"A Nation On the Move"

A Discourse Analysis of Namibian Policies for Development

Elise Jansson

Linköpings universitet

Linköpings universitet, Institutionen för samhälls- och välfärdsstudier - ISV

601 74 Norrköping

"A Nation On the Move"

- A Discourse Analysis of Namibian Policies for Development

Elise Jansson

Supervisor: Magnus Berg

Linköpings universitet

The Institution for Social
and Welfare Studies

Title

"A Nation On the Move"
A Discourse Analysis of Namibian Policies for Development

Abstract
This thesis is approaching the concept of development in Namibian plans for development, its Vision 2030 and Third National Development Plan. The aim is to analyse discourses of development in the Namibian political context of planning for development. I have done this through the theoretical and methodological framework of Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, CDA. I have identified four contrasting and complementing discourses in the way that the documents talk about development. Two of them, discourse of tradition and discourse of modernity, are connected to meanings of development. The two others, a social equity and justice discourse and a neo-liberal market discourse, are connected to structures of development, which shape how the documents vision development to happen. I have seen that there is a struggle between the discourses in the way they are described as both complementing and conflicting.

Preface

As the sun sets outside my window, as it has so many times before, I realise that the journey that I am in the middle of experiencing has to soon come to an end. My stay in Namibia was framed by time, as most journeys are. It fills me with mixed feelings. I realise that there is a life waiting for me back home, a life companion, family, friends, and all those things I've had to cope without for almost five months. I also start to sum up the time of my stay in my head. What am I now going to have to cope without for the, probably, rest of my life, what am I taking with me, and what will I leave behind. I guess you could say that it is a life-altering thing to travel the world, in every cliché aspect of the word. To leave the safe for the unsafe, home for something new. It is broadening your horizons. I am not coming back the same as I left.

The journey referred to begun a year ago when I found out I was spending the spring term in Africa, Namibia. The country has since then been filling up large parts of my world. The purpose for my stay in Namibia was the writing of this master's thesis and studying Advanced Sociology of Namibian Society at the University of Namibia. However, pretty soon I came to realise that my journey in Namibia was about a lot more then writing a thesis. And that to write a thesis in Namibia is about a lot more than writing a thesis in Sweden, which is what I'm most use to. Writing a thesis in Namibia, for someone who's normally pretty bound to Sweden, is first of all getting to know a new country, new encounters, cultural differences, similarities, new systems and several other, for you, new discoveries. For this to been made possible, and such a great experience that it has been, I am grateful to a lot of people, some of which I will mention here.

First of all I would like to thank my supervisor Magnus Berg at the Department for Social and Welfare Studies at the University of Linköping, for making this exchange possible and for necessary comments and joyful spirit in regards with the writing of this thesis.

Tom Fox, Volker Winterfeldt and Lucy Edwards at the University of Namibia has meant a lot for making my stay in Namibia pleasant. For guidance, dinners, inputs, discussions I am grateful.

I would also like to mention the Linnaeus-Palme scholarship, and the municipality of Norrköping, and even more specifically Monica Hjärn, for making this journey possible.

Essential for my stay in Namibia have been the love and support from my roommates, Carro and Jocke. I will never forget the happy times you filled my journey with.

But most of all I want to give my biggest appreciation to my constant partner throughout the whole of my education, my dear friend Sofia Littmarck. I will always remember this last endeavour we survived together, at least education wise. Confined into each rooms, struggling to create a thesis, sharing both moments of hope, and of great despair. I truly appreciate the love and support you have showed me, throughout the whole of my education, but especially during our joint stay in Namibia.

The process of writing a thesis is a process filled with ambivalent feelings, and throughout the whole time I have been swaying between feelings of hope and feelings of despair. The times of crisis where I actually thought I felt my soul wanting to crawl out of my body, always lead to

some kind of progress, and I realised that those times were crucial for working towards an end of the writing. It is always hard to picture the end, but I think that I am now close to a sort of end, a deadline is approaching. I am actually thankful for this deadline. Without it I would probably be writing on this thesis forever. It is hard to decide when something actually is complete, and I'm not sure it ever is. But, with this journey ending, a new one starts. The finishing of this thesis means the conclusion of my education, and new journeys and possibilities is opened up.

Last, but not least, to those I left behind, my thoughts are with you in these last moments of this journey. The love I feel for you have become very apparent in the divide that was created between us in space. I am now coming back home. At least for this time. That is another thing with broadening your horizons; you can't seem to get enough.

Elise Jansson,
Windhoek, Namibia
2010-05-16

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ACP	African, Caribbean, Pacific Countries
CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HIV	Human Immuno-Deficience Virus
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IMF	International Monetary Fund
KRA	Key Result Area
LaRRI	Labour Resource and Research Institute
NDP	National Development Plan
NFLS	Namibian Labour Force Survey
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
SADC	the Southern African Development Community
SME	Small and Medium-Size Enterprises
SWAPO	South West African People's Organisation
TNC	Transnational Corporation
UN	United Nations
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Table of Contents

Introduction

Not knowing what to aspect, I landed in Namibia in the beginning of the year 2010. Filled with excitement towards the five months that was before me I got into the mini bus that would take me to my home for some time. In several ways I was speechless from what I saw. A green landscape with small crumpled trees, and high mountains in the horizon spread before me, monkeys running on the side of the van. This was Africa. But I wasn't convinced. The picture got more blurred when we entered the city. Small suburbs with big houses and high fences, and the further we got a big city emerged. It was a large city like anyone else in the world, with big roads, multi-storey buildings, it was the same, but yet so different. The picture didn't really fit in with the picture of Africa that had fed me back in Sweden. I don't really know what I had expected, but I am guessing not so much, it had been too hard. I think the amazement actually came from that, to finally see what I had been trying to picture since I found out that I was going. What I had been trying to picture, but felt was impossible. So here I was, in Namibia, in Africa, for almost the first time (one trip to Tunis does not count). It reminded me of a place in Europe, any place in Europe.

One thing that pretty soon after my arrival in Namibia came to my attention was the way that a lot of the people that I met, the people of Namibia, described their country. After having settled the normal courtesies of how I liked Namibia, the concept of development almost always emerged. However positive I was towards their home, still, the reply I got often brought up the development of the country, "Give us a chance, we're still developing" or "we are not fully developed yet" or "still developing". It left me in wonders.

The year 2010, the same year as the writing of this thesis, marks the celebration of Namibia's twenty years of independence (1990-2010), a milestone in the Namibian history. It is also a time of summing up the country's achievements so far, the development of the country, and examining the challenges for the future. Several seminars are being held in the purpose of this. The talk about development seems, to me, to be central in the beginning of the year 2010. It is also central in this thesis. Two of the most important documents in the Namibian Governments talk and planning for development are being analysed, *Namibia Vision 2030* and their *Third National Development Plan*. My wonders formed the course of this thesis, and I wanted to know how the Namibian Government talked about and planned for development. Twenty years of independence comes with a lot of different connotations, a young state only twenty years old, a country marked by colonialism and apartheid, a country viewed as a middle income country which has come a long way, a country who is viewed as managing on their own facing out the aid, but also a country with the highest inequalities when it comes to income rates, a country where some have it all and some have nothing. That is a country full of diversities and complex meanings. That is what faced me when I first arrived in Namibia.

Problem Formulation

The aim for the thesis is to study discourses of *development* in the Namibian political context, and the rhetoric's behind the planning for development, and further to connect the analysis of the political documents to social practices of discourse. In order to do that I am analysing Namibia's Main Document for Long-term National Development, *Namibia Vision 2030*, and their current National Development Plan, *Third National Development Plan* (NDP3). The main question for the analysis is how the documents talk about development, and how the talk about development is connected to social practices of development or discourse?

Demarcations

Development is a broad term, and reach to all areas of politics. To study development is to study everything, and there is therefore a need to narrow down the field. That also, in some sense, means leaving interesting topics out. Development can be *defined* in different ways, in different contexts, and refer to various activities, meanings, relations, and so forth. I am interested in the politics of development in the Namibian context, the policies for development, and the governmental promotion for development. This is analysis at macro level, and leaves out specific implementation projects and development results. It also leaves out the experiences of the people in Namibia, the people who are living with the development, experiences at a micro level. I am aware that the process of development has to do with a lot more than just planning, and just the planning from a governmental perspective. However, with the aim of the thesis something other than that does not follow. This is not an evaluation of the development in Namibia and does not concern how developed Namibia is. I have instead chosen to have a large theoretical part broadening the analysis according to the method of choice. This will work as social practices of the Namibian political talk about development and examples on how the development in Namibia is connected to other discourses and talks of development. With a broad theoretical background it is possible to analyse the social, and theoretical, context in which development is discussed in a global context, which have effect on the specific view of development in the Namibian example, and further the ideology of development. With this said, there are, however, still several interesting areas regarding the topic of the thesis that unfortunately cannot be analysed in this thesis. This is being discussed in the ending discussion part as recommendation to further research in the field.

Disposition

It always seems problematic to decide how to disposition the different parts of a thesis. For me, the writing of a thesis is a relational process where the different parts are alternated between, and, because of that, have a big part in each other; one cannot be separated from the other. A separation is, however, needed for the thesis to be able to apprehend and digest. Another problematic issue then arises, in what order should the different parts be read in, since they have such big part in each other. This especially goes for the theoretical, methodological and analysis

part who all are part of the same process, that is to live up to the purpose of the thesis. However, a disposition has been settled, so this short outlay is just a reminder to the reader of the relational process of writing a thesis.

After the above opening and outlining of the aim for the thesis, a background to the topic will be described starting with some historical aspects of development in Namibia, and the country today twenty years since independence and the transitions that have been important. This chapter ends with a description and discussion of the Namibian plans for development, the empirical material in this case. The thesis goes on with a theoretical and methodological chapter. I feel that it is hard to separate strictly between method and theory, especially with the method that I have chosen for my thesis. Fairclough's *Critical Discourse Analysis* is both theoretical and methodological. The chapter starts with a discussion of the theories that comes with the method, and that are my ontological and epistemological background for the thesis. Fairclough's critical analysis is a social theory of discourse, and as such it is discussed in the beginning of this chapter. After that I discuss relevant theories and concepts that the reader needs when going through to the later Analysis. Those are theories and background to 'development', discussions of 'globalisation' with Namibian examples, and some thoughts on 'universalism' or 'global governance' in development planning and theories of 'governmentality'. This can be seen as a social practice of development discourses, and are analysed as that further on. The chapter ends with a discussion of methodological implications and a more explicit account for my mode of procedure and relevant analytical tools. The next chapter is the Analysis and the thesis later ends with a Discussion chapter.

A Nation On the Move

Amazed with the country that I saw for the first time I suddenly realised that this was both the place and subject for my thesis. The country that was almost unknown to me, the country on a continent that I was not familiar with. At first it startled me. However, I also realised the challenge in this, and the excitement in experience a new and, from the beginning, foreign place. So, from the beginning of my stay I have been trying to absorb as much of this country as possible, its history, complexities, the people, and the debates. I am now going to share some of the things that have seemed important for my topic, things that I six months ago didn't have much knowledge of at all. However, due to lack of space several important features in Namibia's history have to be left out, and there is always more to the history than the story is telling.

Namibia achieved its Independence 1990 after being colonised for 106 years. As Magnus Berg states, *"[n]othing has mattered so much as the white presence and domination in the country that today is called Namibia"* [my translation][1]. This, of course, also has great impact on the country's development today. The colonial era are divided in two, the German rule and the South African rule. Both eras are signified by racial segregation, violent conquest and a need of cheap labour,

---

[1] Magnus Berg, (2004), *Förlåta men inte glömma*, (Stockholm), p. 19

which left the country, and its people, in poverty, high inequalities and with several casualties. During the South African rule the apartheid policy were introduced and the non-white people were forced to live separate and on distance from the white population, and were further divided into areas according to ethnicity.[2] One of the purposes with apartheid was to create an army of cheap, moveable and powerless workforce. And it was through such work that actually resistance could mobilise. It was as such resistance that the Ovamboland People's Congress were created in 1958, today called South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO). They wanted to work for better terms for the workers from Ovamboland, but also to enlighten the world outside the region about the conditions that South Africa had created, and to abolish their power. This reflects struggle for independence, which at first was a mediating with South Africa through UN. However, the member states in UN had there own interest in South West Africa, so even though Namibia were administrated under UN it meant little success for Namibia. Disappointment over the loss in these mediations was the start of an armed struggle, and the shift to the name SWAPO, which marked a shift from the focus on the Ovambos to national unity. Namibia eventually gained its independence, not as a victory for the Namibian army over the South African forces, but through a negotiated settlement that involved extensive international mediation and entailed substantial compromises.[3] SWAPO played a forefront role in the liberation struggle in Namibia, and won its first free election in 1989 with a large margin. The party has since then been the ruling party in Namibia.

The 21st of March 1990 Namibia gained its independence as one of the last colonies in Africa. The transition to an independent country must be understood through the colonial background. The heritance and foundation from colonialism made the frames for the building of an independent Namibia. The country was still financially dependent on South Africa, mostly because almost all import came from there, and they still controlled important industries, like the mining industry, together with other foreign powers.[4] Namibia was at that time of independence a country plagued by inequalities due to the colonial past. It is estimated that about two thirds of the population were living in conditions of absolute poverty. The black majority were trapped in poverty due to a systematic system of labour exploitation, and the financial assets were unequally distributed between white people and black people.[5]

This was the society that the government took over at independence, and the independence did not mean any immediate changes in economic and social structures. The economic power still largely lies within South African and transnational corporations, and white farmers.[6] The political programme lined up in 1976 by SWAPO, the programme that lead towards independence, was characterised by socialist rhetoric. The goal was to build a class-less

---

[2] For further reading of the colonial era in Namibia see amongst other, Berg, (2004) and Herbert Jauch, Lucy Edwards & Braam Cupido, (2009), *A Rich Country With Poor People*, (Windhoek)

[3] Berg, (2004), p. 36-52 and, Jauch, Edwards & Cupido, (2009), p. 6-8, 20

[4] Berg (2004), p. 51ff

[5] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 9

[6] Berg (2004), p. 54f

society based on socialistic ideals.[7] However, the socialist approach came to be put in the background. The political negotiations that paved way for the independence involved international mediation and lead to substantial compromises. International, and more specifically Western, support came to be more important than the socialist agenda, and the Government showed this by demonstrating allegiance to market-related economic policies.[8] This is, as will be shown, important for understanding the analysis later.

The picture painted of Namibia since independence is a contradictory one. The country is classified as a "Medium Income Developing Country", but scores low on other indices of development. The World Bank ratings tell that Namibia has made significant economic and social progress, especially regarding social spending. But the unemployment rate is still at very high levels, and the levels of poverty and inequality is also very high.[9] A booklet of Jauch, Edwards and Cupido discuss some of these inequalities. They talk about the urban-rural inequalities, and the Namibian economic structure shows significant regional disparities, a rural-urban dichotomy. Rural households are affected by poverty to a far greater extent. They also talk about gender inequality and racial, ethnic and class inequalities. Women are the bulk of caregivers in Namibia, yet they are considerably under-represented in the formal economy. The levels of inequality is also structured along racial and ethnic lines, where Khoisan-languages and Rukawangali speakers are particularly affected by poverty and German and English-speaking households are hardly affected by poverty at all. Namibia also has a high HIV prevalence and AIDS death rates which has large affects on poverty and inequality in the country, where AIDS increases income poverty of households and communities. Poor families are also more vulnerable to AIDS and less able to ease its impact.[10] Namibia's high levels of income inequality are further kept up by an extremely skewed labour market that widens the gap between various categories of employees, within the formal labour market and the informal economy. Namibian workers by large fall into the category of unskilled and semi-skilled workers, and the unemployment rates are very high.[11] According to an article in the March issue of "Insight Namibia" the Namibian Labour Force Survey (NFLS) from 2008 was presented in September 2009 and recorded the official unemployment rate to 51.2 percent.[12] It is a contradicting picture. Twenty years since independence and various attempts from the Namibian Government to provide basic services for all and redress the inequalities of the past, Namibia still ranks amongst the most unequal societies in the world.[13] The contradiction in this is that their actual GDP is still pretty high, actually one of the highest amongst the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). Suggestions are made that this means that the people are not deriving a reasonable share of the national wealth. It

---

[7] Berg (2004), p. 48ff

[8] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 21f

[9] Ibid., p. 38f

[10] Ibid., p. 40ff

[11] Ibid., p. 48ff

[12] Insight (March 2010), "Into the breach", p. 20

[13] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 75f

could also further mean, and is suggested by Jauch, Edwards and Cupido, that the actual capacity exists but the public policy is either failing or is wilfully unfair.[14]

Planning For Development – My Empirical Background

2010 is the year that marks the 20th anniversary for Namibia as an independent country. It is also a milestone in Namibia's aim for development. In 1998 the president of Namibia at the time, Dr Sam Nujoma, draw attention to a need for clarity about the countries aims, present conditions and a time frame for its development. This was the birth of the idea for a vision for the country, and later turned into *Namibia Vision 2030*. I am in the following part going to describe the documents for analysis, the Namibian plans for development. The empirical background for this thesis consists of the above mentioned, *Namibia Vision 2030*, and the *Third National Development Plan*. These documents will be analysed in this thesis as part of representing the Namibian Government and its political planning and view of development.

The Vision 2030 is Namibia's policy framework for long-term national development and was completed in March 2004. It is described by Sam Nujoma as *"a framework that defines clearly where we are today as a nation, want to be by 2030 and how to get there"*[15]. The Vision 2030 identifies national issues for development, and these form an overall national Vision; *"A prosperous and industrialised Namibia, developed by her human resources, enjoying peace, harmony and political stability"*[16]. The Vision is divided in three pillars, which are "people's quality of life", "sustainable resource base" and "creating the enabling environment", which are sub-divided into different categories. Each of these categories maintain objectives and strategies, and assessments over Namibia's current situation, things that needs to be done, things that needs to be avoided, and visions for 2030. There is also a sub-vision for each category. The Vision 2030 is also a guide to the country's five-year development plans, from NDP 2 through to NDP 7.[17]

Namibia has, at the time of this thesis, created its *Third National Development Plan* (NDP3) witch stretches from 2007/2008 until 2011/12. The NDP3 is deeply connected to the Vision 2030 and the plans work as tools to achieve the long-term aims of the Nation's Vision. It is also an *"attempt to translate the Vision 2030 objectives into action"*[18]. The Third National Development Plan draws upon the Second National Development Plan witch stretched from 2001-2006.[19] After NDP3 there will be an NDP4, 5, 6 and 7, which will be effective towards reaching the objectives of the Vision 2030.

The third national development plan exists in three parts. Firstly it consists of two main volumes where the first one comprises the main chapters, and the second includes different programs for implementation. In addition to the two Volumes there is also a third part which is a

---

[14] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 35ff

[15] Office of the President (2004), *Namibia Vision 2030*, (Windhoek), p. 9

[16] Ibid., p. 38

[17] Ibid., s. 9-17

[18] Office of the President (2008), *Third National Development Plan (NDP3)*, (Windhoek), p. iii

[19] Ibid., p. i, iii

Popular Version of the NDP3, which is conducted in a simplified fashion. However, I am mainly focusing on the Volume I of the NDP3. The eight objectives of the Vision 2030 are in the NDP3 summarised into eight Key Result Areas (KRAs) and several goals. The overall theme of the NDP3 is *"Accelerated Economic Growth and Deepening Rural Development"*[20].

Theoretical and Methodological Reflections

During the course of the writing of this thesis, I have experienced some problems with having a clear demarcation between theory and method. In my opinion the discussion of these needs to be done in a reflexive way, where one cannot be understood without the other. Because of that implication I have chosen to have the part of theory and the part of method together in a methodology chapter, and further to discuss method and theory in relation to each other. The method that I have committed myself to is both a theoretical and methodological approach, and that further explains my choice of discussing them together[21]. In the first part of this chapter I am going to outline the theoretical basics for understanding the thesis, and that I draw upon for the analysing process and conducting research. I am also going to account for some methodological implications and a more specific mode of procedure. However, as said, the different parts are deeply correlated. Built in to the following are also previous and earlier research on the topic development, and more specific development in Namibia.

A Social Theory of Discourse

The deeply connected theoretical and methodological structure for this thesis draws upon the framework of *discourse analysis*, and more specifically Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, *CDA*. This beginning theoretical chapter outlines the more theoretical parts of the framework, which constitutes the ground that my thesis stands on. The more methodological part is going to be outlined in the end of this theoretical and methodological reflection chapter as my mode of procedure. The aim for the thesis is to study the Namibian Governments talk and plans for development. In this planning and talking I suggest that they take part in the creation and building of the reality, and more specifically discourses of development. In this creation they are both building on existing discourses, talks and texts regarding the issue at hand, but also take part in the restructuring and transformation of the same. Discourse is therefore a practice, in Fairclough's sense of the word. It is a practice of representing and signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning; it is reproducing and transforming society.[22] Language use in my thesis is therefore a form of social practice, and as such I analyse the

---

[20] NDP3, p. iii

[21] See Lilie Chouliaraki and Norman Fairclough (1999) in *Discourse in Late Modernity*, (Edinburgh), p. 16, for a further discussion of CDA as both a method and theory

[22] Norman Fairclough (1992), *Discourse and Social Change*, (Cambridge), p. 63ff

documents. Practices can further be described as *"habitualised ways, tied to particular times and places, in which people apply resources to act together in the world"*.[23]

To analyse practices are firstly to analyse its *elements* and *mechanisms*, which build up a practice. Practices are further also part of *networks* of practices, that also build up the practice and determines the internal mechanisms and elements of a practice. Such determinations are both part of the practice, and representing the practice, and the representations help sustain relations of domination within the practice and are therefore ideological. Here the concept of hegemony becomes relevant. The networks of practices and particular practices within the network with its elements and mechanisms create a complex, inter-relational and dialectical relationship. Hegemony refers to the struggle between the different parts of a practice, its networks, elements and mechanisms, over closure, which can never totally succeed and always give rise to resistance.[24] This is the basic for *hegemonic struggle* within practices. Hegemonic struggle over closure is analysed in my thesis with regards to the documents. I am going to explain more how this is done in the chapter of mode of procedure. These networks of practices can further also be analysed as *Orders of Discourse*. Orders of discourse are the totality of such networks, and the relationship between them.[25] Texts are, however, not just effects of such linguistic structures and orders of discourse, but also other social structures.[26] This relationship is ground for the three-dimensional approach in Fairclough's critical discourse analysis. A specific language use has three dimensions, and should be analysed as such. It is a *text* that is being analysed linguistically, it is a *discursive practice*, which means the production, distribution and consumption of a text, and it is also a *social practice*.[27] This dimensional approach has guided me through the analysing process. In my view these dimensions are incorporated in a dialectical relationship and can't be totally separated. Still, in order to give an explanation for the three dimensions, I have to try and separate them. To analyse text is to analyse the characteristics of a text, the different mechanisms for example. This is mostly done on a linguistic level. This is deeply connected to the discursive practice of a text, which is to analyse how a text builds on other texts and discourses in its making. Texts are further also shaped by broader social practice, and takes part in reproducing or restructuring the order of discourse. To analyse social practices of the text I need to add social theories. This is also analysis of ideology and power relations within and around a text.[28]

This above outlined approach is the framework that my thesis draws from and how I view my material. It suggests that there is a need for a critical stance towards knowledge that is taken for granted, and that we create reality through our categorisations of the world. These categorisations, as our way to view and comprehend the world, are produced and reproduced through social processes. A specific way to describe the world can, in a specific context, be

---

[23] Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999), p. 21

[24] Ibid., p. 37f (also draws upon p. 19-35)

[25] Norman Fairclough (1995), *Critical Discourse Analysis*, (Essex, England), p. 132

[26] Norman Fairclough (2003), *Analysing Discourse*, (London), p. 24f

[27] Marianne Winther Jorgensen & Louise Phillips (2000), *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*, (Lund), p. 74

[28] Ibid., p. 74ff

viewed as natural, or closer to the truth than other, which has social consequences.[29] To analyse discourses of development in the Namibian political context is to analyse how they create meanings of development, and how some of these understandings are viewed as more natural than others. This approach further suggests a need to have a dialectical approach towards what constitute what in discourse, not overemphasising the one over the other, and not reducing discourses to social practice or the other way around.[30] Such a stand is also important for how I view power relations in discourse. The creation of meaning is always part of a struggle for closure or naturalisation in discourse. This is what I referred to above as a hegemonic struggle. In this view power is not a force that is put on someone by another. Hegemony is leadership as much as domination; it is power over society but is never achieved more than partially or temporally; and further it is about constructing alliances. In this there is always a struggle.[31]

Development

My many encounters with the concept of development, in the beginning of my stay in Namibia, left me in wonders over the high importance the concept seemed to have. It also made me thoughtful over the meanings attached to the concept. What did people really refer to when they emphasised it so greatly? Of course, there are also theoretical backgrounds to the discussions of development, which are important when outlining discourses of development. Ray Kiely, the author of *The New Political Economy of Development*, confirms my first suspicion of the concept and its possible ambivalent meanings in his attempt of defining development. He states *"[d]efining development is not perhaps as straightforward as it may first appear"*[32]. This calls for a theoretical understanding before I go into the analytical thoughts of development when analysing the documents.

The history of development seems to be described in similar ways in most of the literature. Development, or at least the *idea* of development, argued by Kiely, have some roots in older debates about modernity and progress, even if the concept itself where not used explicitly before 1945. Norman Long also acknowledges similar roots for development in the Post-Enlightenment period and its obsession for "progress", "social evolution" and the pursuit for "modernity".[33] Maria Eriksson Baaz argues similarly that development has it roots in the concept of evolution, and that applied on societies it express the view of progress and that all societies are moving in the same determined direction, from the simple, primitive, to the modern western society.[34] However, development emerged as a far more prominent idea after 1945 in the context of former colonies and newly independent sovereign states that committed themselves to a

---

[29] Winther Jorgensen & Phillips (2000), p. 11f

[30] Fairclough (1992), p. 65f

[31] Ibid., p.91f

[32] Ray Kiely, (2007), *The New Political Economy of Development*, (New York), p. 9

[33] Norman Long (2001), *Development Sociology*, (London), p. 52

[34] Maria Eriksson Baaz (2001), "Biståndet och partnerskapets retorik" in Michael Mc Eachrane & Louis Faye (ed.) (2001), *Sverige och de Andra*, (Stockholm), p. 168

consciously directed process of capitalist movement. The aim was to catch up with the developed world through the process of industrialisation along capitalist lines, but with a state fostering of industries. Jude Howell and Jenny Pearce calls this the post-war "modernization" paradigm, where the nation-state still was the territorial and political unit for development, and it was this assumption that third world countries were required to follow. *"The state was the mechanism through which some countries managed to create industrial capacity of their own."*[35] Norman Long describes the modernisation theory as the imagining of the undeveloped world becoming modernised. This is happening through mechanisms of involvement in the commodity markets and interventions from the more 'developed' world to the less 'developed' world. *"In this way 'traditional' society is propelled into the modern world".*[36] Modernisations theorists visualised development as gradual change from the traditional to the modern western societies. These views has, however, lost its credibility, but the idea of a gradual universal process where different societies mirrors different stages is still present, and in particular regarding representations of Africa and Europe.[37]

This post-war thinking of development was challenged in the 1980s. The challenge came from the neo-liberalistic influence in the development thinking[38], and its growing hegemony in the international order.[39] Kiely argues that this laid the foundation for a new set of policies designed to increase global competitiveness in the developing world.[40] It was at this time that Namibia became an independent state and continued to set their agenda for development. Of course this neo-liberal thoughts influenced even Namibia. A lot of support was also put into ideas of globalisation as the best way forward for the development of the former Third World, and by the turn of the twentieth century globalisation took over from neo-liberalism as a taken-for-granted solution to sustainable development in poorer countries.[41] It is also during these influences and timeframe that Namibia develops their Vision 2030 and also, but a little bit later, the current National Development Plan 3. However, Kiely argues that globalisation, even if it represented a move from neo-liberalism, was more a continuation of the era, and its parameters has been set by the neo-liberalism of the 1980s. Development had, in terms of social questions such as poverty; inequality and participation in social and political life, become a genuinely global issue that applied to both so called developed and developing countries.[42] The relationship between development and globalisation is, however, also viewed by some as contradicting, and the implications for developing countries have not been as positive as 'pro-globalisation'

---

[35] Jude Howell & Jenny Pearce, (2001), *Civil Society and Development*, (London), p. 14f

[36] Long (2001), p. 10

[37] Eriksson Baaz (2001), p. 169

[38] Howell & Pearce (2001), p. 14f

[39] Kiely (2007), p. 11

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

advocates suggests.[43] I will have reason to come back to the relationship between globalisation and development later in this theoretical outlining.

Globalisation

With this above introduction to development it is implied that development eventually became more of a global matter. Long suggests that development can be viewed in a similar stand as a commodity. He means that for some firms and consultancy bureaus, and even government agencies and NGOs involved, development is big business. He explains one part of development as conditioned by social interests of those involved in manufacturing, promoting, selling and utilising a particular commodity.[44] There are also clues for this global matter in the business of development aid. The planning for development, and how it is talked about and vision, is cohesive with how you talk and plan for *development aid*. Bertil Odén writes that development more than ever is a joint international agenda, and especially through the UN-system and the World Bank-system, which now has been brought closer together in a joint platform for North and South to work from.[45] It should be clear by now that development today cannot be discussed without theories of globalisation and, I will further suggest, theories of imperialism and hegemony.

To outline the concept globalisation is complex in the same matter as I described the concept of development to be. It is in itself inherent with a variety of descriptions, meanings and even importance. As Kiely attempts to summarise these varieties, it seems that globalisation reflect changing realities of social and political territorial space, the rise of institutions of global governance that were not confined to particular nation-states, the rise of movements of capital, commodities and people from one territory to others, cosmopolitan human values, and problems transcending nation-states, such as global warming. Globalisation thinking spread across the world and challenged the role of the nation-state. Its consequences were, however, varied and unequal in different parts of the world. The nation-state system in the global era is a hierarchical one, which can be seen in the uneven and unequal development of nation-states within this system.[46]

Views on the current globalisation process vary, and it has both critiques, such as Kiely, and dedicated followers. Those who celebrate the events of globalisation often do it with the argument that globalisation ultimately will improve the lives of the people all over the world, and that globalisation is beneficial for developing countries. Globalisation in this view comes with promises of a better tomorrow and the people of the world will benefit from greater economic efficiency and increased wealth in the long run.[47] This is also mirrored in the neo-liberal approach

---

[43] Kiely (2007), p. 12

[44] Long (2001), p. 37

[45] Bertil Odén, (2006), *Biståndets idéhistoria*, (Lund), p. 143

[46] Kiely (2007), p. 2ff

[47] Herbert Jauch (2001), *Playing the Globalisation Game*, (Windhoek), p. 11

inherent in the promotion for this process. Those who on the other hand stand critical towards this process, like Kiely, instead emphasis the inequalities that is built into the process, and that the process has different and unequal effects in different parts of the world.[48]

Globalisation and neo-liberalism

The driving ideology behind globalisation is, as already hinted, neo-liberalism. It can be useful to quickly summarise some of the most important features of neo-liberalism for the further understanding. However, I am simply focusing on those features that are mostly relevant to this thesis. Neo-liberalistic thought emphasise the role of the market above the state, and think that the state should reduce its role in regulating the economy. It further stresses that the market is the most efficient means of allocating resources, and that countries should liberalise and open their economies to foreign trade and investment.[49]

Development in the beginning of 1990s lead the way for neo-liberal expansion all over the world, and later also the expansion of the globalisation promotion. The US hegemony, dominant elites and ruling classes within many states have been promoting this expansion of neo-liberalism. This has led to the centrality of the need to promote *competitiveness* in the global economy.[50] Namibia achieved its independence in a time were neo-liberal views were expanding, and the Vision and development plan were conceived at a time of considerable globalisation promotion. This is reflected in the two Namibian plans for development. The promotion of competitiveness in the global economy is criticised by Kiely for its unevenness. Developing countries suffers from a competitive disadvantage, and the result from such competitiveness is bound to be uneven and unequal. Already established producers capture markets and undermine potential competitors in developing countries. This is, however, not an absolute relationship. It affects developing countries in different ways and some developing countries and certain elites surely benefits from this approach. But overall the South is in a relatively marginal, subordinate position in the world economy, and neo-liberal globalisation intensifies this marginalisation.[51]

Another argument by neo-liberals is that globalisation, deepening global integration and the opening up of markets promotes *growth* and therefore poverty reduction. However, Kiely argues that this approach over-estimates the ease which developing countries can break into new export markets, and that the liberalisation of free trade undermines the capacity of developing countries to develop dynamic comparative advantages due to the current uneven international context.[52]

---

[48] Kiely (2007), p. 5

[49] Jauch (2001), p. 17f

[50] Kiely (2007), p. 227

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid., p. 158

Globalisation and development

As said, I will now further look into the relationship between globalisation and development by describing different views of globalisation that is correlating with views of development. Kiely describes a neo-liberal approach to globalisation that emphasises that everyone can win from globalisation provided that each state adopts the correct policies. Kiely calls this approach "globalisation as a Win-Win situation". This view states that each country should specialise in exercising its *comparative advantage*, which means that each country specializes in producing those goods or services that it can produce most effectively, and in that way be part of the increasing integration into the international economy. In that way each country specializes in its own comparative advantage and there is a fair trade between those countries. In this way all countries have something to gain from globalisation, as long as they adopt the right policies.[53] This neo-liberal approach is important to understand the Namibian approach towards development.

As a critique towards this view Kiely presents a view that argues that globalisation is only representing the interests of the powerful, which are mostly part of the western world. In this way some parts of the world grow at the expense of other parts and this intensifies the gap between the powerful and powerless.[54] Kiely's own view reflects the middle of these views. The relationship is not as static as the second view argued where one grows simply by the expense of others. It is more dynamic than that, but the process still is an uneven one. This is the reason that he also rejects the neo-liberal approach. Unevenness is a product of the way competitive markets work in the real world. The competition built into this perspective is an inherently uneven process where the market leaders have a competitive advantage over new entrants to national and international markets, an advantage that they are likely to exercise when promoting greater openness through trade and investment liberalisation. This could intensify the uneven development. The barriers to entry these sectors are so high, so the competitive advantage seem to remain concentrated in the developed world.[55]

The Namibian example

The globalisation as discussed above has had impact on the Namibian development and the policies that has been created. I am in the following going to give some brief examples of this. Some economist and business organisations in Namibia believe that globalisation stands to benefit Namibia. They state that it offers the opportunity for Namibia to become competitive and Namibia's investment policies are actually by large shaped by the process of globalisation and the neo-liberal line of thought that claims that developing countries have to attract investment by offering increasing recognitions to foreign investors.[56] The country has by large imported policy guidelines prescribed by international institutions, as for example IMF/World Bank policies and

---

[53] Kiely (2007), 13ff

[54] Ibid., p. 16f

[55] Ibid., p. 18ff

[56] Jauch (2001), p. 6f, 36

WTO regulations on world trade. Those who propose globalisation policies in Namibia does that in the spirit of neo-liberalism and argues that the poor will gain most from liberalising the economy. They also argue that the country will have to develop its skills base as one of the strategies to become internationally competitive, skills where the country has its comparative advantage.[57] The government policies is on the one hand subscribing to the neo-liberal line of thought, but on the other hand also promoting the Small and Medium Size Enterprises Sector (SME) as key sectors for job creation. This creates a tension between the various policies, according to Jauch, Edwards and Cupido. Trade liberalisation has in for example other African countries favoured large Transnational Corporation's (TNCs) and this has lead to the destruction of local industries. SMEs tend to be the first causality in the liberalisation process, they argue. It can be hard to attempt both strategies at the same time. The rules of the World Trade Organisation tend to reflect the interests of industrialised countries and their transitional companies. As a member of the WTO, Namibia is bound by their rules and might find it difficult to reconcile their rules with the programmes aimed at supporting and building local SME sector and specific industrial sectors.[58]

There are, however, also signs of a different approach in Namibia, and Jauch, Edwards and Cupido stresses the need to eliminate or minimise imperial interventions by the global actors such as the IMF, the World Bank and the G8.[59] They criticise the neo-liberal approach in Namibia and that the globalisation process is imagined to benefit the people of Namibia.[60] Several organisations in Namibia have taken up the struggle against the proposed Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs) between the EU and ACP Countries, for this purpose.[61] These different approaches call for a change in Namibian policy strategies towards reducing inequality and poverty. Such alternative approach holds that *"[t]he market-based development paradigm of the past decades simply offers no hope for the poor."*[62]

Universalistic approach as global governance

Twenty years ago Namibia achieved its independence and the 106 years of colonial rule was over. Despite this fact there are some scholars who have started to question if we really can talk about a post-colonial era, whether the talk about colonialism really has lost it significance.[63] In the most obvious way, such statements regard the continued impact that colonial eras still has in several post-colonial countries, Namibia being a clear example of that. Scholars who stress this fact also stress another important fact, namely the colonialism *within*, towards the people living in the outskirts of the nation. This refers to the way that liberated and independent nation-states only

---

[57] Jauch (2001), p. 36

[58] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 29f

[59] Ibid., p. 69

[60] Jauch (2001), p. 8

[61] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 70f

[62] Ibid., p. 76f

[63] Ania Loomba (2005), *Kolonialism/Postkolonialism*, (Hägersten),p. 245

have created a selective and unequal distribution of the fruits from independence.[64] Another stipulation that can be, and is, discussed in the Namibian context. However, the way that colonialism can come to be relevant for my thesis is by large another, and can be described as either global governance in a global era, or simply as modern imperialism.

The above discussion on globalisation and neo-liberalism reflects the need to discuss development in a context of such global governance, or even modern imperialism, coloured by universalistic claims. The era of colonialism may be concluded to be over, but, as Berg states, the foundation for a modern universalistic thought is the same as have been seen before; there is one way to understand the world, and this way has always been defined in the West. The universalism of today is ultimately bound with relations to a united market, but also to global risks, global catastrophes, ecological disorder and epidemical sickness, which makes us think of a united earth.[65] In this global era transnational arrangements, bilateral agreements and multilateral institutions regulate events, which has effects that isn't bound to the nation-state borders. International organisations, summits and agreements, such as the United Nations, World Trade Organisation, World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, addresses issues that are viewed as genuinely global and transcend nation-state.[66] The global universalistic approach can further be seen in the development aid agenda that, as argued earlier with reference to Odén, is more of a joint global agenda, now more then ever.[67] Loomba argues that the globalisation of today and the movement of capital have created a market fundamentalism correlating with a neo-liberalistic fundamentalism. This has both created new possibilities, but are also consolidating global unequal relations and dividing lines.[68]

The modern imperialism consist largely by powerful organisations such as the TNCs, which try to control the global economy while nation-states feel compelled to offer a 'competitive' environment to attract investment. Jauch argues that countries that have not been willing to adopt economic policies which hold on to the assumptions of neo-liberalism and globalisation have often been pressured into doing so by the World Bank and IMF which have made economic liberalisation a condition for qualifying for a loan. This has made an increasing number of countries self-impose a neo-liberal economic framework based upon the assumption that individual countries cannot in their own resist globalisation, and in the belief that there are no viable macro-policy alternatives.[69]

The universalistic approaches of today can also be seen behind the work of the United Nations. The UN is described on their own website as being *the global centre for consensus-*

---

[64] Loomba (2005), p. 22ff

[65] Berg (2004), p. 58

[66] Kiely (2007), p. 107f

[67] Bertil Odén (2006), p. 35f, 143

[68] Loomba (2005), p. 245f

[69] Jauch (2001), p. 13, 19

building"[70]. This approach is very much present as a global development agenda, and as such it has effects for Namibian plans for development. The UN recognise that there are global problems that transcend national boundaries, and further that there is a commonality of interests between rich and poor countries in solving these problems. Problems that are said to require coordinated action. The UN takes on the role to coordinate these actions, and state that it has played a crucial role in building international consensus of action for development.[71] With this said it seems possible that the Namibian planning for development are interlinked with the UN:s consensus-building on development.

Kiely draws the conclusion that the hierarchies that characterise the globalisation existence, such as the capacity of some states to determine, or strongly influence, the actions of others, and the unevenness and inequality of international capitalist accumulation, concludes that we still can talk of imperialism.[72]

Governmentality

As the section above suggest a form of global governance for development and global powers, I am now going to add to the discussion by taking up a specific form of governance. This is a concept that by large is owed to Foucault's work, and is referred to as *governmentality*.[73] It is described as the form of power or governing in accordance with the modern state and is linked to changes in government together with the weakening of the welfare state and the hegemony of the neo-liberal discourse in governance.[74] Even though it has mostly been discussed in a post-industrial, post-welfare manner according to the modern western states, the analysis will show that the theory has relevance also in the Namibian post-colonial governing. Governmentality refers to the power structures of modern government as a non-forceful power to make its citizens govern themselves, and other. It represents governing from a distance and the need to create the population as subjects who are willingly adapting to fit into the norm.[75] This sort of governance is integral to democratic governments, which depend upon the people's ability to participate as responsible citizens. Democratic governments are in that way limited in their capacity to govern, and therefore needs to rely on the citizens to voluntarily subject themselves to power. Empowerment and self-esteem are important tools for producing this sort of self-governing citizens.[76] It further requires specific disciplinary technologies, such as examination,

---

[70] United Nations, "About Development", http://www.un.org/en/development/other/overview.shtml, From the Internet 2010-03-24

[71] Ibid.

[72] Kiely (2007), p. 261

[73] Nikolas Rose (1996), "Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies" in Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nikolas Rose (1996), *Foucault and political reason*, (London). p. 41

[74] Jonna Johansson (2007), *Learning To Be(come) A Good European*, (Linköping), p. 27f

[75] Ibid., p. 29-42

[76] Barbara Cruikshank, (1996), "Revolutions within" in Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nikolas Rose (ed.), (1996), *Foucault and political reason*, (London), p. 233-247

observation and statistical normalisation, which make the population observable and calculable. The power is no longer used explicit, but through different technologies, such as the institutions of a country and specifically education and training, which can be used to create citizens capable of governing themselves. Another governmentality technology that can be used by politicians to justify their decisions is risk. The actions are then justified as protection against certain explicit or implicit threats.[77] Liberal societies becomes dependent on these technologies, or devices, that promise to create individuals who do not need to be governed by others but will govern themselves, devices like, education as said, and family, the reformatory prison, and so forth.[78]

Mode of Procedure and Methodological Implications

In this section I am going to describe the way in which the analysis process is conducted, the method of choice, and the implications that I have encountered. Some of these implications have already been discussed in accordance with the demarcation chapter in the beginning. I am now going to connect these implications to the analysis and mode of procedure. In order to fulfil the aim for the thesis I have applied to a specific form of discourse analysis, which has been described in the beginning of this chapter as Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, CDA.

As I described in the beginning of the thesis, several encounters when I first arrived in Namibia steered me towards the field of development. However, the more specific course of the analytical process has changed throughout the whole process. It has been important for me to have a reflexive and open approach towards the field. This approach is also correlating with the fact that I had just arrived in a, for me, foreign country with almost no ideas of what to expect. This is important for the way the thesis has been carried out. The plan that I had imagined for the thesis when I still was in Sweden does not reflect the outcome. The reflexive and open approach towards the aim for this thesis made it possible to let the material steer me in a relevant direction. The reflexive and open approach has helped me to see my own place in the study and the new, and in some ways difficult, position I was in, and realising my preconditions. My base is in Sweden, my thesis is about Namibia. This lead to the fact that I couldn't use the tools that were well known for me, I had to start with finding new ways to approach the writing of a thesis. The, in some ways, lack of knowledge from the beginning can be seen with both positive and negative eyes. It lead to a more careful and thoroughly investigation of, first of all, area of interest and second a possible field. The lack of knowledge could actually mean that it is harder to get stuck in presuppositions and assumptions, and that it could be easier to spot and refute those pre-conceptions that you have. In the beginning everything was new.

In order to analyse discourses of development in the Namibian political context I have chosen a material that can represent the political approach towards development in Namibia. The material consists of plans, goals and visions over and for Namibia's development process. One long-term national vision that visions where it experiences the country to be, and where it wants

---

[77] Johansson, p. 29-42

[78] Nikolas Rose, (1996), p. 45

to be, *Namibia Vision 2030*, and one implementation plan for development, *Third National Development Plan*. These documents are public published political documents, which don't require any consent to analyse, or any requirements to hide the source behind the material. The political approach in the documents rather makes it important to account for the source of the material. These documents represent the Namibian Governments view of development, in the specific context of the documents. According to Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, signs in a text are always socially motivated, and there are social reasons for the way a text is formed. A text is also building on other texts and discursive practices, which brings different meanings to texts.[79] The creation of the documents in the specific way it is formed, the motivation of different signs, and their combinations, are therefore socially constructed, but also socially constructing, and as such the documents are being analysed. The mode to do this in the framework of Fairclough is a three-dimensional approach, which already has been described in the beginning of this chapter. Texts are language, discursive practice and social practice. These three levels are not separated in my analysis, but rather complementing and deeply connected to each analysis part, and the analysis has been done dialectical. The textual level consists of linguistically and textual analysis close to the text and the quotes. This is correlated with the way that it forms discursive practice and builds on other texts and discourses. To be able to interpret these discursive practices I have used social theories, and this is analysis of social practice in my thesis. The social practices of the development discourses are further discussed in the Discussion chapter.[80]

I am now going to describe the different analytical tools and methodological standpoints that I have found useful when conducting the analysis. I have, however, found that Fairclough's critical discourse analysis lacks in close textual tools for analysis, at least that fits my material and analysis. Because of that I have borrowed some analytical tools from other discourse analyse scholars to better comprehend the material. This will be expressed when describing the tool in question. This will also be clearer in the analysis itself, when I am able to show how I have done. In the analytical process I have looked at the usage of different *signs*, and how some words seems to be more intensely worded than other. This is to analyse how signs are part of a political and social struggle. I have particularly looked at how the sentences are built up through the use of different specific signs, and how these signs are put together. This means further to analyse the *word meanings*, in Fairclough's methodological approach. I have used this to look at how different meanings of words are built up, put together and stand in conflict with other signs. This also means to analyse *cohesion*. I have analysed this through how different signs and clauses are put together in meaning, how the documents build on signs from other discourses, the *repeating* of certain words, and the use of *synonyms* for a word.[81]

Using these tools I have interpreted how signs and nodes are formed together in different meanings of development. This is analysis of the discursive practice. To be able to see how the

---

[79] Fairclough (1992), p. 74

[80] Inspired by Fairclough (1992), p. 70f

[81] Ibid., 75ff

texts build on different discourses when talking of development I have used the term *interdiscursivity*. Texts build on other discourses to form meaning. To analyse interdiscursivity is to see how texts use elements from the order of discourse when talking of development.[82] This has further helped me to outline four *discourses* in the field of development, which both correlates and stand in conflict with each other. The analysis of these is analysis of *the order of discourse*, which means to analyse how different discourses struggle over meaning in the same field.[83] These discourses have been interpreted through analysing social practices. The analysis has been done dialectically between theory, method and analysis. The interpretations therefore also build on other social theories. I have also seen how these discourses take part in a *struggle over hegemony* in the order of discourse. The four discourses build on ideological constructions when creating meanings of development. I have identified that there is a struggle over such meanings in the text and that the meanings are unstable. I also suggest that this struggle use different tools to form naturalization. Hegemonic struggle is seen in the articulation, disarticulation and rearticulating of elements. It is also seen in contradictions in the order of discourse, and the articulation and rearticulating in such order, which is at stake.[84] This will be made clearer in the analysis.

One analytical tool that has been useful for analysing the documents is that of *metaphors*. I have used the metaphors in the text to interpret the meanings of a saying, and how they can be interpreted as structuring systems of knowledge and belief. [85] Metaphors entail something about the discourse, and by analysing the meanings of the metaphor I can interpret the way the documents view development. I have borrowed some analytical tools and wordings from *Discourse theory* as described by Marianne Winther Jorgensen and Louise Phillips. Discourse theory uses *nodes* to outline discourse. Nodes are privileged signs around which the other signs are arranged and from which their meaning is established.[86] I have identified specific nodes in the documents, through which the analysis is structured and development is analysed. These nodes have formed discourses. The use of the different nodes in different ways has also allowed me to see struggles over meanings in discourse. I have also borrowed the tool of *chains of equivalence* to see how certain nodes, or signs, are chained together in a specific quote.[87] This has helped me to interpret meanings of development, and how the nodes are correlating to each other in a specific quote, which also sometimes form a struggle over meaning. I have also borrowed the rhetorical tool of *extreme formulations* from Jonathan Potter and *Discourse Psychology*.[88] Extreme formulations can be words that are reinforcing, and are used in my thesis to analyse how the documents reinforce a statement to either justify the saying, or argue for something specific. The more specific use of the tools and mode of procedure will be clarified throughout the whole analysis.

---

[82] Fairclough (1992), p. 84f

[83] Winther Jorgensen & Phillips (2000), p. 76

[84] Fairclough (1992), p. 87ff, 92ff

[85] Ibid., p. 194f

[86] Winther Jorgensen & Phillips (2000), p. 33

[87] Ibid., p. 50ff

[88] Jonathan Potter, (1996), *Representing Reality*, (London), p. 107

Analysis

The overall aim for the analysis is to analyse discourses of development in the Namibian political context, and the rhetoric behind the planning for development, in Fairclough's three-dimensional approach. I am therefore going to discuss and analyse how the documents talk about development, how they build on correlating discourses in the planning for development, and how this can be interpreted together with correlated social theories. I am analysing how the documents form alliances and partnerships with such interlinked discourses and social theories, but also how they stand in conflict with each other. The foundation for the analysis, built on Fairclough's theoretical framework, is that the documents, through the creation and choice of different statements and the building on other and previous statements, take part in constructing systems of knowledge and belief. However, there are always possibilities of change, through struggles over different use of statements and possible new ways of using a statement. In this specific analysis this regards the creation and building on ways to talk about development. The documents are both reproducing talks of development as it is, but also contributing to transforming the development thinking and society.

I have in the analysis seen four discourses that are integral to how the Namibian government, through the two documents, view development. These discourses both dictates and change the course for the development. Two of the discourses, which are being analysed first in this analysis, take part in the struggle over meanings of development in the Namibian plans for development. The other two are more connected to how the Government visions development to happen, and are structures of development that take part in a struggle over the course of development. However, the four discourses are also very much integral to each other and are part of a network of discourses that shapes and reshapes the Namibian Governments views of development, the order of discourse.

The analysis that follows is structured into two comprehensive chapters. The first chapter is outlining *meanings* of development, and in so doing describing a prevailing conflict over such meanings. I have seen two discourses that struggle within the Namibian government's views of meanings of development, two discourses that I refer to as *Discourse of Tradition* and *Discourse of Modernity*. The second chapter are concerned with *structures* in the Namibian governments talking of how to achieve development. Even here two discourses are struggling to reach naturalisation in discourse. These discourses can be described as a *Social Equity and Justice Discourse* and a *Neo-liberal Market Discourse*. However, these discourses cannot totally be separated from each other, whereby the one also can be seen in the other.

Meanings of Development

In this chapter I am going to discuss different use of the word development and therefore its different meanings. However, meanings of development in the documents are an overall focus in the thesis, and will be analysed throughout the whole analysis. The chapter consists of the different meanings of development that is expressed in the analysis, which eventually stretches

out as two discourses that struggle over such meanings. I have identified one Discourse of Tradition and one Discourse of Modernity. Tradition is expressed as being the platform for development, and modernity as being its aim. And I am analysing how the documents both connect and separate the two. In this chapter I analyse meanings of development by looking at the different *signs* connected to development, the use of near *synonyms* and the *repeating* of different signs. This is further to analyse how the signs are used in sentences to form *cohesion*. I use the term *chain of equivalence* to see what signs are connected to each other in a specific quote.

Towards Modernity

Namibia Vision 2030 begins with a foreword by the former President of Namibia, Sam Nujoma, where he states the reasons for the Vision 2030, changes that are expected and the challenges that are ahead. Development in the two documents is expressed both explicitly and implicitly.

> A national vision is a perception of the future, which reveals and points to something new, beyond what is already available and accessible. The goal of our Vision is to improve the quality of life of the people of Namibia to the level of their counterparts in the developed world, by 2030. In order to get there, we need a framework that defines clearly where we are today as a nation, where we want to be by 2030 and how to get there.[89]

This quote by the former President is part of shaping the Namibian Governments views of meanings with development. This the beginning quote emphasis implicit signs of development used in the documents. The signs "future", "points to", "new", "beyond" and "improve" form a *chain of equivalence* that are important for understanding how to interpret development in the documents. Such a chain of equivalence can be seen as different synonyms for development. They imply *movement* and *progress* as ways to interpret development. The connotations of "new" and "beyond" further connect development to *change* and *transition*. It is also possible to interpret development as *action*, especially when looking at connotations of "improve", which synonyms are 'progress' and the active form of development, to 'develop'. The next quote will also point to the action form of development.

> *Ensuring* that the health […] *Strengthening* the health system […] *Promoting* institution and human capacity-building […] *Effectively decentralising* health services […] *Developing* the HIS […] *Establishing* a research institution […] *Strengthening* and *expanding* Information, Education and Communication (IEC) programme, and *ensure* its effective and efficient implementation […] *Formulating* an occupational health policy […] *Ensuring* the availability […] *Changing* the policy […].[90] (My italics)

Development as action can be seen in the documents through the usage of signs correlating to action. Such as in this quote where different signs of action form a chain of equivalence, for example *ensuring, strengthening, promoting, developing, establishing, expanding, formulating,* and *changing*. These are all signs that points to action inherited in development thinking in the documents. Development is in this quote also connected to change, and I am going to discuss the change part of development some more. Change is also transformation, which Sam Nujoma points to

---

[89] Vision 2030, p. 9

[90] Ibid., p. 60

when stating, *"The Vision will transform Namibia […]"*[91]. The process of development will transform Namibia, from where it is today to something new, something for the future, as the first quote in this section also pointed to, *"[a] national vision is a perception of the future, which reveals and points to something new, beyond what is already available and accessible."*[92]. Development through the quotes that have been lifted is connected to movement, progress, change, transition and action, which have been interpreted through the use of different synonyms for development. These signs have formed chains of equivalence in the specific quotes that connects them to each other, and development. These signs is emphasised throughout the documents, which the following also will point to.

> Namibia's long-run future depends on its being able to make the transition from a resource-dependent economy, to one which thrives as a producer of manufactures and services. This is achieved through investment in people – in education and health – of a quantity and quality sufficient to reverse the devastating legacy of apartheid and colonialism.[93]

This quote further emphasises the transition that Namibia has to make. It is expressed as going from "a resource-dependent economy" to "a producer of manufactures and services". The quote also connects to the history of Namibia, which further implies that a resource-dependent economy is the past, and a producer of manufactures and services is the future. I have already before stressed this focus of the past, present and the direction towards the future. In this quote the history and its legacy need to be reversed, which can be interpreted as a metaphor for being on the wrong track. The quote further implicates leaving the past behind. If I connect the signs "reverse" and "devastating" to the other signs "quantity", "quality" and "sufficient", this transition also becomes about going from something that is on the wrong track and, with the metaphor devastating, destructive, to something that with the use of synonyms can be interpreted filled with capacity, value and that is satisfying. Development in this quote is about transition, of going from negative connotations to more positive connotations. It is going from something old, history, to something new, reversing the history. This can further be connected to ideas of modernity, and of being modern.

> The modern world is moving from heavy industry to a knowledge-based economy based on specialist services, specialised industries, communications, and information technologies. Namibia needs to fast track its development process, and springboard over the heavy industry development path taken by the industrialised countries. […] To achieve this, we will have to transform ourselves into an innovative, knowledge-based society, supported by a dynamic, responsive and highly effective education and training system.[94]

The quote expresses the modern world as an example of, firstly, being modern and what that means, and secondly that this is the place Namibia aims for. The aim for the development in this quote is to become modern and to reach the place that the already modern world has reached. In this quote the already developed world therefore sets the agenda for development. The use of the

---

[91] Vision 2030, p. 9

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid., p. 103

[94] Ibid., p. 77

signs "fast track", "springboard" and "transform" can be interpreted as metaphors for a *divide* between the place were the modern world are assumed to be and the place that Namibia is in. The divide is both in *time* since they need to fast track as in speed up the process, and in *space* since they need to springboard as in using tools to jump long. To be able to make this leap over this divide they have to *transform* as in change to something new. I want to connect this interpretation, and the other interpretations over how Namibian documents talk about development, to the theoretical discussion about ideas of development, which I had in the theoretical part of the thesis. I pointed to ideas of modernisation that was, by some, referred to as the modernisation paradigm. These ideas were active in the post-war period and then challenged by the neo-liberal views in the 1980s. However, the idea of progress and modernity as an old debate[95] is still very present in the Namibian view of development seen in the documents. Connected to the modernisation theory, as explained in the theoretical part, development is emphasised as progress and movement towards technologically and institutionally forms of 'modern' society. This is, amongst other, happening through interventions from the more developed world to the less developed world. Long describes this as *"'traditional' society is propelled into the modern world".*[96] In the spirit of this theory the Namibian document emphasis, as have been shown, development as *progress*, *change*, *transitions* and *movement* towards the future and from one place to another, and further it is also *action*. The documents also emphasises that the aim for development is to transform into a modern society. I have interpreted this transformation as having to leap over a divide that is present between the already developed world and the developing countries. The creation of this divide in the quote, and the importance that is put in making the leap over the divide, can further be interpreted as it is the already developed countries, or as expressed in the quote "the modern world", that still depict the path for development. This also fits into the modernisation theory, which states that development of the less developed world is happening from interventions from the more developed world. The less developed world is in this theory expressed as "traditional society". I have seen that tradition is very present in the Namibian plans for development and I will continue to discuss this in the following part. I have however seen that there is a conflict in the way that the Namibian documents both acknowledge and celebrates tradition, but at the same time rejecting it.

A struggle over meaning

In Namibian development planning tradition has a significant role, but in some contradictive ways. The integration of both traditional and modern in the Namibian culture is described as one of the countries many comparative advantages, the documents emphasise, *"Namibia has a large number of comparative and competitive advantage over other countries in the world"*[97]. One of these is *"the unique blend of traditional and modern"*:

---

[95] Kiely (2007), p. 9

[96] Long (2001), p. 10

[97] Vision 2030, p. 32

> Namibia is a country where people are proud of their culture, and take it with them in the development pathway, thereby evolving a unique blend of traditional and modern, in ways that integrate social harmony with economic growth and progress.[98]

In this quote tradition becomes an integral part of the development of the country into a modern state. The sign "tradition" is connected to "culture" and these are further connected to the sign "people", "development" and "modern". Development is connected to becoming modern, and tradition is connected to the culture and people, which brings tradition along the modernisations process. Tradition and culture seems to be attached to the people who are entering the path of development. This is expressed as something positive, as one of Namibia's "comparative advantages". However, the next quote will show that there is a struggle built into that view.

> We cherish our national sovereignty and it must be preserved at all costs; great value is also attached to Namibian tradition and culture. However traditional ideas and practices which tend to inhibit progress towards development targets, may be sacrificed in the interest of the nation.[99]

This quote expresses this struggle. The signs "tradition" and "culture" is attached to the signs "great" and "value", in a similar matter as the quote above connected tradition and culture to comparative advantage mixed with modernity. However, the second half of the quote connects "development" to the "nation" and interests, while "tradition" is connected to "inhibit", which create a divide between two sides. *Inhibit* is a metaphor for a potential hinder for development, and therefore the interests of the nation. It is interesting to connect the two quotes above. In the first quote tradition and culture were connected to people. If we bring this connection with us to this second quote, it can be interpreted as sacrificing the interests of the people for the interests of the nation. This quote further separates *development* from *tradition*, and therefore also the nation from the people, and see them as, possibly, opposed to each other. This is rearticulating the way that tradition and culture were described in the previous quote, and could be signs of a *hegemonic struggle* between the emphasis of culture as complementing the modern, and as inhibiting the development process, which can further be seen as a conflict between tradition and development. This can be a sign of a change in discourse. If tradition and culture don't follow the development path, they have to be sacrificed and left behind in the same matter as the past has been left behind in earlier quotes. In order to develop the traditional has to change, or be sacrificed. It is a sign of struggle and change in the way of thinking, and the progress that the country wishes to make.

The struggle can also be seen in the way that Namibia seem to reply to earlier stereotypical pictures of African countries, and further implies the need for change and transition. This points to a struggle over images towards the country, and the striving to change specific images of the country in the development process. The quotes reply to stereotypical views of African countries as being undeveloped, passive and with a lack of good governance and institutions. Deeply integrated in the development process is the aim of being on the same level as the already

---

[98] Vision 2030, p. 33

[99] Ibid., p. 34

developed countries, as seen above. The next quote exemplifies the striving towards changing the relationship between the industrialised countries and Namibia. *"To achieve qualitative change in relations between Namibia and industrialised countries, which transforms Namibia from an aid-recipient country to a trading state and business partner."*[100] The quote implies that the current relationship is not viewed as satisfying. The change lies in the signs "recipient" and "partner". Recipient points to an image of being passive, while partner points to being active and on the same level. This show the course of the wish to change the relationship, Namibia wants to go from being seen as a passive receiver to and active partner on the same level as the industrialised countries. Such change in rhetoric's can also be seen within the area of development aid. Maria Eriksson Baaz states that this area has for some time tried to change the stereotypical relationship between Africa and Europe and create a more equal relationship. This has particularly been done with a change in rhetoric's. Concepts like 'donor', 'recipient' and 'aid' has been abandoned for signs like 'partnerships', 'development cooperation' and similar.[101] This change is very much similar to the way that Namibia is trying to change their image and relationship with the industrialised countries. Such similarities in rhetoric between the area of development aid and the Namibian documents for development can imply that the Namibian government has assimilated the rhetoric's from the aid area into its own development rhetoric's. This suggests intertextuality between the rhetoric's, according to Fairclough's critical analysis. Eriksson Baaz also implies another relevant rhetoric in the aid area. I refer to the talk of the developing countries as being 'aid dependent'. According to the talk of aid dependency, the aid has created a culture of dependency and passivity in the receiving countries, and amongst other this passivity is supposed to change trough the partnership relation referred to above. This means to activate the receiver so that it can take responsibility for its own development, and learn to use its resources well.[102] The Namibian documents are replying to such images also, and refute them, when stating, *"[…] Namibia is not aid-dependent as is the case with number of African countries where aid constitutes more that 50% of the government budget"*[103]. With this quote the documents refute the image of Namibia being passive and dependent, but also confirms the overall image of African countries being aid-dependent. In this way they confirms the picture, but draw themselves out of it and therefore creates a new position for themselves. In the following quote the documents are responding directly to such images, which confirms the analysis above.

> Since Independence 1990, Namibia has occupied a high international profile. This high profile has contributed towards countering the widely perceived marginalisation of the African continent. Namibia exemplifies to the international community a model African country with democratic governance, peace, political and civic stability, the rule of law and low level of corruption.[104]

---

[100] Vision 2030, p. 187

[101] Eriksson Baaz (2001), p. 160f, 166

[102] Ibid., p. 175ff

[103] Vision 2030, p. 184

[104] Ibid., p.179

In this quote the documents is directly replying to the stereotypical and negative picture of Africa and the marginalisation of the continent. Namibia is connected to "high profile" and "a model African country" and this is connected to "countering" the "widely perceived", which aims at those stereotypical images. Through this chain of equivalence the documents recognise the stereotypical image, but once again take themselves out of the picture, and thereby changing it. Present in the quote, and all quotes above, is "the international community" mostly also referred to as the industrialised or already developed countries. The international community is both expressed as being those who have the stereotypical image that needs to be change, seen in the use of the signs "exemplifies to", and also as being the model for the country to transform to, as the previous discussion above implied. They are both the aim for the development, and those that needs to be convinced of Namibia's advantages.

To conclude this chapter I have shown that Namibia is establishing meanings of development that correlates with the modernisation theory, discussed in the theoretical chapter, where development is seen as progress, movement, transition, action and change of the traditional to the modern. In this way a traditional and a modern discourse dictates meanings of development. However, I further saw a conflict in such a meaning where the traditional where seen as both a complement to the modern, and inhibiting the process of development. This is a sign of change in discourse. The country is striving towards becoming developed and modern, tradition can be viewed as complementary only when it does not inhibit such a process. The change were further seen in the way that the documents are responding to stereotypical images of Africa and developing countries, and how they are trying to refute those. This is connected to meanings of development as being a process, progress and transition towards modernity and the already industrialised countries. In order to achieve such goals tradition and stereotypical images of the country has to change. Those who set the example are the already developed countries, which is possible to discuss further as the continued hegemony of these countries. I am coming back to this last point in the ending discussion chapter. I will now continue to analyse structures of development, and two prominent discourses regarding such.

Structures of Development

When analysing the material I identified certain *nodes* that seemed integral to development planning. Nodes are privileged signs around which all the other signs are ordered. These nodes, however, emerged as both connected and conflicting and they eventually formed two interrelated standpoints towards the talk of development. I interpreted these standpoints as two discourses within the order of discourse. This implies that the documents are building on already existing discourses when structuring development, which show *interdiscursivity* connected to the development discourse. The two discourses therefore structures development in the documents, and how the country visions to be developed. They both structure the talk of development, and change it. They are highly integral to each other and contradictive. Such contradictions are further interpreted as hegemonic struggle. To interpret these discourses I am analysing the social

practice of discourse with the help of relevant social theories. I have chosen to name the discourses *Social Equity and Justice Discourse* and *Neo-liberal Market Discourse*.

The Social Equity and Justice Discourse is first to be analysed in the following section. I analyse this through the use of the nodes *equity*, *equality*, *poverty reduction* and development *for all* Namibian people. This is outlining the first discourse. The chapter then continue to discuss this first discourse, but show how it is correlating with the second discourse, and neo-liberal views of development through the theory of *governmentality*. I then continue with outlining the second discourse, the *Neo-liberal Market Discourse*, through the nodes *competitive, comparative, advantage* and economic *growth*. The economic growth section continues to show how the discourses are interrelated, in a similar way that I'm doing with the first discourse, through the node of *sustainability*.

Development For All – A Social Equity and Justice Discourse

I am now going to analyse *the Social Equity and Justice Discourse*. This discourse is being outlined mostly trough the nodes of *equity, equality* and development *for all*. I have also seen it develop trough the aim for *poverty reduction*. As this discourse is part of the structures for development it is analysed as structuring *how* the Namibian government is visioning development, in what way.

The social justice discourse can be seen firstly in the description of several broad strategies for Vision 2030. One of these strategies is expressed as, *"Upholding human rights and ensuring justice, equity and equality in the fullest sense for all, regardless of gender, age, religion, ethnicity, ability or political affiliation"*[105]. In this quote the social justice discourse is expressed explicitly, with the connecting of the nodes *human rights*, *justice*, *equity* and *equality*. The discourse is also created through the emphasis of the including appellation *"for all"*. When analysing this nodes together in this quote as a chain of equivalence with the signs "upholding" and "ensuring" they are interpreted as structuring the development. Further, the appellation "for all" is *integral* for the understanding and interpreting of the social equity and justice discourse that is being analysed here, and is expressed throughout the documents in several areas. It is particularly emphasised when describing different goals, visions or objectives and seems to aim for an including environment of development. For example *"[…] is designated to promote a healthy living environment for all Namibian's through […]"*[106] and *"[…] collaborate in social and economic development for the benefit of all."*[107]. Emphasised in the quote should be the appellations *"for all Namibian's"* and *"of all"*. These quotes suggest that the development is imagined to be for all people in Namibia, and the development approach in that purpose is an *including* one, and is creating a sense of direction of development. Development is *for all* Namibians.

This including approach is also seen in the way that the documents talk about gender equality and equality between different ethnic groups, and people with disability.

---

[105] Vision 2030, p. 42

[106] Ibid., p. 57

[107] Ibid., p. 132

> Namibia is a just, moral, tolerant and safe society, with legislative, economic and social structures in place that eliminate marginalisation and ensure peace and equity between women and men, the diverse ethnic groups, and people of different interests.[108]

This quote connects signs and nodes that can be correlated to the social equity and justice discourse. The signs of "just", "moral", "tolerant", "safe", "peace" and "equity" are typical for this discourse and are further connected to "eliminate marginalisation", "men", "women", "groups" and "people". This implies the including approach of this discourse when connecting the signs of the discourse to the action "eliminate marginalisation" and further to individuals. It further implies that development in a just and equitable society is something that is given to the people through the structures created by the social equity and justice discourse. It can therefore be interpreted as a *right* that the people have for being Namibians. I will, however, further ahead suggest a contradicting approach to the interpretation that social justice is *given* to the people. This next quote correlates with the view of development as a right. *"To ensure that children remain disciplined and have an inalienable right to survival, development, protection and participation in the development of society."*[109] In this quote I am firstly focusing on the signs "inalienable", "right" and "development". This chain of equivalence suggests that development is seen as a right. Synonyms to the sign "inalienable" suggest that this right is one that is unchallengeable, absolute and undeniable. This further implies that development has similarities to a human right in the documents. Development is given the same status, in this quote, as "survival", "protection" and also "participation in the development of society". The last emphasis of participation in development as a right is signs of action in the discourse. I am going to analyse how this action is discussed with regard to the social equity and justice discourse in the next section of this chapter. The above analyse of this discourse as an including one, and also as a right, has intertextual connotations with the way that UN describes development in their Millennium Declaration, which for example can be seen in the following quote; *"No individual and no nation can be denied the possibility to benefit from development. Equal rights and possibilities for men and women must be guaranteed."*[110] This quote emphasis development as a right and also has the including approach, that has been discussed, of "no individual can be denied" such right. This quote shows the possibility of an intertextual relationship between the Namibian development plans and the UN Millennium Declaration.

The including approach connected to the social equity and justice discourse, through the appellation "for all Namibians", are now further going to be connected to the node *the people*. This node also takes part in building up the discourse, but, as will be shown, also challenge it. I have up until now been discussing development to be viewed as a right in the documents, that it

---

[108] Vision 2030, p. 109

[109] Ibid., p. 115

[110] Svenska FN-förbundet (2007), "Millenniedeklaration", http://www.fn.se/fn-info/verksamhetsomraden/utveckling-och-fattigdomsbekampning/millenniedeklarationen/, From the Internet 2010-03-24, p. 6

is something that is given to the people. I am now going to add to that picture with saying that the people also are both the *aim* for and the *tool* for development.

> The development of our country is in our hands, and our people are the most important resource of the country; therefore, we consider investing in people and our institutions to be a crucial precondition for the desired social and economic transformation. This calls for increasing investments in institution-building, in education and training (including promotion of science and technology), and implementing health/population and related programmes and policies.[111]

The quote explains the people of Namibia as the most important resource for development of the country. The quote connects the node "people" to the sign "resource", which can be interpreted as the people are viewed as the *tool* for development, as I suggested above. The connection of the "people" to the sign "investing" further suggests that they also are the *aim* for the development. The use of the expression "most important" in connection with the "people" and "development" implicates that this needs to be emphasised. It can be seen as an extreme formulation, together with the sign *crucial*. The people as the aim for the development is also expressed through the moment "empowering", and the aim for the development of the people are therefore that the people are being empowered. To create social justice in this context means to empower the people to take charge of their own development. This is particularly seen in the way the documents talk about rural development.

> […] Crucially, it [rural development] involves creating a political, legal, economic and social service environment which enables and empowers the rural people and communities to take charge of their own development. […] Rural development, although focusing on poorer and vulnerable population groups, does not focus exclusively on the poor but on reducing poverty through inclusive approaches where everybody has a chance to participate and benefit from resources and services.[112]

The social justice discourse is seen in the quote through the node of "reducing poverty" and the referring to an "inclusive approach" and connected to the sign "everybody". In this quote the inclusive approach don't just refers to development *for* "everybody", but also development *of* everybody. This is seen through the signs "enables" and "empowers" connected to the rural "people", which once again suggests that the people are the aim for development. This is further connected to the clause "take charge of their own development", which suggests that the people also is the tool for development, but in this case they are the tool to develop the aim, that are themselves. The people are in this quote supposed to develop themselves.

These discussions above gets to introduce the social equity and justice discourse, where social justice is built around nodes of equality, equity, and the including approaches and appellations, like for example "for all Namibians". I have suggested that the social justice approach is an including approach where development is imagined to be for all. I have analysed development to be "for all", and suggested that development further was viewed as a right connected to the people of Namibia. I then analysed the node "the people" further and suggested

---

[111] Vision 2030, p. 33

[112] NDP3, p. 195

that development was not just given to the people as a right, but the people was also seen as both the tool and aim for development. I am now going to build on this approach and suggest that there is a struggle between the social equity and justice discourse and the neo-liberal market discourse, and that such struggle can be seen in how the documents talk about the people.

Creating self-governing subjects

I will further show that this conclusion, that the people are at the centre of development as both the tool and aim for development, takes part in a broader theoretical understanding of governmentality. The theory of governmentality has mostly been connected to modern post-industrial capitalist western states, but as will be made explicit in the following it has some reference points to the Namibian governance. In the following it will be discussed as a specific form of power that is creating a picture of the good citizen as one that can make itself competitive on the labour market. The Namibian government, in strict governmentality spirit, does this on the premises of the best interest of its citizens, at the same time as it is creating the picture of a "common public subjectivity", as described by Jonna Johansson, that can help increase productivity.[113] I will show that the node "the people" and the development "for all" and "of all", and even "by all", which were analysed as part of the social equity and justice discourse, will be connected to the neo-liberal market discourse. The nodes of the neo-liberal market discourse that are emphasised in this chapter are "competitive", "market", and economic "growth". The following quote express the dualistic structures of this approach.

> An effective education and training system is fundamental to generating the skills and knowledge that are critical for the country to prosper and compete in international markets. In addition to economic gains, such a system has broader benefits that are crucial to development. These benefits include: poverty reduction and social equity including gender equality; a social vaccine for HIV/AIDS; improved absorptive capacity for other social services […]; better social participation and the resultant participatory democracy; and good governance.[114]

This quote emphasises the preparation of the people and creating skilled citizens through education and training, which can make the country competitive on the international markets. The quote connects the two discourses trough the signs "compete" and "international markets" on the one hand and "poverty reduction", "social equity" and "equality" on the other. The two discourses are both expressed as being central to development and are connected through the people, and more specifically the signs "skills" and "knowledge". These signs are "critical", for the neo-liberal market discourse, so that the country can compete in international markets. They are further "crucial" for the social equity and justice discourse for creating poverty reduction and social equity. The signs "critical" and "crucial" can be seen as extreme formulations that show that this *needs* to be emphasised, and that the two discourses are both essential to development. The signs "skills" and "knowledge", which are the signs that connects the two discourses, further

---

[113] Johansson (2007), p. 27f

[114] NDP3, p. 135

needs to be connected to a subject, and I am with the next quote suggesting that such subjects are the people of Namibia or, more specifically in this quote, the youth.

> Ensure that the young people of Namibia are educated, skilled, motivated, confident, assiduous, responsible and healthy, and are thus empowered to play an active role in shaping a better society, which will be their inheritance and their duty to sustain and manage in the future.[115]

This objective from the Vision 2030 shows that the skilled subject is the people of Namibia, specifically the young by connecting the sign "skilled" to the "young people of Namibia". This shows that the two discourses are connected through the people. It further expresses a specific view of the citizen when attaching certain values to "the people". The people are "educated", "skilled", "motivated", "confident", "assiduous", "responsible" and "healthy", they are also "active". They are also having a "role" in the development, through "shaping a better society". Through the signs "duty", "sustain" and "manage" I interpret that the people have an obligation to this development. The next quote further points to the responsibility of citizens to develop the society, and themselves.

> Empower the youth by fostering proper upbringing of young women and men to become responsible citizens and enabling youth to initiate actions which promote their own development and that of their communities and the broader society.[116]

Through these quotes development are no longer seen as a right, it is rather seen as a "duty" or a "responsibility". This can be seen in the chain of equivalence pointing to "empowerment", "fostering", "responsible", "citizens" and "development", their own and the society. Empowerment now becomes the tool through which people are fostered into responsible citizens that take charges of their own development. A picture of the 'good citizen' emerge, one that is responsible, self-governing and take charge of its own development, and that of the broader society. The people, or the citizens, that connects the two discourses are not any citizens, as can be seen in the two quotes, they are above all responsible and self-governing, which are typical for the governmentality perspective. The government need to empower the people to govern themselves.

I am now going to continue and discuss *how* the documents seems to motivate the self-governing, and how they govern the citizens into becoming *good* citizens. The quotes above have already suggested that "skills" and "knowledge" are connected to development, and therefore also education and training, and is often discussed in contexts of governmentality[117]. I am, however, going to suggest also another tool for creating such citizens. The following quote points to such tool.

> Productive and competitive human resources and institutions are critical for Namibia to accelerate economic growth and compete effectively in global markets. Without acceleration in

---

[115] Vision 2030, p. 53

[116] NDP3, p. 219

[117] Johansson (2007), p. 36f

> economic growth, it is difficult for the country to create additional jobs, especially jobs that
> signal productivity growth, reduce poverty and attain equitable social development.[118]

This quote has a chain of equivalence that connects "human resources" to "economic growth" and further states that without those it is difficult to create "jobs", "reduce poverty" and "attain equitable social development". This can be interpreted as a *risk* if the development of the human resources and institutions into competitive and productive doesn't happen. It can further be seen as a *threat*, if you connect this quote to the discussion above about the importance to develop the people. If the institutions and human resources are not developed, so that the citizens can compete effectively in the global market, the country are going to have trouble with job creation and reducing poverty. The use of the sign "critical" can be interpreted as another extreme formulation, which suggests a need to reinforce the statement to justify it. Johansson connects such creations of risks and threats to ways of governmentality. The creation of risks and fears are measures used to able the people to govern themselves.[119] The government becomes dependent on these devices and technologies to govern by because of there ability to create individuals who do not need to be governed, but can govern themselves.

> There are special benefits that come from involving people in development efforts. It can build community pride, promote ownership and responsibility, teach skills and create learning experiences. It can also mobilise resources that are within communities and promote a stronger social cohesion.[120]

The quote states the benefits that come with involving people in the development efforts, which is to make the people participate in the development of themselves and the country. It promotes ownership and responsibilities, community pride, skills enhancing and learning, mobilise resources within communities and promote social cohesion, all features that ensure that the people can govern themselves. The citizen that is created through these quotes are a responsible citizen filled with skills and learning that are useful in the society or community he/she feels pride for and therefore wants to participate to govern and develop. The "social cohesion" could imply the development in a specific way, a way that creates unity among citizens and society. That is typical for governmentality, to promote people to govern themselves and others, in a specific way.

The analysis above started with outlining the social equity and justice discourse through the nodes justice, equity and equality. It further connected an including approach to this discourse where development were aimed to benefit *all*. This further connected the people to the discourse, and showed that development was seen as a right for the people. Analysing this further I showed that the people of Namibia where expressed as both the aim for the development, and at the same time the tool for development. Further on this perspective was completed with a view that expressed development to also be a responsibility and a duty of the people. The social equity and justice discourse was also connected to the neo-liberal market discourse through the people. The

---

[118] NDP3, p. 134

[119] Johansson (2007), p. 36f

[120] Vision 2030, p. 131

one discourse emphasises equity, equality and poverty reduction, whilst the other emphasise being competitive on the global market. The people, the empowered, skilled and responsible citizens, are connecting the two discourses as being the ones who enables this. Through empowerment, skills-enhancement, education and training the people are expected to become self-governing subjects that take responsibility for developing both themselves and the society. So the social equity and justice discourse is connected to the neo-liberal market discourse through the neo-liberal perspective of governmentality. The neo-liberal market discourse needs people that are competitive and that compete on the global market. It needs responsible citizens that take care of their own development, and the development of the society. Through this approach a specific sort of citizen are created. The governmentality approach creates a naturalisation between the two discourses by ensuring the creation of empowered and responsible citizens that take care of their own and societies development so that both society and people can compete on the global market. This also creates poverty reduction and social equity, as long as *all* the people aim for the same thing, as a form of social cohesion and unity.

Global Competitiveness – A Neo-liberal Market Discourse

I am now going to continue and outline the *Neo-liberal Market Discourse* more explicitly through the nodes of "competitive", "comparative" and "advantage". This discourse have also been seen through the node economic "growth", but this is going to be discussed first in the next section together with the node "poverty reduction", as a way to show how the two discourses are connected, and struggling. This will show how the two discourses are struggling over the structuring of development in Namibia.

I have already in the beginning of the analysis discussed the aim for development as progress, modernisation, action, movement and change, and further the goal of advancing rapid to the place where the already developed countries seem to be, now and by the year 2030. In this part this becomes relevant once again, but more as a discussion of *how* they expect to reach this goal, and when discussing structures that shape such goals. I am further suggesting that there is a neo-liberal market discourse that shapes such goals.

> For all the above reasons, Namibia does not have to work through the development pathways
> followed by the current industrialised countries. Instead, by concentrating on skills
> development, services and its comparative advantages, Namibia can leap ahead to where
> currently developed countries are likely to be in 30 years.[121]

I am in this section focusing on *how* the Namibian documents express that they can achieve development. In this quote I am emphasising the chain of equivalence as "skills development", "comparative advantage", "leap ahead" and "currently developed countries". This suggests that the tools to develop, and leap ahead to the place where the already developed countries are, are through *skills development* and through developing its *comparative advantage*. This imply the neo-liberal market discourse as the tool to create such development, since I have identified the nodes

---

[121] Vision 2030, p. 33

"comparative" and "advantage" as integral in this discourse. Comparative advantage therefore becomes very important for development.

> Globalisation would not bring Namibia to the level of the USA and Japan overnight. As globalisation progresses, we should focus on development of our own resources, otherwise globalisation in some sense could be suicidal. We need to identify a competitive edge upon which Namibia's position in the world economy will be based. We should strengthen our industrial capacity in order to pursue realistic goals dependent on our natural endowment.[122]

The tool by which Namibia can leap ahead to the place where the already developed countries are is also to identify and develop its *competitive edge*. In this quote competitive edge is used in the same matter as comparative advantage and I therefore interpret the nodes comparative and competitive to be deeply connected. The tool for rapid development, which makes Namibia move fast and forward is to develop its competitive edge and comparative advantage. This was shown in the previous quote. This quote expresses the globalisation process, which I have discussed in the theoretical part as being based on neo-liberal thoughts. This quote identifies such advantages, or edge, as being "own resources", "industrial capacity" and "natural endowment". These advantages are further being connected to "competitive" and "position in the world", and therefore suggest that such advantages shape Namibia's development in the neo-liberal market discourse. Competitive means comparative, for example on Global Development Ratings, but more specifically on the global market. The competitive edge is important to survive the backside of the globalisation process. The documents recognise the critique that the globalisation process has received, and the marginalisation of Africa in this development. They recognise the risks of globalisation.

> However, the risks of globalisation include the following: the investment capital seeks out the most efficient markets, while producers and consumer seek the most competitive suppliers. This would expose and intensify existing structural weaknesses in individual economies.[123]

This quote connects "risk" to "efficient markets", "competitive suppliers" and "structural weaknesses". This once again implies the need to be competitive and efficient, for not being a victim to its own weaknesses. The risks with globalisation where discussed in the theoretical part, and some scholars where said to stress the inherent inequalities in the current globalisation process and the global markets. However, the Namibian document express that such risk is possible to overcome.

> The rapid increase in capital and private ventures/opportunities available to Namibia, has accelerated the pace of its development beyond what it could otherwise have achieved. The benefits of globalisation outweigh the costs of that free trade results in countries that specialise in the production of those goods efficiently, while importing goods that they cannot produce efficiently, from other countries.

The quote states that despite the inherent risks with globalisation, the benefits outweigh the costs, and the globalisation process has helped to speed up the development in Namibia to a large extent. The above discussion and quotes further reflects the "Win-Win" view on

---

[122] Vision 2030, p. 197f

[123] Ibid., p. 197

globalisation and development described by Kiely, which I wrote about in the theoretical part. This view believes that everyone can win from globalisation. In order to exercise a fair trade policy every country should exercise its comparative advantage. In this neo-liberal view comparative advantage means that each country specializes in producing those goods or services that it can produce most effectively, which results in fair trade between those countries.[124] The quotes above emphasis this view in several ways, for example it states *"countries specialize in the production of those goods [comparative advantage] efficiently, while importing goods that they cannot produce efficiently, from other countries"*. This reflects the Win-Win approach to globalisation through the emphasis on that every country should focus on what they most effectively can specialize in and produces, and if all countries do such the trade will be fair. In this way comparative advantage is a way to shield the country from the risks bound to the current globalisation process.

> The best means of harnessing the potential of our comparative advantages are through partnerships. This is the key to economic progress, to social harmony and to sustainable development.[125]

In this quote the sign 'comparative advantage' is connected to other signs, such as 'partnership'. The word *harnessing* in this quote can be interpreted as a metaphor of taking control over, and making the best of the comparative advantage. This is done through partnerships. The quote further connects 'comparative advantage' to the sign 'economic progress', which can be interpreted as the node growth and show the interconnectedness between the different nodes. It is also connected to 'social harmony' and 'sustainable development'. These signs are perhaps more suitable in the social equity and justice discourse, and I am going to discuss such connections later. However, the quote suggest that these features are integral in a way where one lead to the other. I will analyse that further when analysing this second discourse.

Interlinked to the discussion of comparative advantage is, as already suggested, a more thorough analysis of the node *competitive* and how the documents talk about being competitive.

> It is based on the Vision 2030 objective of transforming Namibia into a knowledge-based, highly competitive, industrialised and eco-friendly nation, with sustainable economic growth and a high quality of life.[126]

This quote connects competitiveness to the transformation of the country and to a goal with development. The wording "highly competitive" suggest that the documents put strong emphasis to the competitiveness of the country, and therefore also the neo-liberal idea of being competitive on the global market.

> Some sub-sectors remain shielded from competition, which stifles innovation and improvements in productivity. GDP growth has been healthy in recent years. However, it has been driven by a few sub-sectors, while others have stagnated. The banking and finance sub-sector is modern and highly profitable but there is a lack of competition and access to financial services is still limited. Structural change in the economy is slow, with urban labour markets

---

[124] Kiely (2007), p. 13ff

[125] Vision 2030, p. 209f

[126] NDP3, p. 149

> unable to absorb the excess labour from the rural areas and modernisation of the agriculture sector has been slow.[127]

This quote entails several different things regarding how the Namibian plans for development view competitiveness, and its importance for development. First of all I would like to emphasis the use of the word *stifles*. The use of the word stifle is a metaphor, which also can mean to smother or to suppress, which are active words. That can be interpreted as the lack of competition actively constructs something. It actively constructs smothering and suppressing of improvement and innovation in productivity. The quote further entails that some sub-sectors don't take part in the drive for GDP growth because they have stagnated, due to what can be interpreted as lack of competition if you consider the context of the whole quote. That further leads to the assumption that lack of competition can make a sub-sector stagnate. Further analysis of the quote entail that competition *does* something more than that. Even if a sector is modern and highly profitable, without competition there is limited access to financial services and structural change is slow. The lack of competition brings about and stifles innovation and improvements, stagnation, limitations and slow change. Competition seems, when analysing the quote, to be the motor that drives development further and prevent stagnation. It also seems to take development further than modern and profitable. That seems further to be the way that competition within a nation is connected to development and in that way it seems important for development in the documents.

Competitive and comparative is, as already suggested, interlinked concepts that both emphasis neo-liberal line of thought. These wordings also connects the different nations to each other through, at first, the global market but secondly also through the different global ratings of, for example, development.

> Limited investment and focus in this area [ICTs] reduces the potential for Namibia to benefit optimally from the many opportunities offered by ICTs. Unless this changes, Namibia will loose its current Human Development Index rating and fall behind the other development countries.[128]

The quote expresses the need to develop ICT, which are Information and Communication Technology, to benefit from the many opportunities that it creates. If they don't it would mean that Namibia fall behind in development ratings. Human Development Index rating is here seen as a motivation for development, and further competitive and comparative becomes a motivation for development. This can be seen as an example of the global governance that I discussed in the theoretical part. Different global ratings are used as motivation for developing countries, and other countries, to achieve the goals that are put up and score good places results in these ratings means being viewed positive by the international and global community. This can further connect competitive and comparative to the need of a favourable reputation, as discussed in the

---

[127] NDP3, p. 50

[128] Vision 2030, p. 78

beginning of the analysis. If I analyse the same quote as I used in the beginning in this context the result is made clearer.

> In diplomatic terms, Namibia enjoys a favourable reputation as a principled and responsible country. As a trading nation with the economy predominantly engaged in regional and international trade, it is important for Namibia to have favourable international partnerships, and the maintenance of regional and international peace, stability and cooperation.[129]

The quote states the reputation that Namibia already has "as a principled and responsible country". In global terms this reputation seems important, and UN documents emphasis the need for good governance for achieving the global goals that has been set up[130]. The quote further emphasis the need for favourable international partnerships when you are engaged in regional and international trade, this requires a favourable reputation. When connecting the two analysis parts this quote can be seen as both in the context of Namibia trying to change the stereotypical image of African countries, but also as the need to change this image comes from the motivation of being competitive and comparative in a global context. These ratings are by large produced by the UN, the World Bank and the global society, and it can be interpreted as a form of global governance. If I further connect the analysis to the discussion about governmentality and global imperialism, competitive and comparative becomes tools to govern the global society where it empowers countries and motivate the development, but also sets up ratings that suggest that the development should be steered in a certain direction. Kiely connect this sort of need for competitiveness to the neo-liberal approach, which in his view has been promoted by the US hegemony and supported by dominant elites an classes within many nation-states. In a neo-liberal sense of the word competitiveness is regarded as desirable, and that is how it is presented in the documents.[131] I am however, connected to the social equity and justice discourse, going to point to a different approach in the final discussion of the thesis, one that has already been suggested in the theoretical part. But first and further I am going to connect the neo-liberal market discourse, once again, to the social equity and justice discourse, by analysing the connection that can be seen in how the documents talk about economic growth and poverty reduction.

Sustainable economic growth

As said in the beginning of this chapter economic *growth* is another important node connected to development structuring, and the *Neo-liberal Market Discourse*, in the documents. The analysis of the sign in the documents is therefore linked to the analysis above. This node is further also connected to the first discourse, the *Social Equity and Justice Discourse*, as partly a neo-liberal approach on how to achieve social justice, but also in a way that social injustice is an obstacle to

---

[129] NDP3, p. 259

[130] See for example Svenska FN-förbundet (2007), p. 11

[131] Kiely (2007), p. 227

economic growth. This node is connected to several different signs, and is expressed as a tool to achieve the development goals. I am going to show all of this in the following analysis part.

Economic growth is so integral to reducing poverty and inequalities in the documents that they cannot be analysed separately.

> [...] Namibia's economic vision still remains central to the need of its desire to enhance the standard of living and to improve the quality of life of all Namibian people. This can be achieved only if there is accelerated economic growth and sustainable economic development in the country.[132]

The quote connects 'economic growth' to features of the social equity and justice discourse such as "enhanced standard of living", "improved quality of life" for "*all* Namibian people". It further connects "achieved" to "accelerated economic growth" and "sustainable economic development", which are viewed as the tools to achieve the social equity and justice discourse. The use of the sign *only* can be interpreted as an extreme formulation that rules out all other possibilities and therefore reinforce and justify the saying. The quote is, through the nodes of the social equity and justice discourse and the emphasis of "economic growth", connecting the two discourses. The neo-liberal market discourse is perceived to be the *tool* through which the other social justice discourse is to be achieved. However, I have identified a struggle between the two perspectives, and the relationship is not uncomplicated, which the following will show. *"Since economic growth does not necessarily guarantee equitable development, the nation must ensure that social and economic development programmes reach the poor and vulnerable."*[133] This quote expresses complications in the neo-liberal discourse of economic growth and realises that economic growth does not "guarantee" equitable development. "The nation" is therefore connected to ensuring that the benefits of the neo-liberal approach are made equitable. I am further going to analyse how the documents perceive this to be done.

The first quote above also emphasised *sustainable* economic development. I am going to analyse this further since it is an important feature when analysing economic growth as a node of neo-liberal discourse. The concept of sustainable development/economic development actually brings the two discourses together, and offers a solution to the relationship between social justice and economic growth that sometimes is expressed as a complicated one. The NDP3 states, *"There is a close link between income distribution and poverty, economic growth and sustainable development"*[134]. This quote expresses that there is a relationship between the two discourses, through the nodes "poverty", "economic growth". It further connects this relationship to the node "sustainable". This relationship is, however, further expressed as complicated one. *"The pace of economic growth is often inversely correlated with inequalities in wealth and income distribution."*[135]. The relationship is in this quote even described as contradicting, and therefore conflicting. The signs "inversely correlated" points to such contradiction. Using synonyms for the sign "inversely" suggest that the

---

[132] Vision 2030, p. 61

[133] Ibid., p. 101

[134] NDP3, p. 51

[135] Ibid., p. 57

relationship is being described as being "in reverse", which can be seen as going in the wrong direction. I interpret this contradicting relationship as a hegemonic struggle between the two discourses. This "wrong direction" is also implied in the next quote, and suggests that one discourse cannot be reduced to the other. *"High inequality is an obstacle to economic growth as well as sustainable development and rapid economic growth does not automatically reduce inequality in a society"[136]*. This shows the "inverse" relationship. High inequality is an "obstacle" to "economic growth", and in that way the two discourses seems to be connected. Reducing the inequalities is good for economic growth. However, "economic growth" is not per se resulting in "reduced inequalities". This suggests a hegemonic struggle between the relationship of the two discourses, because of the described contradicting relationship, and the different ways that this relationship is emphasised. It is through the concept of *sustainable* economic development that the neo-liberal approach overcomes the presented obstacles and achieves hegemony.

> Namibia's goal of increased sustainable economic growth aims to achieve sustained economic growth while ensuring that all Namibians share the opportunity to benefit fully from o development. Economic growth will enable access to employment for the many currently unemployed or under-employed, and access to resources will reduce poverty and inequality among many Namibians.[137]

This quotes expresses the naturalisation of one discourse over the other. *Sustainable* economic growth is expressed as the salvation of the conflict, and the possible connection of the two discourses. The quote expresses the neo-liberal approach of economic growth and the social justice approach of *"ensuring that all Namibians share the opportunity to benefit"* and the reduction of poverty and inequality. This is the meaning of a growth that is *sustainable.* Through the node of sustainable development the two discourses comes together as one and hegemony is achieved for the neo-liberal market approach through its promise that economic growth in a sustainable matter also is creating social equity and justice.

I have in the two last sections been discussing the Neo-liberal Market Discourse as a structure that shape how the documents talk about achieving development. I have seen this discourse unfold through the nodes "competitive", "comparative", "advantage" and economic "growth". These nodes have been discussed connected to several features of development, and has been suggested to be viewed as the tool for development. And, therefore, the neo-liberal market discourse is expressed as the tool for development. Comparative advantage and competitive edge has been presented as the solution to many obstacles of development. Obstacles such as the huge divide between the already developed countries and developing countries and the risks with globalisation. It has been presented as the Win-Win approach towards globalisation, that was discussed in the theoretical part, where globalisation were viewed as benefiting *all* through the development of comparative advantages and thereby a competitive edge. Competitiveness have further been analysed as being a motor in development process, which prevents development form stagnating. Motivations for such competitiveness and

---

[136] NDP3, p. 52

[137] Ibid., p. 57

development are different global ratings of development. I then implied that this could be connected to the global governance that was discussed in the theoretical chapter. I am going to discuss this further in the final discussion chapter. I then continued the discussion of the neo-liberal market discourse with connecting its node of "economic growth" to social equity and justice discussions of "poverty reduction". Economic growth is in the neo-liberal market discourse seen as a tool to achieve development in the same matter as the "competitive" node was. However, it is connected to the social equity and justice discourse through actually being viewed as the tool to achieve even this. I then interpreted a struggle between the discourses in the way the relationship is described in the documents. The relationship came out to be contradicting and as moving the wrong way in the development struggle. It implied that the one discourse couldn't be reduced to the other, and the need for a nation to enable the relationship. The solution was presented through the node of "sustainable". Through this node the two discourses came together as one and a naturalisation in discourse was achieved, at least momentarily.

A Final Discussion

The analysis above has been structured into two comprehensive chapters, where the first focused on how the documents talk about different meanings of development and the second on structures that shape the development plans. Within these chapters I have outlined four discourses connected to the overall aim of each chapter. Connected to meanings of development I have seen that a *Discourse of Tradition* and a *Discourse of Modernity* shape the meanings of development that are expressed in the documents. Connected to structures of development I have identified a *Social Equity and Justice Discourse* and a *Neo-liberal Market Discourse*, that are structuring and shaping how the documents talk about development, and vision it to happen.

In the first chapter I showed that there is a modernisation theory shaping how the documents talk about development, which creates meanings of development. In such development is seen as progress, movement, transition, action and change of the traditional to the modern. This implied that a traditional and modern discourse shape meanings of development in the documents. However, I further saw a conflict in such a meaning where the traditional where seen as both a complement to the modern, and inhibiting the process of development, and I interpreted that as signs of change in discourse. I also saw such a struggle for change in the way that the Namibian document seemed to reply to stereotypical images of African countries. I further connected these struggles over change to the modernisation paradigm of development, which discussed development as being a process, progress and transition towards modernity and the already industrialised countries. I interpreted that the documents expressed that tradition and stereotypical images of the country had to change in favour of modernisation and reaching the same page as already developed countries. I ended with suggestion that this could imply that it still is the already developed countries that sets the agenda for development in Namibia.

The second chapter identified two discourses that shape the structures of development in the Namibian plans for development. The first discourse, *a Social Equity and Justice Discourse*, was outlined first through the nodes justice, equity and equality, and expressed an including approach through the appellation "for all Namibians". This connected the people of Namibia to the discourse, through development being viewed as a right for the people, but also as being both the aim and tool for development. Development was then further connected to the people as being a duty and responsibility. The people were also identified as being a node that connected the two discourses, a social equity and justice discourse to the neo-liberal market discourse, to each other. The one discourse emphasises equity, equality and poverty reduction, whilst the other emphasise being competitive on the global market. The people, the empowered, skilled and responsible citizens, are connecting the two discourses as being the ones who enables this. I analysed this perspective, as being connected to the governmentality approach were the people are being empowered into self-governing subjects that take responsibility for developing both themselves and the society. The governmentality approach created a naturalisation between the two discourses by ensuring the creation of empowered and responsible citizens that take care of their own, and societies, development so that both society and people can compete on the global market. This also creates poverty reduction and social equity, as long as *all* the people aim for the same thing, as a form of social cohesion and unity.

The chapter then continued with discussing the Neo-liberal Market Discourse as another both complementing and conflicting discourse that shapes structures of how the documents talk about achieving development. This was analysed as being expressed as the tool for development and to overcome developing obstacles such as the huge divide between the already developed countries and developing countries and the risks with globalisation. I also showed that comparative advantage and competitiveness were motivated through different global ratings on development, which suggested that development in Namibia was connected to global governance that was discussed in the theoretical chapter. This neo-liberal market discourse was then connected to the social equity and justice discourse through the nodes economic growth and poverty reduction. The connection was made through the emphasis in the documents that economic growth was the tool to achieve poverty reduction. However, I interpreted a struggle within that approach, and between the two discourses, and in the way that the relationship between them came out contradicting when analysing the documents. I further interpreted a naturalisation in discourse through adding the node 'sustainable' to the concept of economic growth, which were expressed as capturing both discourses.

Conflicting Paradigms

I have in the second chapter in the analysis described how I saw two discourses that structured how development where vision to happen, and therefore shaped development in the documents. I suggested that there was a struggle between hegemony from the two discourses. I also suggested that the documents solved this struggle to the governmentality approach and with the adding of the concept sustainable to economic growth. In such matter the neo-liberal market

discourse and the social equity and justice discourse were viewed as complementing and working together. Both discourses could be achieved at the same time; both were able to structure development in the documents. I am, however, in this section going to suggest another way to see this, with the adding of social theories and analysis of social practices.

In opposition to what the documents seem to be expressing, which the analysis above have shown, Volker Winterfeldt argues that the two identified discourses represent "reconciliation of the irreconcilable". Such approaches are "conflicting paradigms" and can't be reconciled. Despite the struggle over combining the two perspectives, in the documents, Winterfeldt means that the global economic liberalism is merciless towards such a social equity and justice approach. He states, *"Contrary to its claim, liberalism does not halt marginalisation."*[138]. He further means that, in actual reality social progress is only a function of the capitalist market forces, which neglect social responsibility. In the Namibian context the combining of the two approaches is believed to change social inequalities of the past. Winterfeldt, however, argues that such approach is more likely to worsen such inequalities.[139] Kiely argues similar to Winterfeldt and states that the desirable competitiveness within the neo-liberal ideology actually are bound to be uneven and unequal. The developing countries have a competitive *dis*advantage towards the already developed countries and are therefore not competing on the global market on the same terms. Some developing countries and elites within a country could of course benefit from such approach, but overall the South is in a marginal subordinate position, which is only intensified by the neo-liberal approach. [140]Also Bruce Frayne argues that a reinforcement of market ideology as the basis of access to wealth is mostly socially unsustainable. Such approach excludes the majority of the urban population in Namibia. He states that, had the situation in Namibia been another, and the planners hadn't been forced to work with the legacy from colonialism and apartheid, and *if* the prevailing ideology actually *had* been one of equity and justice, *"Namibia would today be a quite different place"*[141]. He also points to international drive that has affects for Namibia's planning for development. With such pressure it is going to be hard for a country like Namibia to transform its planning system to reflect the social equity and justice discourse. The prevailing approach of the neo-liberal ideology has not had a positive impact on reducing poverty for the majority of Namibia's people, as such discourses claim.[142]

Both Winterfeldt and Frayne argue that such approach is more likely to worsen the trend of increasing poverty and a widening gap between rich and poor in the country.[143] The power of the global economy in dictating the course for Namibian development approaches has been implied in the analysis, and in the text above and further discussed by Winterfeldt. He means that the Namibian approach to adopt such ideology is driven by an interest to overcome national

---

[138] Volker Winterfeldt (2007), "Liberated economy?" in Henning Melber (ed.), *Transitions in Namibia*, (Uppsala), p. 68
[139] Ibid., p. 66ff
[140] Kiely (2007), p. 227
[141] Bruce Frayne (2000), "Political Ideology, Social Change, and Planning practice in Namibia" (2000;20;52), p. 62
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid.

economic dependency and negative global terms of trade. However, Winterfeldt further argues, by adopting such policies the Namibian government accepts the social costs of such approach, and further neglect the social damage.[144] With the analysis of the social practice of the discourses, and the adding of social theories to further interpret them, it becomes clear that the, in the documents, believed naturalisation between the two discourses actually are an imagined one inspired by the power of the global economy.

Global Discourse of Development

In the analysis I have at some points implied the global influence on the documents. This has been done through analysing intertextuality, which look at how the documents are building on other texts. I have mostly referred to UN, and that the documents from this global institution state similarities as the Namibian. I have further seen these global influences in other ways, for example when referring to different global ratings and when talking of different relationships between global and international actors. This could mean that the global community influence the Namibian plans for development. It can also be seen in the emphasising of the neo-liberal approach, and have been discussed in the previous section of this discussion. Kiely argues that the neo-liberal expansion has been promoted by the US hegemony and have also been supported by dominant elites and ruling classes within states. Such promotion has lead to an assumption of the need for competitiveness in the global economy.[145] Such assumption is highly present in the Namibian documents. The process of globalisation implies the world as interconnected, and as such the UN promotes its policies. With the adoption of the Millennium Declaration the UN, and the world leaders that stand behind it, acknowledge a collective responsibility for all the people in the world, and certain founding assessments of freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and joint responsibility. This declaration and its assessments have resulted in the Millennium Development Goals, as a way to put these assessments into action.[146] The declaration made by the world leaders has been described as *"a blueprint for a better world"*[147]. Namibia is participating in the global acts towards the Millennium Development Goals, and presents its own estimations on how the country is doing in the achievement of the Millennium Goals. These goals correlate with the nations National Vision. *"The MDG campaign forms part of the national process of strengthening policies that can mobilise all Namibians and the international community behind the Grand Vision for the year 2030 [...]."*[148] This suggests that the global UN agenda for development is highly present in the Namibian plans for development. It also suggests a more

---

[144] Winterfeldt (2007), p. 89f

[145] Kiely (2007), p. 227

[146] Svenska FN-förbundet (2007)

[147] United Nations; Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2009*, (New York), p. 3

[148] Office of the President, National Planning Commission, (2004), *Namibia 2004 Millennium Development Goals*, (Windhoek), p. 1

joint agenda for development, and the approach of world development. In such approach the neo-liberal ideology can be seen, and are therefore promoted in the developing agenda.

This global approach has been criticised by several, which I have pointed to repeatedly. There is therefore a need to ask the question of an alternative. Frayne also stresses such a need. *"The world needs a new ideology to meet the social and political needs of postcolonial countries. Countries like Namibia need a new ideology that serves the interests of its people, and not just the urban elite and the capital markets of the world."*[149]Jauch, Edwards and Cupido also argue such a need for a change in the global economic system that is producing poverty and inequalities in various parts of the world. Structural changes are required to change the inequalities in Namibia.[150] Jauch (2001) suggests the deepening of the participatory democracy to replace the dictates of market imperatives. The international competitiveness will further have to be shifted towards more national and regional economic strategies oriented.[151] Frayne connects this global governance that has been discussed above to the apartheid system, *"Then it was apartheid, today it is economic efficiency and "growth".*[152]". Just as such a system had the evidence against them this, the neo-classical economic paradigm, are also being proved to be failing.[153]

The global governance on development needs to be more closely researched, I believe. It would be interesting to see more creative suggestions and alternatives to the global market and neo-liberal approach. It would be interesting to more closely analyse the relationship between different development countries and the UN strategies for development. It would also be interesting to analyse the specific Swedish approach to such governance. For example through analysing the Government Communication *Global Challenges – Our Responsibiliy,* where Sweden acknowledges the need for policies that address "global development".[154] The Namibian context is also interesting to research further. It would be interesting to connect the analyse above to development thinking of the civil society, NGOs, the private sector and also to more thoroughly look at different partnerships for development. The development plans that have been analysed in this thesis actually have affects for the lives of the people of Namibia. This makes a study like this highly important. Also, because of that, there is a need to study how development is viewed and discussed among the people of Namibia, the people whose lives the development affect.

---

[149] Frayne (2000), p. 62

[150] Jauch, Edwards & Cupido (2009), p. 1

[151] Jauch (2001), p. 101f

[152] Frayne (2000), p. 62

[153] Ibid., p. 62

[154] Government Offices of Sweden, Sweden's Policy for Global Development, Govt Comm. 2007/08:89

Summary

This thesis has been analysing discourses of development in the context of Namibian planning for development. More specifically it has been analysing Namibia's long-term policy for national development, *Namibia Vision 2030*, and it's *Third National Development Plan* (NDP3). This has been done through the theoretical and methodological framework of Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, CDA. The aim for the thesis was to study discourses of *development* in the Namibian political context, and the rhetoric's behind the planning for development, and further to connect the analysis of the political documents to social practices of discourse. The analysis have been outlining two different approaches towards development, one that was analysing meanings of development and one that was analysing structures of development. Connected to these approaches were four identified discourses. Connected to and shaping meanings of development I identified a *Discourse of Tradition* and a *Discourse of Modernity*. And further connected to and shaping structures of development I identified a *Social Equity and Justice Discourse* and a *Neo-liberal Market Discourse*.

In the first chapter I described a modernisation paradigm that shaped meanings of development. I further contrasted that view with one traditional discourse of development. I identified a struggle within the ways that the documents talk about tradition and modernity correlated to meanings of development. Tradition was both seen as complementing and inhibiting the modernisation and development progress. This struggle for modernity was also seen in the way that the documents seemed to reply to previous stereotypical images of African countries. The second chapter analysed two discourses, and started with the social equity and justice discourse. This discourse was outlined through the nodes justice, equity and equality, and expressed an including approach through the appellation "for all Namibians". This connected the discourse to the people of Namibia, which also brought the two discourses together and entailed a conflict between them. I broadened this analysis with the governmentality approach and suggested that this brought hegemony to the struggle. The chapter then continued with discussing the Neo-liberal Market Discourse. This discourse unfolded through the nodes "competitive", "comparative", "advantage" and economic "growth". They, and the neo-liberal market discourse, was analysed as being expressed as the tool for development and to overcome developing obstacles. The analysis was connected to globalisation and the influences from the global community. I also analysed a conflict between the two discourses through the nodes economic growth and poverty reduction. I interpreted a struggle within that approach, and between the two discourses, and in the way that the relationship between them came out contradicting when analysing the documents. I further interpreted a naturalisation in discourse through adding the node 'sustainable' to the concept of economic growth, which were expressed as capturing both discourses. The ending discussion then connected the results to discussions of global governance, and the view that the two last discourses actually are conflicting paradigms.

References

Printed Sources:

Berg, Magnus, (2004), *Förlåta men inte glömma: Röster om rasism, nationalism och det mångkulturella samhället I Namibia. Och i Sverige*, (Carlsson Bokförlag: Stockholm)

Chouliaraki, Lilie & Fairclough, Norman, (1999), *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*, (Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh)

Cruikshank, Barbara, (1996), "Revolutions within: self-government and self-esteem" in Barry, Andrew, Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (ed.), (1996), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, (UCL Press Limited: London)

Eriksson Baaz, Maria, (2001), "Biståndet och partnerskapets problemtik" in Mc Eachrane, Michael & Faye, Louise (red.), (2001), *Sverige och de Andra: Postkoloniala perspektiv*, (Bokförlaget Natur och Kultur: Stockholm)

Fairclough, Norman, (1992), *Discourse and Social Change*, (Polity Press: Cambridge)

Fairclough, Norman, (1995), *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*, (Pearson Education Limited: Harlow, England)

Fairclough, Norman, (2003), *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*, (Routledge: London)

Howell, Jude & Pearce, Jenny, (2001), *Civil Society and Development: A Critical Exploration*, (Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc: London)

Jauch, Herbert, Edwards, Lucy & Cupido, Braam, (2009), *A Rich Country with Poor People: Inequality in Namibia*, (LaRRI: Windhoek)

Jauch, Herbert, (2001), *Playing the Globalisation Game: The implications of economic liberalisation for Namibia*, (LaRRI: Windhoek)

Johansson, Jonna, (2007), *Learning To Be (come) A Good European: A Critical Analysis of the Official European Union Discourse on European Identity and Higher Education*, (Institutionen för ekonomisk och industriell utveckling, Linköpings universitet: Linköping)

Kiely, Ray, (2007), *The New Political Economy of Development: Globalisation, Imperialism, Hegemony*, (Palgrave Macmillan: New York)

Long, Norman, (2001), *Development Sociology: Actor perspectives*, (Routledge: London)

Loomba, Ania, (2005), *Kolonialism/Postkolonialism: En introduktion till ett forskningsfält*, (TankeKraft Förlag: Hägersten)

Odén, Bertil, (2006), *Biståndets idéhistoria: Från Marshallhjälp till millenniemål*, (Studentlitteratur: Lund)

Potter, Jonathan, (1996), *Representing Reality: Discourse Rhetoric and Social Construction*, (Sage Publications: London)

Rose, Nikolas, (1996), "Governing 'advanced' liberal democracies" in Barry, Andrew, Osborne, Thomas & Rose, Nikolas (ed.), (1996), *Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government*, (UCL Press Limited: London)

Winterfeldt, Volker, (2007), "Liberated economy? A case of Ramatex Textiles Namibia" in Melber, Henning (ed.), (2007), *Transition in Namibia: Which Changes for Whom?*, (Nordiska Afrikainstitutet: Uppsala)

Winther Jorgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise, (2000), *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*, (Studentlitteratur: Lund)

Articles:

Frayne, Bruce (2000), "Political Ideology, Social Change, and Planning Practice in Namibia", (Journal of Planning Education and Research: 2000;20;52)

Government Offices of Sweden (2008), "Sweden's Policy for Global Development", (Govt Comm: 2007/08:89)

Insight (2010), "Into the breach", (2010:03:p20)

Office of the President (2004), "Namibia 2004 Millennium Development Goals", (Government of the Republic of Namibia: Windhoek)

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, (2009), *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2009*, (United Nations: New York)

Empirical Materials:

National Planning Commission, (2008), *Third National Development Plan (NDP3) – 2007/2008-2011/12, Volume I*, (Windhoek)

Office of the President (National Planning Commission), (2004), *Namibia Vision 2030 – Policy Framework for Long-term National Development, Main Document*, (Office of the President: Windhoek)

Electronic Sources:

Svenska FN-förbundet (2007), "Millenniedeklarationen", last updated 2008-06-16 http://www.fn.se/fn-info/verksamhetsomraden/utveckling-och-fattigdomsbekampning/millenniedeklarationen/, from the Internet 2010-03-24

United Nations, "About Development" http://www.un.org/en/development/other/overview.shtml, from the Internet 2010-03-24