

## SHORT TAKES – Commentary on Papers in this Volume

### Three Theories of the Direction of the Development

**Shinya Konaka\***  
Faculty of International Relations  
University of Shizuoka

*Mila (N.S.), Vol. 10 (2009), pp. 81 – 83, © 2009 Institute of Anthropology, Gender and African Studies*

Today Prof. Fre has already pointed out “the danger of generalization.” But, ironically my obligation as a commentator is to generalize this workshop. In this commentary, I would like to generalize this workshop with three theoretical frameworks. The first one is “the upper direction theory.” This means so-called “the modernization theory” that may sound rather antique. The second one is “the parallel direction theory” that can be paraphrased as “sustainability” which is the one of the theme of this workshop. Then, the last one is the “downward direction theory”. The representative attempt of this theory is the concept of “the human security.” Mr. Hazama also touched on these. I would like to comment on the presentations from the viewpoint of the three theories.

“The upward direction theory” started in 1950s and had been influential up to 1980s in the context of the development projects on African pastoralists. Then, researchers were so optimistic on the continuous upward growing in the direction to the modernity. So another name of the theory is “the modernization theory.” Borrowing the famous economist Rostow’s word, a sort of “take-off” to the upward market economy growth was expected. However, the pastoral economy has never easily “taken-off,” as economists formerly expected. This is not because the pastoralists were reluctant to develop, but because they were excluded from the adequate

development opportunities. The strong criticism to the modernization theory has emerged from the “world system theory” (Wallerstein 1995). Most of the African pastoralists have been excluded from the modern policies and the rapid economic growth in the colonial and postcolonial policy framework, that have been pointed out by Mr. Wario, Dr. Kandagor and Prof. Ohta in this workshop.

What is the policy of “the upward theory”? The answer is very simple: the conversion to the non-pastoral industry. Since the non-pastoralists in Africa, mostly are agriculturalists, have already achieved the development to a certain extent after the independence, the development officers thought that the pastoralists should also follow the same way. They insisted that the pastoralists should be converted to the agriculturists, who have already attained the development. But as pointed out by Goldschmidt (1981), this was not so simple, since many development projects intended to convert them to the non-pastoral industry have failed in pastoral areas in Africa. Today, Dr. Fre listed many agendas: globalization, modernization, state integration, commercialization, sedentarization, urbanization, and the increase of immigrant workers. All those change factors are brought to the pastoral areas, expecting “the upward growth.” These policies might be partly successful, but was partly unsuccessful, because not all development projects are well planed and considered the local contexts. Taking a case example of the Samburu, where I was 2 days ago, some development

---

\* Corresponding author: Shinya Konaka  
Faculty of International Relations, University of Shizuoka  
Email: konaka@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp

agency officers from outside tried to introduce farming to the Samburu, providing an acre of land and all the farming equipment to the Samburu villagers. They wondered why the local pastoralists were not interested in farming, although they have enough rainfall. But the Samburu explained that they have tried to farm many times in the area, but the rainfall was never enough. But agent officers didn't listen to their explanation. In consequence, insufficient rain brought no crop, as the Samburu expected. The offices inadvertently felt that the pastoralists simply had no idea of farming. Today, at least, it is evident that too much optimistic views based on "the upward direction theory" might bring us no realistic possibilities of the development.

The theory was followed by "the parallel direction theory" that focuses on the continuity and sustainability, instead of the unlimited economic growth. The theoretical shift occurred from the economic growth to the sustainability of the ecological environment from 1990s to 2000s in Africa. The theory is most applicable to the Dr. Sun's presentation that showed us how the Rendille tactically keep their sustainability in a harsh dry environment. The theory implies the conservative attitude and therefore neither represents optimistic nor pessimistic views itself. The implication may be described with a Swahili word "*maendeleo*" which both means "development" and "continuation" ("*endelea*" means "to continue"). In Africa, especially in their communal resources management, the pastoralists have been blamed as the cause of the environment destruction of the pasture in the dry lands. But as Prof. Ohta and Dr. Sun showed us well today, the sustainability of the area has never been maintained without the local knowledge and the practices of the pastoralists.

What is the policy of "the parallel direction theory"? It is sure that pastoralists have been managing their environment well, according to their own culture. I also agree that outsiders should not disturb or intervene the pastoral way of life violently. However, as

Prof. Ohta pointed out, we must notice that this sort of relativistic attitude might be distorted with the wrong implication: "The pastoralists should remain untouched and behind, since they have their own way." Borrowing the Fratkin and Mearns, this kind of attitude might bring us "a policy of benign neglect (Fratkin and Mearns 2003)." At least, the outsiders also should make a contribution positively in order to assist them to keep their sustainability beyond "the benign neglect". "The parallel direction theory" is also related to the theory of "the tragedy of the commons" proposed by Hardin (1968). As Dr. Kandagor showed us today, the introduction of the ranching systems and the land ownership issues are also problematic to the pastoralists. Unfortunately, we do not have enough time to touch on those complicated issues in detail, so we must proceed to the third theory.

"The downward direction theory" that focuses on the downside risks and the human security is much more pessimistic and the most influential theory today. As is pointed out today by Dr. Mkutu and Mr. Hazama, East Africa pastoralists have been facing the insecurity induced by the modern weaponry and the risk of recurrent droughts. "The downward theory" became influential after the UN Millennium Summit. In a Report for the former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan (<http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/index.html>), Sen and Ogata proposed the concept of the "human security" that is based on the concept of the "human development". The concept is also related to an agenda of this workshop: Is pastoralism just a "livestock production" or a "way of life?" In other words, is pastoralism the matter of human development or economic development? Which direction should we choose? As one of the audience commented, "pastoralists may keep cattle until they die." But, if they do so, it is not for the economic reasons but for the cultural reasons and welfare of the local people, which is sometimes more important than the market.

What is the policy of “the downward theory”? What can we do to support the secure life of the African pastoralists and reduce their risks beyond the “neglect”? The policy should be built not only from the viewpoint of the economic growth, but also from the viewpoint of the safety and stability of the local people themselves. Borrowing from the Samburu local word, “*serian*,” which means “peaceful life” is more important than the rapid economic growth. At least, currently we can no longer support too optimistic view. Therefore, our view should be pessimistic or realistic, but not neglectful. Especially, based on the research on the local knowledge of response, more positive policies to ameliorate the damage of “resource conflicts (Markakis 1998)” and natural disasters (droughts and floods) should be attempted beyond “the benign neglect”. Today we are happy to hear two very good examples of that: one is Dr. Fre’s project on finding animal feeds, and the other one is the Dr. Sun’s risk management project.

#### References

- Fratkin E, Mearns R (2003). Sustainability and pastoral livelihoods: Lessons from East African Maasai and Mongolia. *Human Organization*, 62 (2), 112-122.
- Goldschmidt W (1981). The failure of pastoral economic development programs in Africa. In: Galaty JG, Anderson D, Salzman PC, Chouinard A (editors). *The Future of Pastoral Peoples: Proceedings of a Conference Held in Nairobi, Kenya, 4-8 August 1980*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, p.101-118.
- Hardin G (1968). The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162, 1243-1248.
- Markakis J (1998) *Resource Conflict in the Horn of Africa*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Wallerstein I (1995). *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization*. London: Verso.