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**Programme**

**Thursday, January 13**

15:00  Workshop opening

**15:20  Keynote: Perspectives on Development Discourse**
- Aram Ziai (University of Hamburg): From Colonial to Post-colonial Discourse on Development: Questions of Method
- Françoise Dufour (CNRS, University of Montpellier 3): The Paradigm of “Development”: Social Implications of a Change in Discursive Practice
- Discussant: Walter Schicho (University of Vienna)

16:50  Coffee / Tea break

**17:15  Panel 1: Labour, Capital, and Development**
  (Panel Convenor: Margarete Grandner, University of Vienna)
- Regina Finsterhölzl (Humboldt University, Berlin): Development Discourse in Socialist Debates: The Fabian Colonial Bureau, 1940-1960
- Billy Frank (University of Central Lancashire): Conflicting Ideologies: The ‘Public’ and ‘Private’ Faces of African Development in the Trans-colonial Period, 1930-1970
- Cyrus Veeser (Bentley University): Homo Economicus in the Tropics
- Susan Zimmermann (CEU, Budapest): Forced, Free or Protected Labor? Competing Vision and Interest in Developmentalist Labour Policy for Africa within the ILO around 1930

20:00  Dinner for the participants of the workshop

**Friday, January 14**

**9:30  Panel 2: Strategies of/against Control**
  (Panel Convenor: Marie Rodet, University of Vienna)
- Caio Simões de Araújo (CEU, Budapest) and Iolanda Vasile (University of Coimbra): Colonize is Needful. What About Develop? The Portuguese Empire from Scientific Colonialism to Luso-tropicalism
- Eric Kushinga Makombe (University of Witwatersrand): Urbanism/Ruralism and the Pedagogy of Development during Colonialism: The Case of Zimbabwe 1946-1979
- Julian Reid (University of Lapland, Rovaniemi): The Biopolitics of Development Discourse in Late Colonial Africa

11:15  Coffee / Tea Break
11:30 **Keynote**

Mamadou Fall (University of Dakar): Fog of Empire and the Development Dilemma in French Colonialism

Discussant: Henning Melber (Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, Uppsala)

12:45 Lunch break

14:15 **Keynote**

Robert Shenton (Queen’s University, Kingston/Ontario): Development, Welfare, and ‘Surplus People’

15:15 Short Break

15:30 **Panel 3: Focus on Tanganyika**

(PANEL CONVENOR: Birgit Englert, University of Vienna)

Walter Bruchhausen (University of Bonn): From Precondition to Goal of Development. Health and Medicine in the Planning and Political Conflicts of British Tanganyika Territory

Juhani Koponen (University of Helsinki): Faces of colonial development in South-eastern Tanganyika

Karlheinz Spitzl (University of Vienna): Educational Development in the Occupied ‘(Trusteeship) Territory’ of Tanganyika: From the Asymmetries of Power to the Asymmetries of Discourse

17:00 Short Break

17:15 **Panel 4: (Social) Science and Technology**

(PANEL CONVENOR: Berthold Unfried, University of Vienna)

Joseph Morgan Hodge (West Virginia University): Knowledge and Networks of Science and the Late Colonial and Early Postcolonial Epoch: The Case of British Tropical Agriculture, 1925-1980

Gerald Hödl (University of Vienna): Colonial Development Studies? The British Social Sciences and Africa, 1940-1960


---

**Saturday, January 15**

9:30 **Panel 5: Cultural Constructions**

(PANEL CONVENOR: Hanna Hacker, University of Vienna)

Hubertus Büschel (University of Gießen): *White Mothers* – The Power of Gender in British Colonial Development in Africa

Suzanne Hanson (University of Leeds): Developing Africa: The Dream of a Great White State

Martina Kopf (University of Vienna): Developing East Africa in the British Colonial Imagination
11:00  Coffee / Tea Break

11:30  **Panel 6: Perspectives from within**  
(Panel Convenor: Heike Schmidt, University of Vienna)  
Ewald Blocher (University of Munich): Constructing Modern Egypt: Modernization and Development Discourses in the Context of British and Egyptian Water Engineering  
Emma Hunter (University of Cambridge): Development Discourse in Tanzania’s Swahili Public Sphere, 1945-1961

12:30-13:30  **Concluding Round Table “The Past in the Present”**  
(Convenors: Gerald Hödl and Martina Kopf)  
Andreas Eckert (Humboldt University, Berlin)  
Odile Goerg (University Paris Diderot - Paris 7)  
David Simon (University of London)
Abstracts

de Araújo, Caio Simões/Vasile, Iolanda

Colonize is needful. What about develop? The Portuguese Empire from scientific colonialism to luso-tropicalism

In his well known study, Colombian anthropologist Arturo Escobar points out that ‘development’ may be seen as a discursive formation and a set of institutions and practices that filled up the lack produced by the end of colonialism, providing new forms of producing global asymmetries. Based in an eclectic methodology defined as “anthropology of modernity”, Escobar helps us to clarify the imbrications between development and colonialism in European modernity.

This paper aims to further explore this theoretical approach by facing it with different geopolitical spaces and a diverse time-span. If Escobar described the ‘institutionalization’ of development after World War II, we will focus in the historical period from the late 19th century till decolonization. We will put forward a vaster concept of development, broadening its historical amplitude by arguing that it may be seen as a qualitative discursive shift in European colonialism that goes hand in hand with the ‘second (European) modernity’ and its by-products such as the ideas of progress and ‘civilization’. We may, then, identify the emergence of the notion of ‘development’, or at least a protodevelopmental discourse, in the moment that Empire claims the right to, by the use of western knowledge and modern law, improve, normalize, educate, cure, and, in the last extent, develop the aberrant colonial society and its indigenous populations.

In this paper, we will analyse a vast range of texts, from literature to academic writing to official documents, in order to map the emergence and mutations of the discourse of development over time in the geopolitical space of Portuguese Empire in Africa. In a first moment, we will argue that the first appearance of ‘development’ in Portuguese Empire may be identified in the late 19th century in the writings of Portuguese intellectuals that claimed for a ‘scientific colonialism’, a trend that was initiated by the founding of the Lisbon Geographic Society (Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa), in 1875, and afterwards deepened with the proclamation of the Republic, in 1910, and the emergence of Salazar’s Estado Novo, in 1933. It is worthy noticing that modern Portuguese colonialism was worried not only in developing its colonies, but, interesting enough, to develop itself in relation to the British Empire. In a second moment, we will try to analyse a major shift towards the ‘luso-tropical’ approach, mostly adopted after World War II as the Portuguese strategy for denying its imperial reality by affirming its multicultural, multiracial and multi-continental nature. Under luso-tropicalism, the idea of the benign presence of the Portuguese in the tropics was expressed in terms of its hybridity and precisely its capacity of developing a ‘luso-tropical civilization’.

Last but not the least, we present the hypothesis that in both moments shifting and unstable notions of development sustained the ideology of ‘benign colonialism’ and, in the last extent, legitimized the political reality of Empire.

Blocher, Ewald

Constructing Modern Egypt: Modernization and Development Discourses in the Context of British and Egyptian Water Engineering

This paper deals with water engineering in Egypt as a modernization and development project both in the phase of British presence at the Nile and in the first period of Egyptian independence during the Nasser era. Herewith the temporal and geographical framework is set. It contains the time span around 1882 to 1970 and generally encompasses the East African Nile Valley with particular attention to Egypt. The Egyptian case can be located within the British concept of ‘Colonial Development’ as an exception, since already in the late 19th century a program had been put in action by the colonial administration to ‘develop’ the country economically. The goal was enabling Egypt to overcome its enormous foreign debts owed to European creditors. Another reason for calling Egypt an exception of the rule is its early stage of – albeit
only formal – independence granted by the British in 1922. This gave to colonial development projects a notion of self-employment and nationalism in a much earlier stage than in other later cases. The Egyptians were eager to apply their own modernization concepts to their country. These two aspects make Egypt an early example of colonial development policy.

Egypt was to be modernized or ‘developed’, both from the British and the Egyptian viewpoint, by means of water engineering and therewith by exploiting the most valuable resource in the region: the River Nile. Within this framework the paper wants to contribute to the three main questions of the workshop by raising the following three theses:

(1) The re-measuring of the Nile Valley as conducted by the British at the turn of the century became the epistemic framework of perceiving the modernization and development of Egypt. In this process the transcendence or “translation” of the framework in question and the discourses contained within into the sphere of Egyptian elites is of great importance. Within this framework the meaning of development and its conversion into a nationalistic concept highlighted in the Nasser era becomes evident.

(2) The Nile as an object of development discourses allows conclusions on the subjects namely first of all water engineering experts and engineers and their patterns of perceiving the world around them.

(3) These mixtures of colonial policy, hydrological modernization concepts and nationalistic ambitions on the one hand, and patterns of perception and knowledge recognizable on a discursive level on the other hand allow non-discursive and discursive practices and actions to be put in relation to each other.

Methodologically this analysis deals with different concepts and approaches and wants to interconnect them. By means of discourse and social networks analysis the epistemic framework of perception of water engineering and its importance for modernization and development ideas as mentioned above will be reconstructed. Both for the analysis of the discursive ‘translation’ and the social reproduction of those ideas into the sphere of Egyptian elites the approaches of ‘Large Technical Systems’ (LTS), taken from the sociology of technology and the concept of ‘mental maps’ will be applied. Both are used to show the great political and social importance of water engineering as a modernization concept in Egypt. Finally these theoretical approaches reveal the relationality between discourses and specific political actions and practices.

The main sources for this analysis are contemporary (specialist) literature, particularly of engineers engaged in the hydro projects here in question as well as their personal papers and correspondence as far as available. Administrative correspondence from the British colonial authorities, contemporary newspaper articles and articles from relevant engineering magazines in general and water engineering in particular will be drawn into consideration, too.

Bruchhausen, Walter

From precondition to goal of development: Health and medicine in the planning and political conflicts of British Tanganyika Territory

When the health of the African population became a concern of the German colonial administration of Africa in the years after 1900, it was for the sake of economic development. The first years of the British mandate in Tanganyika continued this argument, until the wave of “social medicine” in the 1930ies made health care, also as a growing demand of the population and their representatives in Indirect rule, one of the major points in the new ‘development and welfare’ policy. Already then, in 1933, a fundamental difference between general (political) development and health care was noticed: “Native Administrations are attempting to develop themselves from existing native laws and customs, whereas the native medical service, at present at least, dissociates itself completely from native medicine” (Memorandum Director of Medical Services, 16.5.1933). This idea that development means improvement or modernisation of pre-existing local institutions whereas medicine demands a complete break with and replacement of previous services made health policy a special case. In addition, for national and local decisions the ideas of what development in health should be differed largely between ‘native’, governmental and medical authorities, culminating in open conflict in the 1940s. For the ‘native authorities’ and their white counterparts in the
political administration (e.g. their paper *Development of Native Administration dispensaries*, May 1946) ‘development’ meant an increase in health care facilities and staff, whatever their quality was, whereas for those medical experts familiar with public health the improvement of health indicators, by disease control, hygiene and health education, thus demanding certain alterations in life, was the true meaning of progress and development. Competing views dominated the debate: the individual perspective of accessible curative services vs. the epidemiological perspective of decreasing morbidity and mortality, the expectation of further benefits from the administration vs. the appeal to change one’s behaviour. It might be characteristic that – differing from the later ‘Primary Health Care’ since the 1970s with its emphasis on ‘community development’ – then the term ‘development’ rather signified the physical infrastructure including numbers of staff (‘centrifugal development’ of dispensaries, 1946; responsibility for hospital building in the 1950s’ ‘Member for Communications, Works and Development Planning’), but not the intended changes in the population, e.g. in the consciousness of disease aetiology and health related behaviour.

Based on official British reports and archival material (memos, correspondences, statistics) mainly from Dar es Salaam, Kew and Oxford the paper will illustrate and analyse the meaning, political use, popular expectations and medical views connected to the term ‘development’ in the health care of Tanganyika Territory (1920-1960). This includes changes in time as well as differences between social groups (local and territorial administrators, heath care staff) or contexts (local, territorial, national and international political and medical discussions).

Büschel, Hubertus

**White Mothers:**
**The Power of Gender in British Colonial Development in Africa**

The paper will focus on development discourses and practices (field trips, project work) of British female colonial experts between the late 1920s and the 1960s, which again and again referred on the figure of “white motherhood” for African people. The sources will be contemporary publications as well as archival material from the National Archives Kew and the Rhodes House, Oxford.

Already in the late 1920s Audrey Richards, a scholar of Bronislaw Malinowski, started field trips to Northern Rhodesia and researched the cultural background of food shortage and hunger in contemporary so called ‘Bantu-societies’. Her publications – like for example *Hunger in a Savage Tribe* (1932) – show exemplarily how women in the colonial office tried to establish ‘different’ ways to their male colleagues and how they tried to find ways to communicate with the people in the field. Like Richards Lucy Mair and Margery Perham also used terms like “white mother” or “white sister” in publications, letters and diaries in order to distance themselves from male colonial officers, to establish “close relationships” to Africans, and to legitimate (in their view) ‘new humanitarian’ forms of colonial development. Well known became the letters between Perham and young East African Kikuyu-Warriors, in which she tried to show herself as a “warm hearted white mother” and attempted to convince the youngsters to be more patient concerning the improvement of the living conditions of their families. This is just an example. There are many cases, in which Richards, Mair and Perham presented themselves as ladylike “white mothers” who could reach the “heart and soul” of local chiefs and young warriors. Further, Richards, Mair and Perham used gender to establish close emotional relationships to “black sisters” in the field in order to get them interested in Western models of agriculture or hygiene.

Regarding the main questions of the workshop, I will compare discourses and practices of Richards, Mair and Perham in order to analyse the strategies of these three female colonial officers and development experts with which they attempted to establish ‘new humanitarian’ and ‘special female ways’ of development. I will also ask how discourses in the sense of Michel Foucault’s ‘dispositive’ became involved with practices. Last but not least the reception and experience of these discourses and practices by African counterparts will come to an analysis: One central case study will be a very critical perspective on Perham’s field trips in the 1950s by an African driver, who praised and criticised the habits of the “white lady” in remote areas and in the communication with “primitive people”.

Altogether, the aim of the paper is to show how the discourse and practices of “white motherhood” could create power on different levels of colonial development. It will be discussed how it could create distinctive
“humanitarian and female” ways of development, if and how it could help to establish close relationships to the African people in the field.

Regina Finsterhölzl, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

**Development Discourse in Socialist Debates: The Fabian Colonial Bureau, 1940-1960**

In the 1940s, development discourse and policy intensified in British imperial politics as a response to strikes and unrests in the many colonies and increasing international critic of British colonial rule. Although this policy was initiated by the Tories during the war, its implementation after the end of the war coincided with political change in England, when, for the first time, the Labour Party held office with parliamentary majority 1945-1951 and found itself confronted with the task of governing an Empire. Although thus far having been rather critical of colonial rule, the Labour Party did hardly possess significant expertise in colonial policy.

One exceptional case was the Fabian Colonial Bureau (FCB), which was founded in 1940 by members of the Fabian Society. It was closely connected with the Labour Party and acted as a ‘think tank’, playing an important role in British colonial politics in the first post-war years, which so far has hardly been investigated. Its members were members of parliament, holding posts in the colonial administration, and the Colonial Secretary Arthur Creech Jones was a founding member and chairman of the Bureau. Therefore, the FCB was located in the centre of imperial power, yet also saw itself as part of a growing movement critical of empire. The Bureau had numerous contacts with African and European activists and circulated its journal *Empire* both in Britain and in the colonies. It quickly established itself as important medium of the colonial press and was central in presenting, discussing and spreading the Fabians’ policy.

Investigating the debates about Sub-Saharan Africa, this historiographical essay analyses the development discourse emerging of the encounter of socialist visions with colonial imaginations in times of crisis of colonial rule.

The Fabians’ discourse about colonial development stemmed in large parts from their metropolitan reformist concepts for establishing socialism in British society. The growth of industrial capitalism was depicted as a necessary ‘state of transition’, intending to prepare African colonies for socialism and therefore for political independence. European technocratic experts as well as a social class of ‘modern’ African professional workers were considered to be the crucial actors in a reform, although in the Fabians’ point of view the last group yet needed to be built up and ‘stabilised’ through welfare programmes with the same strong educational moral as they had intended for ‘civilising’ British working classes.

Compared to the Tories, the Fabians clearly promoted the idea of political independence for all colonies as a precondition for world-wide socialism and were very keen on raising living standards. Although depicting the African continent as ‘backward’, they had no doubts that it could make its way into a European ‘modern present’. They were also rather precise in describing their ideas of colonial reform, thereby justifying an intensification of colonial rule. Time differences allowed the Fabians to switch between different roles as well-meaning technocratic planners, socialist comrades of African wage workers and superior colonial rulers.

Frank, Billy

**Conflicting ideologies: The ‘public’ and ‘private’ faces of African Development in the trans-colonial period, 1930 - 1970**

This paper will take a regional focus and examine the former British territories of Northern Rhodesia (Zambia), Nyasaland (Malawi) and Tanganyika (Tanzania). Drawing on official government papers, the records of the Colonial Development Corporation, Barclays Bank (Dominions, Colonies and Overseas), the British Labour Party, the Co-operative Movement Archive, and the Fabian Colonial Bureau, as well as
interviews with various individuals involved in ‘development’, this paper seeks to explore the notions of ‘development’ and its discourse over 40 years in relation to ‘British Africa’ south of the Sahara.

During and after the Second World War two competing ideologies battled in Whitehall for dominance over colonial development policy. On the left was a doctrine emphasising state sponsored policies which were largely concerned with improving the conditions of colonial peoples; this ‘welfarist’ agenda was typified by the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts of 1940 and 1945. In opposition was a doctrine championed by private business which favoured a market-led strategy for colonial development with a more pronounced emphasis upon meeting the needs of the British economy. The main protagonists on the left were the Fabians, the Trades Union Congress (TUC), the Co-operative movement, and the British Labour Party. To the right were strong business lobbies based in the City of London, typified by Barclays Bank (Dominion, Colonial and Overseas). The bank enjoyed strong links with colonial businesses, as well as social links with politicians and civil servants in London and colonial administrations at the periphery.

While much comment has been made about the ‘development’ policy of the British imperial government and its local administrations at the periphery, few commentators have looked to the role of private capital other than to lament its role in colonial expansion and subsequent exploitation. This paper seeks to try and redress this balance. Capitalists enjoyed an unprecedented influence on Britain’s colonial development policy during and after the Second World War. This can be explored through the role of banks (owned and controlled from London) that advanced their own ‘development’ ideals – responding to new circumstances and requirements in the various territories in which they operated. The capitalist agenda also came to the fore in state-sponsored institutions such as the Colonial Development Corporation (CDC, now Commonwealth Development Corporation) established in 1948.

It will be contended that the meaning of ‘development’ was different for these various actors within imperial policy and remained so throughout this period. Neither fully engaged with the indigenous peoples of the region, however, the advent of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (which obviously excludes Tanganyika), gave rise to a strong nationalist backlash that often critiqued the British record on development and shaped new development ideals for post-independence.

Hanson, Suzanne

**Developing Africa: The Dream of a Great White State**

It is commonly understood that the purpose of the British in Africa was to enable the extraction of natural resources; indeed, one could not negate the importance of this primary objective. However, from the earliest point, the concept of development, on behalf of the colonial government, in principle, extended beyond economic output. The drive for the overall advancement of civilisation in Africa particularly for the ‘native’ represented the stated official goal. Development was therefore conceived in a multifaceted way. Whilst economic growth lied at the heart of this strategy it was recognised that this could not be achieved in isolation of education, cultural and political concerns. The education of the ‘native’ (vocational and doctrinal) formed an integral part of the development objective, as did the creation of political structures to promote the stability of the emerging states.

This paper hypothesizes that the meaning of development not only fluctuates throughout the colonial period but differs depending upon the subject: European or African. During the 1920s and 1930s development was conceived by the colonial officials and the settler community to be synonymous with civilisation. However, post World War II the emphasis on development as a cultural product underpinned by economic and technological processes begins to wane. Development is no longer overtly concerned with its civilising mission (in the indigenous community) but becomes preoccupied with fashioning the economic landscape and welfare. The late colonial period witnesses the emergence of a more holistic concept of development embracing economic, social and political concerns in readiness for independence. For the African, development is conceived in an economic (livelihood) and political (emancipation) sense. The importance of these aspects varied depending upon the socio-economic position of the individual.

To explore this preliminary hypothesis this paper reviews the development discourses of East Africa (including Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Zanzibar) from 1925 to 1960. A wide range of information sources
are used to reflect the multiplicity of views during this period. The colonial government occupied a
prominent position in terms of its ability to shape the development discourse. Key administrative
documents include: reports from the East Africa Commission 1925, 1927, the Colonial Development Bill
1929, papers from the Board of Economic Development 1935, 1938, Colonial Development Fund schemes
1934-40, East Africa Royal Commission reports 1953 and Ten year Development Plans for Kenya, Uganda
and Tanzania 1954-1960. Initial findings highlight the influence that the settler community had in
determining development policy in the region. Two sources of information are investigated to unearth this
perspective: The literary works of Elspeth Huxley in particular Flame Trees of Thika: Memories of an
African Childhood (1959) and its sequel The Mottled Lizard (1962). As a keen advocate of colonialism
during this period these works provide insight into the views and experiences of the early settler
community. To supplement the settler perspective newspaper articles from 1930-1932 in the Times of East
Africa (a settler publication) will be reviewed. To discover the African perspective on development petitions
from indigenous organisations including the Kikuyu Central Association, North Kairondo Central
Association and Ukamba Members Association dating from 1932-51 are reviewed. Anti imperialist and
radical newspapers such as the Daily Chronicle and the East African Chronicle are also assessed. And
finally, the literary works of Jomo Kenyatta, in particular Facing Mount Kenya (1938), provide a valuable
source of information. Discourse analysis will be employed to analyse the material. Given that this
methodological approach is concerned with how meaning is constructed as well as defined it lends itself
very well to the aims of this research.

Hodge, Joseph Morgan

“Knowledge and Networks of Science and the Late Colonial and Early
Postcolonial Epoch:
The Case of British Tropical Agriculture, 1925-1980”

The one of the most striking features of British colonialism in the 20th century is what might be termed
the ‘technocratic turn’; that is the increasing utilization of science and technical expertise, joined with the
new bureaucratic capacities of the state, to develop the natural and human resources of the empire. This
paper examines the often ambiguous place of British tropical agricultural science and scientists in the late
colonial enterprise. From 1925 until 1960, the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture in Trinidad, was
responsible for training a steady stream of colonial agricultural administrators and specialists who went to
work in various British colonial territories, mostly in Africa, but also in the Caribbean and Asia. They
created a network of scientific researchers, ideas, practices and techniques that might be termed the British
‘school’ or ‘tradition’ of tropical agricultural research. This paper examines the different approaches,
debates and legacies of this colonial science.

I wish to show that British agricultural resource experts – agronomists, soil scientists, plant ecologists,
land use planners, entomologists and so forth – held diverse views that were shaped not only by British
research traditions and institutional networks, but also by the local colonial contexts in which they worked,
and that the differing views they held often led to vigorous policy debates, which could produce significant
shifts in thinking about tropical environments and development. Further, this paper suggests that the
relationship between British tropical agricultural science and local indigenous knowledge and farming
practices was more complex and reciprocal than previously assumed, and that this led over time to a certain
level of hybridity, and in some cases to important critiques of previous theoretical assumptions that
underpinned the field.

One of the most important questions this paper seeks to answer is whether or not the past experiences of
these former colonial agricultural experts were processed by the post-colonial, international development
industry? As this paper will demonstrate, many of the pioneering studies produced by these scientists and
researchers became key reference works for subsequent generations. What is more, a significant number of
these experts went on to become prominent scientists and specialists, working for the UN’s specialist
agencies like the FAO and the World Bank, as well as for such international agricultural research centers as
the International Crop Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics in Hyderabad, India, the International
Maize and Wheat Improvement Center in Mexico, the International Center for Agro-Forestry in Nairobi, and the International Institute for Tropical Agriculture in Ibadan, Nigeria among many others.

This paper argues that in the context of the post-Second World War moment of the Cold War and decolonization, the debate over agricultural modernization shifted decisively. Proponents of what might be called the ‘modern package’, involving extensive technological inputs of high-yielding seed varieties, chemical fertilizers, mechanization and large-scale production regimes gained favor, eclipsing an older, more peasant-focused, biological approach to tropical agriculture that had characterized the mid-century generation of colonial agronomists and field practitioners. Nevertheless, I argue that these earlier approaches survived in some circles and networks, only to be resurrected in the wake of disappointment with the early Green Revolution programs. The Farming Systems Research approach in particular, bears close resemblance to earlier efforts, due in part to the contributions of former colonial specialists examined in this study.

Hödl, Gerald

Colonial Development Studies? The British Social Sciences and Africa, 1940-1960

Via the Development and Welfare Act of 1940, the British government provided up to £500,000 a year “for the promotion of research and enquiry into matters affecting the Colonies”. To a large extent, this money was spent on applied research in the natural sciences, but a considerable part of it was supposed to fund appropriate research schemes in the social sciences.

The social sciences’ growing importance within the developmentalist colonialism of the 1940s and 1950s foreshadowed the central role they came to play within more recent configurations of the development dispositive. Yet in the 1940s the relationship between government and this segment of academia was an uneasy one, marked by divergent goals and expectations.

By analysing the minutes and papers of the Colonial Social Science Research Council (CSSRC), one of several advisory bodies the Colonial Office created in the early 1940s, I will try to show how government and academic establishment interacted (or failed to interact) in conceptualizing and executing development policies designed to reshape African societies, or, in James Ferguson’s more elaborate words, “what kinds of flows exist, linking academic theories and knowledges to the world of agencies, policies, and practical politics.”

Apart from the interactions between governmental and academic spheres I intend to analyse how the CSSRC approached its African objects of inquiry: Which disciplines and which methods were regarded as appropriate, which kinds of knowledge as important – and, above all, what part did the new catchword development and its concomitant notions play in the deliberations of the Council and in the research schemes it supported? This analysis is supposed to shed some light on the early history of those academic endeavours which later came to be subsumed under the labels of development theory and development studies, and thus may represent a modest contribution to the intellectual history of development.

Hunter, Emma

Development Discourse in Tanzania’s Swahili Public Sphere, 1945-1961

In the mid-twentieth century, the concept of ‘development’ was argued over and given new definitions in national contexts: it became a tool of both nationalists and empire-builders. This paper explores the concept of development in late colonial Tanzania, where it functioned both as a means of asserting colonial power and of imagining alternative political futures. The frequency with which the term maendeleo, or development, was employed in Swahili public discourse in the late colonial period, from district and national newspapers to the minutes of local council meetings, suggests a potentially fruitful case study in which to explore development discourse in the late colonial period.

Historians of Tanzania have set up a contrast between interwar concepts of ustaarabu [civilization] and post-war maendeleo [development], the former religiously inflected and the latter more secular. The
organisers of this workshop invite discussion of a transition from an economic notion of ‘development’ towards “a more extensive concept enabling and justifying the profound penetration and transformation of colonial societies”. I argue that while definitions of ‘development’ certainly changed in the post-war period, there was more continuity with the earlier period than might be expected. In Swahili public discourse, the term *maendeleo*, like *ustaarabu*, was used both by those who supported the colonial state and by those opposing it as a keyword with which to debate the meaning and nature of ‘modernity’. As such, it was a fluid space which encompassed cultural prescriptions and attempts to reshape modes of behaviour as much as practical schemes for the provision of social services. It provided a space for arguing about what a ‘modern’ ethnic political community, a Tanzanian national community or a racial community could look like.

This paper employs a range of sources (district and national newspapers, petitions, letters, colonial policy documents, local council minutes and the records of the United Nations Trusteeship Council) to explore the ways in which Swahili public discourse changed in interaction with broader shifts in international thinking and colonial policy making. The existence of a vibrant public sphere with debate conducted in a *lingua franca*, as well as Tanzania’s status as a Trusteeship Territory in which colonial policy making was accountable to the United Nations Trusteeship makes Tanzania a particularly useful case study for this type of analysis. The focus of the paper is primarily the period 1945-1961, but the paper will also draw on my wider research which encompasses the interwar period. My preliminary hypotheses suggest that:

1. While the meaning of development may have changed over time, the function of *maendeleo* within public discourse did not.
2. Discursive and non-discursive practices must be understood through a model of interaction, rather than as hermetically sealed spaces to be analysed separately.
3. In the Tanzanian case, the notion of subjectivity must be understood broadly, to include both those active in shaping debate in the public sphere, which included colonial and international officials as well as Tanzanians, and those whose voices are less well preserved in the textual record but who by their actions shaped both the extent and limits of possibility.

Kopf, Martina

**Developing East Africa in the British Colonial Imagination**

“She is living like a white baby.”

“Yes, but she is growing into a lovely, happy, healthy, black baby, isn’t she?”

“Yes, she’s the best black baby we have ever seen.”

The above quotation is a passage of the narration *Treasure of Darkness* (1936, p. 54). In it the author Mabel Shaw relates the growing up of an African girl child in the London Mission Society Girls’ Boarding School of Mbereshi in today’s Zambia. Shaw, principal from 1915 to 1940, was not only an influential agent in the field of ‘native education’, but also a prolific and at her time widely read writer. Her writing – like that of a large number of Europeans who went to late colonial Africa as teachers, missionaries, civil servants, traders or settlers – thus evolves from a junction of different social, political and discursive practices which interacted in the discourse of development under scrutiny here.

This paper explores concepts of development and asks how far development discourse entered into colonial writing. Is the thinking of development an important factor in the narratives of the diverse social and professional groups that expressed themselves, their experience and their imagination through writing? What functions does it fulfil? The analysis departs from the assumption that in the researched period the ‘development of Africa’ was becoming a discursive ground for negotiating and asserting conflicting interests and for exerting power. I will argue that through colonial narratives the construction of ‘development’ gets dialectically associated with the construction of ‘Africa’.

My corpus consists of narrative fiction and non-fiction from and about British East and Central Africa by European and African authors. The temporal focus is on the 1930ies and 1940ies, the period which
Frederick Cooper characterized as the turn of the “preservationist colonialism of the 1930s” into the “developmentalist colonialism of the 1940s and 1950s”.

In a first step I want to position popular fiction and non-fiction as a particular form of discursive practice in the discursive and institutional field of colonial development. Here I will rely on the conceptual framework of critical discourse analysis on language as social practice and on the interaction of text, context and subject. In a second step I will juxtapose and analyse texts by Kenneth Bradley, at the time colonial servant in Northern Rhodesia, Mabel Shaw, Eric Reid, author of a popular introduction into the history and peoples of Tanganyika and Parmenas Gikundu Mockerie, a Gikuyu nationalist.

Koponen, Juhani

**Faces of colonial development in South-eastern Tanganyika**

This paper explores three very different colonial interventions in South-eastern Tanganyika from the 1930s to 1950s and their implications to the idea of development – both colonial and postcolonial. The paper investigates what happened in these interventions on the ground and how they were variously conceptualised by the colonialists and the local people. On the basis of this, it builds an argument about the relationship between colonial and postcolonial development, suggesting that although the practices of development started during the colonial time its discursive uses changed with the time and most decisively with the advent of the independence.

The interventions discussed in the paper are: (1) the Groundnut Scheme (2) the creation of what became the Selous Game Reserve, and (3) the promotion of cashew nut as a cash crop. These are unevenly known in the historical literature. The Groundnut Scheme, of course, is popularly presented as a paradigm case of an ill-informed colonial productive push but its broader ramifications such as the establishment of the town of Mtwara have received less attention. The Selous story has been partially told and can be gleaned from the existing scattered accounts but these tend to remain in an environmentalist framework. The spread and promotion of cashew is virtually a virgin topic in Tanzanian historiography and has to be constructed from archival and other primary sources (of which I have collected a fair amount from Tanzania and the UK).

As all historical research, the paper seeks to provide a better empirical knowledge and a fuller understanding of the historical processes discussed in it, i.e. the three interventions. But the empirical contribution of such a short paper inevitably remains limited as it only can sketch the broadest outlines and point out some gaps in our knowledge. An emphasis of the paper is to look at to what extent these interventions were conceptualised in terms of development, and what other notions, such as improvement or betterment, were used by the colonialists, and to what we know about their reception and conceptualisations among the local people. These will be briefly compared with those interventions elsewhere in the country that were explicitly conceptualised as ‘development plans’ (Lusotho, Sukumaland, Mbulu, Maasailand...).

The main theoretical argument advanced on the basis of the above explorations takes on the issue of the historical depth of development. It is plain that in its everyday practice colonialism involved much what we nowadays call development, as was the case with all the three interventions discussed in the paper. Also the notion of development was an integral part of colonial vocabulary, in Tanganyika already from the German times onward. Although it first primarily meant development of exploitable resources, it increasingly was taken to denote at the same time also the goal of the very exploitation and providing a justification for it, just as it is nowadays used. Yet under colonialism development remained one notion among many: only after the independence it acquired the status of a foundational concept, shaping a discourse.

Makombe, Eric Kushinga

**Urbanism/Ruralism and the Pedagogy of Development during Colonialism: The Case of Zimbabwe, 1946-1979**

From the time of colonial occupation in the 1890s until the independence of Zimbabwe in 1980, the urban areas of Zimbabwe were considered the preserve of the white population. In turn, colonialism
systematically introduced schemes of preferential land division, differential property rights, economic incentives, etc, that effectively precluded black competition. Thus before the economic depression of the 1930s, most African urban migrants remained temporary and seasonal. From the Second World War, as the global rhythm of demographic growth accelerated and the need for cheap labour increased, cities began to expand. Salisbury (now Harare), for instance, witnessed the African urban population (more than) double every decade. The immediate concern for the government was now on the impact this would have on the provision of basic urban services and on the capacities of urban areas. Hence, the colonial administrations tried to discourage African urbanisation, as they perceived it as antithetical to ‘development’. The colonial regimes thus opted for centralistic government and planning in an attempt to curtail the process and the 1940s and 1950s period is generally regarded as the height of planned modernization. Colonial state intervention was perceived as functional to the development of settler capitalism that sought to reduce the cost of wages by localising social reproduction in the rural areas. The resulting emergence of a rural-urban divide in colonial policy discourse led to African urban and rural social settings being increasingly treated separately, as two distinct objects of administrators’ ‘modernizing’ efforts. In line with the colonial perspective, and after recognizing that traditional target groups, such as ‘tribal’ and peasant people, had been increasingly integrated into the urbanized world, both anthropologists and sociologists began conducting research on urban phenomena with particular attention given to rural-urban migration, urban adaptation, ethnicity, and poverty. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, circulatory migration between town and country gave way to a situation of quasi-stabilisation such that some ex-migrants began to define themselves in urban terms. A number of ex-migrants established stores that sold a range of essential goods, as well as small maize milling and sewing machines to provide needed services. In addition, they would deposit their money in a post-office savings account, and most of them used ‘modern’ farming technology and built better houses than non-migrants. Central to the conceptualisation, methodology and discourse of urban enquiry that emerged at the time was an imagery of opposites, for the virtues of rural life mirrored against the vices of the city, coupled with a hostile association of the country as backward, ignorant, and limiting. This paper is, therefore intended, as a discursive engagement on how notions and perceptions of urbanism and ruralism informed the conceptualisation and understanding of what constitutes ‘development’ among colonial officials, social scientists and more importantly the urbanites and rural dwellers. The paper will thus rely on the personal testimonies of ex-migrants and non-migrants; colonial records, literature, film and academic texts in an attempt to highlight the interplay of theory, memory and text and how these informed ‘development’ paradigms during high colonialism.

Reid, Julian

The Biopolitics of Development Discourse in Late Colonial Africa

How can we understand the historical function of development doctrine in late colonial Africa? How did the strategic function of development in Africa change in the process of the liberalisation of European rationalities of governance post-1945? Answering these questions requires examining the fundamental and complex correlations of liberal categories of economy, politics, security and life in late colonial development discourses as they arose within the African contexts. These correlations of economy, politics, security and life in development discourse can tell us a lot about the biopolitics of late colonial strategies of governance in Africa. As this paper will explore, we cannot understand how liberalism came to function as a bedrock for the legitimacy of forms of late colonialism in the African context without addressing how systematically the category of life came to shape the nature of development doctrine there. Deriving from a Finnish Academy funded research project titled “Governing Life Globally: The Biopolitics of Development and Security”, this paper will undertake precisely such an analysis.
Speek, Sven

**Visions of Crisis and Development: Ecology & Agriculture in British Central Africa ca. 1929-1951**

"Mother Africa is a grand old lady: we may guide her, persuade her – and even seduce her – but we cannot drive her. We must learn to know more of her home life and economy, her ecology."


Ecology has been interpreted by historians of late colonialism both as a tool of empire, aiming at the efficient exploitation of resources and people (Anker 2001), and as a starting point for counter-narratives, revealing the plurality and complexity of African ecosystems and paving the way for bottom-up approaches of development (Tilley 2003). My current PhD project focuses on agro-ecological research in former British Central Africa (primarily Zambia, partially Malawi), covering a time span roughly from the Great Depression to the beginning of the so called ‘Second Colonial Occupation’ (ca. 1929-1951). Within these twenty years time colonial researchers and technical officers started to intensively survey African agricultural systems, criticized haphazardly conceived modernization schemes and attacked common stereotypes that depicted African agriculture as wasteful and primitive. These utterances emerged in a complex discursive field, dominated by the narrative of a threatening social and ecological breakdown of ‘native’ subsistence communities triggered by the impact of colonialism and capitalism ('Pax Britannica'-thesis). Ecology – with its affinity to the emerging field of systems theory – held the promise of not only helping to come to grips with the complexities presented, but of serving as a science of planning, opening up the possibility to successfully steer a course between the Scylla of social and ecological breakdown and the Charybdis of stagnation and low productivity. The Northern Rhodesian Agricultural Department, starting to calculate carrying-capacities for ‘native’ subsistence systems in the 1940s and trying to engineer stable artificial equilibriums by enforcing the redistribution of populations and introducing modifications to the ‘traditional’ practices, exemplifies in a rather peculiar way the thesis forwarded by Cooper, Hodge and others, that development in the late colonial period was at least partially designed to ameliorate the effects of capitalism rather than to ‘modernize’. This vision did not go unchallenged. With the Northern Rhodesia Copperbelt booming and ‘expectations of modernity’ (Ferguson) rising high, while the racial politics of ‘parallel development’ in the neighboring colonies of Southern Rhodesia and South Africa tremendously complicated notions of ‘development on native lines’, visions of proper development presented a highly contested field. Focusing on the development work done and the representations of proper development constructed by the agricultural departments and technical officers and trying to further elucidate the relationship of ecology and empire, I am drawing primarily on archival government resources, reports, academic and imperial journals on ecology and tropical agriculture as well as personal documents.

Spitzl, Karlheinz

**Educational Development in the Occupied "(Trusteeship) Territory" of Tanganyika: From the Asymmetries of Power to the Asymmetries of Discourse.**

*Invade. Destroy. Occupy [...] & Educate!* My contribution will be based on Critical Discourse Research investigating hegemonic discourse practices in the occupied ‘(Trusteeship) Territory’ of Tanganyika. Since the discourse on education has always [i.e. from the early days of occupation] played a prominent part in the overall socio-political discourse there, the results should help advance our understanding of the causes, nature and potentials of the current globalization discourse in this particular field (discursive flow back to its source).

The analysed primary-source text corpus includes official statements by *His [and later Her] Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland* and its representatives in the occupied territory – the Colonial Office (administrative body in charge), secretaries of state, governors,
consuls (later residents) or high-ranking educational advisors. The text sequences have been taken from
periodical administrative or fact-finding mission reports, educational handbooks and journals, studies,
strategy papers and memoranda (including the aspect of language ‘politricks’ and planning) and
educational policy plans. The main feature that all selected sequences have in common is their dealing with
the would-be colonisers’ major educational aims (i.e. explicitly ascribed and expected function/role/agency
of education).

The legitimation or delegitimation of discursive statements is accomplished by: (a) syntactic focus (on
beneficiaries or major actors), (b) semantic association of the participants with positive/negative processes,
(c) lexical choices casting the participants in a negative light or portraying them positively; (d) definition of
the unsayable, (e) denial of access. Due to the asymmetry of power relations (incompatible interests) it
would be quite reasonable to expect an increased use of legitimating but consensus-oriented practices (in a
Gramscian sense). Nevertheless, results showed that the major discursive practices only aimed at the
population’s denigration and segregation. The contradiction between the discursive segregation and real
need for co-operation was overcome by the pivotal metaphor of the child (a strategy still applicable today).
From the total discursive degradation of the people and the utmost promotion of the colonizers followed the
simple and apparently reasonable conclusion that the potent actors had the moral obligation to act on
behalf and in the best interests of their impotent subjects […] As usual, it were the owners of discourse and
not its beneficiaries who profited from this setting.

Veeser, Cyrus

Homo Economicus in the Tropics

My current research examines British, French and Portuguese strategies to achieve the ‘mise en valeur’
of their African colonies from the late 1800s into the 1930s. Colonial officials agreed that a main obstacle to
development in Africa was that natives lacked the desire to improve themselves. In official reports, scientific
essays, newspaper accounts, and travel memoirs, Europeans constructed a distinctive African ‘homo
economicus’ who contradicted Adam Smith’s conviction that “the desire of bettering our condition […]
comes with us from the womb.” Beyond simple racism, they blamed Africa’s tropical fertility, since the
“animal appetites” of natives were “practically supplied by nature.” An upward curve in labor supply would
follow only from stimulating the desire of Africans for imported consumer goods.

The colonial powers did not, however, wait for self-sufficient Africans to evolve into consumers. The
discursive creation of the lazy African had its non-discursive correlate in the universal policy of forced labor,
the focus of my research. Forced labor took many forms, from the use of conscripts (la deuxième portion) to
build infrastructure in French Africa to British ‘calls’ on village chiefs for manpower to the delegation of
labor control to private companies in Mozambique. The resort to forced labor contradicted metropolitan
concepts of political economy and prompted unflattering comparisons to slavery, yet colonial offices
remained convinced that ‘development’ would not occur in Africa without it.

After World War I labor and socialist politicians, anti-slavery societies and missionaries publicly
denounced forced labor in Africa, and in 1927 the International Labour Organisation proposed a global
convention regulating forced labor with an eye to its eventual abolition. Colonial powers reacted to the ILO
initiative with trepidation; London, Paris and Lisbon asked colonial governors to report on labor conditions
and on the likely effects of a ban on forced labor. The reports from the colonies are a treasure trove of
information about existing labor regimes, economic development, and of course European concepts of
progress in Africa.

The paper will compare British, French and Portuguese reactions to the threatened ban on forced labor.
I will focus on how officials justified the ongoing need to compel Africans to work for their own betterment.
Europeans found that fostering indigenous cash-crop agriculture created consumers but simultaneously
undermined labor supplies for European enterprises, whether private plantations and mines or public
works such as railroads.

My hypothesis is that different colonial discourses of development shared key assumptions and
contradictions—for example, the inability to explain why Africans too “lazy” to work for wages nevertheless
showed great industry growing cash crops on their own land. The primary sources for this research include 6,000 pages of documents, mainly on British East Africa, from the colonial office files at Kew; over 2,000 pages of documents from the French colonial archives (CAOM) at Aix-en-Provence, and some 300 pages of documents from Lisbon’s Arquivo Ultramarino, as well as contemporary books, journals, and newspapers.

Zimmermann, Susan

**Forced, Free or Protected Labor?**

**Competing vision and interest in developmentalist labor policy for Africa within the ILO around 1930**

In this paper I present a close analysis of competing discourses and policies regarding the relationship between the abolition of forced labor in Africa on the one hand and idea and practice of ‘development’ on the other. In focusing on the making of the ILO Forced labor convention (Convention concerning Forced or Compulsory Labour, no. 29, 1930) the paper analyses the various constructions of this relationship in public statements, intra- and extra-institutional maneuvering and debate, and contemporary analysis and vision as produced by the various actors involved in the process, i.e. representatives of metropolitan and colonial governments, employers and unions, ILO-officials, and non-ILO interest groups. I conceive of the making of the Forced labor convention as a key historical moment in creating, changing and shaping discourse and politics over international development strategies in the field of labor politics for Africa. The convention marked both the transfer of inherited patterns of Anti-slavery and ‘humanistic’ discourse into and the invention of differential and developmentalist policy patterns within the field of international labor politics. It involved both the idea of replacing forced by ‘free’ labor and protecting African workers from extreme forms of exploitation. It was clearly meant to contribute, within the field of labor politics, in a particular manner to ‘producing’ a more flexible and expanding work force available for the deepening of capitalist penetration and economic involvement of the colonies, mandated territories, and states of Africa (and beyond) into the global economy, and it did so by intervening, in a highly particularistic and specific manner, in unequal local labor relations and social struggle and ongoing processes of global interaction.

As I analyze the material as indicated above I ask the following questions:

(1) Did and how did the various actors involved in the making of the convention conceive of the abolition of forced labor in Africa as a precondition of triggering and fostering economic and social development? Did they develop conflicting and/or multiple discourses regarding this question and how were these divergences related to the perspective and interest of the various groups they represented within the ILO?

(2) How did, in preparing the convention, the various actors and then the convention itself, construct different groups of workers – namely (a) ‘native’/‘indigène’ and other (b) women, children, men involved in (c) forced, ‘free’ and other labor in (d.) public and private enterprise as well as subsistence production and pursued for (e) divergent purposes – and the need for differential or equal treatment of these workers? How did these differential ideas, propositions and regulations relate to the divergent interests of the actors in ‘humanizing’ labor in the colonies (and elsewhere) and in giving direction to the process of ‘valorizing’ the colonies and ‘developing’ the South?

(3) Last not least I will try to situate and rethink my findings within the broader horizon of the ongoing process of internationalizing and globalizing politics over the South in the interwar period and beyond: How did the making of the Forced labor convention contribute to the process of unequal internationalization of differential and developmentalist labor policy for Africa? How did elements of continuity and change in politics over the South (in terms of actors, vision, North-South-interaction, and difference within the South) shape the making of the Forced labor convention and its results and how did the convention contribute to continuity and change in globalizing development policies?
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E-Mail: shentonr@queensu.ca
**Simon, David** is Head of Department and Professor of Development Geography at Royal Holloway, University of London. His particular research interests include development theory and policy; the development-environment interface; urbanisation and urban-rural interaction; transport and regional and national development planning. He is a specialist on sub-Saharan Africa and has extensive experience in Namibia, South Africa (his home country), Ghana and Kenya. He also has research experience in Sri Lanka, Thailand, and the Philippines. He is a former editor, and now vice-chair of the editorial board, of the Journal of Southern African Studies. His most recent books are *The Peri-Urban Interface: approaches to sustainable natural and human resource use* (co-ed, Earthscan 2006); *Fifty Key Thinkers on Development* (ed, Routledge 2006); and *Aquatic Ecosystems and Development: Comparative Asian Perspectives* (co-ed, with F. Schiemer, U.S. Amarasinghe and J. Moreau, Margraf/Backhuys 2008) and he was lead co-editor of a special issue of Third World Quarterly in 2009 entitled *Remapping development studies: Contemporary critical perspectives*. E-Mail: D.Simon@rhul.ac.uk

**Speek, Sven** studied modern history, medieval history and philosophy at the Ludwig Maximilian University, Munich, where he was a member of SfB 536 ('Reflexive Modernization'). Since 2009 he is a PhD student in environmental history at Ruhr University Bochum (supervised by Prof. Zwierlein). He was awarded a research scholarship by the German Historical Institute of London in 2010. His main research interests are the history of science and of colonialism as well as the history of Zambia and Malawi. E-Mail: Sven.Speek@rub.de

**Spitzl, Karlheinz** holds a BA in Translation Studies and an MA in African Studies (both University of Vienna); teaches at the University of Vienna’s Institute of African Studies; works as a researcher in the project ‘When Plurilingual Speakers Encounter Unilingual Environments (PluS). Migrants from African countries in Vienna: Language Practices and Institutional Communication’; particularly interested in cybernetics, de/constructivism, functioning of texts & discourse – language awareness/power/ideology; currently writing PhD thesis on ‘Transcultural Communication and the Recontextualization of Home Narratives’. E-Mail: karlheinz.spitzl@univie.ac.at

**Veeser, Cyrus** earned his Ph.D. in history at Columbia University, where his dissertation won the Bancroft prize. He has been a Fulbright and NEH fellow as well as a fellow at Harvard University’s Charles Warren Center. His research focuses on the ways that colonies and less-developed countries modernized, with emphasis on the strategies of agents, private and official, from wealthy countries to promote modernization in the periphery. He is author of *A World Safe for Capitalism: Dollar Diplomacy and America’s Rise to Global Power* (Columbia University Press 2002) and *Great Leaps Forward: Modernizers in Africa, Asia, and Latin America* (Pearson 2010) and is currently associate professor of history at Bentley University in Waltham, Massachusetts. E-Mail: cveeser@bentley.edu

**Vasile, Iolanda** graduated in Portuguese and Japanese Studies at the Faculty of Letters of the University of Bucharest, Romania. She is currently a PhD student at the Centre for Social Studies of the Faculty of Economics of the University of Coimbra, Portugal, in the Program “Postcolonialisms and Global Citizenship”. She was recently awarded a scholarship for participating in a PhD Workshop at the University of Munich, Germany. She is also working as a research assistant in a project on the Portuguese Colonial War. E-Mail: iolanda.vasile@gmail.com

**Unfried, Berthold, Dozent** at the Institute of Economic and Social History at the University of Vienna, is currently working on international development policies during the 1970s and 1980s, comparing the deployment of development experts by Eastern and Western countries in the context of the Cold War. E-Mail: berthold.unfried@univie.ac.at

**Ziai, Aram** has studied sociology, history and political science (and some more) in Aachen and Dublin. He got his PhD from the University of Hamburg for a thesis on development theory and the Post-Development critique and his habilitation from the University of Kassel for an analysis of German development policy and the dispositif of development. After being a research fellow at the University of Amsterdam and a visiting professor at the International Development Project in Vienna, he is now teaching at the Institute of
Political Science in Hamburg. He has published on the analysis of development discourse and is currently working on postcolonial political research.

E-Mail: aram.z@gmx.net

**Zimmermann, Susan** is Professor of History at Central European University in Budapest. She has long been involved in research and teaching in the field of international development with a focus on social policy and gender and on international organizations and networks. Her recent publications (in print) include “Special Circumstances in Geneva. The ILO and the World of Non-Metropolitan Labour in the Interwar Period”, in: Gerry Rodgers, Lee Swepton, Eddy Lee, Jasmien van Daele (eds), *The International Labour Organization and the Quest for Social Justice 1919-2009* (Geneva/Ithaca 2010), and “The Long-term Trajectory of Antislavery in International Politics. From the expansion of the European international system to unequal international development”, in: Marcel van der Linden (ed.), *Humanitarian Intervention and Changing Labour Relations. The Long-term Consequences of the Abolition of the Slave Trade* (Leiden 2010).

E-Mail: zimmerma@ceu.hu
Practicalities

Arrival - How to get to your accommodation

From the airport
Once you have arrived at Vienna airport you can
- either take the bus 'Vienna Airport Lines' to get to Westbahnhof. Opposite Westbahnhof (one of Vienna’s major train stations) there is an underground station. Walk past the underground station, and right behind it you’ll find the stop of tram No 5 (going to Praterstern). Please take this tram and get out at Lange Gasse (after about a 15 minute ride). Diagonally opposite you will see Pension Baronesse, and just around the corner is Pension Excellence. You can buy your tickets on the bus (7 Euros) and in the tram (2.20 Euros in coins) or at the ticket machines at the underground station.
- or take the suburban train (S-Bahn) to the city centre (the station is located underneath the airport [a note of warning: stay away from the City Airport Train/CAT, prominently advertised at the airport by green-black-white signs, as it is only marginally faster, ends at a rather inconvenient station and is considerably more expensive than the S-Bahn]. The suburban train (S7) will take you to the station Praterstern/Wien Nord. Please leave the station and take tram No 5 to Westbahnhof. After about 20 minutes, please get out at the stop Lange Gasse and cross the main road (Alser Straße). From there, both Pension Baronesse and Pension Excellence are only a few steps away. You have to buy your ticket at the ticket machines at the S-Bahn station (you shouldn’t be paying more than 3,60 Euros).

From the train station
Most probably you’ll be arriving at Westbahnhof – from there, please take tram No 5 (see first paragraph above).

Accommodation

Pension Excellence
1080 Vienna, Alser Strasse 21
Tel.: +43 (0)1 407 96 20
Fax: +43 (0)1 407 96 20-11
E-mail: info@pension-excellence.com
Website: http://www.pension-excellence.com

Pension Baronesse
1080 Vienna, Lange Gasse 61
Tel.: +43 (0)1 405 10 61
F: +43 (0)1 405 10 61-61
E-mail: baronesse@secrethomes.at
Website: http://www.secrethomes.at/

Workshop Location
C3-Centrum für Internationale Entwicklung, Alois-Wagner-Saal
1090 Vienna, Sensengasse 3

If you want (or rather have) to go to the workshop venue directly from the airport, follow the procedure described above and get off tram No 5 at Lazarettgasse (depending on the direction you are going this is one stop earlier or later than Lange Gasse). To get there from Pension Baronesse and Pension Excellence you can either walk down Spitalgasse and then turn to the right (this will take you about 10 minutes) or take the tram No 5 (to Praterstern) or 33 (to Friedrich-Engels-Platz) and get off at Lazarettgasse.
Dinner (Thursday evening)
Restaurant Zur Böhmischen Kuchl
1080 Wien, Schlösselgasse 18

Contact number (in cases of emergency)
+43 699 11 66 28 22 (Martina Kopf)

Map

--- Workshop Venue
--- Accommodation
--- Dinner on Thursday evening