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International development aid and cooperation have been subjected to severe criticism and structural changes during the past decade. There have for instance been changes brought in by international agreements such as the Aid Effectiveness Agenda, including for example the Paris Declaration, which is emphasizing greater receiver ownership and influence on policy writing processes and also mutual donor-receiver partnership. There are however still claims that colonial history and political interests still are major determinants for development policy and practice (see Alesina & Dollar, 2000).

It is widely recognized that the resources of our planet could never support its entire population reaching the current level of development of most industrialized countries (Ekins, 1993; Vanderheiden, 2008). In spite of this, development agencies such as SIDA (Swedish International Development Agency) and USAID (US Agency for International Development) still continue to promote development of ‘developing countries’ without making any effort to promote a reduction of material standard in the ‘industrialized world’. This also applies to international organizations such as the UN. Sweden has for instance introduced Politics for Global Development which is a new framework aiming at incorporating development cooperation with other aspects of foreign politics, thus creating a department-bridging practice with multiple actors. USA has been working along the same line since 1938 (see Helleiner, 2006), and has recently introduced reforms to further emphasize the role of development for national security policies, making it in part a tool for achieving general foreign policy goals. One must stop to consider why the development agencies still continue on the track of traditional development rhetoric; what advantages make governments reluctant to change course? Mohanty (2004) talks about the US imperial project, showing how neocolonialism and imperialism is justified through national security strategy. So even though an equally developed world is impossible, with the current western level of development as goal, a pretended strive for it continues in order to serve national political interests of western governments. The concept of development needs to be revised, as stated by a number of postdevelopmental theorists, in order to facilitate a globally equal distribution of resources. Though stating the fact that the development paradigm lives on in western governments makes promoting a postdevelopment perspective an unrealistic first step. Governments and agencies need to first take on postcolonial analyzing of power structures and the effects on implementation without selfpositioning.

There is a growing group of theorists promoting the incorporation of postcolonialism into development theory and, through bridging gaps between research, policy and practice, integrating it into all levels (McEwan, 2008; Court & Young, 2006; Alesina & Dollar, 2000; Hyden, 2008). This article seeks to investigate to what extent a postcolonialist perspective has been integrated in SIDA and USAID policy.

The article will firstly be dedicated to a presentation of postcolonialism, followed by a more specified discussion of postcolonialism and development. The methods are then presented
and a motivation of the deconstruction of postcolonialism into five dimensions as used in the dimensional analysis. The results from the analysis are presented and a comparative analysis is performed in which the results are presented in the MIP index.

**Terminology**

USAID uses the terms ‘development’ and ‘foreign aid’ in the documents, while SIDA refers to ‘international development cooperation’. This article will use ‘international development aid and cooperation’ when referring to practice and policy, and ‘development studies’ or ‘postcolonial studies’ respectively when referring to academic theorizing.

The term discourse in this context refers to a Foucauldian definition. A discourse exists in the intersection between power and knowledge; the forum where meaning of knowledge is constructed. (Foucault, 1989).

**Postcolonialism: an overview**

During the 18th century, the European enlightenment brought with it a new line of academic disciplines attempting to find ‘truths’ about human nature – including history, sociology, anthropology and political science. This, combined with a fixation with progress resulted in a naturalizing of human nature as constantly moving forward, striving for new stages of development. Darwinian evolutionism was applied to a social context, leading to an equalization of this human nature and the westerners (mainly Europeans). They were in turn defined in contrast to the ‘others’, non-Europeans, who did not have the same ‘human’ qualities. This had a substantial impact on colonial politics and relationships. The inequality of colonial power structures is the focal point for postcolonialist deconstructing criticism. Franz Fanon has been named the founding father of postcolonialism, setting the tone for the academic discipline with his work *Black Skin, White Masks*, published originally in 1952 and *The Wretched of the Earth* from 1967 (Eriksson et al., 1999). Other tone setting theorists in postcolonialism are Aimé Césaire (*Discourse on Colonialism*, first publishes 1950) Said (e.g. *Orientalism* (2003) first published in 1978), Parry (2004) and Bhabha (2004).

Postcolonialism is a wide theoretical perspective influencing theorizing in a multitude of academic disciplines. More than a theory, it could be seen as an umbrella perspective for what Mongia (1997) terms ‘the burden of Western philosophy’ – the questioning of the assumed basis of knowledge and the terms and languages with which the discourses are constructed. Young (1998) defines postcolonialism as an interdisciplinary political, theoretical and historical academic work that sets out to serve as a transnational forum for studies grounded in the historical context of colonialism and in the political context of contemporary problems of globalization. Postcolonialism should, according to Young, not be seen as a coherent theoretical method, but rather a shared political perception employing an eclectic range of theories. Furthermore, the postcolonial perspective could, according to Young, both be seen as a critique and ideology itself.

Postcolonialism is, as Dirlik states, a ‘child’ of poststructuralism and postmodernism (Ahluwalia, 2005). It is influenced by the poststructuralist focus on the significance of language; theorists like Saussure and Derrida talk about the necessity of binary opposites to create meaning; such as the traditional colonial perception of white Europeans as rational,
progressive and intellectual and the ‘others’ as emotional, uncivilized and without developmental aspiration (Eriksson et al., 1999). The postmodernist influence leads to a relativity suggesting that postcolonialism cannot provide an understanding of society, only a deconstruction and criticism of it – which in turn leads to a frustration among practitioners when old methods and ideas are discarded without being replaced by new ones (Hall, 2003). This is further addressed by Court and Young under ‘Postcolonialism and development’ below. Developing tools for practitioners in the frame of postcolonial perspectives in development cooperation is not the subject for this article and thus left for others to take on.

Loomba (1998) means that the mere deconstruction of society leads postmodernism, poststructuralism and postcolonialism to be the antithesis to political action. Eagleton (1998) picks up on problematic universal human rights. Due to the postmodernist and poststructuralist origin of postcolonialism any essentialist or universal rule should be discarded – still many postcolonial theorists see postcolonialism as a way of ensuring human rights beyond discriminatory structures. This in itself, Eagleton points out, is contradictory to the postcolonial core – and it poses a substantial problem for development policy. See for instance the Cairo Declaration (Member States of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, 1990) claiming to be a Muslim counterpart to the UN Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948).

Ali (2007) discusses development through a feminist and a postcolonial perspective and addresses the importance of maintaining these two perspectives parallel in studies of knowledge and politics, because the intersection of the two provides new methodological agendas in future research and practice. Young (1998) on the other hand argues that gender is not in need of explicit theoretical discussions on strategic material needs and political action in the development context. He argues that gender is an integral part of many theories included in the postcolonial framework, and that the political and historical agenda in a postcolonial perspective gives gender, along with other basis for inequality, a common objective.

Postcolonialism is a controversial term that has been criticized frequently and from various viewpoints. There has been a substantial semantic debate on the definition of postcolonialism – or rather on the use of the prefix ‘post’. Colonialism is defined as entailing a system of superiority, exploitation and power as well as a system for knowledge and the creating of symbols. Shohat (1992), Hall, Dirlik, Appiah and Hulme (Hall, 1996) all have criticized the ‘post’ prefix and what it implies; they consider it to imply that colonialism is a thing of the past and criticize the temporal essentialism, they instead choose to consider postcolonialism a process of what Hall terms decolonization. Hall points out that the process concerns all, not only the immediate actors of colonialism; it is first and foremost a decolonization of the mind.

McClintock (1992) also discusses the semantics of the term. She argues that the recent popular use of the prefix “post” as non-historical reveals a crisis in the linear-historical view endorsing progress for all nations, as promoted mainly in US imperialism. As if history would
have come to an end where both capitalist and communist world order have broken down and as if all nations now had past the colonial state into a hybrid state. McClintock rejects this view and means that the postcolonial perspective could be useful as an organizing rubric of an emerging field of studies, on the condition that it is based on the multiplicity of parallel powers and histories. Thus, the term postcolonialism should, according to McClintock, focus on imbalances in power worldwide rather than on historical progress by nations. Though opinions may part, the focal point of the prefix debate is the relationship between colonialism and postcolonialism.

Eagleton (1998), in line with McClintock, also addresses the multiple significance of the term. He argues that postcolonialism refers to the fact that large parts of the world were once colonized but that they are now colonized in a different, more indirect, way. The term 'postcolonialism', on the other hand, refers to a particular theoretical agenda and has its roots in highly specific Western intellectual history. This coincides with Preece’s (2008) argument, where she refers to Tikly (1999, 2001), and states that postcolonialism is: 1) a chronological period of time when previous colonies are decolonized of the official colonial rule; 2) an ideology of analysis that reveals that this decolonization only reflects a shift in the way that colonial political and economic arrangements function in modern time. Whilst postcolonialism also represents a chronological period in time – the decolonizing period of official colonial rule – the ideology of postcolonial analysis reveals that this decolonization only reflects the legal process of disengagement by the nation state, and a shift in the way that colonial political and economic arrangements now function (Preece, 2008).

McEwan (2008) gives several parallel definitions of postcolonialism; as literary theory, an historical era, an ‘after-colonialism’ condition, an anti-colonialist movement and as a ‘metaphysical, ethical and political theory’ (p17). The last definition treats postcolonialism as a perspective dealing with ‘issues such as identity, race, ethnicity and gender, the challenges of developing post-colonial national identities, and relationships between power and knowledge’ (p17). The last definition is the approach that is being used in this article as a basis for analysis. It is seen as incorporating the views of Preece and Eagleton as well, although slightly more specified in line with what is being analyzed through the dimensional analysis.

Hall (1996) refers to Appiah and Dirlik and their criticism of the earlier theorists; they mean that postcolonialism is merely a competition of political correctness and that all it shows is the sensitivity of - primarily North American - universities to academic trends. They further suggest that postcolonialism is a trend created by intellectuals with roots in so called ‘third world’ countries that have made a career in western universities. They mean that in this way postcolonialism is contradicting its core values; by letting westernized academics have agency to speak for groups they are no longer a part of. Loomba (1998) mentions the fact that most of the conducted postcolonial research is done in English departments at Western universities, and that other languages and universities are underrepresented.

Though, it is not entirely true that postcolonialist theories have only been developed within Western academia. Young suggests that the term tricontinental might be more adequate
than postcolonialism, referring to the *Tricontinental Conference* in Havana 1966 aiming to create a forum, with an independent epistemology for postcolonialist theorists and activists with the common aim of popular liberation of three continents; Latin America, Africa and Asia. Contributors to the *Tricontinental Journal* established at the conference were among others Frantz Fanon, Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara and Jean Paul Sartre (Young, 2003).

Dirlik and Ahmad have claimed postcolonialism to be eurocentric, seeing as its ultimate goal deconstructing European enlightenment and the eurocentrism of global history writing. They mean this fixation also contradicts the ideology of postcolonialism, since its purpose in part is to challenge European domination, this challenging focuses on deconstructing what was, instead of building up what can be. Furthermore, they both direct Marxist criticism against the postcolonial theorizing, saying it needs a greater focus on practice and political and economical aspects rather than purely theoretical (Eriksson et al., 1999). Young (1998), Eagleton (1998) and Loomba (1998) join in and criticize the western academia for self-centered and narcissistic postcolonialism that deals with individualistic experience, mainly from language and literature, without adequate attention being paid to political issues and political action.

Eagleton (1998) accuses postcolonial intellectuals of being naïve about the real incentives in north-south relationships; he states that ‘"postcolonialism” [as an academic theoretical framework] has been on the whole rather stronger on identity than on the International Monetary Fund, more fascinated by marginality than markets’ (p26). This argument is however countered by poststructuralist such as Hall who says that deconstructing discourse is a powerful way of achieving political change (Eriksson et al. 1999).

Individuals are the focal unit within postcolonialism; Gramsci used the term *subaltern* referring to actors who are disadvantaged in power hierarchies. It is a relational term indicating a comparison to other actors that are either more or less subordinated (Spivak, 2003). Young (2003) highlights the excluded experiences of women as a historically ignored subaltern perspective, and that politics have been a fundamentally masculine activity. To Young, the function of the subaltern is, from a western located viewpoint, turning the world upside-down while seeing, hearing and speaking the experiences of the local subaltern and not from the ones already in power. Mohanty (2003) talks about how power structures are multidimensional, and factors of discrimination must be seen as intersectional and mutually dependent. Rabasa (2005) points out that subalternity is not to be viewed essentialistically as a fixed position, but rather as a process of subordination.

According to Rabasa (2005), the only way to overcome a state of subalternity is for the subalterns to be educated on the contextual power structures they’re in and their own subalternity. Kothari (1998) means the education must be provided to all actors; inequality can only change through recognition of subalternity by the subaltern and by the oppressor, along with a reflecting by both sides of the self as an actor. A subaltern can, according to Spivak (2003), never speak and be respected as an equal by the oppressor unless power relations and the discourse, that recognizes the subordination of the subaltern, change. Rabasa (2005), Kothari (1998) and Beverly (1998) further address the issue of representation.
as problematic when placed in a hierarchal context; this because it entails the oppressor taking agency to speak for the subaltern and inescapably use, and thus enforce the usage of, its own conceptions.

Beverly (1998) points out, on the issue of representation, that academics can never set out to speak for subalterns, but they should deconstruct and recognize the impact of their own created ‘knowledge’ and rhetoric; which should be the case for civil society actors as well. Subalternity is a complicated term because of mentioned dynamics and contextuality; Beverly (1998) quotes Guha when promoting an intersectional standpoint and stating that subaltern is a ‘name for the general attribute of subordination…whether it is expressed in terms of class, caste, age, gender and office or in any other way’ (p305). Beverly completes this with saying that surely this can include subordination due to degree of education as well, he claims that new forms of subordination/domination is created daily, while the old ones are sustained.

Postcolonialism and development

Until recently postcolonialism and development theory have been separate and mutually critical, there are however more and more theorists trying to bridge the two and integrate a postcolonial perspective in development theory. McEwan claims that the notion of ‘development’ is one of many expressions of western domination and interference, and that postcolonialism offers a counter story to challenge this traditional conception. She does not intend a postcolonialist input to development studies to bring about anti-development tendencies, but rather a development theory that recognizes the unequal power structures in development discourse. Simon (2006) demonstrates how the postcolonial deconstruction of traditional ‘development’ theory has occasionally turned on the term itself, suggesting colonial and neocolonial implications. Simon and McEwan however agree on that replacing the term development does not in any more successful way address the problems it attempts to remedy, such as poverty and inequality. Simon also promotes bridging the relation between development and postcolonialism in the development discourse; by establishing and extending alliances between organizations based in north and south, promoting and strengthening alternative transnational trading structures, and studying the possible reconstructing of existing economical world institutions. McEwan (2008) highlights that the postcolonial perspective needs to influence both theory and practice of development studies, requiring it to acknowledge the importance of representation and language as well as the effects of development policies on the people subjected to them.

Postdevelopment theory is more radical than postcolonialism in that it, unlike postcolonialism, antidevelopment and ‘beyond development’, rejects the concept of development completely. The origin is the same as that of postcolonialism; it is a reaction to the dilemmas of development and modernity as a whole. As suggested by the term, it too is a product of what can be termed the ‘post’ era, stemming from poststructuralism and postmodernism. The extreme relativism has brought on criticism due to the fact that it, very much like postcolonialism, criticizes without offering alternatives (Pieterse, 2000), for further reading see Escobar, Sachs and Sittirak (1998). As mentioned in the introduction, the limited resources in this world force us to adopt a postdevelopmental view, but we must however
crawl before we walk. As Pieterse (2000) points out; ambitions to ‘change the world’ are often met with cynicism - and rightly so, looking at past attempts. Development is however a reality for most governmental agencies and tone-setting institutions, and despite its pitfalls and dangers it is the way in which attempts to ‘change the world’ are executed today. Starting where we stand, postcolonialism is as mentioned a relevant opening that might further on lead to a questioning of traditional methods.

Natsios (2006), former administrator of USAID, outlines the challenges for the work of the agency and argues that democracy and economic development should be seen as the most important of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG’s, UN, 2000), as opposed to a focus on social service. Helleiner (2006) mentions this as being the standpoint of U.S. development operations since 1938. This can be interpreted as part of what Mohanty refers to when talking about the US imperial project, where she also describes the recent restructuring of US foreign policy (Mohanty, 2004).

Recent theorists present alternatives to the economic development as promoted by Natsios. Paolini (2003) adds cultural, subjective and political dimensions to the discourse and Agostino (2008) directs criticism towards the dominating development discourse and more specifically towards the MDG’s - though from a, to Natsios, opposing perspective. Agostino is a member of the GCAP (Global Call to Action against Poverty) that argues that the MDG’s (UN, 2000) cannot be reached without challenging patriarchal, capitalistic structures and the dominant discourse on development which they mean is more focused on economic growth and profit than on social and human rights. She questions the MDG’s and the development discourse for failing to include diversity and for its tendency to frame all regions outside the mainstream western democracies as ‘underdeveloped’ in need for assistance. Agostino highlights Santos (2003) ‘monoculture of knowledge’ that is assumed within the western hegemonic development discourse based on rationality and efficiency. Agostino promotes a challenging of this monoculture and proposes to complement it with the ‘ecology of knowledge’, where mutual inclusiveness leads to a deeper knowledge; ‘...the dialogue between different knowledge’s is the response to the incompleteness of each of them’ (p5), which is in line with McEwan’s argument on integrating postcolonialism in development theory.

Court and Young (2006) are researchers based at the Overseas Development Institute in the UK. They present a reasoning that in this article is seen as a prolongation of that of McEwan; highlighting the importance of a functional relationship between researchers, policymakers and practitioners. They mean that there is a lack of mutual understanding between these levels; researchers do not express enough consideration as to difficulties policy makers may find in integrating new findings into their work, policy makers often find new research complicated to implement and practitioners don’t have enough insight in neither policy nor research. Court and Young argue that new research must be integrated into the development policies in order to improve development cooperation efficiency and transformational impact on poverty. The authors also state that most research is produced in the North, or if produced in the South often funded by North-based agencies. This raises, according to Young and Court, a questioning of relevance of research for practitioners in
South, when it comes to initiatives and expressed needs for research. Since jargon often plays a big role in funding allocations, emphasis in findings and analysis may also be affected (see Cornwall & Brock (2005); Alfini & Chambers (2007)). Court and Young (2006) have developed several models for research uptake in policy, and summarized the main points in what they call the RAPID model (Research and Policy in Development). Young (2005) talks about necessary key dimension on a more structural level for integration of new research; he mentions political culture, civil and political freedoms, political contestations institutional pressures, capacity of government and attitudes and incentives among officials. According to Young, it is easier for policy writers to integrate action research and comparative studies, rather than hypothetical or theoretical arguments.

Postcolonialism as used in this context is an important tool for actors to use in realizing and recognizing the importance and effect of their own actions in relation to others in unequal power structures. Though postdevelopment could be desirable and, debatably, even necessary, that is a discussion for later when it comes to international development aid and cooperation policy. Recognizing a problematic situation comes before taking action, and the process of recognition is where postcolonialism can be helpful.

**Methods**

**Case Selection for the Comparative Method**

Four policy documents have been analyzed; two from each agency (SIDA and USAID). For the analysis equivalent documents from the different agencies has been sought, and what has been used is a general policy document from each agency along with a policy document on handling corruption. Though the documents are written within a time span of 8 years, they have not been revised since and are currently being used by the agencies. The documents used from SIDA are: *Goals, Perspectives and Central Component Elements* (March 2005) and *A Guide to Acting on Suspicions of Corruption* (February 2007), and from USAID; *USAID - Policy Framework for Bilateral Foreign Aid* (January 2006) and *A Handbook on Fighting Corruption* (February 1999).

Lijphart (1971) argues that the *comparative method* should be seen as a broad and general method, a strategy, and not a pure technique. He argues that in the case of comparing political systems, the comparative method is applicable since the focus cases can be few. In this study, the two cases (SIDA and USAID) are seen as fractions of political systems. He further states that a deep analysis of few cases can be more useful and give clearer results than a superficial statistical analysis of many cases. This study does not aim at presenting any universal findings; it is only focused on the actual cases (N) and the dimensions used in the analysis. The purpose of the study is to detect presence (P) or absence (A) of postcolonial perspective, as indicated in theoretically selected dimensions, in two similar N in a *cross case model*, as described by Seawright & Gerring (2008).

The cases analyzed in this study have been selected through the *Most Similar method*, which is one of the oldest of the qualitative case selection techniques (Seawright et. al, 2008). It is
a deliberate selection of N based on theory-driven comparative method. More specifically, the model that Ebbinghaus calls the most similar N/different outcome (MSDO) was found to be the most adequate for this study. The similarity of N directs the focus for the research on the differences between the N in the dependent variables (Ebbinghaus, 2005). To clarify the terminology; variables in this study are replaced by dimensions in order to adapt it into the dimensional analysis presented below. Though the MSDO model has been used, to what extent the two similar N would be different in the outcome result was for obvious reasons not known beforehand. The model is here used as a tool for case selection, rather than a tool for comparison. The findings are summarized, for a simplified comparison, using the MIP index. These steps are further outlined below.

The choice of policies from SIDA and USAID as most similar N was based on the facts that both institutions are channeling the state budget for development aid and cooperation they could be considered democratic western institutions with similar hierarchal structure and similar organizational structure. Furthermore the policies are based on similar principles such as the MDGs (UN, 2000) and intention to improve the situation for the poor. They have also both been subjected to significant structural changes during the past decade (see the Aid Effectiveness Agenda; including the MDGs (UN, 2000), the Paris Declaration (OECD, 2005) and the Accra Agenda (OECD, 2008)).

**A Small-N Case Selection**

Lijphart (1971) argues that, in order to receive more representative findings, a way of increasing N is to broaden the geographical or historical perspective. But since this study is qualitative and not aiming at generalization, and since the comparative method was used to detect differences in N at present, there was no point in broadening the analysis to include more N. Ebbinghaus (2005) also treats the complications with small N and refers to Smelser (2003); he argues that a small in-depth comparative study could contribute with ‘important qualifications of available theories’ that could open up to broader, more representative, research within the frame of the theory used.

**Dimensional idea and ideology analysis**

For this study, the idea and ideology analysis has been used, as presented by Bergström & Boréus (2005). They emphasize the content meaning of texts in studies of ideas, meaning that texts have substantial impact on ideas and actions of both individuals and political institutions. They refer to the vast amount of text circulating within the political systems and argue that these texts are vital for analyzing how political institutions operate. They define the term idea as a construction of thought that is more continuous than only a drifting-by reflection or attitude, while the term ideology is a systematical gathering of political standpoints. In this study no strict division between the two terms was adopted since the postcolonial perspective could be broadly and subjectively defined as both idea and ideology. The dimensional analysis is useful for comparative studies (Bergström et. al, 2005).

The postcolonial perspective, as defined above, was operationalized into five dimensions through which the policy documents were analyzed. A kind of 'qualitative data reduction' has been used in order to determine the number of dimensions. The dimensions have been
dichotomized into two categories each (Presence/Absence) as following the MSDO model presented above (Ebbinghaus, 2005).

The comparative discussion and interpretation of results was based on the similarities of the two institutions USAID and SIDA as agencies and on the critical postcolonial discourse that have been directed towards development policies in general. Though the comparison is based on similarities of the agencies in structure and context, this does not automatically imply a similarity in the contents of policy documents.

The results of the dimensional analysis were presented as findings in a cross case model (fig. 1). What was analyzed was the presence (P) and absence (A) of sentences or arguments in the policies indicating a consideration of each postcolonial dimension. The degree of P or A in the result has different implications for the postcolonial tendencies in each dimension; it is to be interpreted as follows:

For dimensions 1, 4 and 5; many P indicates a low degree of a postcolonial perspective integrated in the policy. For example, many sentences emphasizing the economical development (dimension 1) indicate a low degree of a postcolonial perspective integrated.

For dimensions 2 and 3; many P indicates a high degree of a postcolonial perspective integrated in the policy. For example, many sentences emphasizing self positioning (dimension 2) indicate a high degree of a postcolonial perspective integrated.

The cross case model has thereafter been summarized in Malin & Ida’s Postcolonial Index (the MIP index; fig 2) for the comparative analysis. The index value is a calculation of the findings of P and A in the cross case model. 0 is the starting value, signifying no prevalence of either P or A in the document. A positive value in the MIP index would indicate that the prevalence of postcolonialism within a document is stronger than the expressed lack of it. A negative value would indicate that the lack is more obvious than the prevalence. Since P in dimension 1, 4 and 5 indicates low degree of a postcolonial perspective and P in dimensions 2 and 3 indicates the opposite, the calculations have been based on: Dimension 1, 4 and 5; P is a positive value, A is a negative value, Dimensions 2 and 3; P is a negative value, A is a positive value.

Dimensions

1) Particular emphasis on economic development

Natsios (2006) promotes the economic development as the only way for transformational countries to reach humane social conditions for their population. Helleiner (2006) mentions this being the standpoint of U.S. development operations since 1938. Hall (1996) says postcolonialists can be seen to unintentionally give voice to a new capitalistic world order. On the other hand Agostino (2008) is arguing that the capitalistic view must be challenged in development discourse in order to include social and human rights. Also Simon (2006) offers an opposing view to the economically centered development discourse as well as Paolini (2003), who adds cultural, subjective and political dimensions to the discourse. In this dimension, what was focused on in the documents was P of sentences or arguments promoting the
economic development in particular, or A of the same where instead e.g. social or environmental development was highlighted.

2) **Awareness of intersectional power structures in the donor – receiver relationship**
As Kothari (1998) points out, the way to overcome subordination is for all actors to be aware of power structures; subalterns as well as oppressors. Mohanty (2003) talks about how power structures are multidimensional, and factors of discrimination must be seen as intersectional and mutually dependent, which is in line with what Beverly (1998) argues. In this dimension, what was focused on in the documents was sentences or arguments showing P or A of self positioning and recognition of the agencies as actors in intersectional power structures.

3) **Recognition of subaltern agency and representation**
Intersectional awareness of subordination needs to be extended into strategies of inclusion of the subaltern. Spivak (2003) says the subaltern will never be listened to as an equal by the oppressor; thus a deconstruction of subordinating factors is necessary. This in turn requires recognition of subaltern agency and of the necessity of subaltern representation. Beverly (1998) and Kothari (1998) point out that oppressors can never represent subalterns. Ali (2007) argues that the feminist perspective needs to be given a certain place in postcolonial analysis but due to contextual limitations of this article Youngs (1998) standpoint is adapted integrating the feminist perspective in the dimension of the subaltern. In this dimension, the focus for the analysis was sentences or arguments showing P or A of recognition of the subaltern and its active participation and representation in the development process and organizational structure.

4) **The use of universal idioms of human value**
The postmodernist roots of postcolonialism is clear in the endeavor to renounce universal values; as Eagleton (1998) claims, it would mean that tools such as the UN Declaration of Human Rights are not valid. Loomba (1998) claims postcolonialism to be an antithesis to political action, which in an obvious way puts obstacles in the way of international development cooperation, but nevertheless this dimension indicated the prevalence of a postcolonial perspective. In this dimension, what was focused on in the document was sentences or arguments showing presence or absence of the use of universal idioms and definitions.

5) **Neocolonialist tendencies**
Both the Swedish Politics for Global Development (PGD) and the US National Security Plan integrate their development politics in a broader context with other departments in order to promote the economic development in all political spheres. Preece (2008) means that modern official decolonization only reflects the legal process of disengagement by the nation state, a shift from one colonial political and economic approach to another. In this dimension, what was focused on in the analysis of the documents was sentences or arguments showing P or A of neocolonial tendencies.
It should be kept in mind while reading the results, that this dimension is based on theoretical assumptions that are critical to distinguish in documents like these. It ultimately comes down to an analysis from a subjective perspective. The findings should therefore be seen as indications and not as facts. In general, where there is an obvious lack of both recognition of intersectional power structures and lack of recognition of subaltern agency, the tendency of a neocolonialist approach could be discerned.

**Considerations of method**

Due to the postcolonial nature of this analysis, a self positioning of the authors is vital for a reader interpretation and understanding of the article. Ideologically the authors both have postcolonialist, postdevelopment and thus – in a wider perspective – postmodernist, viewpoints. Both authors have an expectation of gaps in the theory-policy relationship in the documents, due to previous experience in the area of development aid and cooperation. Being residents and natives of one of the countries whose agency is being analyzed (Sweden) could signify that the authors are predisposed to be streamlined with the SIDA rhetoric and perspective to a larger extent than with USAID. This is sought to be avoided, and a postcolonial predisposition is more likely to be found by the authors of this article, than agency loyalty. Obviously the authors of this article are part of the dominating – and criticized – group of western academics in postcolonialist theory. This is problematic in seeking to enforce a perspective in the policy writing of aid agencies that might not be entirely grounded with all actors concerned.

**Findings and Comparative Analysis**

For full text findings of analysis see appendix

**Fig 1. Findings of Presence/Absence of postcolonial perspective in dimensions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIDA General</td>
<td>2P 3A</td>
<td>0P 13A</td>
<td>17P 10A</td>
<td>12P 0A</td>
<td>6P 0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID General</td>
<td>2P 4A</td>
<td>0P 1A</td>
<td>5P 5A</td>
<td>2P 0A</td>
<td>23P 0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA Corruption</td>
<td>0P 0A</td>
<td>2P 7A</td>
<td>1P 7A</td>
<td>0P 0A</td>
<td>0P 0A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Corruption</td>
<td>9P 0A</td>
<td>0P 4A</td>
<td>1P 1A</td>
<td>3P 0A</td>
<td>4P 0A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clarifications of Fig.1.**

a. This cross case model is a summation of the findings of the dimensional analysis

b. In the SIDA Corruption document, nothing at all was said in dimension 1, 4 and 5 on economic development, universal measurements or indications of neocolonial tendencies, therefore both P and A show 0.
c. When analyzing dimension 4 and 5 where the findings show A=0, the absence was considered irrelevant for the analysis since it has no implication for the outcome. There was no expressed absence of dimensions 4 or 5; for instance no comment was made on the absence of the UN Declaration of Human Rights in the USAID policy document, this has then consequently been left out of the analysis since an absence of dimensions 4 and 5 indicates a postcolonial perspective has been adopted. (Compared to e.g. A13 in the SIDA Policy in dimension 2 that clearly states lack of self positioning which indicates that neocolonial approaches might occur).

![Fig 2. Malin & Ida’s Postcolonial Index (MIP index)](MIP index)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>MIP Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIDA General Policy</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID General Policy</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA Corruption</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Corruption</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clarifications of Fig. 2 – the MIP index

The index is a rough generalizing comparative overview of the findings from the analysis, and is not a sufficient measurement without the comparative discussion below.

1. **Particular emphasis on economic development** – the amount of P and A findings in this dimensions where rather similar in the two policy documents from SIDA and USAID. Though, USAID states more openly that the economic development is in focus in their operations while the economic development in the SIDA document is less emphasized. Both agencies present prominent (western) economic international institutions as important partners in broad development cooperation. In the two documents on corruption the lack of similarities between the two institutions is visible. In SIDAS corruption document, nothing is explicitly said on economic development. In the USAID version as many as 9 sentences emphasizing the economic development as essential were found; mainly focusing on the consequences of corruption on economic development and on the direct economical aspects of corrupt activities.

2. **Recognition of intersectional power structures in the donor – receiver relationship** – In the policy documents from both SIDA and USAID an obvious lack of self positioning was detected. None of the documents contain a consideration of historical or present power relations or include any recognition of intersectional power structures in the strategies presented. The SIDA document on corruption seems to be a bit more sensitive in this matter, recognizing the possibility of corruption occurring within SIDA, whereas the USAID corruption document has no inclusion of a self positioning perspective at all.
3. **Recognition of subaltern agency and representation** – Both USAID documents show an equal amount of A and P for dimension 3 – the corruption document has 1 of each, while the policy document has 5 of each. The SIDA policy document has a high occurrence of recognitions of subaltern agency; 17 P, but also a high expressed absences; 10 A, while the SIDA corruption document has a very high absence, 7A, and only 1P. All in all the two corruption documents show a lower attention directed to the issues addressed in dimension 3, while the policy documents consider them to a larger extent. SIDA has expressed consideration for subaltern agency and representation to a larger extent than USAID, but the presence of the dimension in relation to the expressed absence does not indicate a palpable postcolonial perspective in either document.

4. **The use of universal idioms of human values** - As mentioned above in the clarification, the absence of dimension 4 has not been expressively implied in any of the documents; thus the lack of A doesn’t automatically mean there has been postcolonial motivation behind the absence; there could be a number of other reasons; such as political considerations to name one. When it comes to P though, SIDA has a significantly larger presence than USAID in its documents. This could overall be directly connected to the fact that USAID in its documents does not mention the UN Declaration of Human Rights, while the rights perspective is prevalent in SIDAs publications. What they mutually refer to is the MDGs (UN, 2000), and USAID also brings up the UNPDs ‘global public good’. Furthermore the two agencies, but mostly SIDA, use generalizations that fit in to this dimension as well; such as ‘peace and democracy’ or ‘Swedish values’ to exemplify. The prevalence of issues concerned in dimensions 4 is far bigger in the general policy documents than in the corruption documents.

5. **Neocolonialist tendencies** – See clarification above for discussion of A. The neocolonial tendencies are more expressively shown in the general policy documents than in the corruption documents. There is a much stronger presence in the USAID document than in the document from SIDA; especially referring to the U.S. National Security Strategy making development – and thus USAID – an integral part of strategic foreign policy and national security, by strategically conditioning development assistance.

**Conclusions**

As the findings show, there is a difference in prevalence of postcolonialist tendencies between SIDA and USAID; showing a slightly higher index for SIDA. The difference is however more evident between the two types of documents; where the general policy documents have greater prevalence of both P and A than the corruption documents. When looking at the different dimensions, a difference in approach to development is evident; USAID is using development of others as a national security strategy, and integrating development with other aspects of foreign policy in general to a larger extent than SIDA. Foreign policy, and thus development, is in the analysis of the USAID policy interpreted as a possible way to strengthen and maintain neocolonialist relations, which is also pointed out by Mohanty (2004). This is not as clear in the SIDA documents, but an increase can be assumed due to the implementation of the Swedish PGU which clearly indicates a wish to incorporate
international development aid and cooperation into a more general foreign policy scheme and include an increased number of actors. SIDA focuses on the rights perspective, with the UN Declaration of Human Rights as the base, which is counteractive to a postcolonialist discourse due to the universalist and essentialist nature of the declaration. All documents lack self positioning and reflections of self as active in creating and maintaining unequal hierarchal relationships, which is especially clear in the corruption documents which use clarifying examples only from countries receiving development aid. The MIP index indicates that the USAID general policy document has the most non-postcolonialist indications at -24, while the SIDA general policy isn’t much better at -23. The USAID corruption document got -20 in the indexing, while the SIDA corruption got -11. Looking at the index; SIDA as an agency is more consequently integrating postcolonialist perspectives than USAID, but in general policy they are very close. Though the focal points in the documents are very different, this is a generalizing statement that can be made due to the fact that the different obvious focal points in the documents analyzed could be indicators of different levels and aspects of postcolonialist integration, whether consciously or not.

This study is merely focusing on the content of documents, and is not able to take in consideration of other factors that might be affecting the findings; such as skilled policy writers or global political aspects that affect what is emphasized or left out in the documents. Nor is this an ample forum for discussing historical and current national politics and welfare policies of the two countries that might provide further explanations. Important to remember is that policy documents don’t necessarily reflect implementation, evaluation and organizational development accurately. The impact of the policy documents cannot be considered here.

As mentioned in the author self positioning, this analysis has been conducted with an underlying opinion that postcolonialism can help improve development work, and eventually build up to official government acceptance of a postdevelopment perspective. As the analysis shows a lack of postcolonial considerations in all documents, recommendations could be made based on the RAPID models for research and policy bridging. Research – policy relations are obviously contextual, but a more proficient streamlining of research into policy is vital in order to further improve development studies and practice; important is that this must be done in a way that doesn’t further alienate policy from implementation.
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