

violence, implying that structural violence leads to enormous human suffering.

Galtung's motivation for the differentiation between physical and structural violence is that, if peace is only to be defined as the absence of physical and direct violence, an unacceptable social order would be compatible with peace (Galtung, 1969: 168) – a situation which from the normative perspective of peace research could not be accepted. Peace should rather be seen in positive, constructive terms.

Johan Galtung is also the founding father of the conceptual pair: 'positive' and 'negative' peace. Negative peace is at hand when there is an absence of direct and physical violence, while positive peace only exists when there is an absence of both direct and structural violence.

The terminology has had a great impact on debates within peace and conflict research. The conceptualization has also been criticized. One critique has to do with the difficulties in determining whether structural violence is actually at hand. A second but related point of criticism has to do with the risk of ideologizing violence. Since structural violence is not assessed as violence by actors involved, there is a risk that researchers impose their own values on the actors and the situation. Third, if structural violence of some sort exists in all societies, then true positive peace can never be achieved.

In recent years, Johan Galtung has added a third concept of violence ('cultural' violence) to the other two. By cultural violence is meant aspects of culture which may be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence (Galtung, 1990). Thus cultural violence is to be seen as legitimizing ideological or discursive systems.

References and further reading

- Ehrlich, P. and Ehrlich, A.H. (1972) *Population, Environment and Resources*, San Francisco, CA: Freeman.
- Galtung, J. (1969) 'Violence, peace and peace research', *Journal of Peace Research* 3: 167.
- (1971) 'Structural theory of imperialism', *Journal of Peace Research* 1, 15: 51–66.

— (1990) 'Cultural violence', *Journal of Peace Research* 27, 3: 291–305.

Wallerstein, I. (1974) *The Modern World System*, New York: Academic Press.

HELENA LINDHOLM SCHULZ

structuralism

The term 'structuralism' is widely used in such disciplines as anthropology, development economics, cultural studies, linguistics and psychology, albeit with different meanings. A structuralist perspective within INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY (IPE) is gaining recognition, as evidenced by the work of R.J. Barry Jones (1995) who compares structuralism with liberal, Marxist, economic realist and institutional perspectives (see LIBERALISM; MARXISM–LENINISM; REALISM; INSTITUTIONALISM). Aukie Hoogvelt (1997) in turn distinguishes three perspectives within IPE, namely realism, institutionalism and structuralism. In her view, ROBERT COX (1981) is a key contributor to the structuralist perspective in the field through his development of an 'historical structure' analytical framework which contests the assumption that countries constitute independent units, as their development can only be understood through their systemic linkages. SUSAN STRANGE (1988), a well-known scholar in international studies, develops a power-focused view of structuralism in the international political economy. She distinguishes several interacting power structures in the WORLD ECONOMY, none of which is dominant on its own. This gives her particular structuralist perspective a multidimensional and non-deterministic character. A more recent attempt to link structuralism to IPE has been made by Björn Hettne (1995). He argues that development theory and IPE are complementary and should be merged into a single discipline known as the international political economy of development.

Structuralism largely evolved from the interaction between development economists in Europe and Latin America. Pioneers in devel-

opment economics, such as Paul Rosenstein-Rodan, PAUL BARAN, GUNNAR MYRDAL, ARTHUR LEWIS and HANS SINGER, and later writers including Dudley Seers, Nicholas Kaldor, Thomas Balogh, Paul Streeten and Hollis Chenery among others, influenced the Latin American structuralist school and were in turn influenced by it. The Latin American structuralist school largely emanated from the UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA (ECLA) under the leadership of RAUL PREBISCH. Other key contributors to the structuralist paradigm include Aldo Ferrer, Celso Furtado, Anibal Pinto and Osvaldo Sunkel. A significant number of European structuralists, who resided mainly in England, were of Central European origin, mostly from the agrarian and less-developed Eastern European countries. This may explain why they favoured industrialization and protectionism, having been influenced by the INFANT-INDUSTRY PROTECTION argument of the German political economist FRIEDRICH LIST and having observed at close range the rapid industrial development of Germany as a result of protectionist policies and strong state intervention:

¶ The most comprehensive attempt to develop a structuralist position in development economics was made by the Latin American structuralists. It can be argued that the essential antithesis in development economics is between neo-classical and structuralist theories. Structuralists perceive the economy in LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES (LDCs) as being inflexible and as confronting major constraints or structural barriers. They distrust the price mechanism and justify government intervention in the economy as accelerating the process of economic development and structural transformation. Above all they regard the distinct asymmetries in international political economic structures and relations as having a detrimental impact on LDCs. By contrast, the neo-classical position emphasizes flexibility in which prices rule and government intervention or *dirigisme* is spurned. They hold a benign view of international economic trade and investment relations. Following the rise of

NEO-LIBERALISM and the CHICAGO SCHOOL in the 1970s and 1980s, it has become more common to refer to the neo-classical position as neo-liberalism.

Characteristics and originality of structuralism

The key propositions of structuralism concern the WORLD MARKET ECONOMY and UNEQUAL EXCHANGE as formulated in the CORE-PERIPHERY MODEL of the late 1940s and early 1950s. The originality of the structuralist model lies in its central proposition that development and underdevelopment constitute a single process, so that centre and periphery form one world economy. Furthermore, the disparities between the centre and periphery are reproduced through international trade. Thus the periphery's development problems are located within the context of the international political economic system.

This analysis of the world economic system directly challenged prevailing orthodox theories and continues to generate controversy. The argument that the centre and periphery countries are linked in a series of asymmetric relationships which reproduce the international political economic structures represented a radical break with evolutionist and mechanical stage theories of development. Modernization and stage theories, such as that of W.W. ROSTOW, maintain that all developed countries (DCs) were once underdeveloped and that present-day underdeveloped countries can evolve into DCs by following similar policies and stages to those pursued by the capitalist DCs. Structuralists consider such theories to be ahistorical or unhistorical, as they do not take into account the different origins, structures and dynamism of the peripheral economy, nor the changing nature of the world-system.

Structuralism thus grew out of a profound critique of NEO-CLASSICAL ECONOMICS which was seen to contribute little to an understanding of the development problems of the periphery or LDCs. In its place, the structuralist group (centred in ECLA) aimed at constructing an alternative autochthonous

analysis, one which identified the major obstacles to development in Latin America and proposed remedial policies. Among the numerous contributors to the structuralist paradigm, Prebisch's ideas were pivotal and his pioneering book (published in 1950) was praised by ALBERT O. HIRSCHMAN (1961) as 'ECLA's manifesto'. Prebisch's view of the international economic system as comprising an industrial centre and an agrarian periphery, in which the former dominates and exploits the latter, has been enormously influential in the analysis of UNDERDEVELOPMENT – as seen in the theory of unequal exchange developed by Arghiri Emmanuel and in DEPENDENCY THEORY and WORLD-SYSTEMS THEORY (see also FRANK, ANDRE GUNDER; WALLERSTEIN, IMMANUEL). Prebisch also played a major role in setting up the UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT (UNCTAD), becoming its first Secretary-General from 1964 to 1969.

Structuralism is both a holistic and historical perspective. It probes into the origins of the integration from colonial times of THIRD WORLD economies into the dominant capitalist system as producers of agricultural and mineral primary commodities. Structuralists term this pattern of development in the periphery the 'primary-export model' or the 'outward-oriented development model', to distinguish it from the industrial-export and AUTONOMOUS DEVELOPMENT model of the centre countries.

The structuralist approach is not narrowly economic, as it emphasizes the part played by institutional and social factors in the functioning of an economy and particularly the role of the state as a key agent in the development process. Structuralism and the institutional approach in economics have thereby certain affinities and have benefited from their mutual influence (see STREET, JAMES H.). The analysis of the external impact of the centre countries on the periphery, such as the impact of COLONIALISM, the GREAT DEPRESSION, World War II and GLOBALIZATION, and the internal transformations which these brought about are of particular significance to structuralists.

Structuralism was influenced by KEYNESIAN ECONOMICS in its advocacy of major increases in government expenditure for development purposes. However, it went further than Keynesianism in regarding the state as the crucial agent for economic, social and political change (see also DEVELOPMENTAL STATE). Through economic planning and protectionism, the state was seen to spearhead the industrialization process in developing countries. Structuralists influenced government policy in many developing countries between the 1950s and the 1970s, providing arguments in favour of LAND REFORM and STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISES (SOEs). Its ideology was anti-feudal, anti-oligarchical, democratic, reformist and technocratic. It questioned the perverse effect of capitalism in the periphery and the resulting inequities in the institutional economic arrangements. While it promoted structural change, it did not advocate revolution, DE-LINKING or SOCIALISM.

Features of the centre and the periphery

According to the structuralist paradigm, the key features of the centre and the periphery emerged with the industrial revolution and the growing linkages forged between them by the new international political economy. This increased the productivity of the factors of production dramatically, but the diffusion of technical progress was very uneven throughout the world. The centre countries internalized the new technology by developing an industrial capital-goods sector and employing more advanced technology across economic sectors. This resulted in the development of an homogeneous and integrated economy. In the periphery, by contrast, new technologies were largely imported and mainly confined to the primary-commodity-producing export sector. The industrial sector was insignificant and the capital-goods sector rudimentary or non-existent. As a consequence, the peripheral economy became both disarticulated and dualist: disarticulated because it had to import advanced technology from the centre and dualist because of the large productivity gap

which existed between the export and subsistence sectors.

The periphery is characterized as having a sizeable low-productivity pre-capitalist sector which continuously produces a large surplus of labour. This surplus labour keeps wages low and prevents the periphery from retaining the fruits of its own technological progress, productivity increases in the export sector being largely transferred to the centre through a deterioration of the **TERMS OF TRADE**. Thus, in the structuralist view, international trade both perpetuates and deepens the asymmetry between centre and periphery.

Unequal terms of trade

The terms of trade analysis demonstrates ECLA's distinctive approach to the problems of development and underdevelopment. The structuralist thesis on the secular deterioration of the periphery's terms of trade has generated much controversy. It challenged the orthodox theory of international trade and questioned the international division of labour (see **DIVISION OF LABOUR, INTERNATIONAL**). As such, it was strongly criticized by neo-classical economists such as **JACOB VINER**. Contrary to the predictions of conventional trade theory, Prebisch found that the periphery's commodity or net barter terms of trade – that is, the relationship between the price index of the periphery's exports to the centre countries and the price index of its imports from the centre countries – had turned against the periphery since the 1870s. Although these terms of trade fluctuate continuously, the long-term trend was clearly unfavourable to the periphery. This meant that the periphery had to export an increasing quantity of raw materials in order to import the same amount of industrial commodities. As Hans Singer came to a similar conclusion at the same time, the thesis on the deterioration of the terms of trade is known in the economic literature as the **PREBISCH-SINGER HYPOTHESIS**.

Prebisch's analysis of the deterioration of the terms of trade deals with both demand and supply conditions of commodity markets. On

the demand side, the terms of trade deteriorated against the periphery because of the different **INCOME ELASTICITY OF DEMAND** for imports by the centre and periphery or, as Prebisch puts it, because of the 'dynamic disparity of demand' between centre and periphery. This means that imports of primary products by the centre from the periphery rise at a lower rate than its national income. Meanwhile, imports of industrial commodities by the periphery from the centre grow at a faster rate than its income. The low income elasticity of demand at the centre, which is well below unity, is explained by various factors. As income increases, a smaller proportion is spent on food (**ENGEL'S LAW**), technical progress develops new ways of producing commodities requiring fewer raw materials or substituting synthetic for natural products, and protectionist policies pursued by centre countries restrict the market for exports from the periphery. In the periphery, by contrast, the income elasticity of demand for imports is generally high (well above unity) as they mainly import industrial products, the demand for which rises proportionally more than income.

With respect to the supply arguments, or the 'cycle version' of the periphery's deterioration of the terms of trade, these are characteristically structuralist and are related to the differential effect of the world economic cycle on centre and periphery. The capitalist economic system evolves in a cyclical fashion with the centre being the initiator of these cycles, which provoke an adaptive cyclical response by the periphery. During an economic upswing, the terms of trade generally turn in favour of primary producers, but during a downswing they turn against them to an even greater degree. This results in the long-run deterioration of the periphery's terms of trade, especially as the downswings tend to last longer than the upswings.

This differential impact of the world economic cycle on centre and periphery is explained by the differential behaviour of prices, profits and wages in the centre and periphery during the phases of the cycle. During an economic upswing, wages grow

substantially in the centre but hardly rise in the periphery (given the availability of surplus labour). In a downswing, the fall in wages and prices in the centre is limited by trade union power and the oligopolistic structure of industry; by contrast, the downswing greatly reduces prices and wages in the periphery, as producers are able to compress wages substantially on account of the availability of surplus labour and the absence or weakness of trade unions. Thus, while workers and capitalists in the centre are able to gain the fruits of their technical progress through higher wages and profits, the opposite holds true for the periphery. For structuralists, the greater scope for productivity-increases in industrial production and the maldistribution of gains from trade explain the rising gap in incomes between centre and periphery. As Singer expressed it, the centre countries enjoyed the best of both worlds, retaining both the fruits of their own technical progress and capturing part of the underdeveloped countries' productivity increase. By contrast, the periphery suffered the worst of both worlds.

Although the periphery's terms of trade might deteriorate, this does not necessarily mean that it is unable to reap any gains from trade. What it does mean is that any gains resulting from international trade are distributed unequally between centre and periphery. In condemning the deterioration of the commodity terms of trade, structuralists are not arguing against international trade, nor have they ever suggested delinking. On the contrary, structuralists see international trade and foreign capital as essential elements for raising productivity and growth in the periphery.

In short, structuralists argued that the unequal terms of trade were not the only cause of the periphery's poverty, but they did reduce the economic surplus available to relieve it. This export-led growth of the periphery, known as the 'outward-looking' development model, retains its dynamism so long as export earnings grow fast enough to sustain an adequate rate of growth in the economy. The world depression of the 1930s dealt a major blow to exports and had severe internal consequences for income

and employment. To overcome the constraining effects of this outward-oriented process, ECLA proposed an 'inward-oriented' development model for the periphery, whose centre-piece was **IMPORT SUBSTITUTION INDUSTRIALIZATION (ISI)**.

The inward-oriented development model

Structuralists expected an ISI strategy to transform industry into the most dynamic sector of the periphery's economy and to lead to a higher rate of economic growth than could be achieved by continuing with the primary-export strategy. It was hoped that this substitution process would lead to two types of structural transformation in the periphery: changes in the structure of production as industry's share of national income increased, and changes in the volume and composition of imports.

Such an ISI policy was to be implemented by a variety of means, such as easy credit, infrastructure support and favourable foreign-exchange measures, but chiefly through protectionist measures such as **TARIFFS** and **QUOTAS**. This advocacy of protectionism ran counter to the dominant orthodoxy and principle of **COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE** as it was understood at the time. It was believed that industrialization would prevent a repetition of the disastrous effects of the 1930s world crisis, that it would lead to greater increases in productivity and incomes, and that it would reduce unemployment and the surplus labour, thereby removing one of the causes of low wages in the periphery. In addition, it would help the retention of productivity increases in the periphery, avoid further deterioration of its commodity terms of trade and reduce the economy's external vulnerability.

For structuralists, industrialization is justified in the periphery even where the cost of production of local industry is higher than the international price, as otherwise some factors of production would remain unemployed or would be used to produce export commodities with further adverse consequences for the terms of trade. The relevant comparison is

not between industrial costs and import prices but between the increase in incomes obtained by employing the factors of production in industry and their alternative employment in the export sector. This is the key criterion for determining the type and degree of industrialization in the periphery. Once this has been established, a corresponding protectionist policy must be implemented to allow for the establishment, survival and growth of the chosen industries. Protectionism is required so long as the productivity of the periphery's industry falls below that of the centre countries and so long as this productivity differential is not compensated for by wage differentials. However, excessive protectionism has to be avoided as this would discourage agricultural production and weaken industrial efficiency.

Structuralists were initially optimistic about the benefits that industrialization would bring to the periphery. It was regarded as a way of overcoming the limitations of the outward-directed development process and of bringing social and political benefits, such as a strengthening of the middle and working classes and of democracy. Notwithstanding, one of the first criticisms of ISI came from within the ECLA fold itself. By the early 1960s, there was talk of an 'exhaustion' of the ISI process and an acknowledgement that the inward-directed development strategy had not led to a diversification of exports as anticipated. Indeed, despite substitution, the external bottleneck became even more problematic as the volume of imports continued to increase rapidly. Furthermore, a shift in the composition of imports to raw materials, spare parts and capital goods made them more, not less, crucial for sustaining industrial growth. In order to cover the resulting chronic deficit in foreign exchange, Latin American countries had continually to increase their foreign debt, the servicing of which became a major economic burden.

Structuralists therefore came to realize that industrialization could not remain enclosed within the national boundaries if the continuing shortage of foreign exchange was to be resolved. They vigorously promoted the idea of

regional ECONOMIC INTEGRATION, such as the setting up of a Latin American common market. It was hoped that the formation of the LATIN AMERICAN FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION (LAFTA) with its larger market would increase exports and encourage greater industrial efficiency by taking advantage of ECONOMIES OF SCALE. REGIONALISM was also regarded as strengthening the bargaining power of the periphery with regards to the centre. In order to ameliorate the new external vulnerability created by ISI, structuralists had already proposed in the early 1960s that industrial exports should be stimulated with special subsidies. By then it had become evident that the small size of the internal market and the exaggerated and indiscriminate protection of local industry had resulted in an inefficient monopolistic or oligopolistic industrial structure.

Structuralists further argued that industrialization was impaired by governmental delays in carrying out structural and institutional reforms, such as land and tax reforms. The unequal land-tenure system was seen as hampering agricultural productivity and growth as well as skewing the distribution of income. The stagnation of the agricultural sector limited industrial development, not only because agriculture failed to provide sufficient cheap raw materials and foodstuffs for the internal market, but also because the low purchasing power of the rural population limited the internal market for industrial commodities.

The ISI development process was also characterized by structuralists as having become both concentrating and excluding. By this it is meant that the fruits of technological progress brought about by industrialization were concentrated in the hands of the owners of capital, excluding the majority and aggravating inequalities in the distribution of income. Furthermore, this model resulted in 'structural heterogeneity' as differences between economic sectors (such as those between a backward agriculture and a modern capital-intensive industry) and those within economic sectors (such as those between the INFORMAL

ECONOMY and the 'formal' economy) were exacerbated.

Structuralism versus monetarism

Further insights into the structuralist paradigm and method of analysis can be gained by examining the structuralist analysis of INFLATION. From the mid-1950s, a group of largely Latin American structuralists challenged conventional wisdom on the nature of and cures for inflation. This gave rise to a protracted debate between monetarists and structuralists (see MONETARISM), at the heart of which lay different economic philosophies.

Structuralists give much more weight to the social and political origins of economic events than monetarists. They also place greater emphasis on the state as a key agent in promoting economic development and in overcoming the deficiencies of the market. For structuralists, the removal of the main obstacles to development requires structural reforms of a social and political, as well as an economic, kind. While structuralists favour an inward-oriented and, to some extent, a self-reliant development strategy, monetarists advocate an outward-oriented development strategy that places greater reliance on the international market. Important political differences also exist: structuralists are considered to be broadly on the left, while monetarists are seen to be on the right.

With respect to inflation, structuralists situate the problem of inflation within the context of the structural transformation of the THIRD WORLD, while monetarists are less likely to do so. For structuralists, inflation also arises from the socio-political tensions, sectoral imbalances and expectations generated by the process of development. By contrast, monetarists regard the inflationary process itself as the major obstacle to growth. The principal difference arises over the causes of inflation: for monetarists inflation is a monetary phenomenon arising from excessive demand (too much money chasing too few goods), while for structuralists inflation arises from structural

maladjustments and rigidities in the economic system.

As a consequence of this debate, monetarists began to acknowledge the importance of structural factors, but turned the structuralist argument on its head by arguing that the supply rigidities arise from the distortions which inflation creates in the price and market system. Meanwhile, structuralists began to recognize that excessive and persistent inflation can jeopardize the desired structural transformations and development objectives, thereby requiring tighter fiscal and monetary measures to control it. Thus neither monetarist nor structuralist explanations are adequate by themselves and it is necessary to draw on both to explain and control inflation.

The neo-liberal counter-revolution and neo-structuralism

While structuralists were on the offensive in the 1950s and 1960s, the resurgence of neo-classical theory in the 1970s and 1980s turned the tables. Deepak Lal's fierce neo-liberal critique of structuralism and the 'poverty of development economics' (Lal, 1983) was countered by John Toye's structuralist critique of 'the counter-revolution' in development economics (Toye, 1993). In the ensuing debate, a neo-structuralist position began to emerge while, in turn, neo-liberals were influenced by structuralist ideas (although in ways not always intended by the contenders).

Turning first to developments in neo-liberalism, neo-liberals were influential in designing STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMMES (SAPs) which the INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (IMF) and the WORLD BANK recommended to governments in LDCs as a means of tackling the DEBT CRISIS. Their adoption of the term 'structural' could be taken to mean that neo-classical and neo-liberal adherents of SAPs have become structuralists of a sort. However, while the World Bank 'neo-liberal structuralists' have come to recognize the importance of structural factors in development, the reforms they advocate point in the opposite direction to those

proposed by structuralists. The neo-liberal structural changes entail rolling back the WELFARE STATE by radically reducing government expenditure (especially WELFARE expenditure), privatizing state enterprises, eliminating subsidies and protectionism, liberalizing markets, and switching from inward-oriented to outward-oriented development strategies so as to integrate LDCs even further into the world market. This paramount belief in the market mechanism clearly distinguishes neo-liberal structuralists from structuralism as understood here.

A second development in the 1980s concerns the espousal of a neo-liberal vision of a NEW WORLD ORDER in contrast to the NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER (NIEO) proposed by Prebisch and UNCTAD in the late 1960s and 1970s. Following Prebisch's structuralist analysis of a deterioration of the terms of trade, and the establishment of UNCTAD, the idea of reforming international trade and creating an NIEO took hold. But this NIEO never came about and UNCTAD's influence greatly declined during the neo-liberal 1980s. The neo-liberal world order promoted by the international financial institutions, the ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD) countries and the United States in particular, espouses EXPORT-LED GROWTH and EXPORT-ORIENTED INDUSTRIALIZATION (EOI), regarding these as superior to inward-oriented and ISI development policies.

A third development concerns the respective roles of the state and the market in development. Neo-structuralists have revised structuralism's earlier benign view of the state as rational, progressive and acting in the national interest with a more realistic view. While still favouring state intervention, neo-structuralists aim to 'get the balance right' between state and market (instead of just 'getting the prices right' as in the case of the neo-liberals). Neo-structuralists seek to stimulate a positive and dynamic interaction between state and market. Thus neo-structuralists have adopted a more 'market-friendly' position than 'orthodox structuralists' and have sought to remedy the lack of political analyses of the state.

Neo-liberals, by contrast, remain hostile to the state and trade unions, advocating PRIVATIZATION, LIBERALIZATION, DEREGULATION of the labour market and an ENTERPRISE CULTURE through private entrepreneurship. The state is seen as the source of most of the development problems in the LDCs. State interventionism or STATISM is said to have created distortions in the price mechanisms, which have resulted in the misallocation of productive resources and therefore lower rates of growth. The neo-liberal slogan is that, in an imperfect world, imperfect markets work far better than imperfect governments and planning.

A fourth development concerns the industrialization process in LDCs. Compared to the neo-classicals' earlier view that the LDCs' natural comparative advantage lay in the production and export of agricultural and mineral primary products, neo-liberals now contemplate the industrialization of some Third World countries. But the form of industrialization envisaged is of an export-oriented kind, being part of an export-led growth strategy. Undoubtedly the success of the South-East Asian NEWLY INDUSTRIALIZED COUNTRIES (NICs) played a part in changing their minds. However, the neo-liberals' explanation of the NICs' success as emanating from laissez-faire, the rejection of state intervention and an exclusively outward-oriented development policy has been fiercely contested.

Structuralists have also developed in their thinking. Although the neo-structuralists continue to favour 'development from within', they now more openly advocate the promotion of exports, particularly of industrial exports, and demand an end to the DCs' protectionism against the LDCs' exports. In this sense, the neo-structuralists are no longer trade pessimists. Rather they see the problem of industrialization as one of finding the right mix and sequencing of ISI and EOI.

To conclude, structuralism arose out of a critique of orthodox economic theory and, in particular, neo-classical theory. From the 1950s to the early 1970s, the structuralist paradigm exerted a major influence on Third World

governments. Although eclipsed in the 1970s and 1980s by the resurgence of neo-classical theory and neo-liberalism, structuralists remain unconvinced that neo-liberalism has the answer to the development problems of the Third World. The income gap between the North and the South has continued to widen, especially during the 'debt-ridden' decade of the 1980s. Only a few NICs have reduced the enormous gap in incomes with the DCs and they remain the exception that proves the rule. The NICs do not herald either 'the end of the Third World' or 'the disintegration of the Third World'. Furthermore, the essentially unequal nature of the world system continues to be reproduced. In this sense, structuralism has not been superseded, although it did not always get things right. Despite the neo-liberal critique, structuralism provides penetrating insights into the world economy, on which it is possible to build.

See also:

semi-periphery; structural change; Washington consensus; world-systems theory

References and further reading

- Chenery, H.B. (1975) 'The structuralist approach to development policy', *American Economic Review* 65, 2: 310–16. Economistic view which is narrower than the Latin American and institutional approaches to structuralism.
- Cox, R. (1981) 'Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10, 2: 126–55. Pioneering article which presents a structuralist approach to IPE by developing a critical theory of world order.
- Dietz, J.L. and Street, J.H. (eds) (1987) *Latin America's Economic Development: Institutional and Structuralist Perspectives*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. Comparison and exploration of the links between institutionalism and structuralism.
- Furtado, C. (1964) *Development and Underdevelopment: A Structural View of the Problems of Developed and Underdeveloped Countries*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Excellent example of structuralism at its best, written by a key contributor to the structuralist paradigm.
- Hettne, B. (1995) 'The international political economy of development', special issue of *The European Journal of Development Research* 7, 2: 223–32. Argues that a fusion between international political economy and development theory would benefit both disciplines and lead to a better understanding of the processes of globalization.
- Hirschman, A.O. (ed.) (1961) *Latin American Issues: Essays and Comments*, New York: Twentieth Century Fund. Discusses Latin American structuralism and 'ECLA's manifesto'.
- Hoogvelt, A. (1997) *Globalisation and the Postcolonial World*, Basingstoke and London: Macmillan. Adopts an IPE approach, much influenced by the work of Robert Cox, to the analysis of globalization and the developing world.
- Jones, R.J.B. (1995) *Globalisation and Interdependence in the International Political Economy: Rhetoric and Reality*, London: Pinter. One of the few major attempts to incorporate a structuralist approach into IPE.
- Lal, D. (1983) *The Poverty of 'Development Economics'*, London: Institute of Economic Affairs. Polemical and dogmatic attack on the largely structuralist strand within development economics by a neo-liberal economist.
- Palma, J.G. (1989) 'Structuralism', in J. Eatwell, M. Milgate and P. Newman (eds) *The New Palgrave Economic Development*, London: Macmillan. Concise and balanced overview of structuralism.
- Prebisch, R. (1950) *The Economic Development of Latin America and its Principal Problems*, New York: United Nations. Launched Latin American structuralism.
- Rodríguez, O. (1977) 'On the conception of the centre-periphery system', *CEPAL Review* 3: 195–239. Systematic and knowledgeable exposition and critique of Latin American structuralism.
- Seers, D. (1983) 'Structuralism vs monetarism

in Latin America: A reappraisal of a great debate, with lessons for Europe in the 1980s', in K. Jansen (ed.) *Monetarism, Economic Crisis and the Third World*, London: Frank Cass. Insider view of the structuralist–monetarist controversy by one of the pioneers of development economics who made a substantial contribution to structuralism.

Singer, H.W. (1950) 'The distribution of gains between investing and borrowing countries', *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 40, 2: 473–85. Classic article which, together with Prebisch (1950), launched the Prebisch–Singer hypothesis on the deterioration of the terms of trade.

Strange, S. (1988) *States and Markets*, London: Pinter. Engaging view of IPE in which various interlinked structures of power in the world economy are analysed in a novel framework.

Sunkel, O. (ed.) (1993) *Development from Within: Towards a Neoliberalist Approach for Latin America*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. Key collection on neo-structuralism, edited by one of the pioneers of structuralism.

Toye, J. (1993) *Dilemmas of Development: Reflections on the Counter-revolution in Development Economics*, 2nd edn, Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Vigorous counter-critique of the neo-liberal assault on development economics from a structuralist perspective.

Wallerstein, I. (1989) 'Periphery', in J. Eatwell, M. Milgate and P. Newman (eds) *The New Palgrave Economic Development*, London: Macmillan. Brief and insightful overview of the evolution and conceptual history of the term, written by one of the founders of world-systems theory.

CRISTÓBAL KAY

structuration

One of the primary foundations of structuration theory is the work of sociologist Anthony Giddens. Giddens (1981) argued against the structural determinism of conventional Marxist analysis and the individual voluntarism in

many strands of liberal theories (see LIBERALISM; MARXISM–LENINISM). The first reduced individual actions to epiphenomena of underlying structural conditions, which might even be hidden to the actors themselves. Individuals were considered to operate under false consciousness, incognizant of the deeper conditions that constrained and influenced their behaviour. Liberal theory, by contrast, paid insufficient attention to the constraints and opportunities which confronted individuals in particular historical settings. Individual actions and the aggregate effect of such outcomes could be fully understood by analysis of preferences and resulting behaviour. In Marxism, history was all reducible to structure; in liberalism, history was all agent-driven.

By contrast, Giddens argues, agents operate in structures which are often not of their own making, but they are not historical dupes. Agents in every structure have some latitude to choose alternative paths or policies. Such choices, while intelligible within an existing script, are not *a priori* predictable. Moreover, the very structure in which individual agents operate is itself continuously subject to reinterpretation and alteration. The aggregate effect of such behaviour constrains and influences agents' subsequent options and choices.

The structurationist view has had two main effects on the study of international relations (IR). In political economy, it has led to a move away from Marxist structuralist analysis (see STRUCTURALISM), as well as to a re-examination of how states and social actors create international economic patterns and configurations.

Structuration theory has also led to a critique of the neo-realist paradigm in IR. Neo-realism essentially posits the primacy of structure. Due to the ANARCHY of the international system, states (the agents in the international system) must necessarily rely on self-help and focus on their own survival. From a structurationist viewpoint, this privileges the international system and its architecture at the expense of individual state choice. That is, policies are fully understood as the inevitable