developing?

The exercise of challenging is infinite which is a problem when it comes to find a definitive answer. In fact, Post-structuralism works better as a methodology to find new responses and to find hidden realities.

Post-structuralism and discourse analysis makes us doubt of donors because of their context of ambitious (because of their privilege position) but also questions the low level of power of recipients because of their no need to develop by themselves.

In other words, contextualisation and the idea of questioning everything around opening from binary categories to infinite ones, places the donor – recipient dynamics within the arena of development as one where donors not necessarily help recipients expecting the improve of development levels of the latter but also secondary or even primary interests that goes beyond development itself. And as for, the recipients, the same open situation can be applied, where recipients are not powerless but powerful enough to oblige donors help them in order to save resources and become strategic partners.

There is more than meets the eye when it comes to Post-Structuralism and how it analyses power in the development arena and that is why, besides providing the exploration with more than one variable, there is no exact answer but a infinite number of possibilities that allow us think the established roles of donor and recipient can vary and respond to unlimited interests and realities.

In a nutshell,

- Do the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development reinforces asymmetrical relations of power?

According to Post-Structuralism and Discourse analysis the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development not necessarily reinforces asymmetrical relations of power because within the infinite possibilities open by Post- Structuralism, there is the chance that the roles are switched and therefore instead of a reinforcement of an asymmetrical relation of power towards development, an equality of forces can be fostered and development increases as well.

- Is the dynamics of donor – recipient within the arena of development necessarily beneficial for developing countries?

According to Post-Structuralism and Discourse analysis the dynamics of the donor – recipient in the field of development is not necessarily beneficial for developing countries since there are chances that the asymmetrical relation of power of the donor – recipient increases.

Despite the fact that behind that asymmetry there is past of domination and development towards help is the answer to equalise well being conditions worldwide, developing countries can still be manipulated and a direct benefit can actually be a long term damage.

- Does power play an important role in the arena of development?

According to Post-Structuralism and Discourse analysis, there is no doubt that power plays an important role within the arena of development since the relation donor – recipient is placed due to the levels of power of the countries. The not necessarily is the same as the level of development since the latter is more related to the well being of the citizens and the first one to the possibility of exercise domination, knowledge, etc. over others.

- Can international help have a negative dimension towards recipients?

According to Post-Structuralism and Discourse analysis, there are always chances that international help triggers development in developing countries or that make them dependence on the provided aim. Recipients can be manipulated as a possibility and can be culturally invaded by the imposition of western traditions. Let's remember that a negative dimension of the help can survive the positive ones such as security, democracy, justice, etc.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The current exploration allows us open our eyes to infinite possibilities regarding the arena of development and the asymmetrical donor – recipient dynamics.

The first conclusion to point out is the fact that power always plays a relevant role within the donor – recipient relation.

In fact, no matter how many variables Post- Structuralism provides us with, there is no chance, as Foucault understood, to escape from the system of power, which is differs from escaping from underdeveloped realities.

According to the chosen approach it is not possible to be sure if a reinforcement of the asymmetrical dynamics of donor and recipient would occur within the arena of development however it was possible to identify power as a irreplaceable element in the donor – recipient dynamics.

At the same time, many variables were applied during the exploration resulting in discarding all necessarily consequence (positive or negative to the recipient) since, according to Foucault's view of power, post-structuralism and discourse analysis, many variables are possible.

Another and last conclusion fro the exploration is the fact power and development are related. The more power, the more chances to increase development levels and the more means cut the gap between the roles of donor and recipients.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

United Nations General Assembly resolution 41/128, Declaration on the Right to Development, (04 December 1986), available from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm>

97th Plenary Meeting. (1986). In: *Declaration on the Right to Development*.

[online] Vienna. Available at:

<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm> [Accessed 1 Jun. 2016]

Alston, P. and Robinson, M. (2005). *Human rights and development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Baeck, L. (1993). *Post-War Development Theories and Practice*, UNESCO and The International Social Science Council, Paris.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bennington, G. and Derrida, J. (1993). *Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bingham, T. (2010). *The rule of law*. London: Allen Lane.

Canning, V. (2010). Who's human? Developing sociological understandings of the rights of women raped in conflict. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 14(6), pp.849-864.

Cardoso, F. and Faletto, E. (1979). *Dependency and development in Latin America*. 1st ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Cargas, S. (2011). Human Rights from Below: Achieving Rights Through Community Development by Jim Ife. *CJHR*, 10(2), pp.243-246.
- Castles, S. (2001). *Development, social transformation and globalisation*. 1st ed. Wollongong: Centre for Asia Pacific Social Transformation Studies, University of Wollongong.
- Chase, A. (2012). Legitimizing Human Rights: Beyond Mythical Foundations and Into Everyday Resonances. *Journal of Human Rights*, 11(4), pp.505-525.
- Dahl, R. (1957). The concept of power. *Syst. Res.*, 2(3), pp.201-215.
- Derrida, J. and Caputo, J. (1997). *Deconstruction in a nutshell*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Derrida, J. and McDonald, C. (1985). *The ear of the other*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Donnelly, J. (1982). Human Rights and Human Dignity: An Analytic Critique of Non-Western Conceptions of Human Rights. *The American Political Science Review*, 76(2), p.303.
- Donnelly, J. (2007). The Relative Universality of Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 29(2), pp.281-306.
- Dunne, T. and Wheeler, N. (1999). *Human rights in global politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish*. 1st ed. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. and Rabinow, P. (2002). *The essential works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984*. London: Penguin.

Foucault, M., Bertani, M. and Ewald, F. (2004). *Society must be defended*. London: Penguin.

Goodale, M. and Merry, S. (2007). *The practice of human rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoover, J. (2012). Human Rights Contested. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 6(2), pp.233-246.

Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2016). *What are Human Rights?*. [online] Available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Pages/WhatareHumanRights.aspx> [Accessed 1 Jun. 2016].

James, P. (1997). Postdependency? The Third World in an Era of Globalism and Late-Capitalism. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 22(2), pp.205-226.

Kendall, G. and Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's methods*. 1st ed. London: Sage Publications.

La Saussure, F. (1986). *Course in General Linguistics*. 1st ed. New York: Open Court.

Maloof, J. (1999). *Voices of resistance*. Lexington, Ky.: University Press of Kentucky.

McLuhan, M., Powers, B., Leonhardt, C. and Baacke, D. (1995). *The Global Village*. 1st ed. Paderborn: Junfermann.

Moyn, S. (2010). *The last utopia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Multiculturalism and International Law: Discussing Universal Standards. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 32(1), pp.21-48.

Mutua, M. (2002). *Human rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Nealon, J. (2008). *Foucault beyond Foucault*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Paras, E. (2006). *Foucault 2.0*. New York: Other Press.

O'Connell, P. (2007). On Reconciling Irreconcilables: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Human Rights. *Human Rights Law Review*, 7(3), pp.483-509.

OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms - Official development assistance (ODA) Definition. [online] Available at:
<http://stats.oecd.org/glossary/detail.asp?ID=6043> [Accessed 8 Nov. 2016].

OECD. (2008). *Is it ODA?*. [online] Available at:
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/34086975.pdf> [Accessed 8 Nov. 2016].

Peterson, V. (1990). Whose Rights? A Critique of the “Givens” in Human Rights Discourse. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 15(3), pp.303-344.

Rawat, V. (2014). *Knowledge-power/resistance*.

Russell, B. (2004). *Power*. London: Routledge

Roughan, N. (2014). *Authorities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Samoff, J., Amin, S. and Pierce, B. (1978). Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism. *ASA Review of Books*, 4, p.87.

Strozier, R. (2002). *Foucault, subjectivity, and identity*. 1st ed. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Tomaševski, K. and Tomaševski, K. (1993). *Development aid and human rights revisited*. London: Pinter Publishers.

United Nations General Assembly resolution 41/128, Declaration on the Right to Development, (04 December 1986), available from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm>

Woodiwiss, A. (2005). *Human rights*. London [u.a.]: Routledge.

Wrong, D. (1979). *Power, its forms, bases, and uses*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers. pp. 38-64.