
Editorial

The contrasting cities of Bath and Swansea are alike in that each has a Centre for Development Studies within their respective universities.

The Centre for Development Studies at Bath is located in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, which also provides most of its members. The interests of the Centre, focused on the Third World, include the control of bureaucratic corruption (Leslie Palmier), development administration (Brian Smith), export income instabilities (Edward Horesh), human resources development (Erik Frank), natural disaster mitigation (James Lewis), rural development evaluation (John Pilgrim), settler economies (Paul Mosley), State and class (Geof Wood).

The Centre is concerned only with the research of its members. Most of them, however, are engaged in teaching the Diploma and M.Sc. in Development Studies offered by the School. This was launched in 1972-73 and has an annual intake of up to 20 students, the majority coming from developing countries. The course is distinguished by its even balance in the study of development between economics, politics and public administration, and sociology.

In Swansea, the new Centre for Development Studies (CDS) was established in 1976 and has just welcomed Charles Elliott as its first Professor of Development Policy and Planning. There is an academic staff of 11, nearly 100 overseas post-graduate students and a small but increasing number of British undergraduate students. Swansea offers a Master's course in Social Planning and a Diploma course in Social Policy and Administration. A new Diploma in Development Policy and Social Planning began in September 1977. Two new Master's courses, one in Regional Development Planning and the other in the Management of Social Services, will start in September 1978, and additional staff are to be recruited during 1978. There are also 3-month courses on Community Development (January to April), and Planning Services for Offenders (April to July). Current research projects in the Centre include Ray Bromley's study of policies towards urban informal service employment in Cali, Colombia, and Gavin Kitching's historical study of class formation in Kenya. Ray Bromley and Jim Whetton have been consulted on regional planning in Ecuador and children's services in

Jamaica respectively. A series of monographs and papers has recently begun (see page 16) with essays on rural inequality in East Africa, unbalanced urbanisation, the politics of development studies, urban poverty in Senegal and market place trade. John Latham and Leonard Mars (both contributors to this edition) are but two of around 30 non-CDS staff in the University College of Swansea who have some interest in development studies and the CDS hopes to play an increasing role as coordinator, especially between faculties.

Now to one or two of the issues raised in this guest issue of the *IDS Bulletin*. Paul Mosley indicates at least four ways of defining the informal sector and underlines the danger of formalising it by contributions of government aid. One might reply that formalisation is a small price to pay for employment and income gains by the poor, and formalisation, in the sense of an informal enterprise employing more people, may be less adverse in its effects than formalisation in the sense of bureaucratisation. Many 'informal' products in Nairobi and rural Rhodesia apparently have low income elasticities of demand and those with high elasticities are bought more by the rich, who might even be ultimate beneficiaries of aid to informal producers with rich customers. Aid to the informal sector must inevitably be selective and producers of commodities for which demand is declining or which are bought mainly by the rich could be given low priority. Aid might also include help in switching to production of more sophisticated goods and services for which demand is rising.

John Latham has found that between 1868 and 1914 Indian imports of British industrial goods, especially cotton cloth, fluctuated fairly closely with rice prices so that demand for industrial goods was high when rice fetched a good price. Many economic historians would apparently be surprised by this, but in countries where the number of food producers exceeds the number of food buyers and includes farmers whose incomes are high enough to allow them to buy industrial products, a positive relationship

between food prices and industrial demand would seem to follow. High food prices obviously need not be equated with high rural incomes. In addition, high food or other farm prices will not stimulate industrialisation if the main industrial inputs are food or other agricultural products. Latham seems to be arguing for high food prices as an anti-egalitarian measure which would stimulate industrial demand, when in fact high food prices would usually help equalise incomes and would be likely to increase agricultural investment and demand at the expense of industry, in the short-run.

Edward Horesh suggests that staple export products need not always generate further growth through linkages, and analyses the examples of cocoa and gold in Ghana.

Leslie Palmier considers the effect of corruption on development and *vice versa*. His discussion prompts several questions, including whether corruption is accepted more if economic development is sufficiently rapid to allow the nation to afford being 'creamed' in this way. Sociologists frequently point out that while corruption may help achieve results, goals can be achieved in other ways, some of which are more congenial to the majority. Economists need to study the price system of corruption and how the 'market rate' for various jobs, such as property registration or landing of contracts, or licences, is determined. The grey areas of 'semi-corruption' seem to be neglected, except by students of 'white-collar crime', as does the question of which social categories succumb most and why. Fluctuations in public attitudes to corruption also need to be studied more, as well as the effect of corruption on the political fortunes of parties and governments.

Centre for Development Studies
University College of Swansea
Singleton Park
Swansea SA2 8PP
Wales
UK

Leonard Mars describes some labour problems in the new port of Ashdod and how their settlement has involved national institutions, including Ministries and the multipurpose *Histraduth*.

Geof Wood argues that rural Bangladesh has a more complex class structure than descriptions of rural society in Comilla district suggest. Other areas (especially the north and west) have bigger landlords, more tenants and landless and, in addition, 'antediluvian' capital, accumulated through exchange (moneylending, trading and petty leasing), rather than through production. The author claims that capital in the sphere of agricultural production alone "would be consistent with the development of capitalist social relations" and that capital in the sphere of exchange distorts the pre-capitalist mode of production but "does not necessarily entail its substitution by a capitalist mode".

This account of the contents of this guest issue has been necessarily selective, as indeed has the issue itself. However, it is hoped that readers of the *IDS Bulletin* will gain some idea of the direction and scope of Development Studies at Swansea and Bath, and that an exchange of views can be generated. Pressure of space has prevented the inclusion of articles by Ian Jeffries on 'Increasing Heterodoxy in Soviet Development Economics'; Jim Whetton on 'Criminal Justice and the Community' and Mike Shepperdson on Michael Lipton's recent book, *Why Poor People Stay Poor*. Copies of these are available from CDS Swansea for 25p each.

L. P. and M. S.

Centre for Development Studies
University of Bath
Claverton Down
Bath BA2 7AY
Avon
UK